

# CHANCZ PROWESS

Sui Juris/Pro Se Advocate Division | Giving Back To The Community

ADDRESSING FALSE ADVERSE ACTION(S) LEVIED UPON RUTH HALL &  
CHANCZ PROWESS of SLANDER, DEFORMATION, FRAUD UPON THE COURT

---

Directly Slandering/Defaming Chancz Prowess- At no time during either  
Hearings did the Presiding Judge(s) of Delaware Court(s) nor the Defendant  
ever Affirm, Confirm or Ask if Chancz Prowess was 'ACTING' as an Attorney.

**LAW NOTE: ATTACHED AT BOTTOM-**

There is **NO SUCH THING** AS A LAW LICENSE!!!

**JUDGES ARE NOT THE COURT!!!**

Judges are Court Co-Workers, paid more to do more... Nothing Else!!!

**People v. Zajic, 88 Ill.App.3d 477, 410 N.E.2d 626 (1980).**

1 IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE  
2 **COURTESY NOTICE**  
3

4 **REDRESS TO MISREPRESENTATION OF PLAINTIFF RUTH**  
5 **HALLS’ UNDISPUTED AFFIDAVIT BACKED FACTS.**

6 A ‘DECLAARITORY JUDGMENT’ Complaint automatically requires an examination of  
7 the existence of an actionable contract to which, the Judge(s) of Delaware State Court(s) failed to do  
8 and thereby committed an automatic **SELF-EXECUTING RECUSAL VIOLATION. SEE:**  
9 **"Recusal under Section 455 of the Judicial Code is self-executing- "Recusal " Taylor v. O'Grady,**  
10 **888 F.2d 1189 (7th Cir. 1989)." Ignoring what constitutes an ACTIONABLE CONTRACT.** The  
11 Pre-existing Contractual Agreement between the Parties, Offered by the Defendant seeking to avoid  
12 complication known to Defendant (Breached by Defendant) converted this from an Injury Claim to a  
13 Debt Action – Offered by Defendant & Accepted (Conditionally) by Plaintiff Ruth Hall. Also, at no  
14 point after two hearing has the Presiding Judge(s) of Delaware State Court(s) nor the Defendant nor  
15 Counsel for Defendant ever Affirm, Confirm or Ask if Chancz Prowess was ‘ACTING’ as an Attorney.

12 **Ruth Hall**

C.A. No:N21C-06-066 MMJ

13 HEREAFTER KNOWN AS:  
14 PLAINTIFF(S)/AFFIANT(S)  
15 (Pro Se Litigant)

Civil Action No: \_\_\_\_\_

16 TRIAL BY JURY OF 12 DEMANDED

17 VS.

18 **Casino at Delaware Park (and/or assigns)**  
19 **William Rickman (Owner),**  
20 HEREAFTER COLLECTIVELY KNOWN AS:  
21 Defendant(s)/Respondent(s)/Respondent(s)

22 **TO:**  
23 Casino at Delaware Park (and/or assigns)  
24 **Casino at Delaware Park 777 Delaware Park Blvd Wilmington, DE 19804**

25 **PLEASE TAKE NOTE:** Question humbly asked of the Honorable Judge Mary M. Johnson. Is  
26 there a such thing as a Current Filing going on the Layaway Plan as not to be counted until some  
27 future Date.

1 IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE  
2  
3 **COURTESY NOTICE**

4 **REDRESS TO MISREPRESENTATION OF PLAINTIFF RUTH**  
5 **HALLS' UNDISPUTED AFFIDAVIT BACKED FACTS.**

6 A '**DECLARATORY JUDGMENT**' Complaint automatically requires an examination of  
7 the existence of an actionable contract to which, the Judge(s) of Delaware State Court(s) failed to do  
8 and thereby committed an automatic **SELF-EXECUTING RECUSAL VIOLATION. SEE:**  
9 **"Recusal under Section 455 of the Judicial Code is self-executing- "Recusal " Taylor v. O'Grady,**  
10 **888 F.2d 1189 (7th Cir. 1989)." Ignoring what constitutes an ACTIONABLE CONTRACT.** The  
11 Pre-existing Contractual Agreement between the Parties, Offered by the Defendant seeking to avoid  
12 complication known to Defendant (Breached by Defendant) converted this from an Injury Claim to a  
13 Debt Action – Offered by Defendant & Accepted (Conditionally) by Plaintiff Ruth Hall. Also, at no  
14 point after two hearing has the Presiding Judge(s) of Delaware State Court(s) nor the Defendant nor  
15 Counsel for Defendant ever Affirm, Confirm or Ask if Chancz Prowess was 'ACTING' as an Attorney.

12 **Ruth Hall**

C.A. No:N21C-06-066 MMJ

13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
HEREAFTER KNOWN AS:  
PLAINTIFF(S)/AFFIANT(S)  
(Pro Se Litigant)

Civil Action No: \_\_\_\_\_

TRIAL BY JURY OF 12 DEMANDED

VS.

**Casino at Delaware Park (and/or assigns)**  
**William Rickman (Owner),**  
HEREAFTER COLLECTIVELY KNOWN AS:  
Defendant(s)/Respondent(s)/Respondent(s)

---

21 **ORDER**

22  
23 AND NOW this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2023, upon consideration  
24 of all the facts within Plaintiff(s)/Affiant(s) RESPONSE

25 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT PLAINTIFF(S)/AFFIANT(S) Motion To Dismiss**  
26 **Defendants' Defense is GRANTED.**

27 **The Defendant(s) Defense is denied with extreme prejudice.**

28  
29 **J**

1                   **IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE**  
2  
3                                   **COURTESY NOTICE**

4                   **REDRESS TO MISREPRESTATION OF PLAINTIFF RUTH**  
5                   **HALLS' UNDISPUTED AFFIDAVIT BACKED FACTS.**

6                   A '**DECLAARITORY JUDGMENT**' Complaint automatically requires an examination of  
7 the existence of an actionable contract to which, the Judge(s) of Delaware State Court(s) failed to do  
8 and thereby committed an automatic **SELF-EXECUTING RECUSAL VIOLATION. SEE:**  
9 **"Recusal under Section 455 of the Judicial Code is self-executing- "Recusal " Taylor v. O'Grady,**  
10 **888 F.2d 1189 (7th Cir. 1989)." Ignoring what constitutes an ACTIONABLE CONTRACT.** The  
11 Pre-existing Contractual Agreement between the Parties, Offered by the Defendant seeking to avoid  
12 complication known to Defendant (Breachd by Defendant) converted this from an Injury Claim to a  
13 Debt Action – Offered by Defendant & Accepted (Conditionally) by Plaintiff Ruth Hall. Also, at no  
14 point after two hearing has the Presiding Judge(s) of Delaware State Court(s) nor the Defendant nor  
15 Counsel for Defendant ever Affirm, Confirm or Ask if Chancz Prowess was 'ACTING' as an Attorney.

16                   **Ruth Hall**

C.A. No:N21C-06-066 MMJ

17                   HEREAFTER KNOWN AS:  
18                   PLAINTIFF(S)/AFFIANT(S)  
19                   **(Pro Se Litigant)**

Civil Action No:\_\_\_\_\_

**TRIAL BY JURY OF 12 DEMANDED**

20  
21                                   **VS.**

22                   **Casino at Delaware Park (and/or assigns)**  
23                   **William Rickman (Owner),**

24                   HEREAFTER COLLECTIVELY KNOWN AS:  
25                   Defendant(s)/Respondent(s)/Respondent(s)

26                   **TO:**

27                   William Rickman (Owner),  
28                   **Casino at Delaware Park 777 Delaware Park Blvd Wilmington, DE 19804**

# PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

This was an Extremely Easy Case for Plaintiff to be deemed the Prevailing Party.

Redress For Online Submission that have posted Slander & Deformation.

## **STIPULATED AS FACT:**

The Judge(s) or the Delaware State Court(s) ignores that an AFFIDAVIT BACKED COMPLAINT can only be Answered by an AFFIDAVIT BACK DEFENSE. The SUMMONS (Created verbatim from Delaware Forms) relieves a Judge from the Intentional or Unintentional Error in or Abuse of Discretion, Discernment or any other Judicial Error when it states the **Consequences** for a Defendant who FAILS to attach an AFFIDAVIT Backed Defense to an Affidavit Backed COMPLAINT. Absent FRAUD UPON THE COURT Plaintiff Ruth Halls Prevails. Any Published Assertion to the Contrary are FRAULENT.

1           **Fully Addressing Self-Evident Surgical,**  
2 **Deliberate, Misrepresentations and Selective**  
3 **Recognition of the Facts.**  
4

5           Plaintiff Ruth Hall entered her Complaint as a DECLARATORY  
6 JUDGEMENT. Entered as such because the Dispute had already been  
7 Contractually settled between the Parties. The case was only docketed because the  
8 Defendant (after covering it from an Injury Matter To a Debt Action) breached the  
9 agreement. By Law, the Judge(s) of Delaware State Court(s) only had Jurisdiction  
10 to, first- Examine to see if Plaintiffs' Undisputed Contractual Agreement  
11 Constituted being an Actionable Contractual Agreement. They Failed!!!

12           By the Judge(s) of Delaware State Court(s) failing to do this standard simple  
13 action then, the Presiding Judge(s) of Delaware State Court(s) committed an  
14 automatic **SELF EXECUTING RECUSAL VIOLATION** as of the September  
15 15th 2021 Motion hearing thereby making all Orders & Rulings from then forward-  
16 Null, Void and without Legal Effect. **SEE: "Recusal under Section 455 of the**  
17 **Judicial Code is self-executing- "Recusal " Taylor v. O'Grady, 888 F.2d 1189 (7th**  
18 **Cir. 1989)." Ignoring what constitutes an ACTIONABLE CONTRACT.**

19           NOTE- The Pre-existing Contractual Agreement between the Parties was  
20 verbally Offered by the Defendant (seeking to avoid complications known to  
21 Defendant) who converted this matter from an Injury Claim to a Debt Action.

22           Once completed the Defendant cut off all communications giving rise to the  
23 Defendants' Offer to covert it to a Debt Action as Deception. Initiated Offer(s) by  
24 Defendant were Accepted (Conditionally) by Plaintiff Ruth Hall. However,  
25 Defendant didn't expect Plaintiff Ruth Hall to secure her acceptance Backed By an  
26 Affidavit Backed Reply... To which, the Defendant elected to Willingly or by  
27 Default- ACCEPTED!!! The Judge(s) of Delaware State Court(s) had a Duty to  
28 examine what Constituted an Actionable Contract before doing anything else-  
29 Failed and now further engages in FRAUD UPON THE COURT and the PUBLIC  
30 with Selective Recognition of the Actual Actionable Fact(s).  
31

## JUDICIAL FRAUD UPON THE COURT

1  
2  
3 You are hereby being told that you are publishing Slander  
4 & Deformation. You are hereby being told that, the above  
5 captioned complaint was filed with an Affidavit Attached. By  
6  
7 Rule & By Law, only an Affidavit can Answer and Affidavit.  
8  
9 Plaintiff Ruth Hall Instantly prevailed due to Noncompliance to  
10 the SUMMON and Well Settled Facts as to failing to properly  
11 respond to Affidavit. Absent Judicial Aiding & Abetting,  
12  
13 Plaintiff Ruth Hall is rightfully the Prevailing Party. Now that  
14  
15 you've been given the FACTS TO CHECK, you are to remove  
16  
17 your Slanderous Online Presentment that's a  
18  
19 misrepresentation of the Facts.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

1           **JUDICIAL FRAUD UPON THE COURT FIRMLY**  
2 **ESTABLISH**

3 1.

4           Judicial Self Executing Recusal Violation.

5 This was a Declaratory Judgment Complaint. (Judge(s) only  
6 had Jurisdiction to examine Contractual Authentication over an  
7 already Contractually Settled Dispute that was settle long  
before time concern become a factor.

8           NOTE: The Law dos not demand that you can only use  
9 the Courts to settle matters... before a breach occurs in order  
10 to satisfy timelines.

11           The current or future Judge(s) that also Fail to observe  
12 this Genuine Issue are also immediately disallowed to rule on  
the above Captioned Complaint.

13 **Plaintiff Ruth Hall 'INVOKES' Federal Based Remedy to**  
14 **regain Due Process rights.** NOTE: Where there is confuse  
15 over procedure, Federal Rule, Under the Supremacy Clause  
16 comes into effect. This affords Ruth Hall Justice over and  
17 above the Games Played against Plaintiff Ruth Hall in the  
18 above Captioned Complaint.

19           **SELF EXECUTING VIOLATION**  
20 **EXPLAINED:**

21           *"Recusal under Section 455 of the Judicial Code*  
22 *is self-executing- "Recusal " Taylor v. O'Grady,*  
23 *888 F.2d 1189 (7th Cir. 1989)." Ignoring what*  
24 *constitutes an ACTIONABLE CONTRACT.*



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

2.

This Complaint required the Judge(s) of the State of Delaware to Examine for the existence of valid Contracts. The Judge(s) committed a Self Executing Violation by not checking for Plaintiff Ruth Halls' preexisting Affidavit Backed Proof of a Contractual Agreement between the Parties... that the Defendant Breached.

3.

A Complaint that was Backed by an Affidavit, under the Penalty of Perjury, whereby Plaintiff Ruth Hall Conditionally Accepted the Defendants' Offer, thereby, moving this from an Injury Claim to a Breached Debt Collection Action.

4.

A Complaint that, as stated in the SUMMONS; could only be answered by an Affidavit Backed Defense  
It's An Already Contractually Settled Complaint

5.

The office of the Clerk/Prothonotary (a group of clerks, to be exact) along with Plaintiff Ruth Hall, witnessed by Chancz Prowess all got together. It was determined that the Office of the Clerk Overlooked that the Defendants' motion was Defective, lacking the required attachment of an Affidavit.

1 6.

2 Clerk/Prothonotary Error followed by Judicial Malpractice-

3  
4 The Presiding Judge(s), offering no basis to accept the  
5 defective defense merely told the office of the clerk to allow  
6 Defendants' Noncompliant, Defective Complaint, disregarding  
7 the SUMMONS command that Plaintiff prevails absent an  
8 Affidavit Backed Defense to answer Plaintiff Ruth Halls'  
9 Affidavit Backed Complaint  
10  
11  
12

13  
14 7

15 Upon a simple examination of the docketed record, **'AT**  
16 **NO POINT'** after two hearing has the Presiding Judge(s) of  
17 Delaware State Court(s) nor the Defendant nor Counsel for  
18 Defendant ever Affirm, Confirm or Ask if Chancz Prowess was  
19 'ACTING' as an Attorney.  
20  
21  
22

23 **The above Captioned Dispute was Contractually**  
24 **settled between the Parties. Like a true Plutocrat, the**  
25 **Defendants' Objection is only that, Plaintiff Ruth Hall was**  
26 **smart enough to understand OFFER & ACCEPTANCE and**  
27 **did Accept (Conditionally) the Defendants' Offer to settle).**  
28  
29  
30  
31

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

# **STATEMENT OF THE FACTS**

---

**STIPULATED and AFFIDAVIT BACKED  
as being the only truth in the above  
CAPTIONED COMPLAINT**

---

**MAJOR ACT(S) OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT/PUBLIC  
EXISTS IN THE ABOVE CAPTIONED CASE**

**VIOLATION WERE COMMITTED and/or ASSISTED BY:**

- a). Office of the Clerk/Prothonotary
- b). The Judge(s) of the Delaware State Court(s)
- c). Counsel for Defendant

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

**A.**

**JUDGE(S).**

- Self Recused Judge(s)
- Acting where no Subject Matter Jurisdiction Existed

**B.**

**DEFENDANT(S)**

- Defense Lacked the Required Affidavit required to speak to an Affidavit Backed Complaint.
- The SUMMONS specifically Commanded that only an Affidavit could respond to Plaintiff.

**(Yes- Redundancy Is 100% Necessary)**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

C.

## The Law on how Affidavits Are To Be Addresses/Respected

Based on the SUMMONS or in GENERAL, here's how Plaintiff Ruth Halls' Affidavits were to be address (In Plaintiff Ruth Halls' Favor)

"Allegations in affidavit in support of motions must be considered as true in absence of counter-affidavit."  
[Group v Finletter, 108 F. Supp. 327 Federal case of Group v Finletter, 108 F. Supp. 327]

Tweel, (1977) 550 F 2d 297. The STATE must speak or by default uphold as true the allegations of the party the STATE fails to respond to.

Affidavit uncontested unrebutted unanswred  
Morris vs. NCR, 44 SW2d 433 Morris v National Cash Register, 44 SW2d 433: "An Affidavit if not contested in a **timely manner** is considered undisputed facts as a **matter of law.**""

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

D.

## **An Appeal Isn't the Only Remedy to address Fraud Upon The Court.**

1. There was Unanswered Motions that prevented the Appeals Stage to begin

2. **By Law Plaintiff Ruth Hall is allowed to attack the Fraud Upon The Court, pursuant to-**

Long v. Shorebank Development Corp., 182 F.3d 548 (C.A. 7 Ill. 1999). Orders PROCURED BY FRAUD can be attacked **at any time, in any court, either directly or collaterally.**

" Kenner v. C.I.R., 387 F.3d 689 (1968); 7 Moore's Federal Practice, 2d ed., p. 512, ¶ 60.23. The 7th Circuit further stated "**a decision produced by fraud upon the court is not in essence a decision at all, and never becomes final.**"

1 **E.**  
2 **MALPRACTICE IN THE APPLICATION OF**  
3 **WELL SETTLED LAW.**  
4

5  
6 By Law, only an Affidavit can answer an Affidavit.  
7 (It's well settle law as to how Affidavit are to be addressed)

8 Plaintiff Ruth Hall Filed an Affidavit Backed 'DECLARATORY  
9 JUDGMENT' Complaint .

10 1).

11 The SUMMONS warned Defendant that, Plaintiff would prevail  
12 absent an Affidavit backed response to an Affidavit Filed  
13 Complaint

14 2).

15 Defendant Didn't Attach an Affidavit to their Defense... Judicially  
16 Supported.  
17

18 3).

19 On the Genuine Issue of there being a verbal agreement  
20 between the parties in addition to Plaintiff Ruth Halls' Affidavit  
21 Backed Reply to the Defendants OFFER tied to the verbal  
22 communication that helped the Defendant with moving it from a  
23 Injury Claim to a Debt Matter that they would pay off- Defendant  
24 was Allowed to ignored the Required Answer to the Question of  
25 their being an Agreement Between the Parties  
26  
27  
28  
29

# MAJOR FAILURE(S) BY THE JUDGE(S)

The Presiding Judge(s) of the Delaware State Court(s) had to Answer these allegations Raise by Plaintiff Ruth Hall and Didn't. Therefore, by law, Plaintiff Ruth Hall Prevailed on Judicial Negligence in addition to the rightness of Plaintiff Ruth Halls Complaint.

'**When the States does not respond** to a petitioner's allegations, the unrefuted statement of facts **must** be taken as true.' ”), quoting Smith v. State, 581 So.2d 1283, 1284 (Ala.Crim.App.1991).

and

Tweel, (1977) 550 F 2d 297. **The STATE must speak** or by default uphold as true the allegations of the party the STATE fails to respond to.

Also,

## **ESTOPPEL BY SILENCE.**

Estoppel by Silence “arises where a person is under a duty to another to speak or failure to speak is inconsistent with honest dealings,” as stated in the case of In Re McArdles Estate, 250 NYS 276, 287... “Silence can only be equated with fraud where there is a legal or moral duty to speak, or when an inquiry left unanswered would be intentionally misleading” US v Tweel, (1977) 550 F 2d 297.



## **GROUNDNS FOR UPCOMING ACTION**

1  
2  
3 (a). FRAUD UPON THE COURT,

4  
5 (b). JUDICIAL MALPRACTICE,

6  
7 (c). CONTEMPT OF COURT PROCEDURES,

8  
9 (d). AIDING & ABETTING

10  
11 (e). JUDICIAL PARTIALITY,

12  
13 (f). ACTING WHERE NO SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION  
14 EXISTED,

15  
16 (g). REJECTING RECUSAL AFTER PROOF & A CHALLENGE  
17 OF PARTIALITY WAS MADE,

18  
19 (h). GROSS NEGLIGENCE,

20  
21 (i). INTENTIONAL INFLICTION OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS

22  
23 (j). SLANDER,

24  
25 (k). DEFORMATION OF CHARACTER,

26  
27 (l). FRUAD IN GENERAL,

28  
29 (m). CREATING and/or PARTICIPATING IN A KANGAROO  
30 COURT. Producing ORDERS/RULINGS USING  
31 NONCOMPLIANT LEGAL INSTRUMENTS AND ACTIONS  
FOR THOSE LISTED IN THE ABOVE CAPTIONED  
COMPLAINT IN OPPOSITION TO THE COMPLAINT.

# ARGUMENT:

This was a Pre-existing Contractual Agreement between the Parties, Offered by the Defendant seeking to avoid complication know to Defendant (Breached by Defendant) converted this from an Injury Claim to a Debt Action – Offered by Defendant & Accepted (Conditionally) by Plaintiff Ruth Hall

**FRAUD UPON THE COURT** is the correct charge based on the facts in the above Captioned Complaint because beyond the concerns of Plaintiff Ruth Hall the entire court process was corrupted.

**SEE:** Bulloch v. United States, 763 F.2d 1115, 1121 (10th Cir. 1985), the court stated

*"Fraud upon the court is fraud which is directed to the judicial machinery itself and is not fraud between the parties or fraudulent documents, false statements or perjury. ... It is where the court or a member is corrupted or influenced or influence is attempted or **where the judge has not performed his judicial function** --- thus where the impartial functions of the court have been directly corrupted."*

THE QUESTION of FRAUD UPON THE COURT '**MUST BE SPECIFICALLY & COMPLETELY ANSWERED**' IN ORDER TO RENDER THIS MATTER AS COMPLETELY **FINALIZED**.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

**SEE: United States v. Kis---**

"a decision **produced** by **fraud upon the court** **NEVER BECOME FINAL**. "Kenner v. C.I.R., 387 F.3d 689 (1968); 7 Moore's Federal Practice, 2d ed., p. 512, ¶ 60.23. "*a decision produced by fraud upon the court is not in essence a decision at all, and never becomes final.*"

"...it is the function of the citizen to keep the Government from falling into error." American Communications Ass'n v. Douds, 339 U.S. 382; 70 S.Ct. 674 (1950).

# CAUTION TO ALL JUDGES

Again, the Judge(s) of the Court(s) are "NOT" the Court  
People v. Zajic, 88 Ill.App.3d 477, 410 N.E.2d 626 (1980.)

And, a properly functioning 'Court' with the Judge(s)  
of the Court(s) acting under their Oath(s) Of Office  
would have taken action by now against the  
Defendant(s)/Respondent(s) and their negligence.

This is being pointed out because-

"...it is the function of the citizen to keep the Government from falling into  
error." American Communications Ass'n v. Douds, 339 U.S. 382; 70 S.Ct. 674  
(1950).

Willful Contempt of the Court(s) is what the actions of the  
Defendant(s)/Respondent(s) amounts to.

Judges must satisfy the APPEARANCE OF JUSTICE.

Supreme Court Ruling, SEE: Levine v. United States, 362 U.S. 610, 80  
S.Ct. 1038 (1960), citing Offutt v. United States, 348 U.S. 11, 14, 75  
S.Ct. 11, 13 (1954).

1                   **CONSEQUENCES THE JUDGE(S) of the COURT(S)**  
2                   **FOR ACTING WHERE NO JURISDICTION EXISTS**

3  
4                   **TREASON.**

5                   (Being Factual, not overly dramatic)

6                   Ruling on a case where there is a **LACK OF SUBJECT**  
7                   **MATTER JURISDICTION** is an act of treason. SEE ATTACHED  
8                   MEMORANDUM(S). Judges and Attorneys who do not report actions  
9                   that constitute treason as required by law may... ..., 18 U.S.C.  
10                  Section 2382.

11  
12                  **Also, No Immunity From Law Suits**

13                  **SEE: Uniform Bonding Code 5.4**

14                  **For Judges and 5.4 (1, i) for LEGAL COUNSEL.**

15  
16                  The U.S. Supreme Court, in Scheuer v. Rhodes, 416 U.S. 232,  
17                  94 S. Ct. 1687 (1974) stated that "when a state officer acts under  
18                  the state law **in a manner** violative of the Federal Constitution, he  
19                  "comes into conflict with the superior authority of that Constitution,  
20                  and he is in that case **stripped** of his official of  
21                  Representative **character** and is subjected in his person to the  
22                  consequences of his individual conduct. The **State has no power**  
23                  **to impart to him any immunity** from responsibility to the  
24                  supreme authority of the United States." [Emphasis supplied in  
25                  original] By law, a judge is a state officer. The judge then acts not  
26                  as a judge, but as a private individual (in his person)  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

1        **CAUTION TO SITES THAT HAVE PUBLISHHED**  
2        **UNRESEARCHED VERSIONS OF THE ABOVE COMPLAINT —**  
3

4  
5        That the Defendant has been allowed an Obvious Defective  
6        Plead(s) in order to Prevail and that you Publish the Opinions,  
7        Rulings, Orders or anything else other than the Plaintiff Ruth Hall  
8        Prevailing then, you are now deemed be engaged in Slander &  
9        Deformation of Plaintiff Ruth Hall too.  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

# MEMORANDUM:

## MERIT:

Prima Facie- Indeed, no more than affidavits is necessary to make the prima facie case. [United States v. Kis, 658 F.2d 526, 536 (7th Cir. 1981); Cert. Denied, 50 U.S. L. W. 2169; S. Ct. March 22, 1982]

### Default Judgment. (1) By the Clerk.

In the above Captioned Case the Judge(s) of the State Court(s) committed a Self Executing Recusal Violation. With no other Judge correctly examining Plaintiff Ruth Halls' Affidavit Backed Complaint for what Constituted an Actionable Contract that the Defendant Breach then, the following Rule is invoked to bring about Remedy and Plaintiff Ruth Halls' Due Process Rights as to bring this case to a conclusion:

The Office of the Clerk/Prothonotary pursuant to- **Federal Rule 55. Default; Default Judgment.** (b) Entering a Default Judgment. (1) By the Clerk., this rule governs the use of the Clerk/Prothonotary to execute a Default Judgment

The Violation the Judge(s) of the Court(s) violated was pursuant to-

FEDERAL RULES(S) ARE PROPERLY INVOKED IN STATE MATTERS especially where there exists **conflicting actions** (or, as in this case- 'NO ACTION') on how matters pertaining to justice and/or how laws are to be addressed so as to leave no room for hesitant or conflicting approaches.

1 **If there is no replacement JUDGE to complete the proper**  
2 **functions of the COURT** as asserted by Plaintiff(s)/Affiant(s) in the  
3 above Captioned Complaint and, no other Judge introduces  
4 themselves to reposition the COURT to function properly,  
5 Plaintiff(s)/Affiant(s) is afforded the ability to apply known Remedy.  
6 Plaintiff(s)/Affiant(s)' remedy selection is the use of the Federal  
7 **SUPREMACY CLAUSE.**

8 **SUPREMACY CLAUSE.**

9 The supremacy clause contains **Doctrine of Pre-emption** which  
10 says the use of federal laws/government wins over any STATE  
11 **LAWS and ends conflicts based on the Federal Law.**

12 Plaintiff(s)/Affiant(s) invokes in enjoys the use of the Supremacy  
13 Clause when **Federal Rule 55. Default; Default Judgment. (b)**  
14 **Entering a Default Judgment. (1) By the Clerk.,** was applied to  
15 the above Captioned Complaint to protect and enforce  
16 Plaintiff(s)/Affiant(s) claim **Rule of the Doctrine of Pre-emption -**  
17 **Article VI** is protection against all confusion and WHERE/WHEN  
18 APPLIED the use of FEDERAL LAWS to SUPERSEDE State laws where  
19 State Laws.

20 **The Office of the Clerk/Prothonotary must remember:**

21 **Judge(s) of the Court(s) are "NOT' the Court.** People v.  
22 Zajic, 88 Ill.App.3d 477, 410 N.E.2d 626 (1980).).

23 The Office of the Clerk/Prothonotary is sworn to Protect the  
24 COURT not misguided Judge(s) of the Court(s) in opposition to this  
25 **uncommon but correctly used Black African American Justice**  
26 **Enforcement Action.**



1 It's now moving towards being the Tort Claim- Act  
2  
3 (TCA) because Defendant prevailed by means of Fraud Upon The  
4 Court assisted by Sworn Officers of the Court(s).

5  
6 **No matter the wait--- Properly executed, Undisputed, Indisputable**  
7 **'Affidavits' have a 100% Win Rate. The Hall Family 'WILL' Prevail!!!**

## 9 **CONCLUSION:**

10  
11 Default Judgment favoring Plaintiff(s)/Affiant(s) is the action a  
12 properly functioning by the Judge(s) of the Court(s) operating under  
13 the Oath(s) of Office.

- 14 • **This is an ALREADY SETTLED MATTER; evidenced by Affidavit(s).**
- 15 • **Being an already Settled matter, it's a Debt Collection Action!!!**

16 (No matter a Debt is called before the Breach, it's can and is deemed a Debt Collection Action after.)

17 • **Twice, Defendant(s) elected to ignore Affidavits/Summons**  
18 **Defendant(s)/Respondent(s)' own negligence** either  
19 willingly or by default are 'BOUND' to the Written and/or Verbal  
20 **Affidavit Backed Counter-Offer**, TERMS & CONDITIONS stated  
21 within the Offered & Accepted Contractual Agreement between the  
22 two parties.

23 Defendant(s)/Respondent(s) WILLINGLY or by DEFAULT  
24 BREACHED THE CONTRACTUAL AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE  
25 PARTIES. Plaintiff(s)/Affiant(s) seeks FULL RECOVERY.

26  
27  
28 **2023 ENFORCEMENT TYPE:**

29 **ADMINISTRATIVE BLACK AFRICAN AMERICAN JUSTICE ENFORCEMENT ACTION**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

# EXHIBITS

---

**All Judicial Surgical Misrepresentation and Selective Recognition of the Facts are Visibly Exposed Here. Starting with Delaware Court Templates Plaintiff Ruth Hall Used that Properly Had to state actionable grounds for relief before being logged into the Court System... And More.**

**The Judge(s) of the Delaware State Court(s) are Exposed as Lying Under Oath, displaying Actions that gives rise to Aiding & Abetting the Defendant whenever possible. And, Absent saying- Plaintiff Ruth Halls' Complaint is Rule on With Prejudice then, how does the Court Command other co-workers not to accept Plaintiff Ruth Halls' right to Attach Fraud Upon The Court?**

**SEE A, B, C...  
DIRECT COURT 'PICTURE BASED' TEMPLATES  
REPLICATED & USED BY PLAINTIFF RUTH HALL:**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

# EXHIBIT

# A

## **Exhibit a1. THE JUDGE(S)**

### Judicial Deceit In Deciding This Case

Ground For Relief Had To be based on Delaware Coding which, was: CDEJ based on Break of Contract.

**A Mandatory Examination was required first!!!**

## **Exhibit a2. THE PLAINTIFF**

### What Was Actually Submitted By Plaintiff Ruth Hall

GROUND: Properly Docketed under Delaware CODE- **CDEJ** with the Request For An Examination of the already Settle Pre-Existing Contract Between the Parties to affirm 1. That an Authentic Contract Existed and the 2. The Defendant Breach It. This approach give two bite at Justice in case of anticipated FRAUD UPON THE COURT in protection of the Defendant

**Can't Make a Mistake on Grounds For Relief – It's Coded and won't enter otherwise**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

# **Exhibit a1. THE JUDGE(S)**

## **Judicial Deceit In Deciding This Case**

Ground For Relief Had To be based on Delaware Coding which, was: CDEJ based on Break of Contract.

**A Mandatory Examination was required first!!!**

**SEE:**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

**SUPERIOR COURT  
CIVIL CASE INFORMATION STATEMENT (CIS)**

COUNTY: N K S CIVIL ACTION NUMBER: \_\_\_\_\_

Caption: _____ _____ _____ _____ _____	Civil Case Code: _____
	Civil Case Type: _____ <small>(SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR CODE AND TYPE)</small>
	MANDATORY NON-BINDING ARBITRATION (MNA) _____
	Name and Status of Party filing document: _____
	Document Type: (E.G.; COMPLAINT; ANSWER WITH COUNTERCLAIM) _____
	JURY DEMAND: YES _____ NO _____

ATTORNEY NAME(S): _____ ATTORNEY ID(S): _____ FIRM NAME: _____ ADDRESS: _____ _____ TELEPHONE NUMBER: _____ FAX NUMBER: _____ E-MAIL ADDRESS: _____ _____	IDENTIFY ANY RELATED CASES NOW PENDING IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OR ANY RELATED CASES THAT HAVE BEEN CLOSED IN THIS COURT WITHIN THE LAST TWO YEARS BY CAPTION AND CIVIL ACTION NUMBER INCLUDING JUDGE'S INITIALS: _____ _____ EXPLAIN THE RELATIONSHIP(S): _____ _____ _____ OTHER UNUSUAL ISSUES THAT AFFECT CASE MANAGEMENT: _____ _____ _____ (IF ADDITIONAL SPACE IS NEEDED, PLEASE ATTACH PAGE)
--	--

--	--

**THE PROTHONOTARY WILL NOT PROCESS THE COMPLAINT, ANSWER, OR FIRST RESPONSIVE PLEADING IN THIS MATTER FOR SERVICE UNTIL THE CASE INFORMATION STATEMENT (CIS) IS FILED. THE FAILURE TO FILE THE CIS AND HAVE THE PLEADING PROCESSED FOR SERVICE MAY RESULT IN THE DISMISSAL OF THE COMPLAINT OR MAY RESULT IN THE ANSWER OR FIRST RESPONSIVE PLEADING BEING STRICKEN.**

Revised 01/2019

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

# Exhibit a2. THE PLAINTIFF

## What Was Actually Submitted By Plaintiff Ruth Hall

GROUND: Properly Docketed under Delaware CODE- **CDEJ** with the Request For An Examination of the already Settle Pre-Existing Contract Between the Parties to affirm 1. That an Authentic Contract Existed and the 2. The Defendant Breach It. This approach give two bite at Justice in case of anticipated FRAUD UPON THE COURT in protection of the Defendant

**SEE:**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

**SUPERIOR COURT  
CIVIL CASE INFORMATION STATEMENT (CIS)**

COUNTY: **N** K S CIVIL ACTION NUMBER: \_\_\_\_\_

Caption: <b>Ruth Hall</b> <hr/> <b>v.</b> <hr/> <b>Casino at Delaware Park,</b> <hr/> <b>William Rickman (Owner)</b> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/>	Civil Case Code: <u>CDEJ</u> Civil Case Type: <u>Declaratory Judgment Request (due to Breach of Agreement)</u> MANDATORY NON-BINDING ARBITRATION (MNA) _____ Name and Status of Party filing document: <u>Ruth Hall - Pro Se Plaintiff(s)/Affiant(s)</u> Document Type: (E.G.; COMPLAINT; ANSWER WITH COUNTERCLAIM) <b>COMPLAINT</b> JURY DEMAND: YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>
---	--

ATTORNEY NAME(S): <hr/> ATTORNEY ID(S): <hr/> FIRM NAME: <b>Ruth Hall</b> ADDRESS: _____ _____ TELEPHONE NUMBER: _____ FAX NUMBER: <b>REDACTED</b> E-MAIL ADDRESS: _____ <hr/>	IDENTIFY ANY RELATED CASES NOW PENDING IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OR ANY RELATED CASES THAT HAVE BEEN CLOSED IN THIS COURT WITHIN THE LAST TWO YEARS BY CAPTION AND CIVIL ACTION NUMBER INCLUDING JUDGE'S INITIALS: <hr/> <hr/> EXPLAIN THE RELATIONSHIP(S): <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> OTHER UNUSUAL ISSUES THAT AFFECT CASE MANAGEMENT: <hr/> <hr/> (IF ADDITIONAL SPACE IS NEEDED, PLEASE ATTACH PAGE)
---	---

THE PROTHONOTARY WILL NOT PROCESS THE COMPLAINT, ANSWER, OR FIRST RESPONSIVE PLEADING IN THIS MATTER FOR SERVICE UNTIL THE CASE INFORMATION STATEMENT (CIS) IS FILED. THE FAILURE TO FILE THE CIS AND HAVE THE PLEADING PROCESSED FOR SERVICE MAY RESULT IN THE DISMISSAL OF THE COMPLAINT OR MAY RESULT IN THE ANSWER OR FIRST RESPONSIVE PLEADING BEING STRICKEN.

Revised 01/2019

**SUPERIOR COURT CIVIL CASE INFORMATION STATEMENT (CIS)  
INSTRUCTIONS**

**CIVIL CASE TYPE**

Please select the appropriate civil case code and case type (e.g., **CODE - AADM** and **TYPE - Administrative Agency**) from the list below. Enter this information in the designated spaces on the Case Information Statement.

<p><b>APPEALS</b>  AADM - Administrative Agency  ACER - Certiorari  ACCP - Court of Common Pleas  AIAB - Industrial Accident Board  APSC - Public Service Commission  AUIB - Unemployment Insurance Appeal Board</p> <p><b>COMPLAINTS</b>  CABT - Abatement  CASB - Asbestos  CAAA - Auto Arb Appeal  CMIS - Civil Miscellaneous  CACT - Class Action  CCON - Condemnation  CCLD - Complex Commercial Litigation Division <b>(NCC ONLY)</b>  CDBT - Debt/Breach of Contract  CDEJ - Declaratory Judgment  CDEF - Defamation  CEJM - Ejectment  CATT - Foreign &amp; Domestic Attachment  CFJG - Foreign Judgment  CFRD - Fraud Enforcement  CINT - Interpleader  CLEM - Lemon Law  CLIB - Libel  CMAL - Malpractice  CMED - Medical Malpractice  CPIN - Personal Injury  CPIA - Personal Injury Auto  CPRL - Products Liability  CPRD - Property Damage  CRPV - Replevin  CSPD - Summary Proceedings Dispute  CCCP - Transfer from CCP  CCHA - Transfer from Chancery</p> <p><b>MASS TORT</b>  CABL - Abilify Cases  CBEN - Benzene Cases  CFAR - Farxiga Cases  CHON - Honeywell Cases  CMON - Monsanto Cases  CPEL - Pelvic Mesh Cases  CPLX - Plavix Cases  CPPI - PPI Cases  CTAL - Talc Cases  CTAX - Taxotere Cases  CXAR - Xarelto Cases</p> <p><b>INVOLUNTARY COMMITMENTS</b>  INVC- Involuntary Commitment</p>	<p><b>MISCELLANEOUS</b>  MAGM - AG Motion - Civil/Criminal Investigations *  MADB - Appeal from Disability Board *  MAFF - Application for Forfeiture  MAAT - Appointment of Attorney  MGAR - Appointment of Guardianship  MCED - Cease and Desist Order  MCON - Civil Contempt/Capias  MCVP - Civil Penalty  MSOJ - Compel Satisfaction of Judgment  MSAM - Compel Satisfaction of Mortgage  MCTO - Consent Order  MIND - Destruction of Indicia of Arrest *  MESP - Excess Sheriff Proceeds  MHAC - Habeas Corpus  MTOX - Hazardous Substance Cleanup  MFOR - Intercept of Forfeited Money  MISS - Issuance of Subpoena  MLEX - Lien Extension  MMAN - Mandamus  MWIT - Material Witness *  MWOT - Material Witness - Out of State  MRAT - Motion for Risk Assessment  MROP - Petition for Return of Property  MCRO - Petition Requesting Order  MROD - Road Resolution  MSEL - Sell Real Estate for Property Tax  MSEM - Set Aside Satisfaction of Mortgage  MSSS - Set Aside Sheriff's Sale  MSET - Structured Settlement  MTAX - Tax Ditches  MREF - Tax Intercept  MLAG - Tax Lagoons  MVAC - Vacate Public Road  MPOS - Writ of Possession  MPRO - Writ of Prohibition</p> <p><b>MORTGAGES</b>  MCOM - Mortgage Commercial  MMED - Mortgage Mediation  MORT - Mortgage Non-Mediation (Res.)</p> <p><b>MECHANICS LIENS</b>  LIEN - Mechanics Lien</p>
---	---

\* Not eFiled

**DUTY OF THE PLAINTIFF**

Each plaintiff/counsel shall complete the attached Civil Case Information Statement (CIS) and file with the complaint.

**DUTY OF THE DEFENDANT**

Each defendant/counsel shall complete the attached Civil Case Information Statement (CIS) and file with the answer and/or first responsive pleading.

Revised 10/2019



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

# EXHIBIT

# B

## **Exhibit b1. THE JUDGE(S)**

### Judicial SUMMONS Negligence

Deliberate Acceptance of a Defective Submission

HERE'S THE COURTS TEMPLATE REGARDING ANSWERING  
AN AFFIDAVIT BACKED COMPLAINT DIFFERENTLY THAN A  
NON-AFFIDAVIT BACKED COMPLAINT

Deliberate Judicial FRAUD UPON THE COURT!!!

## **Exhibit b2. THE PLAINTIFF**

### Plaintiff Ruth Hall REPLICATION OF SUMMONS

(A Replication had to be made because the Template was an Un-editable Image)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

**Exhibit b1. THE JUDGE(S)**  
**Judicial SUMMONS Negligence**  
Deliberate Acceptance of a Defective Submission

HERE'S THE COURTS TEMPLATE REGARDING ANSWERING  
AN AFFIDAVIT BACKED COMPLAINT DIFFERENTLY THAN A  
NON-AFFIDAVIT BACKED COMPLAINT

Deliberate Judicial FRAUD UPON THE COURT!!!

**SEE:**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

SUMMONS

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE

	) C.A. No.
	)
	)
Plaintiff,	)
v.	)
	) SUMMONS
	)
	)
Defendant.	)

THE STATE OF DELAWARE,  
TO THE SHERIFF OF COUNTY:  
YOU ARE COMMANDED:

To summon the above named defendant so that, within 20 days after service hereof upon defendant, exclusive of the day of service, defendant shall serve upon , plaintiff's attorney, whose address is , an answer to the complaint (and, if the complaint contains a specific notation requiring the defendant to answer any or all allegations of the complaint by affidavit, an affidavit of defense).

To serve upon defendant a copy hereof and of the complaint.

Dated:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Prothonotary

\_\_\_\_\_  
Per Deputy

TO THE ABOVE NAMED DEFENDANT:

In case of your failure, within 20 days after service hereof upon you, exclusive of the day of service, to serve on plaintiff's attorney named above an answer to the complaint (and, if the complaint contains a specific notation requiring the defendant to answer any or all allegations of the complaint by affidavit, an affidavit of defense), judgment by default will be rendered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Prothonotary

\_\_\_\_\_  
Per Deputy

Rev:02/20

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

# **Exhibit b2. THE PLAINTIFF**

## **Plaintiff Ruth Hall REPLICATION OF SUMMONS**

(A Replication had to be made because the Template was an Un-editable Image)

**SEE:**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

**IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE**

**Ruth Hall**

C.A. No: \_\_\_\_\_

HEREAFTER KNOWN AS:  
PLAINTIFF(S)/AFFIANT(S)  
(Pro Se Plaintiff/Litigant)

**SUMMONS**

VS.

Civil Action No: \_\_\_\_\_

**Casino at Delaware Park (and/or assigns)  
William Rickman (Owner),**

HEREAFTER COLLECTIVELY KNOWN AS:  
Defendant(s)/Respondent(s)

**TO THE SHERIFF OF NEW CASTLE COUNTY,  
IN THE STATE OF DELAWARE  
YOU ARE COMMANDED:**

In case of your failure, within 20 days after service hereof upon you, exclusive of the day of service, to serve on the **Pro Se Plaintiff** Ruth Hall, 229 Shetland Drive., New Castle, DE 19720 named above an answer to the complaint (and, if the complaint contains a specific notation requiring the defendant to answer any or all allegations of the complaint by affidavit, an affidavit of defense), judgment by default will be **rendered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint.**

To serve upon defendant a copy hereof and of the complaint.

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Prothonotary

\_\_\_\_\_  
Per Deputy

**TO THE ABOVE NAMED DEFENDANT:**

In case of your failure to respond, within **20 days** after service hereof upon you, exclusive of the day of service, to serve on plaintiff's attorney named above an answer to the complaint (and, if the complaint contains a specific notation requiring the defendant to answer any or all allegations of the complaint by affidavit, an affidavit of defense), judgment by default will be rendered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Prothonotary

\_\_\_\_\_  
Per Deputy

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

# C

**Exhibit c1. THE JUDGE(S)**  
**VERBAL AGREEMANT BYPASSED**  
Bypassed the SUMMONS request For An Answer.

In Addition to Plaintiff Ruth Halls' Affidavit Backed Counter Offer  
was there also a Verbal Agreement Made By Defendants'  
Management- Cynthia Carroll?

Judge Ignored yet another SUMMONS Command

**Exhibit c2. THE PLAINTIFF**  
**Plaintiff Ruth Hall REPLICATION OF SUMMONS**

Material Evidence Ignored by the Judge(s) of  
Delaware State Court(s)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

**Exhibit c1. THE JUDGE(S)**  
**VERBAL AGREEMANT BYPASSED**  
Bypassed the SUMMONS request For An Answer.

In Addition to Plaintiff Ruth Halls' Affidavit Backed Counter Offer  
was there also a Verbal Agreement Made By Defendants'  
Management- Cynthia Carroll?

Judge Ignored yet another SUMMONS Command

**SEE:**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE

ABC TECH, INC.	)	C.A. No.
a Delaware corporation,	)	
	)	
	)	
v.	)	
	)	SUMMONS
XYZ INVESTMENTS, L.P.,	)	
a Delaware Limited Partnership	)	
WILLIAM JONES,	)	
FREDERICK SMITH,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

THE STATE OF DELAWARE,  
TO THE SHERIFF OF NEW CASTLE COUNTY: YOU ARE  
COMMANDED:

To summon the above named defendant so that, within 20 days after service hereof upon defendant, exclusive of the day of service, defendant shall serve upon Larry Lawyer, Esquire, plaintiff's attorney, whose address is 0000 Market Street, Wilmington, DE 19801, an answer to the complaint (and, if the complaint contains a specific notation requiring the defendant to answer any or all allegations of the complaint by affidavit, an affidavit of defense).

To serve upon defendant a copy hereof and of the complaint.  
Dated:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Prothonotary

\_\_\_\_\_  
Per Deputy

TO THE ABOVE NAMED DEFENDANT:

In case of your failure, within 20 days after service hereof upon you, exclusive of the day of service, to serve on plaintiff's attorney named above an answer to the complaint (and, if the complaint contains a specific notation requiring the defendant to answer any or all allegations of the complaint by affidavit, an affidavit of defense), judgment by default will be rendered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Prothonotary

\_\_\_\_\_  
Per Deputy



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

# **Exhibit c2. THE PLAINTIFF**

## **Plaintiff Ruth Hall REPLICATION OF SUMMONS**

Material Evidence Ignored by the Judge(s) of  
Delaware State Court(s)

**SEE:**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

---

DEFENDANT IS TO PROVIDE ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS HERE-BELOW:

---

1. Did Cynthia Carroll (A Representative of Defendant(s)/Respondent(s)) state anything regarding Paying Plaintiff(s)/Affiant(s) Ruth Hall 'ALL THE MONEY' pertaining to the contusion Plaintiff(s)/Affiant(s) Ruth Hall suffer at/on the DEFENDANT(S)/RESPONDENT(S)' business (Casino/Facility) mentioned in this instant case/claim?
2. What type of OFFER(S) did DEFENDANT(S)/RESPONDENT(S) make to Plaintiff(s)/Affiant(s) as a remedy for the injury Plaintiff(s)/Affiant(s) Ruth Hall sustained at the DEFENDANT(S)/RESPONDENT(S)' Casino/Facility?
3. Did the DEFENDANT(S)/RESPONDENT(S)' per the stated terms between the parties, respond to by way of REGISTERED mail; a NOTERIZED reply to Plaintiff(s)/Affiant(s) CONDITIONAL ACCEPTANCE of DEFENDANT(S)/RESPONDENT(S)' initial Offer(s) and did Plaintiff(s)/Affiant(s) give the DEFENDANT(S)/RESPONDENT(S) enough time to
  - a). Formed some kind or any kind of response to this, #3?
  - b). Categorically Answered or Rejected all or even some Points, Parts or even of Plaintiff(s)/Affiant(s) Counter-Offer and the Terms & Conditions?
4. Due to Plaintiff(s)/Affiant(s) health & age, which, was expressly mentioned to DEFENDANT(S)/RESPONDENT(S)' as a serious concern- When Plaintiff(s)/Affiant(s) offered to accepted a second interview by way of requesting sending secondary sets of questions to Plaintiff(s)/Affiant(s), did

**PREP | TRIAL PRESENTATION:**

=====

**JURY DEMANDED .**

HOW REPRESENTATION FOR RUTH HALL WILL BE INSTRUCTED TO PROCEED:

=====

**TRIAL**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31



**THE COURTS' JUSTICE ORDER**  
**Redress - Remedy - Vindication**  
**Commanded Order...**

**ORDER**

AND NOW this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, Year of \_\_\_\_\_,  
upon consideration of all the facts within Plaintiff(s)/Affiant(s) Uncontested, Undisputed  
Affidavit Backed Complaint and the action of the Delaware State Judge(s) of the Court(s)  
that gives rise to (but not limited to) FRAUD UPON THE COURT-

- Allowance of a Noncompliant, Defective, Non Affidavit Backed Motion to Answer an Affidavit Backed Complaint is Malpractice
- Actively engaged in Correspondence with Office of the Clerk (and the Parties) insisting on blacking the Office of the Clerk/Prothonotary from Rejecting Defendants' Non Compliant, Defective Motion.
- Failed at noticing that it was a Declaratory Judgment Submission first.
- Failed to Examine for the Existence of an Actionable Contract
- Ignored the Summons that Commanded, Plaintiff Prevails Absent a Defendant Attached Affidavit
- Judicial Actions that gives rise to Aiding & Abetting by allowing Defendant to ignore the GENUINE ISSUE regarding a Verbal Agreement in addition to Plaintiff Ruth Halls' Affidavit Backed Counter Offer.
- Judicial Malpractice- Appeals Process concluded while Pleadings were unanswered.
- Absent Judicial Malpractice/Fraud the Defendant Case is Clerk Rejected as Defective. THE COURT CAN'T REACH DEFENDANTS' DEFECTIVE MOTIONS!!!

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT PLAINTIFF(S)/AFFIANT(S) Prevails.**

**And, Defendant(s) Defense is denied with extreme prejudice.**

\_\_\_\_\_  
J



1                   **This is an Extremely Simple Case**  
2                   **To PRESENT TO You The JURY:**  
3

4 =====

5 **Consider these Two Genuine Issues or Primary Facts-**

6 #1.

7 Members of the Jury, by law, the Defendant must provide you  
8 an AFFIDAVIT BACKED DEFENSE in order to say anything in  
9 their Defense in this Case. Absent a timely Filed Affidavit  
10 Backed Defense then, You Must Rule in favor of the Plaintiff.  
11

12  
13 NOTE:

14 The Defendant was only able to last this long without being ruled  
15 against because  
16

17 a).

18 Error by the Office of the Clerk/Prothonotary failed to notice that  
19 the Defendant Elected not t attach an Affidavit... even after this  
20 defect was made know to the Defendant and the Presiding  
21 Judge(s) of the Delaware State Court(s).  
22

23 b).

24 And, here again in this jury trail- The Defendant elects  
25 noncompliance by not attaching an Affidavit Backed Response  
26 to Plaintiff Ruth Halls' Undisputed, Indisputable Affidavit Backed  
27 case, here today, presented to you the Jury.  
28

1 c).

2  
3 Absent unchecked Corruption, Aiding & abetting in Criminal  
4 Behavior, no Party in the Court(s) is afforded the ability to act  
5  
6 above the law and nobody, not even a Judge can save  
7  
8 Defendants' that have repeatedly elected to ignore responding  
9 to a Plaintiffs' Affidavits with a controverting Affidavit.

10  
11 PLAINTIFF RUTH HALLS' UNDISPUTED, INDISPUTABLE  
12  
13 AFFIDAVITS CAN'T BE SET ASIDE BY ANYONE!!! And, if  
14 unanswerd- Plaintiff Ruth Hall must be Ordered as/Ruled on  
15  
16 as, must be seen by a jury as--- the Prevailing Party.

17  
18  
19  
20 #2.

21 State the above (#1) and include how the Judge(s) are also Null  
22  
23 & Void.

24 The Judge(s) of the Delaware State Court(s) Failed to Examine  
25  
26 for 'What Constituted the Existence of an Actionable Contract'  
27  
28 between the Parties.

1  
2  
3  
4

# MEMORANDUM

## UNDISPUTED RELEVANT FACTORS:

5 THE MERIT OF Plaintiff Ruth Halls' Affidavit  
6 Backed Case/Complaint Cannot be challenge:  
7

8 Prima Facie- Indeed, no more than affidavits is  
9 necessary to make the prima facie case. [United States  
10 v. Kis, 658 F.2d 526, 536 (7th Cir. 1981); Cert. Denied,  
11 50 U.S. L. W. 2169; S. Ct. March 22, 1982]  
12

13

### Plaintiffs' Affidavit Backed Protection

14

15  
16 Here's Why Plaintiff Ruth Halls' Undisputed,  
17 Indisputable Affidavits Command The Court and the Jury to  
18 name Plaintiff Ruth Hall the Prevailing Party---

19 "Allegations in affidavit in support of motions must be  
20 considered as true in absence of counter-affidavit."  
21 [Group v Finletter, 108 F. Supp. 327 Federal case of  
22 Group v Finletter, 108 F. Supp. 327]

23 Tweel, (1977) 550 F 2d 297. The STATE must speak or by default  
24 uphold as true the allegations of the party the STATE fails to respond  
25 to.

26 Affidavit uncontested unrebutted unanswered Morris  
27 vs. NCR, 44 SW2d 433 Morris v National Cash Register,  
28 44 SW2d 433: "An Affidavit if not contested in a **timely**  
29 **manner** is considered undisputed facts as a **matter of**  
30 **law.**"  
31

1           **The Judge(s) of the Delaware State**  
2  
3 **Court(s) also failed to respond to**  
4 **Plaintiff Ruth Halls' Affidavit Backed**  
5 **Legal Instruments/Pleading, with the**  
6 **following consequences-**  
7  
8

9  
10           ‘When the States does not respond to a petitioner's allegations,  
11 the unrefuted statement of facts must be taken as true.’ ”), quoting Smith  
12 v. State, 581 So.2d 1283, 1284 (Ala.Crim.App.1991).

13 and

14           Tweel, (1977) 550 F 2d 297. **The STATE must speak** or by  
15 default uphold as true the allegations of the party the STATE fails  
16 to respond to.

17 Also,

18           **ESTOPPEL BY SILENCE.**

19           Estoppel by Silence “arises where a person is under a duty to  
20 another to speak or failure to speak is inconsistent with honest  
21 dealings,” as stated in the case of In Re McArdles Estate, 250  
22 NYS 276, 287... “Silence can only be equated with fraud where  
23 there is a legal or moral duty to speak, or when an inquiry left  
24 unanswered would be intentionally misleading” US v Tweel,  
25 (1977) 550 F 2d 297.  
26  
27  
28



1           **FAILURE BY THE PRESIDING JUDGE(S) & DEFENDANT**  
2           **DEEMS PLAINTIFF RUTH HALL THE PREVAILING PARTY**  
3           **EVEN BY DEFAULT or in the Absence of a Correct**  
4           **Order/Ruling.**  
5

6  
7           Only the Plaintiff Ruth Halls' Charged Allegation are to  
8 be accepted as the Only Truth being Told. Why? Because  
9 the Defendant didn't want to State Their Version of event  
10 UNDER THE PENALTY of PERJURY which, is what they  
11 were required to do, and din not. The Defendant could only  
12 be deemed the prevailing party by means of FRAUD UPON  
13 THE COURT... as Plaintiff Ruth Halls' claim/case has  
14 asserted  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8

# HOW 'FRAUD UPON THE COURT' IS SUPPOSE TO BE HANDED:

9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16

**FRAUD UPON THE COURT** is the correct charge based on the facts in the above Captioned Complaint because beyond the concerns of Plaintiff Ruth Hall the entire court process was corrupted.

17  
18  
19  
20

**SEE:** Bulloch v. United States, 763 F.2d 1115, 1121 (10th Cir. 1985), the court stated

21  
22  
23  
24  
25

*"Fraud upon the court is fraud which is directed to the judicial machinery itself and is not fraud between the parties or fraudulent documents, false statements or perjury. ... It is where the court or a member is corrupted or influenced or influence is attempted or **where the judge has not performed his judicial function** --- thus where the impartial functions of the court have been directly corrupted."*

26  
27  
28  
29

THE QUESTION of FRAUD UPON THE COURT '**MUST BE SPECIFICALLY & COMPLETELY ANSWERED**' IN ORDER TO RENDER THIS MATTER AS COMPLETELY **FINALIZED**.

30  
31

**SEE: United States v. Kis---**

"a decision **produced** by **fraud upon the court** **NEVER BECOME FINAL**. "Kenner v. C.I.R., 387 F.3d 689 (1968); 7 Moore's Federal Practice, 2d ed., p. 512, ¶ 60.23. "a decision produced by fraud upon the court is not in essence a decision at all, and never becomes final."

**Plaintiff Ruth Hall** was supposed to be allowed to Correct & Defeat FRAUD UPON THE COURT and was not allowed to.





1 PS.

2 =====

3 **PRIVATE ATTORNEY GENERAL RIGHTS**  
4 **(Here's what the Law Already Allows)**

5  
6 Use of 'Non-Typical-Attorney' Help on matters that are  
7 greater than an Individual Concern. A Litigant and/or  
8 assigns can act as a PRIVATE ATTORNEY GENERAL

9 FRAUD UPON THE COURT is FRAUD UPON THE PUBLIC and our COURT  
10 PROCESS and is considered to be great than Ruth Halls' Complaint Alone.

11 =====

12 **Defendant reserves the right** to assign a **Private**

13 **Attorney General** should This Fraud Upon The Court fail to make  
14 the ruling that provides a true appearance of Justice.  
15

16  
17 **Private Attorney General Actions, SEE: 1866**  
18 **Vindication and Civil Rights of the 39th Congress. This**  
19 **Congressional Act gives the Citizens the authority to step in,**  
20 **when the states fails or the government fails to uphold and**  
21 **protect the rights of the citizens.** SEE: 1943 decision, by Judge  
22 Jerome Frank, in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second  
23 Circuit. See Assoc. Indus. of New York v. Ickes, 134 F.2d 694,  
24 704 (2d Cir. 1943). A Private Citizen can file suit that in part or  
25 specifically vindicate the public interest. This person would  
26 become a Private Attorney General. Judge Frank conclusion  
27 deemed it to be a suit to a qui tam action. Id. at 704-705  
28 discussing U.S. ex rel. Marcus v. Hess, 317 U.S. 537 (1942));  
and also Colorado Radio Corp. v. F.C.C., 118 F.2d 24, 28 (D.C.  
29 Cir. 1941) (Edgerton, J.,concurring).

1 =====  
2 **Law License Lie Addressed.**

3 **(MORE PLUTOCRATIC BASED LIE(S))**

4 False Enforcement of a False Longstanding Lie.

5  
6 You can't Dismiss a case on a LIE that has been stated as being FACTUAL.  
7 There is **NO SUCH THING AS A LICENSE TO PRACTICE LAW!!!**

8  
9 **LET'S END THIS PLUTOCRATIC BACKED FRAUD NOW!!!**

10 Law License Doesn't Exist -Not to be confused with those Clubs or Associations that have nothing to do with the actual allowance for the Practice of LAW.

11 1. THAT The practice of Law is an occupation of common right, the same being a secured liberty right. (Sims v. Aherns, 271 S.W. 720 (1925))

12 2. THAT No state may convert a secured liberty right into a privilege, issue a license and fee for it. (Murdock vs Pennsylvania 319 US 105 (1943))

13 3. THAT The practice of Law can not be licensed by any state/State. (Schware v. Board of Examiners, 353 U.S. 238, 239 (1957))

14 ...want one through 7?

15  
16 Addressing yet another 'Wrong Belief' beside the belief that Judges are the Court.FACT: Other than belonging to what constitutes a Club (of sorts) there is NO SUCH THING AS A LAW LICENSE.

17  
18 1. THAT The practice of Law is an occupation of common right, the same being a secured liberty right. (Sims v. Aherns, 271 S.W. 720 (1925))

19 2. THAT No state may convert a secured liberty right into a privilege, issue a license and fee for it. (Murdock vs Pennsylvania 319 US 105 (1943))

20 3. THAT The practice of Law can not be licensed by any state/State. (Schware v. Board of Examiners, 353 U.S. 238, 239 (1957))

21 4. THAT Should any state convert a secured liberty right into a privilege, charge a fee and issue a license for it, one may ignore the license and fee and engage in the exercise of the right with impunity. (Shuttlesworth vs City of Birmingham 373 U.S. 262 (1962))

22 5. THAT "If you've relied on prior decisions of the Supreme Court you have a perfect defense for willfulness." (U.S. v. Bishop, 412 U.S. 346), as "The claim and exercise of a Constitutional right cannot be converted into a crime."(Miller v. U.S., 230 F.2d. 486, 489).

1 6. THAT "Where rights secured by the Constitution are involved, there can be no rule making or legislation which would abrogate them." (Miranda v. Arizona 384 U.S. 436, 86 S. Ct. 1602, 16 L.Ed. 2d 694 (1966))

2 7. THAT Should any state convert any right to work into a privilege, issue a license and charge a fee, the same is unconstitutional, void, and without effect in law. (Marbury vs Madison 5 US 137 (1803))

3 [8 - 46 you can look up on your own]

4 Wrong, you can represent others but only under the right title.Perhaps these few (of many) videos will help:

5 No License Required:<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yxjNt6aZIEPrivate> Attorney General  
Link:[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KBbb\\_ue\\_6QI](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KBbb_ue_6QI) ...you don't want to look it up yourself? You want all 48???

6 LONG VERSION 8 - 48:8. THAT "All acts of legislature apparently contrary to natural right and justice are, in our laws and must be in the nature of things, considered as void. The laws of nature are the laws of God; whose authority can be superseded by no power on earth. A legislature must not obstruct our obedience to him from whose punishments they cannot protect us. All human constitutions which contradict his laws, we are in conscience bound to disobey. Such have been the adjudications of our courts of justice." (Robin v. Hardaway, 1 Jefferson 109, 114 (1772)). THAT The Supreme Court has warned, "Because of what appear to be Lawful commands on the surface, many citizens, because of their respect for what appears to be law, are cunningly coerced into waiving their rights, due to ignorance." (U.S. v. Minker, 350 U.S. 179, 187), the general misconception among the public being that any statute passed by legislators bearing the appearance of law constitutes Law. THAT A statute is not a "law," (Flournoy v. First Nat. Bank of Shreveport, 197 La. 1067, 3 So.2d 244, 248), a concurrent or joint resolution of legislature is not "a law," (Koenig v. Flynn, 258 N.Y. 292, 179 N.E. 705, 707; Ward v. State, 176 Okl. 368, 56 P.2d 136, 137; State ex rel. Todd v. Yelle, 7 Wash.2d 443, 110 P.2d 162, 165), nor is 'Code' "Law" (In Re Self v Rhay, 61 Wn (2d) 261) these being defined by Black's Law Dictionary as rebuttable prima facie, or superficial, evidence of law, a facade, represented by 'public policy,' being color-able, or 'color of law,' being 'counterfeit or feigned' as defined.

12 9. THAT "The Natural Liberty of man is to be free from any superior power on earth, and not to be under the will or legislative authority of man, but only to have the law of nature for his rule." - Samuel Adams

14 10. THAT 'Litigants may be assisted by unlicensed layman during judicial proceedings' (Brotherhood of Trainmen v. Virginia ex rel. Virginia State Bar 377 U.S. 1; Gideon v. Wainwright 372 U.S. 335; Argersinger v. Hamlin, Sheriff 407 U.S. 425), and 'Members of groups who are competent nonlawyers may assist other members of the group [family, association, or class] achieve the goals of the group in court without being charged with "Unauthorized practice of law." ' (NAACP v. Button 371 U.S. 415; United Mineworkers of America v. Gibbs 383 U.S. 715; and Johnson v. Avery 89 S. Ct. 747 (1969).

17 11. THAT "Each citizen acts as a 'Private Attorney General who 'takes on the mantel of sovereign' " (Title 42 U.S.C. Sec. 1983, Wood v. Breier, 54 F.R.D. 7, 10-11 (E.D. Wis. 1972; Frankenhauser v. Rizzo, 59 F.R.D. 339 E.D. Pa. (1973). "It is not the function of our Government to keep the citizen from falling into error; it is the function of the citizen to keep the government from falling into error." (American Communications Association v. Douds, 339 U.S. 382, 442 (1950) and a Sovereign Citizen cannot be punished for sincerely held religious convictions, such as the belief that he is in fact born free and at liberty to act as such. (Cheek v. United States, 498 U.S. 192 (1991).

22 12. THAT The "Private Attorney General" concept holds that a successful private party plaintiff is entitled to recovery of his legal expenses, including attorney fees, if he can advance a policy inherent in public interest legislation on behalf of a significant class of persons. ( 'Equal Access to Justice Act'; Dasher v. Housing Authority of City of Atlanta, Ga., D.C.Ga., 64 F.R.D. 720, 722) while "In the early days of our Republic, 'prosecutor' was simply anyone who voluntarily went before the grand Jury with a complaint." (United States v. Sandford, Fed. Case No.16, 221 (C.Ct.D.C. 1806).

27 13. THAT any private citizen acting as Private Attorney General may bring suit against any public official in their private capacity under Rico for crimes against constitutionally protected natural liberty rights, often predicated upon mail and wire fraud, and allows average citizens acting as private attorneys generals to sue those organizations that commit such crimes as part of their private criminal enterprise for damages. There are over 60 federal statutes that encourage private enforcement by allowing prevailing plaintiffs to collect attorney's fees. The object of RICO is thus not merely to compensate victims "but to turn them into prosecutors," acting as "private attorneys generals," dedicated to eliminating racketeering activity, and has the "further purpose [of] encouraging potential private plaintiffs diligently to investigate." (Malley-Duff, 483 U.S., at 151; 3 Id., at 187), and have been awarded judgments declaring entire cities, townships and counties corrupt criminal enterprises. "The provision for treble damages is accordingly justified by the expected benefit of suppressing racketeering activity, an object pursued the sooner the better." (Rotella v. Wood et al., 528 U.S. 549 (2000); Dasher v. Housing Authority of City of Atlanta, Ga., D.C. Ga., 64 F.R.D. 720, 722; See also Equal Access to Justice Act, and Civil Rights Attorney's Fees Award Act of 1976) .

1 14. THAT Facts are stubborn things. And "we are each accountable to our maker for our words, deeds, and even our inaction,  
2 as all that is necessary for the triumph of evil is that good men do nothing. For when good men do nothing, they get nothing  
3 good done, and so help evil to triumph by their inaction. On the field of action is where all honor lies (1st Lady Abigail  
4 Adams), and "There is a higher loyalty than loyalty to this country, [being] loyalty to God" (U.S. v. Seeger, 380 U.S. 163, 172,  
5 85 S. Ct. 850, 13 L. Ed. 2d 733 (1965), See also Public Law 97-280 declares The Bible the 'true word of God,' as Biblical Law,  
6 at "Common Law, which "supersedes all inferior laws," whereas "Christianity is custom, [and] custom is Law." (Robin v.  
7 Hardaway 1790).

8 THAT The A.B.A. and State Bar Associations are Non-Governmental, Private 'Professional Associations,' a foreign agency or  
9 power with respect to government, and NOT a 'Licensing Agency' in fact or Law, though AT it apparently, attempting to  
10 copyright the operation and administration of that which originates with the author of the law, under color of law pursuant to  
11 public policy and legalism it would seem, whereas no one stands in between man and God who is the author of the natural and  
12 common law, which cannot be copyrighted for private use in public administration of the law for the purposes of graft, fraud,  
13 and legal plunder.

14 28. THAT No legislation creates the bar association in any state, being a private closed union and power foreign to  
15 government, operating in the Americas in violation of the Taft/Hardy act as The 81st Congress in 1950 confirmed by  
16 investigation, and determination that the A.B.A is, in fact and law, proof of which can also be located in the hardcopy printing  
17 of 28 USC 3002, section 15a, a branch of the National Lawyers Guild Communist Party, and is run by communist, whereas the  
18 on-line version of Title 28USC has been altered to read something entirely different, apparently because this fact has shown up  
19 in too many court petitions and memorandums of law over the past 100 years.

20 29. THAT No public institution, State office or instrumentality, accredits any law school or holds Bar examinations, as the Bar  
21 Association accredits all law schools, conducting private examinations and selecting the students they will accept into their  
22 private fraternity, issuing these a union card as a defacto license, keeping the fees for themselves. They do not issue state  
23 licenses to Lawyers, and the "State BAR" Card is not a "License" per say, but rather a "Union Dues Card."

24 30. THAT The "CERTIFICATE" issued to public trustee/servants in each State by the Supreme Court of each state IS NOT  
25 A License to practice Law as an occupation, nor to do business as a Law Firm, but rather authorizes only the practice of Law  
26 "IN COURTS" as a member of the State Judicial Branch of Government, to represent only "Wards of [the] court, Infants and  
27 persons of unsound mind..." (See Davis' Committee v. Loney, 290 Ky. 644, 162 S.W. 2d 189, 190." – Black's Law Dictionary,  
28 6th Ed., Corpus Juris Secundum Volume 7, Section 4.) while "Clients are also called 'wards of the courts' in regard to their  
29 relationship with their attorneys." – 7 CJS § 2.

30 31. THAT Attorneys authorized to practice law in the courts to represent wards of the court, such as infants and persons of  
31 unsound mind, are not authorized to represent any private citizen nor any for profit business, such as the privately  
32 incorporated and federally funded STATE. Corpus Juris Secundum, Vol. 7, Sect. 4., as "... (A)n attorney occupies a dual  
33 position which imposes dual obligations..." the same being a conflict of interest. – 7 CJS § 4.

34 32. THAT Attorneys, Judges, and Justices, those who keep an Attorney on retainer to represent them as most all do, as  
35 "clients," being thus "wards of the court," are therefore as defined in Law "Infants or persons of unsound mind."

36 33. THAT The U.S. Constitution Guarantees to every state in this union a Republican Form of government, any other form of  
37 government being FORBIDDEN. Whereas there is No Power or Authority for the joining of Legislative, Judicial, and  
38 Executive branches of government by a private monopoly over these, limiting and restricting eligibility or entry to key public  
39 offices to union members alone, creating the RULING CLASS of an ARISTOCRACY, the A.B.A., State Bar, and State  
40 Supreme Court's currently do in violation of Article 2, Section 1, Separation of Powers clause of the U.S Constitution, the  
41 same being an Unconstitutional Monopoly, operating in Texas in violation of Article 1, Section 26 of the Texas Bill of Rights,  
42 being an "ILLEGAL & CRIMINAL ENTERPRISE" as defined under RICO, whereas Senate Report No. 93-549 clearly  
43 points out and admits that an abridgment of the "Supremacy Clause" and "Separation of Powers" has in this respect in fact  
44 occurred.

45 34. THAT In 1933, as expressed in Roosevelt's Executive Orders 6073, 6102, 6111, and 6260, House Joint Resolution 192 of  
46 June 5, 1933 confirmed in Perry v. U.S. (1935) 294 U.S. 330-381, 79 LEd 912; 31 USC 5112, 5119, and 12 USC 95a, the U.S.  
47 declared bankruptcy. When government went bankrupt, it lost its sovereignty, and being to big to fail, excepted a buy out and  
48 went into receivership, to be reorganized, restructured, and privatized, in favor of its foreign creditors and presumed new  
49 owners, criminals whose avowed and stated intent was to plunder, bankrupt, conquer, and enslave the people of the United  
50 States of America. "...every American will be required to register their biological property in a National system designed to  
51 keep track of the people and that will operate under the ancient system of pledging... By such methodology, we can compel



1 people to submit to our agenda, which will affect our security as a chargeback for our fiat paper currency. Every American  
2 will be forced to register or suffer not being able to work and earn a living. They will be our chattel, and we will hold the  
3 security interest over them forever, by operation of the law merchant under the scheme of secured transactions. This will  
4 inevitably... leave every American a contributor to this fraud which we will call "Social Insurance." - Col. Edward Mandell  
5 House.

6 30. THAT The goal, of an occult theocracy of the ancient mystery school of deceit, it has been alleged, was to merge the people  
7 with government in America, reversing their roles in law and erasing all distinction between jurisdictions in law, public and  
8 private, under public policy and 'color of...' or 'colorable'. ... law, absorbing both into a private commercial corporation  
9 supplanting lawful government and claiming ownership and legal title to the people themselves, all State public institutions  
10 having created a "shadow [of] government," in furtherance of these schemes by privately incorporating all for profit between  
11 1940 and 1970. Admitted in numerous responses to administrative remedy petitions, all public offices are in fact now vacant,  
12 and private contractors masquerade as public officials, who cannot as such hold positions of public office or trust.

13 31. THAT Corporations have a LEGAL obligation to maximize profits. "When government becomes a corporation, it ceases  
14 to be government" (See Clearfield Doctrine), and by becoming a corporator, lays down its sovereignty, so far as respects the  
15 transaction of the corporation, and exercises no power or privilege which is not derived from the charter (U.S. v. Georgia-  
16 Pacific Co., 421 F.2d 92, 101 (9th Cir. 1970), corporations being fictions from which no law may originate, as no right of action  
17 may originate from fraud, invalidating much of the last 100 years of American Jurisprudence, both State and National  
18 legislation.

19 33. THAT all revenue now belongs to admiralty maritime jurisdiction (Huntress), and 'neither for profit government nor the  
20 foreign statute merchant or agent has access to sovereign immunity even though the agent himself may have been unaware of  
21 the limitations upon his authority.' (See Utah Power & Light Co. v. United States, 243 U.S. 389, 409, 391; United States v.  
22 Stewart, 311 U.S. 60, 70, 108; In re Floyd Acceptances, 7 Wall. 666; United States v. Stewart, 311 U.S. 60, 70, 108; Federal  
23 Crop Insurance v. Merrill, 332 U.S. 380, 1947) (Government may also be bound by the doctrine of equitable estoppel if acting  
24 in proprietary [for profit nature ] rather than sovereign capacity); the "Savings to Suitor Clause" is also available for  
25 addressing mercantile and admiralty matters aka "civil process" at the common law and within a state court or by Removal to  
26 Federal District Court exercising Admiralty Maritime Jurisdiction in which the state may not hear cases against the State or an  
27 agent thereof. (citation needed)

28 34. THAT the Eleventh Amendment does not protect state officials from claims for prospective relief when it is alleged that  
29 state officials acted in violation of federal law (Warnock v. Pecos County, Tex., 88 F3d 341 (5th Cir. 1996), "Officers of the  
30 court have no immunity, when violating a Constitutional right, from liability. For they are deemed to know the law." (Owen v.  
31 Independence, 100 S.C.T. 1398, 445 US 622), and Inadequate training of subordinates may be basis for title 42 subsection 1983  
claim. (Mandonado-Denis v. Castillo-Rodriguez, 23 F.3d 576 (1st Cir. 1994). "Public officers are merely the agents of the  
public, whose powers and authority are defined and limited by law. Any act without the scope of the authority so defined does  
not bind the principal, and all persons dealing with such agents are charged with knowledge of the extent of their authority.  
(Continental Casualty Co. v. United States, 113 F.2d 284, 286 (5th Cir. 1940)). THAT public officials and even judges have no  
immunity, as officials and judges are deemed to know the law and sworn to uphold the law; and cannot claim to act in good  
faith in willful deprivation of law, they certainly cannot plead ignorance of the law, even the Citizen cannot plead ignorance of  
the law, the courts have ruled there is no such thing as ignorance of the law, it is ludicrous for learned officials and judges to  
plead ignorance of the law therefore there is no immunity, judicial or otherwise, in matters of rights secured by the  
Constitution for the United States of America. ( See: See, Owen vs. City of Independence, 100 S Ct. 1398; Maine vs. Thiboutot,  
100 S. Ct. 2502; and Hafer vs. Melo, 502 U.S. 21; Title 42 U.S.C. Sec. 1983).

32 35. THAT if such a thing existed as A 'License To Practice Law,' other than in a fictional corporate jurisdiction, the same  
33 would be in fact and law a corporate commercial 'Title of Nobility,' whereas Article I, Section 9 and 10 of the Constitution  
34 prohibits the States and the federal government from issuing titles of nobility or honor to any public trustee, servant, or  
35 officer, in their separate and equal station, as the same would evidence a conflicting interest and disqualification from holding  
36 an office of public trust, and of a felony under various provisions of state and federal law.

37 36. THAT Bar members elected by the people, but paid by a private corporation or agency foreign to lawful government in  
38 unlawful money, in accepting such appointments, commissions, and compensation, bribes in fact and law, to enforce the  
39 licensing of rights as privileges, throwing creditors to the state in unlawful debtors prisons for victimless crimes, acting as  
40 third party debt collector of tribute and contribution for illegal ton-tine wagering ponzi schemes and bankrupted 'social  
41 insurance' programs, as an insurance premium for the national debt, all under colour of copyrighted private law through  
42 legalism, are by the same disqualified from holding any office of public trust for what is defined in Law as their Treason in so  
43 doing in Fact, punishable by hanging.

1 37. THAT Courts, Judges, and Justices, bound by law to uphold and declare the law, are in so doing not at liberty to interpret  
2 the law, or make political determinations, and being unlicensed themselves, are subject to prosecution for impersonating a  
3 public official or officer for damages in federal admiralty maritime jurisdiction as statute merchants. (citations needed - Clerk  
Praxis File)

4 39. THAT a license is permission to do something illegal, and Obtaining a license proves willful intent to commit an illegal  
5 act. THAT the Lawful practice of Law is both a property right, and a Liberty Right, both a sacrament, tenant, and Rite of  
religious practice, secured by the Bill Of Rights and Supreme Law of the Land, including, but not limited to, the Religious  
Freedom Restoration Act, to each citizen.

6 40. THAT Any prosecution pursuant to UPL statute carries the burden of proving that the accused defendant did willfully,  
7 knowingly, and intentionally, avoid a known duty, obligation, or task under the law, that was not known as herein previously  
8 stated, to be an Unconstitutional requirement of legalism, religion teaches is sophistry and witchcraft or deception, any statute,  
regulation, or requirement, null and void and without effect in fact or law, bearing no obligation to obey. The Law may  
restrain, but not compell.

9 41. THAT Compulsion under the natural law does not originate with man, nor with governments formed by men in fictional  
10 jurisdictions of corporate legalese drawn in the sand on the ground or on paper by men, in their separate and equal station,  
but rather with the author of the law. "Rightful liberty is unobstructed action according to our will within limits drawn  
around us by the equal rights of others." --Thomas Jefferson 1819.

11 42. THAT the Writer knows of no duty or obligation within the restrictions of his liberty rights or under the Natural Law, that  
12 he do no harm, to further refrain from championing the rights of others, to not prosecute evil doers, or to obtain a license, that  
does not exist, or permission, from any lesser private commercial authority or jurisdiction of the many on earth, past, present,  
13 or future, to observe, exercise, or practice a lesser private Legalese, or legalism, be it international, federal or state, or the  
higher Law for this matter, being the Natural Law derived as given from a higher authority than any on earth, the author of  
14 the law, where from all lesser jurisdictions, forms of governance and law originate by his commandments.

15 43. THAT all men being created equal, are born into the practice of law in their dealings with one another, as there is no  
16 action outside the natural Law excepting that which is criminal, and probably legalized by those practicing legalism, being  
witchcraft and black magic or sophistry as religion and the law teaches. That which is lawful, and that which is unlawful, are  
17 the sum of all acts, which men posses as an individual legacy, a property right or liability to each as nature accords, the Law  
itself being derived from man's nature, and the author of the Law, not originating with governments of men, from which  
18 legalese and legalism originate. Nothing may regulate that which it did not create, that does not originate there from. 'They  
who wash outside of the cup, but leave the inside filthy.' Substance over form.

19 44. THAT Man, in his separate and equal station, practicing natural law in the election to act upon the creation of government  
20 being a fiction, can confer no power to government to license that practice which the people possess inherently as a liberty  
right to effect such creation of a fiction as government, from which no law may come except but for the regulation of itself,  
21 ants agents or representatives, for the protection of those natural liberty rights inherent in man, being the only lawful purpose  
of government, whereas that which does not originate with government, as is true of man, and the natural law of liberty,  
22 government cannot regulate, as it is rather the natural law in practice by men that regulates the operation of government and  
the creation of lesser laws that may regulate government, and not the reverse. Fictions and the rules by which they operate  
cannot govern their creators.

23 45. THAT The lesser law, legalese, legalism, and legality, color of law and public policy, being no law at all, as created by  
24 supposed agents of government, can not and does not exercise jurisdiction over, nor can it change, alter, diminish, or abolish,  
the greater and higher Law of nature from which all law originates that gives breath to man's liberty, given by god to each  
25 according to nature. It is this higher natural law of inherent liberty, which creates and regulates government, and its creation  
of lesser laws that may regulate, change, alter and diminish or abolish the acts of government(s) and fictions alone, and never  
26 the lawful liberty rights of man who created these. The law cannot divide the man, or the man from himself and his rights,  
only the voodoo, and black magic of legalism, the fictional incorporation of man to serve as a fiction himself, can accomplish  
this in operation apparently, in abrogation of the Law itself.

27 46. THAT the Natural Law, as practiced by all men, and from which all fictions, lesser forms of law and governance are  
28 derived, is from the creator, and man's unalienable and inherent natural liberty rights (the Will), and not from government,  
which can create no right or law governing the liberty of man, existing only to protect those lawfully exercised natural liberty  
rights which existed separate and sovereign from it, before the creation of government by the power of this liberty.