

No. 18-9138

9114 9999 4431 4620 1671 57

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Taguan Rahshe Gullett-El,
General Executor - Caveator,
TAQUAN RASHIE GULLETT ESTATE, and

- Petitioner

Syteria Hephzibah-El,
General Executrix - Caveatrix,
SYTERIA LAWRENCE ESTATE,

In Propria Persona, Claimant, Affiant.

VS.

Timothy J. Corrigan; personal private capacity,
Sean Patrick Flynn; personal private capacity,
W. Stephen Muldrow; personal private capacity,
Jon S. Wheeler; personal private capacity,
Ronnie Fussell; personal private capacity,
et al.

- Respondents

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO
ELEVENTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS (No. 18-11031) AND
DISTRICT COURT MIDDLE FLORIDA JACKSONVILLE DIVISION (No. 3:17-cv-881-J-32JBT)

PETITION FOR REHEARING

Taguan Rahshe Gullett-El, Unlawful Detainee
Political Prisoner of War for National Liberation from Colonialism
[P.O.W 62013-018]

Federal Correctional Institution Coleman Medium; P.O. Box 1032; Coleman, Florida [33521]

N/A
Phone Number

In Propria Persona proceeding in Sui Juris capacity
i of iii

Bismillah - ir - Rahman - ir - Rahim (In the name of Allah, Most Gracious, Most Merciful)

1. On the record and for the record, present is Taquan Gullett, also called Maalik Rahshe El; On Behalf of Himself: General Executor - Caveator for Autochthonous American Moor Alien (Friend) Republican Universal Government [AAMARU] Religious Consul Association Testamentary Trust [*TAQUAN GULLETT ESTATE/SYTERIA LAWRENCE ESTATE - Unified*], hereinafter, "Affiant," Divine Immortal Spirit in Living Flesh and Blood Natural Man of majority, competent by firm sound mind and righteous upright moral integrity, In Propria Persona proceeding in Sui Juris capacity in accord with the meaning of [8 U.S.C. § 1101 - Alien(s), Alien (Foreign) Estate(s), and 18 U.S.C. §§ 1116(b)(1), (2), (3), (4) - Alien (Foreign) Government, Alien (Foreign) Official(s), Internationally Protected Person(s), Family]; irrespective of recognition by the United States [see 4th Judicial Circuit Duval County Florida Probate (Registrar) Court TAQUAN GULLETT ESTATE NOTICE OF TRUST #16-2017-CP-001286, DR BK 18009 Page 978/SYTERIA LAWRENCE ESTATE NOTICE OF TRUST #16-2017-CP-001287, DR BK 18009 Page 922; TAQUAN GULLETT ESTATE CAVEAT #16-2017-CP-001025, DR BK 17971 Page 674/SYTERIA LAWRENCE ESTATE CAVEAT #16-2017-CP-001020, DR BK 17971 Page 808; TAQUAN GULLETT ESTATE Personal Replevin Claim #16-2017-CA-002142 / SYTERIA LAWRENCE ESTATE Personal Replevin Claim #16-2017-CA-002144].

2. AAMARU Religious Consul Association Testamentary Trust Situs is domiciled in Molly's Garden Countee, Timucuan, Al Andalusia, Northwest Amexem [Al-Aqsa Al-Maghrib] (Morocco).

3. Affiant does rise and give honors and recognition to the Noble Qur'an and Sunnah, Holy Koran ⑦ Circle Seven, Zodiac Constitution AA222141 (Al-Truth), Suhuf, Zabur, Tawrah, Injil, Great Law of Peace, Treaty of Peace and Friendship (1787)*, Madrid Convention for Protection in Morocco (1880)*, Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948)*, and all annexes thereto, United Nations Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples Adopted by General Assembly Resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960*, United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous [Autochthonous] Peoples (2007)*, ROME STATUTE, Geneva Conventions, HAGUE EVIDENCE CONVENTIONS*, Inter-American Conventions, and all annexes thereto, Organic Constitution for the United States of America (1787), Statute of the International Court of Justice (ICJ), and Statute of the International Criminal Court (ICC).

4. Affiant does hereby enter an appearance on behalf of Himself, attending by Special Visitation for corrective action in Equity by this Affidavit For Rehearing. Due to Affiant's unlawful/unconstitutional detainment and false imprisonment, one original of this Affidavit For Rehearing, alone, suffices in accord with Supreme Court Rules 12.2 and 39.2.

(Sup. Ct. R. 44.1 and 44.2)

5. Affiant presents this Affidavit for a rehearing of the Petition For Writ of Certiorari-Supreme Court Number: 18-9138 cause, and in support of it respectfully shows:

I. GROUNDS FOR REHEARING

6. A rehearing of the decision in this matter is in the interest of justice because:

A) There was no principle ground cited nor opinion given nor reason given for the denial of a constitutionally warranted issuance of a Writ of Certiorari in this matter [see Exhibit A- Clerical Notice of Order dated October 7, 2019, annexed and appended hereto];

B) As will be shown herein, this matter contains several crucial factual and procedural distinctions of a substantial and/or controlling effect which were not previously presented which warrant a different determination [see S.Ct.R. 44.1, 44.2; see Schriber-Schroth Co. v. Cleveland Trust Co., 305 U.S. 47, 50, 59 S.Ct. 8, 83 L.Ed. 34 (1938); see Massey v. United States, 291 U.S. 608, 609-610, 54 S.Ct. 532, 78 L.Ed. 1019 (1934)].

7. Affiant is injured and damaged by subjection to substantive and procedural constitutional due process violations in this unlawfully removed and unlawful injunction Petition For Writ of Certiorari (S.Ct. #18-9138) cause, as well as the underlying alleged criminal cases directly related (C.D. Cal. #2:14-cr-725-CAS-1 / M.D. Fla. #3:15-cr-16-J-34 MCR), due to inadequacy, insufficiency, and unfairness in implementing the mandated procedural safeguards and decisionmaker impropriety and bias [see Mathews v. Eldridge, 424 U.S. 319, 47 L.Ed. 2d 18, 96 S.Ct. 893 (1976) - a procedural due process challenge concerns the adequacy and fairness of the mandated procedures, and it is well-established that procedures that insufficiently protect against error violate due process; see Schweiker v. McClure, 456 U.S. 188, 72 L.Ed. 2d 1, 102 S.Ct. 1665 (1982) - it is well-settled that "due process demands impartiality on the part of those who function in judicial or quasi-judicial capacities"].

8. Article III, Section 2, Clause 1, of the Constitution embraces alike civil and (alleged) criminal cases [see Tennessee v. Davis, 100 U.S. 257, 10 Otto. 257, 25 L.Ed. 648 (1880)]. Jurisdiction of district court is limited to those cases within Article III, Section 2, Clause 1, of the Constitution over which act of Congress has given it jurisdiction [see Johnson v. Stevenson, 170 F.2d 108 (5th Cir. 1948), cert. den. 336 U.S. 904, 69 S.Ct. 491, 93 L.Ed. 1069 (1948)]. Departure from due process is sufficient to bring about a loss of jurisdiction [see Ashe v. United States ex rel. Valotta, 270 U.S. 424, 70 L.Ed. 662, S.Ct. Rep. 424-426 (1926) - the verdict, judgment, and sentence are voided by loss of jurisdiction, because the relator was deprived of substantial rights assured to him by the Constitution; in accord see Respublica v. Roberts, 2 Dall. 124, 1 L.Ed. 316; United States v. McMahon, 164 U.S. 81, 41 L.Ed. 357, 17 Sup.Ct. Rep. 28; Lewis v. United States, 146 U.S. 370, 36 L.Ed. 1011, 13 Sup.Ct. Rep. 136];

9. Although there is a presumption that decisionmakers are unbiased, that presumption can be rebutted by a "showing of conflict of interest or some other specific reason" [see Schweiker v. McClure, (supra) 456 U.S. at 195]. Due process clause of the Fifth Amendment entitles persons to an impartial and disinterested tribunal in both civil and criminal cases [see Marshall v. Jerico, Inc., 446 U.S. 238, 64 L.Ed. 2d 182, 100 S.Ct. 1610 (1980); see United Retail & Wholesale Employees Teamsters Union Local No. 115 Pension Plan v. Yahn & McDonnell, Inc., 787 F.2d 128, 7 EBC 1273, aff'd, by split decision, 481 U.S. 735, 95 L.Ed. 2d 692, 107 S.Ct. 2171 (1987)]. In a criminal or civil setting, even appeal and a trial de novo will not cure a failure to provide a neutral and detached adjudicator, in violation of the Constitution's due process requirements [see Ward v. Village of Monroeville, 409 U.S. 57, at 61, 34 L.Ed. 2d 267, 93 S.Ct. 80 (1972); see Concrete Pipe v. Pension Trust, 508 U.S. 602, at 618, 124 L.Ed. 2d 539, 113 S.Ct. 2264 (1993)].

10. All of the judges, quasi-judges, arbiters, adjudicators, and decisionmakers involved with this unlawfully removed and unlawful injunction Petition For Writ of Certiorari (S.Ct. # 18-9138) Cause, as well as the underlying alleged criminal cases directly related (C.D. Cal. # 2:14-cr-725-CAS-1/M.D. Fla. # 3:15-cr-16-J-34MCR), from the district court through the appellate court, including the Supreme Court, are (current, former, active, inactive) members of the BAR Association, and are required to register as "agents of a foreign principal" under the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938 [June 8, 1938, ch. 327, 52 Stat. 631 (22 U.S.C. §§ 611-621)]. As is apparent and will be further shown herein, this is a clear "showing of conflict of interest or some other specific reason" which results in the above-stated deprivation of Affiant's substantial and procedural constitutional due process by impropriety, bias, and inadequate implementation of the mandated procedural safeguards.

11. "Justice," indeed, "must satisfy the appearance of justice, and this stringent rule may sometimes bar trial by even judges who have no actual bias, since the requirement of neutrality in adjudicative proceedings safeguards two central concerns of procedural due process:

(A) prevention of unjustified or mistaken deprivations and (B) promotion of participation and dialogue by affected individuals in the decisionmaking process; since neutrality requirement helps to guarantee that no person will be deprived of interests without a proceeding in which he has assurance that an arbiter is not predisposed to find against him; the stringent rule that justice must satisfy the appearance of justice, must be applied" [see Marshall v. Service, 446 U.S. 238, at 243, 64 L.Ed. 2d 182, 100 S.Ct. 1610 (1980)].

12. "If someone is deprived of his right to an impartial tribunal, then he is denied his constitutional (protected) right to due process, regardless of the magnitude of individual and state interests at stake, risk of error and likely value of additional procedural safeguards; balancing test for cases involving allegations of procedures that inadequately guard against error is not appropriate inquiry when due process claim involves allegation of biased decisionmakers" [see United Retail + Wholesale Employees Teamsters Union Local No. 115 Pension Plan v. Yahn + Mc Donnell, Inc., 787 F.2d 128 (3rd Cir. 1986), 7 EBC 1273, aff'd, by split decision, 481 U.S. 735, 95 L.Ed. 2d 692, 107 S.Ct. 2111 (1987)].

"A (lawful non-resident) alien is invested with the rights guaranteed by the Constitution to all people within the country's borders; such rights include those protected by the Fifth Amendment, which does not acknowledge any distinction between citizens and (lawful non-resident) aliens, but which instead extends inalienable privileges to all persons' and guards against any encroachment on those rights by federal or state authority" [see Hellenic Lines, Ltd. v. Rhoditis, 398 U.S. 306, 26 L.Ed. 2d 252, 90 S.Ct. 1731 (1970), reh. den., 400 U.S. 856, 27 L.Ed. 2d 94, 91 S.Ct. 23 (1970)].

II. Judicial Notice of Adjudicative Facts (Fed. R. Ev. 201)

13. It is Judicial Notice that:

A) The American Bar Association (A.B.A.), the International Bar Association (I.B.A.), and the United States Department of Justice (D.O.J.), are commercial derivations and subsidiaries of the Crown Templar, or Temple Crown, whose corporate headquarters are located in London, England. Thus, all (current, former, active, inactive) members of the BAR Association are agents of a foreign principal;

B) The A.B.A. was founded on August 21, 1878, in Saratoga Springs, New York, by Messrs. James O. Broadhead and a coalition of 100 foreign agents ("attorneys") from 21 states. Messrs. James O. Broadhead was the first President of the A.B.A. Representatives of 34 national BAR Associations gathered in New York, New York, on February 17, 1947, to establish the I.B.A. Initial I.B.A. membership was limited to BAR Associations and law societies, but in 1970 I.B.A. membership was opened to individual lawyers. The A.B.A. has over 410,000 members, and the I.B.A. membership now has over 55,000 individuals and 195 BAR Associations and law societies and includes attorneys (Attorneys General, Solicitors General, District Attorneys, U.S. Attorneys, prosecuting attorneys, defense attorneys), solicitors, barristers, advocates, members of the judiciary, in-house lawyers, government lawyers, academics, and law students; with each individual member acting and operating in their own "corporate capacities" (i.e., i.e., i.e., associations, etc.);

C) It is a well documented fact that the A.B.A. and the I.B.A. are "political organizations" with their Principal, Crown Templar, having distinct connections to all nations through State BAR Associations, Inns of the Courts, and District and Middle Inns made up of adjoining State BAR Associations. According to the customary law of the United States courts, in order to "serve at the bench," all judges, from a municipal judge to the Justices of the Supreme Court, must be members of the BAR. This "interstate districting" and the "judicial mandating" for seating of judges and justices violates both State and Federal Constitutions as well as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948);

D) Both the A.B.A. and I.B.A. practice and execute a daily monopoly over the entire United States and International Justice Systems. The customary (practices and procedure) law of the United States courts are admissible evidence of this criminal monopolizing of the Justice System [see 15 U.S.C. § 1 - Trusts in restraint of trade illegally; see 15 U.S.C. § 2 - Monopolizing trade a felony; see 18 U.S.C. §§ 1961-1968 -- Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations (R.I.C.O.); see Supplemental Brief (S.Ct. #18-9138); see Goldfarb v. Virginia State Bar, 401 U.S. 773, at 793, 44 L.Ed.2d 579, 95 S.Ct. (2004) - the interest of the states in regulating lawyers is especially great since lawyers are essential to the primary governmental function of administering justice, and have historically been officers of the courts; in accord see Sperry v. Florida ex rel. Florida Bar, 373 U.S. 379, 383, 10 L.Ed.2d 408, 83 S.Ct. 1302 (1963); Law Students Research Council v. Wadmond, 401 U.S. 154, 157, 37 L.Ed.2d 749, 91 S.Ct. 720 (1971); Cohen v. Hurley, 366 U.S. 117, 103-124, 6 L.Ed.2d 156, 81 S.Ct. 954 (1966) - English and American members of the bar have for centuries possessed responsibility for keeping the courts administration of justice]. The A.B.A. and I.B.A. knowingly and willfully operate Ultra Vires with total infringement and contempt of the human rights guaranteed by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948)* and the numerous procedural safeguards built into State and Federal Constitutions;

E) The A.B.A., by its own admissions and postings, provides law school accreditation, continuing legal education, information about the law, programs to assist lawyers and judges in their work, and initiatives to improve the legal system for the public. The Mission of the American BAR Association is to be the national representative (foreign monopoly) of the legal profession ;

F) According to the Northern Trust Corporation documents obtained from the Securities and Exchange Commission, the A.B.A. is the very same corporation as the Internal Revenue Service, and the A.B.A. owns Wells Fargo Bank, J.P. Morgan Chase, Citicorp, and a host of Fortune 500 companies. This is admissible evidence of an incredibly serious Conflict of Interest and Honest Services Fraud by Misrepresentation, Non-Disclosure, Kickbacks, and Bribes;

G) The A.B.A. and I.B.A., as "political organizations", are two of the most powerful political lobbying organizations within the City/State of Washington, District of Columbia, and in each of the body-politic 50 states, wherein the A.B.A. and the I.B.A. and their subsidiary corporations have an unprecedented "financial interest" in all national and state government agencies. The A.B.A., I.B.A., and D.O.J., draft, construct, present, implement, and instruct elected and appointed government officials and agents of federal and state quasi-government agencies on how best to execute these revenue-bearing statutes, codes, rules, and ordinances, from which the A.B.A., I.B.A., and D.O.J. and their members, affiliates, and subsidiaries, are awarded lucrative corporate-government contracts (kickbacks and bribes) involving the embezzlement of taxpayer sureties and treasuries (CAFR funds, etc.) for the execution and enforcement of their own copyrighted and legislated statutes, codes, rules, and ordinances.

III. Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938

14. Based upon all of the foregoing admissible evidence, all (current, former, active, inactive) members of the (A.B.A. and/or I.B.A.) BAR Association are required to register as an agent of a foreign principal under the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938 (F.A.R.A.) [see 22 U.S.C. - Foreign Relations and Intercourse, Chapter 11 - Foreign Agents and Propaganda, §§ 611-621 - Registration of Foreign Propagandists; see 2 U.S.C. Chapter 26 - Disclosure of Lobbying Activities; see 18 U.S.C. Chapter 11 - Bribery, Graft, and Conflicts of Interest; see 18 U.S.C. § 1341 - Frauds and Swindles; see 18 U.S.C. § 1342 - Fictitious Name or Address; see 18 U.S.C. § 1346 - Scheme or Artifice to Defraud of Right of Honest Services; see Skilling v. United States, 561 U.S. 358, 130 S.Ct. 2896, 177 L.Ed.2d 619, U.S. LEXIS 5259 (2010); see Code of Conduct for United States Judges - Canons 2A, 2B, 2C, 3A, 3C, A commentary - judge is encouraged through bar association, 4D, 4H, 5].

15. "Agent" of a foreign government required to register is one who acts at order, request, or under direction or control of foreign principal, and must engage in alleged political activity for or in interest of foreign principal; in order to meet the first requirement approving that defendant is an agent, relationship between parties must be shown; it is not necessary to show that principal both directs and controls agent, since requirements of statute are stated in the disjunctive; there is no distinction between paid and unpaid agents, and use of volunteers does not argue against finding of agency status [see Attorney General of United States v. Irish People, Inc., 595 F.Supp. 114, 16 Fed. Rules Evid. Serv. 1a18 (D.C. Dist. Col. 1984)].

16. "No person shall act as an agent of a foreign principal unless he has filed with the Attorney General a true and complete registration statement and supplements thereto as required by this section 2(a) and section 2(b) hereof or unless he is exempt from registration under the provisions of this Act. Except as hereinafter provided, every person who becomes an agent of a foreign principal shall, within ten days thereafter, file with the Attorney General, in duplicate, a registration statement, under oath on a form prescribed by the Attorney General. The obligation of an agent of a foreign principal to file a registration statement shall, after the tenth day of his becoming such agent, continue from day to day, and termination of such status shall not relieve such agent from his obligation to file a registration statement for the period during which he was an agent of a foreign principal." [see 22 U.S.C. § 612(a); see Exhibit B - Foreign Agents Registration Act Enforcement from U.S. Department of Justice; see Exhibit C - Short Form Registration Statement Pursuant to the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended (Form NSD-6) from U.S. Department of Justice; see Exhibit D - Affiant's Foreign Agents Registration Act Demand filed on June 11, 2019 in Middle District of Florida (Case # 3:17-mj-01265-JBT) against all relevant BAR Association Foreign Agents].

17. By the Foreign Agents Registration Act [22 U.S.C. §§ 611-6a1], Congress did intend to bring the activities of persons engaged in disseminating foreign political propaganda in this country out into the open and to make known to the government and the people the identity of any person who is engaged in such activities, the source of the propaganda, and who is bearing the expense of its dissemination in the United States [see United States v. Ahlberg, 39 F. Supp. 590 (D.C. Dist. Col. 1941)].

18. Purpose of requirement of registration of foreign agents and disclosure of their activities is to protect interests of United States by requiring complete public disclosure by persons acting in interests of foreign principal where their activities are political in nature; requirement is founded upon indisputable power of government to conduct its foreign relations and provide for national defense, and it falls within inherent regulatory power of Congress [see Attorney General v. Irish Northern Aid Committee, 346 F.Supp. 1384 (SDNY 1972), affd. without op. 465 F.2d 1405 (2nd Cir. 1972)]. General purpose of Foreign Agents Registration Act is to protect security and foreign relations of the United States by requiring agents of foreign principals to identify themselves and disclose activities [see Attorney General of United States v. Irish Northern Aid Committee, 530 F.Supp. 241, 10 Fed. Rules Evid. Serv. 366 (SDNY 1981), affd. 668 F.2d 159 (2nd Cir. 1982)].

19. Congress has power to legislate on activities of foreign agents engaged in subversive activities under powers relating to national defense, and requirement for registration does not violate the First or Fifth Amendments of the federal Constitution [see United States v. Peace Information Center, 97 F.Supp. 255 (D.C. Dist. Col. 1951)]. Registration requirement is triggered by an agency relationship with foreign principal which exists in fact, notwithstanding absence of formal written or oral contract [see United States v. German-American Vocational League, Inc., 153 F.2d 860 (3rd Cir. 1946), cert. den. 328 U.S. 833, 90 L.Ed. 1608, 66 S.Ct. 976 (1946)]. Willful failure of a foreign agent to register and disclose activities which were wholly on his own behalf (since 1942 Amendment) is a criminal offence [see Viereck v. United States, 318 U.S. 236, 87 L.Ed. 734, 63 S.Ct. 561 (1943); see 18 U.S.C. Chapter 11 - Bribery, Graft, and Conflicts of Interest, § 219 - Officers and Employees Acting As Agents of Foreign Principal; see 18 U.S.C. § 201 - Bribery and Graft; see 2 U.S.C. § 1603 - Registration of Lobbyists; see 22 U.S.C. § 617 - Liability of Officers; see 22 U.S.C. § 618 - Enforcement and Penalties; see 5 C.F.R. Subtitle A, Part D, Appendix A To Part D - Statutes Governing Conduct of Federal Employees, Section H - Prohibitions, Number 15 - Prohibition Against Employee Acting As Agent Of A Foreign Principal Registered Under F.A.R.A. (18 U.S.C. § 219); see 5 C.F.R. § 2635.902(a), (b) - Prohibition Against Bribes + Gratuities (18 U.S.C. § 201 (b), (c)); see 5 C.F.R. § 2635.902(g) - Prohibition Against Acting As The Agent Of A Foreign Principal Under F.A.R.A. (18 U.S.C. § 219); see 28 C.F.R. - Judicial Administration, Part 5 §§ 5.1 et seq. - Administration and Enforcement of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as Amended; see 28 C.F.R. Part 73 §§ 73.1 et seq. - Notifications to the Attorney General by Agents of Foreign Governments; see 18 U.S.C. § 951 - Agents of Foreign Governments].

20. Under the amended Foreign Agents Registration Act (22 U.S.C. §§ 611 et seq.), which requires registration by a person acting as an attorney for a foreign principal, and which exempts persons engaging only in private and non-political financial or mercantile activities in furtherance of the bona fide trade or commerce of such foreign principal, attorneys representing a foreign government in legal matters, including litigation, are not exempt and are required to register [see Rabinowitz v. Kennedy, 376 U.S. 605, 11 L. Ed. 2d 940, 84 S. Ct. 919 (1964) - "'Foreign principal' includes 'a government of a foreign country and a foreign political party,' as well as 'a partnership, association, corporation, organization, or other combination of individuals organized under the laws of, or having its principal place of business in, a foreign country..."; in accord see Viereck v. United States, 318 U.S. 236, 87 L. Ed. 734 (1943); also see Irish Northern Aid Committee v. Attorney General of the United States, 409 U.S. 1080, 34 L. Ed. 2d 669, 93 S. Ct. 679 (1972) - The Foreign Agents Registration Act's purpose is to inform the American people of the activities of the agents of foreign principals so that the people may carefully "appraise them and the purposes for which they act." H.R. Rep. No. 1470, 89th Cong., 2d Sess. (1966); 1966 U.S. Code Cong. + Ad. News 2397, 2398].

21. "Agent" within the meaning of 18 U.S.C. § 951 means one who acts directly or indirectly for the benefit of a foreign government [see United States v. Butenko, 384 F.2d 554 (3rd Cir. 1967), vacated on other grounds 394 U.S. 165, 22 L. Ed. 2d 176, 89 S. Ct. 961 (1969), reh. den. 394 U.S. 939, 22 L. Ed. 2d 475, 89 S. Ct. 1177 (1969)]. There is no inconsistency between requirements of 18 U.S.C. § 951, which makes it a criminal offense for one to act as an agent of a foreign government without prior notification of Secretary of State, and 22 U.S.C. § 612 which requires every person who becomes an agent of a foreign principal to register with the Attorney General within 10 days of becoming such agent [see United States v. Melekh, 193 F. Supp. 586 (N.D. Ill. 1961)].

22. Title 18 U.S.C. § 951 does not require proof that defendant knew of the requirement to register [see United States v. Campa, 529 F.3d 980 (11th Cir. 2008), reh. den., reh. en banc den. 307 Fed. Appx. 437 (11th Cir. 2008), and cert. den. 129 S. Ct. 2790, 174 L. Ed. 2d 290 (2009)]. Knowledge or probability of knowledge was not an element under 18 U.S.C. § 951 in that under § 951, defendant had to have acted on behalf of foreign government, and plain language of § 951 did not exclude from its scope cases that did not involve espionage or subversive activities [see United States v. Duran, 596 F.3d 1283 (11th Cir. 2010), cert. den. 131 S. Ct. 210, 178 L. Ed. 2d 46 (2010)].

IV. Honest Services Fraud By Misrepresentation, Non-Disclosure, Kickbacks, and Bribes

23. Furthermore, failure of any and all (current, former, active, inactive) members of the (A.B.A. and/or I.B.A.) BAR Association to register under F.A.R.A. does constitute Honest Services Fraud by Misrepresentation, Non-Disclosure, Kickbacks, and Bribes [see 18 U.S.C. §§ 1341, 1342, 1346; see 18 U.S.C. §§ 1961-1968; see Supplemental Brief (S.Ct. #18-9138)]. The fact that 18 U.S.C. § 1341 and § 1342 have accompanied each other in the statute books through a number of revisions clearly indicates that the two statutes are closely related beyond simply being juxtaposed in United States Code; language "by means of the Postal Service" in 18 U.S.C. § 1342 requires the same connection between use of mails and scheme as was found necessary for violations of 18 U.S.C. § 1341 [see United States v. Maze, 414 U.S. 395, 38 L.Ed. 2d 603, 94 S.Ct. 645 (1974)]. "Scheme or artifice to defraud" language in 18 U.S.C. § 1341 does not mandate holding that there is an offense under the statute only if money or property is involved in scheme to defraud; indictment alleging scheme by defendant to deceive and defraud public and Board of Elections Commissioners of certain intangible political and civil rights contained an indictable offense under either 18 U.S.C. § 1341 or § 1342 [see United States v. States, 488 F.2d 761 (8th Cir. 1973), cert. den. 417 U.S. 909, 94 S.Ct. 2605, 41 L.Ed. 2d 212 (1974), and cert. den. 417 U.S. 950, 94 S.Ct. 3078, 41 L.Ed. 2d 671 (1974); see Cleveland v. United States, 531 U.S. 12, 18, n.2, 121 S.Ct. 365, 148 L.Ed. 2d 221 (2000); see McNally v. United States, 483 U.S. 350, 362-364, and nn.1-4, 107 S.Ct. 2875, 97 L.Ed. 2d 292 (1987) - undisclosed self-dealing by a public official or private employee was "kickback" scheme proscribed by 18 U.S.C. § 1346; see Williams v. United States, 341 U.S. 97, 101, 71 S.Ct. 576, 95 L.Ed. 774; see Screws v. United States, 325 U.S. 91, 101-104, 65 S.Ct. 1031, 89 L.Ed. 1495; see Chiarella v. United States, 445 U.S. 222, 223, 100 S.Ct. 1108, 63 L.Ed. 2d 348 (1980) - established beyond dispute the doctrine that public official has fiduciary duty to public].

24. In proscribing fraudulent deprivations of intangible right of honest services, 18 U.S.C. § 1346, Congress intended at least to reach schemes to defraud involving bribes and kickbacks; a court is required to construe Congress' enactments and a strong presumptive validity attaches to an Act of Congress [see Skilling v. United States, 561 U.S. 358, 130 S.Ct. 2896, 177 L.Ed. 2d 619, U.S. LEXIS 5259 (2010)]. Title 18 U.S.C. § 1346 mail and wire fraud are predicate offenses under the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act (18 U.S.C. §§ 1961(i) et seq.), and the money laundering statute (18 U.S.C. § 1956(c)(7)(A)) [see Skilling v. United States, (supra)]. Under 41 U.S.C. § 52(a), the term "kickback" means any money, fee, commission, credit, gift, gratuity, thing of value, or compensation of any kind which is provided, directly or indirectly, to enumerated persons for the purpose of improperly obtaining or rewarding favorable treatment in connection with enumerated circumstances [see Skilling v. United States, (supra)].

25. Term "honest services" was not unconstitutionally vague as applied to attorneys who received kickbacks from judges for court appointments under 18 U.S.C. §§ 1341, 1346 [see United States v. Castro, 89 F.3d 1443 (11th Cir. 1996), reh. en banc den. 99 F.3d 1157 (11th Cir. 1996), cert. den. 519 U.S. 1118, 136 L.Ed.2d 850, 117 S.Ct. 965 (1997), reh. den. 520 U.S. 1182, 137 L.Ed.2d 566, 117 S.Ct. 1462 (1997)].

26. In order to convict a defendant of 18 U.S.C. § 1346 scheme to defraud another of intangible right of honest services, it is unnecessary to prove that defendant intended economic or pecuniary harm or that any such harm actually resulted from fraud [see United States v. Rybicki, 287 F.3d 257 (2nd Cir. 2002), 354 F.3d 124 (2nd Cir. 2003), cert. den. 543 U.S. 809, 125 S.Ct. 32, 160 L.Ed.2d 10 (2004)]. That defendant, mayor, received no financial benefit in exchange for her complicity in scheme to defraud town was immaterial to determining whether she was guilty of depriving government of her honest services [see United States v. Spano, 421 F.3d 599 (7th Cir. 2005), cert. den. 546 U.S. 1095, 126 S.Ct. 1084, 163 L.Ed.2d 863 (2006), and cert. den. 546 U.S. 1122, 126 S.Ct. 1098, 163 L.Ed.2d 911 (2006)]. Honest services mail fraud does not require proof of fiduciary relationship, trust relationship was sufficient; nor does it require damages to money or property of victim [see United States v. Milovanovic, 627 F.3d 405 (9th Cir. 2010)].

V. Substantive and Procedural Due Process Violations By Decisionmaker Impropriety and Bias

27. Based upon the preponderance and weight of all the foregoing highly probative admissible evidence, Affiant has shown that he is injured and damaged by subjection to substantive and procedural constitutional due process violations in this unlawfully removed and unlawful injunction Petition For Writ of Certiorari (S.Ct. #18-9138) cause, as well as the underlying alleged criminal cases directly related (C.D. Cal. #2:14-cr-705-CAS-1 / M.D. Fla. #3:15-cr-116-J-34 MCR), due to inadequacy, insufficiency, and unfairness in implementing the mandated procedural safeguards and decisionmaker impropriety and bias; and due to all the judges, quasi-judges, arbiters, adjudicators, and decisionmakers involved with the foregoing cause and alleged criminal cases being (current, former, active, inactive) members of the (A.B.A. and/or I.B.A.) BAR Association, which requires registration under F.A.R.A., and which is a clear showing of conflict of interest and honest services fraud by misrepresentation, non-disclosure, kickbacks, and bribes. This is all in addition to the substantial and procedural constitutional violations stated, related, proffered, and preferred to the Supreme Court in Petition For Writ of Certiorari (S.Ct. #18-9138), Supplemental Brief (S.Ct. #18-9138), Affidavit For Modification of Detention Order (S.Ct. #18-9138), and Judicial Notice of Adjudicative Facts (S.Ct. #18-9138) [see Exhibit E - Affidavit For Modification of Detention Order #18-9138; see Exhibit F - Judicial Notice of Adjudicative Facts #18-9138].

28. Herein this Affidavit for Rehearing, the presumption that decisionmakers are unbiased is completely rebutted by a showing of conflict of interest or some other specific reason [see Schweiker v. McClure, 456 U.S. 188, at 195, 72 L.Ed. 2d 1, 100 S.Ct. 1665 (1982)]; in accord see United Retail & Wholesale Employees Teamsters Union Local No. 115 Pension Plan v. Yahn & McDonnell, Inc., 787 F.2d 138 (3rd Cir. 1986), 7 EBC 1273, aff'd by split decision, 481 U.S. 735, 95 L.Ed. 2d 690, 107 S.Ct. 2171 (1987)]. The due process right to an unbiased decisionmaker is not satisfied by speculation that countervailing concerns may restrain clearly biased parties from excessively harsh judgments [see Ward v. Village of Monroeville, 409 U.S. 57, 60, 34 L.Ed. 2d 267, 93 S.Ct. 80 (1972)]; in accord see Yahn, (supra)]. Where an initial hearing is tainted by bias, arbitration (appeal) cannot provide the requisite fair hearing even if the arbitration proceeding is de novo [see Concrete Pipe v. Pension Trust, 508 U.S. 602, 124 L.Ed. 2d 539, 113 S.Ct. 2264 (1993) - in a criminal or civil setting, even an appeal and trial de novo will not cure a failure to provide a neutral and detached adjudicator in violation of due process]. Neither the appearance nor reality of fairness is served when a tainted verdict is presumed correct in subsequent review [see Yahn, (supra)]; in accord see O. Holmes, The Common Law 3 (1881) - "The unfairness that results from biased decisionmakers strikes so deeply at our sense of justice that it differs qualitatively from the injury that results from insufficient procedures".]

29. Words "due process of law," as found in Fifth Amendment do not necessarily imply a regular proceeding in a court of justice, or after the manner of such courts [see Davidson v. New Orleans, 96 U.S. 97, 6 Otto. 97, 24 L.Ed. 1616 (1878)]. Due process requires that there be opportunity to present every available defense, but it need not be before entry of judgment [see George Moore Ice Cream Co. v. Rose, 289 U.S. 373, 53 S.Ct. 620, 71 L.Ed. 1265 (1933)]. Fifth Amendment, while protecting substantial rights, guarantees no particular form of procedure [see NLRB v. Mackay Radio & Tel. Co., 304 U.S. 333, 58 S.Ct. 904, 82 L.Ed. 1381 (1938)].

30. The Due Process Clause entitles a person to an impartial and disinterested tribunal in both civil and criminal cases. This requirement of neutrality in adjudicative proceedings safeguards the two central concerns of procedural due process, ^(A) the prevention of unjustified or mistaken deprivations and the promotion of participation and dialogue by affected individuals in the decisionmaking process [see Larey v. Phipps, 435 U.S. 247, 259-262, 266-267, 55 L.Ed. 2d 252, 98 S.Ct. 1042 (1978)]. The neutrality requirement helps to guarantee that life, liberty, or property will not be taken on the basis of an erroneous or distorted

conception of the facts or the law [see Mathews v. Eldridge, 424 U.S. 319, 344, 47 L.Ed. 2d 18, 96 S.Ct. 893 (1976)]. At the same time, it preserves both the appearance and reality of fairness, "generating the feeling, so important to a popular government, that justice has been done," (Joint Anti-Fascist Committee v. McGrath, 341 U.S. 123, 172, 95 L.Ed. 817, 71 S.Ct. 624 (1951)), by ensuring that no person will be deprived of his interests in the absence of a proceeding in which he may present his case with assurance that the arbiter is not predisposed to find against him. The requirement of neutrality has been jealously guarded by this (Supreme) Court [see Marshall v. Jerrico, Inc., 446 U.S. 238, at 243, 64 L.Ed. 2d 182, 100 S.Ct. 1610 (1980); in accord see Turney v. Ohio, 273 U.S. 510, at 532, 71 L.Ed. 749, 47 S.Ct. 437, 50 ALR 1243 (1927); Ward v. Village of Monroeville, 409 U.S. 57, at 60, 34 L.Ed. 2d 267, 93 S.Ct. 80 (1972); Offutt v. United States, 348 U.S. 11, 14, 99 L.Ed. 11, 75 S.Ct. 11 (1954); In re Murchison, 349 U.S. 133, 136, 99 L.Ed. 942, 75 S.Ct. 623 (1955); Taylor v. Hayes, 418 U.S. 488, 41 L.Ed. 2d 897, 94 S.Ct. 2697 (1974)].

31. Due process has to do with denial of fundamental fairness, shocking to the universal sense of justice; it deals neither with power nor with jurisdiction, but with their exercise [see Kinsella v. United States, 361 U.S. 234, 4 L.Ed. 2d 268, 80 S.Ct. 297 (1960)]. Touchstone of due process is protection of individual against arbitrary action of government [see Wolff v. McDonnell, 418 U.S. 539, 94 S.Ct. 2963, 41 L.Ed. 2d 935 (1974)]. Judicial department of government is, in nature of things, necessarily governed in exercise of its functions by rule of due process of law [see Hovey v. Elliott, 167 U.S. 409, 42 L.Ed. 215, 17 S.Ct. 841 (1897)]. Due process of law in Fifth Amendment refers to that law of the land which derives its authority from legislative powers conferred upon Congress by the Constitution, exercised within the limits therein prescribed, and interpreted according to principles of common law [see Hurtado v. California, 110 U.S. 516, 28 L.Ed. 232, 4 S.Ct. 111 (1884)].

32. While alien lawfully remains within the jurisdiction of United States, he is entitled to the benefit of guaranties of life, liberty, and property, secured by the Constitution to all persons, of whatever race, within such jurisdiction [see Lem Moon Sing v. United States, 158 U.S. 538, 39 L.Ed. 1082, 15 S.Ct. 967 (1895)]. Aliens within territory of United States are entitled to protection of Fifth Amendment [see Wong Wing v. United States, 163 U.S. 228, 41 L.Ed. 140, 16 S.Ct. 977 (1896); see United States v. Pink, 315 U.S. 203, 86 L.Ed. 796, 62 S.Ct. 552 (1942)]. Pursuant to concepts embodied in due process clause of the Fifth Amendment, aliens as a class are a prime example of a discrete and insular (people) for whom heightened judicial solicitude is appropriate [see Examining Bd. of Engineers, Architects & Surveyors v. Flores de Otero, 426 U.S. 572, 96 S.Ct. 2264, 49 L.Ed. 2d 65 (1976); in accord see Zadvydas v. Davis, 533 U.S. 678, 121 S.Ct. 2491, 150 L.Ed. 2d 653 (2001)].

VI. Conclusion

33. For all of the reasons set forth herein, a rehearing tightly and squarely focused on the distinctions presented in this Affidavit for Rehearing is a matter of fundamental fairness to Affiant and would not unduly burden the Court.

34. Affiant respectfully invites the Supreme Court to decide the questions presented for review and grant issue of a writ of certiorari to cause the record of the entirety of these proceedings, including without limitation the timely and complete Habeas Corpus Petitions for Writ of Certiorari pending in Agency Action D.D.C. # 1:19-cv-022015-UNA (D.C. Cir. Appeal # 19-5217), to be certified and reviewed for lack of Article III jurisdiction (in L.D. Cal. # 2:14-cr-725-CRS-1/M.D. Fla. # 3:15-cr-16-J-34MCR), for excess of jurisdiction, for clear absence of all jurisdiction, and to do substantial justice in equity.

35. In an exercise of the realization of the Natural Rights and Human Rights enumerated and guaranteed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948),* United Nations Declaration of Independence To Colonial Countries and Peoples (1960),* United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous [Autochthonous] Peoples (2007),* Madrid Convention for Protection in Morocco (1880),* and Treaty of Peace and Friendship (1787),* Affiant respectfully invites the assistance of the Supreme Court, in the nature of an Ex Rel. Action/Humanitarian Intervention, for special public prosecution and for such equitable relief as may be appropriate to insure the minimum corrective measures necessary, including without limitation, financial assistance and technical assistance, access to and prompt decision through just and fair procedures for the honorable resolution of this cause and the entirety of the directly related actions; as well as access to effective remedies for all infringements [see Petition for Writ of Certiorari (S.Ct. #18-9138); see Supplemental Brief (S.Ct. #18-9138); see Exhibit E - Affidavit for Modification of Detention Order (S.Ct. #18-9138); see Exhibit F - Judicial Notice of Adjudicative Facts (S.Ct. #18-9138); see Petition for Writ of Mandamus (S.Ct. #18-6630); see Petition for Rehearing (S.Ct. #18-6630) with 3rd Letters Rogatory for International Judicial Assistance, et al.].

36. Affiant respectfully seeks leave to file our Universal and International Humanitarian Declaration For Common Law Prejudgment Writ of Personal Replevin (4th Judicial Circuit Duval County Florida # 16-2017-CA-004274) as an Original Action in the Supreme Court of the United States.

37. Affiant respectfully invites the Supreme Court to vacate, set aside, nullify, and dissolve the unlawful removal and unlawful injunction, which violates due process, in this cause and remand the unlawfully removed cases (M.D. Fla. #3:17-cv-881-J-3aJBT/Original 4th Jud. Cir. #16-2017-CA-004374; M.D. Fla. #3:17-cv-440-J-35JRK/Original 4th Jud. Cir. #16-2017-CA-004144 - Default and Default Judgment against Respondents; M.D. Fla. #3:17-cv-472-J-3aMCR/Original 4th Jud. Cir. #16-2017-CA-004142 - Default and Default Judgment against Respondents) to state court for full prosecution, maximum maintenance, maximum cure, and maximum remedy in accord with Natural Equity.

38. For all the reasons herein stated, Affiant urges that this Affidavit For Rehearing be granted, and that, on further consideration, the Petition For Writ of Certiorari be granted for all of the relief sought therein.

CERTIFICATE OF GOOD FAITH BY AFFIANT

I, Taguan Bullett, certify that this Affidavit For Rehearing is presented in good faith and not for delay, and that it is restricted to the grounds specified in Supreme Court Rule 44.

Madile Taguan Bullett PE, Antichthonian American Men Alvin Friend

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE WITH PAGE LIMITS

As required by Supreme Court Rule 33.2(b), I certify that the document contains 15 pages, excluding the parts that are exempted by Supreme Court Rule 33.1(d).

Madile Taguan Bullett PE, Antichthonian American Men Alvin Friend

Commercial Verification

I, Taquan Gullett, also called Maalik Rahshe El, on behalf of Himself: General Executor - Caveator for Autochthonous American Moor Alien (Friend) Republican Universal Government [AAMARU] Religious Consul Association Testamentary Trust, Divine Immortal Spirit in Living Flesh and Blood Natural Man of majority, competent by firm sound mind and righteous upright moral integrity, In Propria Persona proceeding in Sui Juris capacity; do hereby declare and affirm under penalty of perjury under the Universal Law of Our Most High Divine Source of the Force Universal Allah The Exalted and Majestic, and under the laws of the United States, that the foregoing is true, correct, certain, complete to the best of my own first-hand personal knowledge, not misleading, admissible as evidence, and in accord with the righteous upright moral integrity of my honorable intent, and if called upon to offer rhetoric and testify as to the veracity of the evidence herein proffered and preferred, I shall so state. [28 U.S.C. §1746; Fed. R. E.v. 902(10)].

This affidavit is dated on or about the Twenty-Third (23rd) day of Safar in the Moorish Calendar Year (M.C.Y.) of Our Most High Divine Source of the Force Universal Allah The Exalted and Majestic Fourteen Hundred Forty-One (1441)
[Gregorian Calendar Year (G.C.Y.) 2019 - October, 22]

Witness My Hand and Seal:

Maalik Taquan Rahshe Gullett El, Autochthonous American Moor Alien Friend
Maalik Taquan Rahshe Gullett El: General Executor - Caveator for:
Autochthonous American Moor Alien (Friend) Republican Universal Government [AAMARU]
Religious Consul Association Testamentary Trust

Political Prisoner of War for National Liberation from Colonialism
Unlawfully Detained and Falsely Imprisoned at:

Federal Correctional Institution Coleman Medium; P.O. Box 1032; Coleman, Florida [33521]

Certificate of Service

As required by Supreme Court Rule 29: I, Taquan Bullett, also called Maalik Rahshe El, on Behalf of Himself: General Executor - Caveator for Autochthonous American Moor Alien (Friend) Republican Universal Government [AAMARU] Religious Consul Association Testamentary Trust, competent Natural Man of majority, do certify and affirm that on or about the Twenty-Third (23rd) day of Safar in the year of Our Lord Allah The Exalted and Majestic Fourteen Hundred Forty-One (1441) [G.C.Y. 2019 - October, 22], the foregoing Affidavit for Rehearing (105 pages total) was served by U.S. Postal Mail, First-Class Postage Pre-Paid upon:

1) Scott S. Harris, Office of Clerk of Court; Supreme Court of the United States:
1 First Street, NE; Washington, District of Columbia 20543

2) Noel J. Francisco, Office of the Solicitor General; U.S. Department of Justice:
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW; Washington, District of Columbia 20530

3) ^(A) Smith, David J.; ^(B) Young, Bionne S.:
Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals: 36 Forsyth Street, NW; Atlanta, Georgia 30303

4) ^(C) Corrigan, Timothy J.; ^(D) Fussell, Ronnie; ^(E) Wheeler, Jon S.; ^(F) Warren, Elizabeth M.:
U.S.D.C. Middle Florida Jacksonville Division: 300 North Hogan Street, Suites 700/9-150, Jacksonville, Florida 32202

5) ^(G) Lopez, Maria Chapas; ^(H) Muldrow, W. Stephen; ^(I) Flynn, Sean Patrick; ^(J) Harwell, Jr., Lacey R.:
U.S.D.C. Middle Florida Tampa Division: 400 North Tampa Street; Suite 3200; Tampa, Florida 33602

Maalik Taquan Rahshe Bullett El, Autochthonous American Moor Alien Friend

Maalik Taquan Rahshe Bullett El: General Executor - Caveator for:
Autochthonous American Moor Alien (Friend) Republican Universal Government [AAMARU]
Religious Consul Association Testamentary Trust

Political Prisoner of War for National Liberation from Colonialism
Unlawfully Detained and Falsely Imprisoned at:

Federal Correctional Institution Coleman Medium; P.O. Box 1032; Coleman, Florida [93521]

**Additional material
from this filing is
available in the
Clerk's Office.**