
IN THE
Supreme Court of the United States

Tzedkiyah EL Bey (PRIVATE ATTORNEY GENERAL.),
Petitioners, Affiant, Special Appearance
v.

DOUGHERTY COUNTY STATE COURT ET EL,

Respondents.

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

REQUEST FOR REHEARING

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 Piggie 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).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	I
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....	II
PETITION FOR REHEARING	Page 1
REASON FOR GRANTING REHEARING.....	Page 1-2
I. The U.S Congress never acquired the authority to regulate the Aboriginal Indigenous people or the territories.....	Page 2-3
II. “New Evidence” Notice given to Morocco on January 10, 2020.....	Page 3
CONCLUSION.....	Page 3
A. This case should be over turned in favor of the petitioner....	Page 4-5

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Treaty of Peace and Friendship 1787/1836 (Morocco)

Treaty of Tripoli 1796 (the Bey's of Tripoli)

Article VI Clause III of the Articles of Confederation 1778

Article VI of the Constitution for The United States of America 1787/1791

San Fransisco v Liverpool, 74 Cal 113.....Page 2

Ibid; Gibbons v. Ogen 9 Wheat 1; 5 Cond. Rep. 562.....Page 2

Miscellaneous

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.....Page 2

H. CON. RES. 331 the 100th congress 2nd session.....Page 3

Article 1 Section 2 Clause 3.....Page 3

REQUEST FOR REHEARING

Pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 44.1, Tzedkiyah EL Bey the Maur petitions for re-hearing of this case before a fully constitutionally delegated Article III Nine-Member Court. The denial was entered on April 20, 2019. Bey v. Wille Weaver, No. 19-7673, 2019, No. 19-12880-E, 2019, notice to proceed inform a pauperis was filed in this case. Bey moves this Court to grant this petition for rehearing and consider his case with constitutional law in support of treaties and merits. No oral arguments are requested, Tzedkiyah EL Bey the Maur/Moor believes the briefing in this case is sufficient. Pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 44.1, this petition for rehearing is filed in good faith and without delay.

REASON FOR GRANTING REHEARING

This is case of diverse citizenship and brings into question certain constitutional issues before ruled upon and upheld. Among these issues is the right to travel, the right to determine citizenship and the right to contract. On April 20, 2019 the justices denied hearing this case which we do believe is in error. The Respondents herein listed including all corporate representatives involved with this case through normal mode of correspondence was allotted several opportunities to prove their claim (Jurisdiction and authority beyond a shadow of a doubt beginning in 2016, which they failed to do so, even until today. Specifically, and most recently on April 26, June 26 2019 whereas on both dates the Respondents were given 30 days equally to prove jurisdiction, derived authority, and source of law by means of discovery. The Respondents will argue that Mr. Bey held a state license at the time of the issue(s) and yes this maybe very well true due to ignorance of the law, also taking into account the fact that the entire driver service contract was not fully disclosed and is currently canceled May 2, 2018; upon notice to all Parties and the Department of Driver service.

Showing the contract upon discovery of the fraud was and is rescinded to exercise the indigenous right to self-determination. Moreover, the contract and the agencies representing it failed to mention the fact that constitutional guarantees were being relinquished for a privilege and when asking those enforcing the driver statute about the nature of the contract and laws surrounding it, the situation becomes mysterious. In contrast with the acceptance of the driver service contract i.e. (driver's license) is in actuality the relinquishment of an absolute right for a privilege. **SEE. San Fransisco v Liverpool, 74 Cal 113**, *"Licenses are for the conduct of a business, profession, occupation, the exercise of such when they are a privilege. licensing is in the nature of a SPECIAL PRIVILEGE entitling licensee to do something that he would not be entitled to do without a license". Which was rescinded.*

The U.S Congress never acquired the authority to regulate the Aboriginal Indigenous people or the territories.

The U.S Congress never acquired the authority or power to regulate the Aboriginal Indigenous People. The Constitution is the document by which congress or any of the states derive its authority. Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 gives congress the power to regulate commerce only, living people are not commerce SEE. **Ibid; Gibbons v. Ogen 9 Wheat 1; 5 Cond. Rep. 562**, *"Persons are not the subjects of commerce, and not being imported goods, they do not fall within the meaning founded upon the constitution, of a power given to congress, to regulate commerce, and the prohibition of the states for imposing a duty on imported goods".* The law enforcement officer is used in such a way that regulates the people in their everyday pursuit of life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness, unconstitutionally. The fact of the matter is, no crime has been committed here. Though the original action has been classed as a crime, it involved no injured party which is a stipulation set out by the Bill of Rights of the Constitution to limit the power of congress in the

regulation of the people and ruled on by the supreme court as the Corpus Delicti Doctrine. Therefore, any contract that may have existed in the past is today null and void because the people whom originally made certain agreements were unaware of the total take over by the Union States which was never disclosed. Such documents like, H. CON. RES. 331 the 100th congress 2nd session, given honor to the Iroquois Confederacy that set the standard for the Constitution adopted for the United States of America, also proving certain obligations to the Indigenous people being therein at Article 1 Section 2 Clause 3 the Aboriginal people being mis-classed as Indian Tribes and this person requesting this rehearing is direct descendent of the first people in the Americus.

“New Evidence” Notice given to Morocco on January 10, 2020.

The new evidence herewith presented is an authenticated document including certified trust indenture process to Morocco via the Georgia Notary Department/ Apostille Division, and filed with the Dougherty County Recorder of Deeds and can be found at Document NO. 001332 Book 4488 Page 339-347 filed March 5, 2018 at 11:13a.m. Therewith and herewith given notice of such treaty jurisdiction existing at the Shore of the Americus particularly North America. This same document is being serviced on all Parties as Exhibit L1, L2, L3 and appearing at Appendix H herewith enclosed.

CONCLUSION

Let us do recall this case is not of a statutory nature and do keep in mind that no contract exist that subjects this petitioner to the statutory rules of the United States, or any of its States; but this is one case arising out of constitutional standards and a 233-year-old treaty (Treaty of Peace and Friendship 1787 (Old Morocco)) superseding all United States laws even the adopted constitution, rendering this treaty the Supreme Law of the land. This is not a purposed question of which law is

supreme, only that a precise separation is made between statutory rule and common law (constitution, treaties).

A. This case should be over turned in favor of the petitioner.

This case is currently active in the Dougherty County State Court because the state court refuse to dismiss this case even after its representative have discovery and failed to prove jurisdiction. The Dougherty County State Court could not possibly have jurisdiction where no contract exists between Tzedkiyah El bey and the State of Georgia, U.S.A. Therefore, by leaving this important matter undecided, it will give the corporate state court leave to violate the rights of this person and other such persons immune from such statutory rule, this cannot to be tolerated. I Tzedkiyah EL Bey, son of the Maurs, hereby call on this One Supreme Court of the 9 Justices in whom judicial power is vested, to grant the rehearing of this case. If this Court refuses to uphold the Supreme Law of the land, which it is bound to do so, the lower court's decision will stand and the rights of this aboriginal indigenous person will be violated by the Dougherty County State Court and by other acting local, state and federal agencies operating in all common law territories which the people should not have to be forcefully subject to against their will.

Be It Furthermore Concluded,


Tzedkiyah EL Bey the Maur/Moor respectfully requests that this Court grant the petition for rehearing on the merits of this case and because the Aboriginal Maurs have a right to Self Determination and a right to reject the U.S Citizenship in order that we might return to ours fathers land. This court should demand that the Dougherty County State court et el/ The State of Georgia, U.S.A. dismiss this case for lack of authority and jurisdiction over this person and territory rule in

favor of the petitioner, the true injured party. Therefore, this request is submitted in good faith that all law shall provide remedy.

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

I affirm under penalty of perjury under the Treaty of Peace and Friendship 1787/1836, per Article VI of the Articles of Confederation 1778, and per Article VI of the Constitution for the United States of America, that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Executed this 26 day of May 2020 A.D = 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