

19-7678

IN THE
Supreme Court of the United States

ORIGINAL

Tzedkiyah EL Bey (PRIVATE ATTORNEY GENERAL.),

Petitioners, Affiant, Special Appearance

v.

DOUGHERTY COUNTY STATE COURT ET AL.,

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED

FEB - 4 2020

Respondents
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

On Petition for a Common Law Writ of Certiorari
from the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit
Presiding Judge(s) Rosenbaum, Branch, and Grant, Case No. 19-12906-F

AFFIDAVIT FOR COMMON LAW FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

PRIVATE ATTORNEY GENERAL

Prepared by: Tzedkiyah EL Bey

C/o 717 West First Avenue

[Albany] Dougherty Georgia Republic [31701]

Main – (229) 449-9155

When a citizen is attempting to enforce the Constitution, as herein shown, he is doing so "not for himself alone but also [for others] as a **'private attorney general'** vindicating a policy that [the Constitution writers] considered of the highest priority." Newman v Piggy Park Enterprises, 390 US 400; 88 S Ct 964, 966; 19 L Ed 2d 1263, 1265 (1969); Oatis v Crown Zellerbach Corp, 398 F2d 496, 499 (CA 5, 1968); and Jenkins v United Gas Corp, 400 F2d 28, 33 n 10 (CA 5, 1968).

FEDERAL QUESTIONS

- 1) Can the De Jure American citizen be punished by fine or imprisonment for exercising a Constitutional right?
- 2) Can the State, Legislature or Judicial Officer convert the claim and exercise of a constitutional right into a crime?
- 3) Do Statutory Ordinance, Code and Rules supersede the Organic Constitution 1787 ratified 1791?

CERTIFICATE OF INTERESTED PARTIES

The appellant, Tzedkiyah EL Yahsharalah Bey, certifies that to the best of his knowledge the following is a complete list of the trial judge, attorneys, persons, associations of persons, firms, partnerships, or corporations known to it that have an interest in the outcome of this case.

Judge(s):

District Court Judge(s): Leslie Gardner

Circuit Court Judge(s): Rosenbaum, Branch, and Grant

**TRUSTEES, PRIVATE ATTORNEY GENERAL AND JURISCONSULTANT:
COUNSELING PLAINTIFF,**

Al Maurikanos Republic Society

Administrator/Trustee/ Authorized Representatives

AFFIANT/APPELLANT:

Tzedkiyah EL Yahsharalah Bey

PLAINTIFFS/APPELLEE:

DOUGHERTY COUNTY STATE COURT: Chief Judge: Judge Stephenson, Judge Baxter Howell, Assistant District Cheslyn Green,

Chief Judge: Judge Stephenson

P.O. Box 1827

[Albany], Georgia Republic [31702]

Assistant District Cheslyn Green

P.O. Box 1827

[Albany], Georgia Republic [31702]

Almaurikanos Republic Society

C/O 717 West First Avenue

[Albany] Georgia Republic [31701]

Thronateeska Territory- Latitude 31.587873 Longitude -84.166282

RELATED RECENT CASES

DISTRICT COURT FOR MIDDLE GEORGIA CASE NO. 1:19-cv-00119

DOUGERTY COUNTY STATE COURT CASE NO. 19SR813

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW.....	Page 1
VENUE.....	Page 2
JURISDICTION.....	Page 3-5
STATEMENT OF JURISDICTION.....	Page 5-7
PROCEDURAL HISTORY.....	Page 8
STATEMENT OF CASE.....	Page 18-12
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION.....	Page 13-14
CONCLUSION.....	Page 14-16

INDEX TO APPENDIX

Circuit Court Judgment.....	APPENDIX A
District Court Order.....	APPENDIX B
District Court Denial of Reconsideration.....	APPENDIX B2
Dougherty County State Court Order.....	APPENDIX C
Appellants Rebuttal to State Court Order.....	APPENDIX D
Voluntary Relinquishment of U.S Citizenship.....	APPENDIX E
Nationality Documents	APPENDIX F
Drivers Service Contract Rescission.....	APPENDIX G

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

TREATY OF PEACE AND FRIENDSHIP 1787/1836 (Morocco)
ARTICLES OF CONFEDERATION 1778
ORGANIC CONSTITUTION 1787/1791
TREATY OF TRIPOLI 1796

Constitutional Article III, VI.....	Page 3-4
Treaty of Peace and Friendship Article 1787/1836 (morocco) VI.....	Page 4
Treaty of Tripoli 1796 Article XI.....	Page 5
Penhallow v. Doane's Administrators, 3 U.S. 3 Dall. 54 54 (1795).....	Page 6
Thompson v. Smith 154 S.E. 579, 155 Va. 367 (VA 1930).....	Page 8
Richardson v. Lowe, 149 Fed Rep 625, 627-28,.....	Page 9
Brady v. Maryland, 373 U.S. 83 (1963).....	Page 12
Title 18 U.S § 242.....	Page 12
Herrera v Wyoming, No.17-532, 587 U.S _ 2019.....	Page 13
Rodriques v. Ray Donavan 769 F. 2d 1344, 1348 (1985).....	Page 13
Christy v. Elliot, 216 I 131, 74 HE 1035, LRA NS 1905 – 1910:	
California v. Farley 98 CED Rpt. 89, 20 CA 3d 1032 (1971).....	Page 14
Universal inv. Co. v. Sahara Motor Inn., Inc 619 P-2d 485, 127 213 (Ariz. App. 1980).....	Page 15
State v. Coddington, 662 P.2d 155, 135 Ariz 480 (Ariz. App. 1983).....	Page 15
CODIFICATION OF THE STATUTE LAW OF GEORGIA, (Page 833 Number 47)..	Page 15
Norton v. Shelby County, 118 U.S. 425 (1886).....	Page 15
Marbury v. Madison, 5 US 137 (1803).....	Page 15-16
State vs Eberhard, 179 P 853; 246 p2d 1011.....	Page 16
Original 13 th Amendment Article XII, XIX.....	Page 16

UNITED NATIONS DECLARATION RIGHTS OF INDIGENOUS PEOPLE

Rights of Indigenous People Article(s) III, VI, VIII, XXXIII.....	Page 5-6
---	----------

United States Code

Title 18 U.S § 241-242 Verbatim.....	Page 18
--------------------------------------	---------

OPINIONS BELOW

Bey v. Dougherty County State Court- **19-12906-F**, the date on which the United States Court of Appeals entered judgment in this case on December 23, 2019 appears at Appendix A. Order denying reconsideration appearing at Appendix A2- (unpublished)

Bey v. Dougherty County State Court- **1:19-cv-00119**, the date on which the United States District Court entered judgment in this case on January 8, 2020 appears at Appendix B. Order denying reconsideration appearing at Appendix B2- (unpublished)

Dougherty County State Court v. Bey- **19SR813**, the date on which Dougherty County State Court No judgment has been rendered from this court. This court issued an order appearing at Appendix C, which was rebutted appearing at Appendix D

VENUE

The Venue is proper in that (Tzedkiyah EL Yahsharalah Bey the Natural Person) is a Maur/Moor/Muur in fact, party of the Treaty of Peace and Friendship (Morocco) 1787/1836 AA222141 Truth A-1 by inheritance, and, the aboriginal indigenous inhabitant of Societas Republicae Ea Al Maurikanos / Currently known as North America. Accordingly, this Court has jurisdiction pursuant to Article III and Article VI of The National Constitution 1791 (Treaties).

Comes now, Tzedkiyah EL Yahsharalah Bey, Tzedkiyah Ali, the Natural Person, respectfully seek this Court to grant Certiorari to review the JUDGMENT entered on December 23, dismissing this appeal for lack of jurisdiction by the Circuit Court ultimately hindering due process of law in denying the right 4th Amendment, 5th Amendment, 6th Amendment, and Article 6 of the Constitution 1791. Interlocutory appeal was filed in this case on or about July 31, 2019 challenging the denial of IFP which was dismissed by the District Court for alleged claims of being frivolous, yet this has not been proven. This action is to secure the endowed freedoms secured by the National Constitution 1791 per Article 6 in light of treaties. To wit: The Treaty of Peace and Friendship 1787/1836 between the Morocco and The United States corresponding to the Moors and Europeans. Moreover, The UNITED STATES OF AMERICA relinquished all jurisdictions in Morocco pertaining to the Moors on September 15, 1956 by Dwight Eisenhower, reference UNITED STATES CODE TITLE 22 CHAPTER 2 SUBSECTION 141, no one has jurisdiction over any proclaimed Moor Al Maurikan National and to imply such is an "Act of War" under International Treaty of which the United States of America and all of its sub corporations, and all of its officers, inclusive of the STATE OF GEORGIA and its sub corporations are bound.

The Jurisdiction of this court is invoked under Article III of the National Constitution for the United States of America 1787/1791

JURISDICTION

National Constitution for the United States of America 1787/1791

Article III

Section 1. The judicial power of the United States, shall be vested in one Supreme Court, and in such inferior courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish. The judges, both of the supreme and inferior courts, shall hold their offices during good behaviour, and shall, at stated times, receive for their services, a compensation, which shall not be diminished during their continuance in office.

Section 2. The judicial power shall extend to all cases, in law and equity, arising under this Constitution, the laws of the United States, and treaties made, or which shall be made, under their authority;--to all cases affecting ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls;--to all cases of admiralty and maritime jurisdiction;--to controversies to which the United States shall be a party;--to controversies between two or more states;--between a state and citizens of another state;--between citizens of different states;--between citizens of the same state claiming lands under grants of different states, and between a state, or the citizens thereof, and foreign states, citizens or subjects.

In all cases affecting ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, and those in which a state shall be party, the Supreme Court shall have original jurisdiction. In all the other cases before mentioned, the Supreme Court shall have appellate jurisdiction, both as to law and fact, with such exceptions, and under such regulations as the Congress shall make. The trial of all crimes, except

in cases of impeachment, shall be by jury; and such trial shall be held in the state where the said crimes shall have been committed; but when not committed within any state, the trial shall be at such place or places as the Congress may by law have directed.

Article VI

All debts contracted and engagements entered into, before the adoption of this Constitution, shall be as valid against the United States under this Constitution, as under the Confederation.

This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every state shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.

The Senators and Representatives before mentioned, and the members of the several state legislatures, and all executive and judicial officers, both of the United States and of the several states, shall be bound by oath or affirmation, to support this Constitution; but no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States.

Treaty of Peace and Friendship 1787/1836 (Morocco)

Article 6

If any Moor shall bring Citizens of the United States or their Effects to His Majesty, the Citizens shall immediately be set at Liberty and the Effects restored, and in like Manner, if any Moor not a Subject of these Dominions shall make Prize of any of the Citizens of America or their Effects and bring them into any of the Ports of His Majesty, they shall be immediately released, as they will then be considered as under His Majesty's Protection.

Treaty of Tripoli 1796

Article XI

As the Government of the United States of America is not, in any sense, founded on the Christian religion; as it has in itself no character of enmity against the laws, religion, or tranquility, of Mussulmen; and, as the said States never entered into any war, or act of hostility against any Mahometan nation, it is declared by the parties, that no pretext arising from religious opinions, shall ever produce an interruption of the harmony existing between the two countries.

United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People

Article III

Indigenous peoples have the right to self-determination. By virtue of that right they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social and cultural development.

Article IV

Indigenous peoples, in exercising their right to self-determination, have the right to autonomy or self-government in matters relating to their internal and local affairs, as well as ways and means for financing their autonomous functions.

Article VI

Every indigenous individual has the right to a nationality.

Article VIII

1. Indigenous peoples and individuals have the right not to be subjected to forced assimilation or destruction of their culture.

Article XXXIII

1. Indigenous peoples have the right to determine their own identity or membership in accordance with their customs and traditions. This does not impair the right of indigenous individuals to obtain

citizenship of the States in which they live.

STATEMENT OF JURISDICTION

STATEMENT 1.

This case in fact arise under the Treaty of Peace and Friendship 1787/1836 (Morocco), the Treaty of Tripoli 1797, the Articles of Confederation 1778, the National Constitution 1787 ratified 1791, and, (Societas Republicae Ea Al Maurikanos), as it pertains to the Maurs/Moors/Muurs originally inhabiting the land currently known as the North America, before the settlement of the Europeans.

STATEMENT 2.

This case also involves the Original People misidentified by the European invaders, as Creek Indians, later in the early to mid-1900', they were reclassified as Negro/Black/Colored/African American, and, the occupation of their Native Territory previously known as the Thronateeska Territory, by the Corporate CITY OF ALBANY incorporated on December 27,1838, and, the Corporate STATE OF GEORGIA founded on January 2, 1733. Moreover, this Appellant is a direct descendant of the Original People inhabiting the land, the Algonquin people also known as the Maurs, Moors, Muurs.

STATEMENT 3.

In accord with the historical facts stated above at statement two (2), the CITY OF ALBANY, THE STATE OF GEORGIA and its agencies, are corporate in fact and would not possess the authority to regulate the de jure people unless by contractual agreement, being that the CITY OF ALBANY, THE STATE OF GEORGIA are Corporations. SEE. Penhallow v. Doane's Administrators, 3 U.S. 3 Dall. 54 54 (1795), Administrator's defined government succinctly. “*Governments are corporations*”, *in as much as every government is an artificial person, an abstraction, a creature of the mind only, a government can deal only with artificial persons. The imaginary, having no*

reality or substance cannot create or attain parity with the real". Furthermore, this Appellant do not have any contracts with either entity that relinquish any secured rights protected by Treaties and the Constitution 1787.

I. PROCEDURAL HISTORY

This case is diverse in nature, and was initiated with a complaint by notice of removal against the above listed corporation inclusive of all operating agents on behalf of the same on or about (July 11, 2019) in the district court. The Appellant, in his complaint show upon evidence and facts that the Appellee's has not provided proof of jurisdiction, delegation of authority order, official oaths, nor provided due process of law. This Appellant suffered damages as a result of the Appellee's unfaithful actions by being unlawfully detained on May 22nd, 2019, and, forced to pay bond fees, that took out of the mouth of the Appellants family. As set forth more fully below, the Appellee(s) claims are irreparably failing to provide any evidence of fact of law and therefore all claims against the Appellant must be overturned, struck, dismissed with prejudice and all future claims hereby forever barred.

Also challenging the denial of the 4th, 5th, and 6th Amendments. Including the right to due process, the right to heard, the right to petition the government for grievances, the right to examine all evidence, and the right to challenge the jurisdiction of the court even on appeal, the right to be faced with living accuser. The Circuit Court including the District Court has also denied these fundamental rights in violation of their constitutional oath.

STATEMENT OF CASE

1.

On May 22nd, 2019, while exercising the right to travel upon the public roads, in pursuance of, but not limited to, SEE. **Thompson v. Smith 154 S.E. 579, 155 Va. 367 (VA 1930)**, **The Right of a citizen to Travel upon the public highways and to transport one's property thereon, either by carriage or automobile, is not a mere privilege which a city may prohibit or permit at will but a common right which he / she has under the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.**

The Appellant was detained and apprehended by the Albany Dougherty Drug Unit, initially for giving a false name. The Appellant informed the officer of his error and that in fact the information given was correct and true. The Appellants family member came to the scene and verified the information given was correct. The officer insisted to detain the Appellant as stated before, for giving a false name.

2.

At the time of the apprehension, the officer requested a State Issued Drivers; because this Appellant do not hold license or possess a contract with the corporate STATE OF GEORGIA DRIVER SERVICES. This Appellant presented his National Identification, that does display the same information in Driver Service ID database. As this DRIVER SERVICE contract was rescinded and license surrendered **on May 2nd, 2018**, to exercise the right to travel unencumbered upon the public roads filed as **Exhibit C appearing at Appendix G. SEE. Richardson v. Lowe, 149 Fed Rep 625, 627-28,** *"If they proposed to rescind, their duty was to assert that right promptly, unconditionally and invasively"*. This Appellant is not a citizen of the corporate STATE OF GEORGIA or within its jurisdiction willingly.

3.

The Appellant was transported to the Dougherty County Jail by a transporting officer, during the transport, the Appellant informed the officers therein, concerning the error of the arresting officer, that in fact the Appellant gave the proper information and the Appellant was being arrested unlawfully and without proper authority, upon arrival at the Dougherty County Jail, the intake officer employed there, looked in the Appellants face upon opening the door, immediately notifying the transporting officers they had the wrong person. The Officer employed with the Dougherty County Jail requested the Appellants ID number to confirm, he did not give false information, and the Officer did confirm the information given to be true. The transporting officers stated they had to wait for the arresting officer, whom they made contact with by phone. After

about 20 minutes of waiting for the arresting officer, whereupon his entrance, the false charges changed from giving false information to O.C.G.A (OFFICIAL CODE OF GEORGIA ANNOTATED), 40-8-26, and, 40-5-121.

4.

Instead of the arresting Officer correcting his error by releasing the Appellant back with his family, he came up with other false charges to keep the Appellant in custody and justify his error. The officer did state to the Appellant, that he was staying in jail, and, being charged with driving on suspended license resulting from the district courts failure to dismiss **Case No. 1:17-CV-00189** in favor of the Appellant. The Appellant responded, informing the officer he was making another error as that contract/citation was withdrawn, as this Appellant do not possess a license or contract with the STATE OF GEORGIA DRIVER SERVICES.

5.

The Appellants family posted and paid bonds fees on behalf of Appellant.

6.

On June 4, 2019 the DOUGHERTY COUNTY STATE COURT, Chief Judge John Stephenson and District Attorney Tab Hunter was served with, Notice of Demand for Production of Documents and Notice of Special Appearance, Nationality Card and Document. Consequently, the DOUGHERTY COUNTY STATE COURT, did not respond to this lawful request for discovery, this said court stood mute, thereby waiving their due process right.

7.

On or about July 25, 2019 a notice dated July 23 were received from the District Court, requesting an Amended Informa Pauperis application. On or about July 31, the Appellant responded with long form Informa Pauperis Application, notice of reconsideration and Notice of Interlocutory Appeal.

8.

On October 18, 2019, the Appellant made special appearance before Magistrate Judge Baxter Howell, in the DOUGHERTY COUNTY STATE COURT to clear up the matter herein concerned, because the courts have a tendency of issuing unlawful arrest warrants on non-arrestable offenses, which do constitute threat, duress, and coercion, otherwise the Appellant would have not come for lack of jurisdiction and authority over persons being Natural. Wherein the Appellant entered a plea of NOT GULITY UNDER THREAT DURESS AND COERCION. Therein the Appellant also spoke with the Chief District Attorney pertaining to this matter, also note Tab Hunter was removed from this case as District Attorney without notice.

9.

On or about October 21, 2019 the Appellant served the State Court administration with a 2nd Demand for production of documents challenging jurisdiction by requesting the production of certain lawful materials and Notice of Status update. This service was also filed with the District Court and the Circuit Court Case No. 19-12906.

10.

October 24th, 2019 the District Court dismissed this case from its court.

11.

On October 28, 2019 filed with notice of appeal from judgment, titled PROOF OF RECEIPT AND SERVICE OF 2ND INFORMA PAUPERIS time stamped and dated by computer refuting the notion made by the District Court that the Appellant failed to comply with court order. Also, to further reject the district court's ruling a 3rd Informa Pauperis application was filed on or about August 2nd, with the Circuit Court. On or about October 30, notice of reconsideration was filed in this case to the court for reconsideration for this Appellant to proceed without pay.

12.

On or about November 17th the Appellant received Notice from the DOUGHERTY COUNTY STATE COURT filed dated November 6th and postmarked November 15th. Herein enclosed is a

copy of the notice and the rebuttal at Appendix C. Therein discovery was not able to be conducted whereas the Appellant may examine the facts in this case and the source of law governing such offenses. As a matter of fact, discovery was directly denied in violation of, SEE. **Brady v. Maryland, 373 U.S. 83 (1963)**; was a landmark the United States Supreme Court case that established that the prosecution must turn over all evidence that might exonerate the defendant (exculpatory evidence) to the defense. This also falls within the meaning of **18 U.S § 241-242** deprivation of rights under color of law.

13.

On December 20, notice of reconsideration, notice of Clarification, **Exhibit J1** (Notarized Voluntary relinquishment of U.S Statutory Citizenship) **Exhibit L** (Treaty of Peace and Friendship (Morocco 1787/1836) was filed in this case.

14.

On January 8, 2020 the District Court denied notice of reconsideration and IFP.

REASON FOR GRANTING CERTIORARI

This case arises out of the Constitution Article III and VI invoking the Treaty of Peace and Friendship 1787/1836. Between the Moors and Europeans which gave the European families permission to do business at Morocco (North America) and this being evident in the 1956 memorandum of President Dwight Eisenhower relinquishing jurisdiction of the United States in Morocco SEE. 22 USC Ch. 2: CONSULAR COURTS 141-143. The supreme court held in **Herrera v Wyoming, No.17-532, 587 U.S 2019**, that Wyoming's statehood did not void the 151-year-old, 1868 Indian treaty even if the treaty existed before the creation of the state and this does include the Original Treaty of Peace and Friendship 1787/1836 which is the longest standing treaty between the Al Maurikan Maurs/Moors/Muurs of North America and the United States of America.

This Appellant invokes Article III **Section 1**. The judicial power of the United States, shall be vested in one Supreme Court, **Section 2**. The judicial power shall extend to all cases, in law and equity, arising under this Constitution, the laws of the United States, and treaties made.

The appellant moves this court to grant this certiorari. This writ should be granted in accord with substantive rights and to view the constitutionality of this case separate from the statutory rules that are being challenged. The Appellant is competent in the fact that code, statutes and rules apply to artificial persons only, SEE. **Rodrigues v. Ray Donavan 769 F. 2d 1344, 1348 (1985)** "All codes, rules, and regulations are for government authorities only, not human/Creators in accordance with God's laws. All codes, rules, and regulations are unconstitutional and lacking due process", which are corporations or artificial persons that are identified by color stigmas falling within the meaning of color of law, while constitutional and treaty law apply to the natural

living person. The inability to exercise the right to travel freely unencumbered, impairs the Appellants lively hood and the impairs his ability to properly provide for himself and his family. The Appellant cannot be forced into penalty contracts, waiving rights secured by the before mentioned Treaties and up-held in the National Constitution 1787/1791, this would be insanity on part of the Appellant and treason and the abuse of power on part of the Appellee(s) against the Natural People. Therefore, the Appellant seek this court to grant this common law certiorari, this matter is a matter that affects the American people and must be brought before the higher court for resolution.

CONCLUSION

This Writ for Certiorari should be granted, because it is of great importance to the public. Also, it raises constitutional questions in need of answers in this today's time. Moreover, it is the right of the people to travel, this is not a liberty or privilege which the city or the state may prohibit but the right to travel without tags, government registration, or license upon the public roads and highways are an absolute right. SEE. Christy v. Elliot, 216 I 131, 74 HE 1035, LRA NS 1905 – 1910:

California v. Farley 98 CED Rpt. 89, 20 CA 3d 1032 (1971)." *Traveling in an automobile on the public roads was not a threat to the public safety or health and constituted no hazard to the public, and such a traveler owed nothing more than "due care" (as regards to tort for negligence) to the public and the owner owed no other duty to the public (eg. State), he / she and his / her auto, having equal rights to and on the roadways / highways as horses and wagons, etc.; this same right is still substantive rule, in that speeding, running stop signs, traveling without license plates, or registration are not threats to the public safety, and thus, are not arrestable offenses".* When the matter came to the Appellant's attention that having waived his right to travel by accepting the state issued license, it was immediately surrendered. As the driver service contract did not mention

the waiver of such rights which makes the contract void due to non-disclosure of certain material facts. SEE. Universal Inv. Co. v. Sahara Motor Inn., Inc 619 P.2d 485, 127 213-(Ariz. App. 1980) “Concealing a material fact when there is duty to disclose may be actionable fraud”. SEE. State v. Coddington, 662 P.2d 155, 135 Ariz 480 (Ariz. App. 1983) “When one conveys a false impression by disclosure of some facts and the concealment of others, such concealment is in effect a false representation that what is disclosed is the whole truth”. Which is the case with the contract for driver’s services never disclosing the waiver of rights upon acceptance.

The Dougherty County State Court et el, has not proven beyond a shadow of a doubt that it has jurisdiction over the natural person and the Dougherty County State Court et el, has made it clear that the law they are enforcing is listed under (O.C.G.A) OFFICIAL CODE OF GEORGIA ANNOTATED, which finds its basis in the CODIFICATION OF THE STATUTE LAW OF GEORGIA, (Page 833 Number 47) wherein it does specifically mentions *Exceptions in favor of Aborigines, Moors, and Hindoos, - The provisions, and, prohibitions, and penalties of this act shall not extend to any American Indian, free Moor, or Lascar; but the bur-den of proof, in all cases of arrest of any person of color, shall be on such person of color to show him/herself exempt from the operation of this act.* The supreme court has made it clear and undeniable. SEE. Norton v. Shelby County, 118 U.S. 425 “An unconstitutional act is not law; it confers no rights; it imposes no duties; affords no protection; it creates no office; it is in legal contemplation, as inoperative as though it had never been passed”. Therein (Code and Statute) where the language of law is clearly ambiguous, especially where it makes void constitutionally secured rights, therefore the framers were sure to add in Article VI of the National Constitution that “anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding”! and so the Supreme Court ruled in support thereof Marbury v. Madison, 5 US 137 (1803) “The Constitution of these United States is the

supreme law of the land. Any law that is repugnant to the Constitution is null and void of law.”

It is a right of the people to stay out of compelled contracts. SEE. State vs Eberhard , 179 P 853;

246 p2d 1011. “*Where a private occupational statute exists (O.C.G.A), as her, of which the intent is regulation of private commercial occupations (DRIVERS LICENSE, TAG REGISTRATION etc), the particular agency enforcing that private statute (STATE OF GEORGIA, DOUGHERTY COUNTY STATE COURT, DEPARTMENT OF DRIVERS SERVICE et el), shall not apply it by trickery and deceit, and threat and misrepresentation, to persons regulated and taxed, nor should it permit any party to do so, in violation of persons right to stay out of compelled contract, when he is not a person subject to the statute, unless clearly with its words (CONTRACT) ”.* This Court takes this Appellant in light of the natural person in propria persona, *sui juris*, in full life, and living; having pedigree and ancestral tie to the old Moroccan Empire currently known as North America and could not exist within the jurisdiction of the Corporate States. SEE. The Original 13th Amendment. **SECTION 12** – The traffic in Slaves with Africa is hereby forever prohibited on pain of death and the forfeiture of all the rights and property of persons engaged therein; and the descendants of Africans shall not be citizens. **SECTION 19** – When all of the several States shall have Abolished Slavery, then and thereafter Slavery or Involuntary Servitude, except as a punishment for crime, shall never be established or tolerated in any of the States or Territories of the United States, and they shall be forever Free.

Wherefore, Affiant Respectfully Submitted, in 'Good Faith', and with Honor Request:

I/we affirm under penalty of perjury under the Treaty of Peace and Friendship 1787/1836, Articles of Confederation 1778, and the National Constitution for North America 1791 that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Executed this 3 day of February 2020 A.D = 1434/1435 M.C.Y

I am: 

Authorized Representative

Natural Person, In Propria Persona Sui Juris:

All Rights Reserved and Retained

Special Appearance: Under Threat, Duress and Coercion

18 U.S § 242- Conspiracy against rights

If two or more persons conspire to injure, oppress, threaten, or intimidate any person in any State, Territory, Commonwealth, Possession, or District in the free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege secured to him by the Constitution or laws of the United States, or because of his having so exercised the same; or If two or more persons go in disguise on the highway, or on the premises of another, with intent to prevent or hinder his free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege so secured-- They shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both; and if death results from the acts committed in violation of this section or if such acts include kidnapping or an attempt to kidnap, aggravated sexual abuse or an attempt to commit aggravated sexual abuse, or an attempt to kill, they shall be fined under this title or imprisoned for any term of years or for life, or both, or may be sentenced to death.

18 U.S § 242- Deprivation of rights under color of law

Whoever, under color of any law, statute, ordinance, regulation, or custom, willfully subjects any person in any State, Territory, Commonwealth, Possession, or District to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured or protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States, or to different punishments, pains, or penalties, on account of such person being an alien, or by reason of his color, or race, than are prescribed for the punishment of citizens, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than one year, or both; and if bodily injury results from the acts committed in violation of this section or if such acts include the use, attempted use, or threatened use of a dangerous weapon, explosives, or fire, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both; and if death results from the acts committed in violation of this section or if such acts include kidnapping or an attempt to kidnap, aggravated sexual abuse, or an attempt to commit aggravated sexual abuse, or an attempt to kill, shall be fined under this title, or imprisoned for any term of years or for life, or both, or may be sentenced to death.