

STATE WARRANT AND MITTINUS  
GEORGIA, BALDWIN COUNTY

ATT#1

Personally came Special Agent Jackie Gittins who on oath says that, to the best of her knowledge and belief, MICHAEL ALONZA RUFUS did in the County aforesaid, commit the offense of, TO WIT Filing False Lien or Encumbrance in said County, on April 18, 2016. The place of occurrence of said offense being Baldwin County Clerk of Superior Court; 121 N Wilkinson St Milledgeville, Baldwin County, GA; and against the laws of the State of Georgia. Said offense being described as O.C.G.A 16-10-20.1.

The Affiant has probable cause to believe that MICHAEL ALONZA RUFUS did knowingly file, enter, or record any document in a public record or court of this state or of the United States knowing or having reason to know that such document is false or contains a materially false fictitious or fraudulent statement or representation when he filed a lien against Ocmulgee Superior Court Judge Alison Burleson on April 18, 2016, at the Baldwin County Clerk of Superior Court.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this

11 day of January, 2018

Affiant

Hon. Brenda Holbert Trammell  
SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE

GEORGIA, BALDWIN COUNTY

To the Sheriff or his deputy, Coroner, Constable, or Marshal of said State, GREETINGS: For sufficient causes made known to me in the above affidavit, you are hereby commanded to arrest the defendant named in the foregoing affidavit charged by the prosecutor therein with the offense against the laws of this State named in said affidavit and bring him before me or some other Judicial officer of this State to be dealt with as the law directs.

Herein fail not, this January 4 2018

Hon. Brenda Holbert Trammell  
SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE OF GEORGIA, BALDWIN COUNTY

After hearing the evidence in the above case it is ordered that said defendant be bound of \_\_\_\_\_ Dollars for his appearance on the first day at the \_\_\_\_\_ ext term or session next after this day of the \_\_\_\_\_ to be held in and for said County to answer the charge of \_\_\_\_\_

In default thereof that he be committed to the common jail of said County, there to be safely kept until thence delivered by course of law.

Given under my hand and seal this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 20\_\_\_\_\_

(L. S.)  
JUDGE

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF BALDWIN COUNTY  
STATE OF GEORGIA  
July Term, 2018

THE STATE OF GEORGIA

Ct. 1: Filing False Documents

V.

MICHAEL ALONZA RUFUS

True  
Dennis Park

Bill  
Foreperson

S/A Jacqueline Gittins, GBI, Prosecutor

STEPHEN A. BRADLEY,  
District Attorney

**INDICTMENT**

The defendant, **MICHAEL ALONZA RUFUS**, having been advised of his/her constitutional rights, waives formal arraignment, waives copy of indictment, and enters a plea of

This the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_.

Assistant District Attorney

Defendant's Attorney

Defendant

We, the jury, find the defendant, **MICHAEL ALONZA RUFUS**, \_\_\_\_\_.

This the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_.

Foreperson

Returned in open court by the grand jury bailiff, announced by the court, and filed in office  
This the 18<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2018.

Clerk, Baldwin County Superior Court

**WITNESSES FOR THE STATE:**

✓S/A Jacqueline Gittins, GBI  
Chief Magistrate Mike Burke  
Alison T Burleson  
Anthony Carter  
Anthony Galimore  
Patrick Haggard  
Horace Johnson  
Clay Land  
Michael Oldham  
The Honorable Judge John M. Ott  
Honorable Samuel D. Ozburn  
Layla Zon

**BALDWIN COUNTY, GEORGIA**  
**IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF BALDWIN COUNTY**

The Grand Jurors selected, chosen and sworn for Baldwin County, to-wit:

Dennis L. Pickel, Foreperson

Lavesha Thornton	Alphonso Havior
Coby R. Dixon, Jr.	Kenecia C. Devero
Loretta D. Steele	Michael A. Newberry
Teri-Ann Wood	Wilbur Kevin Singley
Edward L. Kirkpatrick	Aminisha J. Holloway
Shari L. Speights	Elvera James
Shandral L. Dumas	Virgil J. Larkin
Sierra D. Johnson	Kimetra M. Roberson
Harold C. Newsome, Jr.	Sharon Y. Davis
Micky Couey	Latosha C. Thomas
Shavon L. Griswold	Adrienne E. Hill

**COUNT 1:** In the name and behalf of the citizens of Georgia, charge and accuse **MICHAEL ALONZA RUFUS** with having committed the offense of **Filing False Documents (O.C.G.A. 16-10-20.1)** for that the said **MICHAEL ALONZA RUFUS** on the 18th day of April, 2016, in Baldwin County, Georgia, did then and there unlawfully and knowingly file in a court of this state, to wit: Superior Court of Baldwin County, a document, to wit: UCC Financing Statement, knowing that such document was false, contrary to the laws of the State of Georgia, the good order, peace and dignity thereof.

Baldwin County Superior Court

July Term, 2018

S/A Jacqueline Gittins, GBI,  
Prosecutor

STEPHEN A. BRADLEY  
DISTRICT ATTORNEY  
OCMULGEE JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

SEARCH

ATT

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF WALTON COUNTY  
STATE OF GEORGIA

STATE OF GEORGIA  
vs.  
MICHAEL ALONZO RUFUS,  
Defendant. CASE NO.  
2011-CR-0354-3  
NOTIONS HEARING

ORIGINAL

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
Monjury proceedings before the HONORABLE SAMUEL D.  
OEDBURN, JUDGE, commencing August 29, 2011, Walton  
Superior Court.

APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL:

For the State: VICTOR MCNEASE, A.D.A.  
MARIE GREENE, A.D.A.  
For the Defendant: BRYAN FROST, Attorney

KELLY O. BRAY, CCR  
ALCOVY JUDICIAL CIRCUIT  
5157 David Circle  
Covington, Georgia 30014  
(770) 786-1137

29  
August  
2011

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  
MR. MCNEASE: Your Honor, I call the  
cases of state versus Vincent Ronald  
Thomas. He's No. 23 on your calendar. He  
is in custody. And Michael Alonzo Rufus,  
No. 19 on your calendar. And this is for a  
motion.

I'm sorry, Your Honor. These two have  
gotten together. Mr. Rufus and --

THE COURT: Are they co-defendants?  
What are they being brought up for?

MR. MCNEASE: For a joinder issue, Your  
Honor, and motions status. We've also got  
motions status and...

Your Honor, this is Case No. 11-CR-0354-  
3, and we're here for motions status. And  
this is also Vincent Ronald Thomas and  
Michael Alonzo Rufus.

They are being charged with possession  
of marijuana with intent to distribute,  
Count 1; and possession of a firearm during  
commission of a felony, here for motions  
status and trying to work out a joinder  
issue. The state is planning to file a  
motion to join co-defendants.

THE COURT: All right. And for the

record, Mr. Thomas is represented by  
Mr. Barrow, and Mr. Rufus is represented by  
Mr. Frost, and they are present here with  
their attorneys of record.

Let's take first Mr. Thomas's case.

MR. BARROW: Judge, just to be clear, we  
were at status the last court date. We  
announced ready for trial. But Ms. Greene,  
who's actually handling this case, asked  
that we reset it so both co-defendants could  
be brought up at once to address the joinder  
issue.

I have no objection to the joinder.

THE COURT: So from Mr. Thomas's  
perspective, then, there are no other  
issues, motions, discovery disputes or  
anything further that needs to be addressed  
apart from going forward with the selection  
of a jury?

MR. BARROW: That's correct, Judge.

THE COURT: And he does not object to  
the joinder of the trial of his case with  
that of Mr. Rufus?

MR. BARROW: Correct.

THE COURT: As I understand it, we're

3

778

28/8/11

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  
MR. MCNEASE: Your Honor, I call the  
cases of state versus Vincent Ronald  
Thomas. He's No. 23 on your calendar. He  
is in custody. And Michael Alonzo Rufus,  
No. 19 on your calendar. And this is for a  
motion.

I'm sorry, Your Honor. These two have  
gotten together. Mr. Rufus and --

THE COURT: Are they co-defendants?  
What are they being brought up for?

MR. MCNEASE: For a joinder issue, Your  
Honor, and motions status. We've also got  
motions status and...

Your Honor, this is Case No. 11-CR-0354-  
3, and we're here for motions status. And  
this is also Vincent Ronald Thomas and  
Michael Alonzo Rufus.

They are being charged with possession  
of marijuana with intent to distribute,  
Count 1; and possession of a firearm during  
commission of a felony, here for motions  
status and trying to work out a joinder  
issue. The state is planning to file a  
motion to join co-defendants.

THE COURT: All right. And for the

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  
also here with reference to a status  
conference on Mr. Rufus's case, and  
Mr. Rufus is represented by Mr. Frost.

Is that correct, Mr. Frost.

MR. FROST: Yep. That's correct, Judge.

THE COURT: Yes, sir.

MR. FROST: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: All right. Now, does  
Mr. Rufus have any evidentiary disputes,  
discovery disputes, unresolved motions or  
anything further that needs to be addressed  
before he can announce ready for trial?

MR. FROST: Yes. I think he has a great  
many, Judge.

THE COURT: For the record, what are we  
looking at?

MR. FROST: Well, for starters,  
Mr. Rufus does not believe that this court  
has any jurisdiction over him. He objects  
to the proceedings, the joinder. He has a  
habeas petition filed and several other  
issues outstanding. And quite frankly, I'm  
not sure that, I'm not convinced Mr. Rufus  
has a grasp on what he's doing here today.

THE COURT: You're his attorney. Have

2

2

2

2

2

2

2

2

2

2

2

2

2

2

2

2

2

2

2

2

2

2

you, did you explain to him what this is for?

MR. FROST: This is actually the first time I've had time to talk with Mr. Rufus. And in our brief encounter and from what I already know from his file...

THE COURT: Do you need time -- you were appointed when?

MR. FROST: I don't know, Judge.

THE COURT: It hasn't been, it's well over two weeks ago.

MR. FROST: It's been a very busy two weeks, I'm afraid.

THE COURT: I'm just saying, I don't think we need to go forward if you haven't had a chance, and it's on the record here that you haven't met with him before.

MR. FROST: No.

THE COURT: I think that needs to be done so that you and he can come to an accord as to where he stands in this before we go forward.

MR. FROST: And let me say that --

THE COURT: If there are any motions, regardless of who filed them, we need to

5

780

address the motions so that we can go forward. I mean, Mr. Thomas is ready to move forward with his attorney, and if joinder is an issue here, we need to get to both cases on the same level procedurally if we are going to join them and go forward with a trial.

Now, I tell you what we can do, I will -- okay. The clerk has given me what appears to be a notice of appeal filed by Mr. Rufus under the same case number that we're proceeding on today and says a copy was sent to the court reporter and to my office. And apparently that is while he has had counsel.

So what I'm going to do is to suspend going forward with this at this time to give y'all time to talk, Mr. Frost.

MR. FROST: Okay.

THE COURT: So that I'm not going to address anything, rule on anything or make any findings until y'all have had a chance talk.

Now, I don't see any need for Mr. Thomas come back up if he is consenting to --

6

1 joinder. He has no further motions or  
2 anything else to be addressed.

3 MR. BARROW: That's correct, Judge. I  
4 don't believe that we need to appear back in  
5 front of Your Honor.

6 THE COURT: We'll note his case as being  
7 ready for trial. He will, he does not  
8 object to joinder with Mr. Rufus, and we'll  
9 mark him as trial ready, either solely or  
10 jointly with Mr. Rufus, subject to my  
11 hearing his motions and to the extent that  
12 we can if a motion, notice of appeal's been  
13 filed. I don't know.

14 MR. FROST: I have no idea, Judge, even  
15 what -- and I don't even know that if I had  
16 three weeks to look at the file it would  
17 help me know what on earth he's appealed.

18 THE COURT: Well, what we are going do  
19 is this, we are going to suspend at this  
20 time, and we will resume after lunch. I  
21 want you to at least have some time to talk  
22 to him to get an idea of where y'all are  
23 procedurally before the Court does anything.

24 Mr. Thomas is excused. He will not need  
25 to come back, Mr. Barrow. And he'll be

7

782

1 notified when to appear to select a jury.  
2 And of course you will as well.

3 MR. BARROW: Thank you, Judge.

4 MR. FROST: May Mr. McNease and I  
5 approach, Judge.

6 THE COURT: Yes.

7 (Bench conference)

8 (Proceedings adjourned)

9 MS. GREENE: Your Honor, I believe this  
10 is a recall. It's No. 19, the state versus  
11 Michael Alonzo Rufus. He's in custody.

12 And good afternoon, Your Honor.

13 THE COURT: Good afternoon.

14 MS. GREENE: Mr. Rufus, if you'll stand  
15 right there.

16 Your Honor, we are here in the state of  
17 Georgia versus Michael Alonzo Rufus, Case  
18 No. 11-CR-0354-3.

19 Mr. Rufus is charged with Count 1,  
20 possession of marijuana with intent to  
21 distribute; Count 2, possession of a firearm  
22 during the commission of a felony.

23 He is here with counsel, Bryan Frost,  
24 and that is by appointment, Your Honor.

25 8

here for motions status. Several motions have been filed by Mr. Rufus. Specifically, the state has explored the motion for hearing to provide effective aid of counsel. I believe that would be resolved by the appointment of Mr. Frost to Mr. Rufus.

There has been, there have been several motions filed by Mr. Rufus, and the state has waded through all these motions, and seems to finally come to some understanding of what Mr. Rufus's argument actually is.

Mr. Rufus, it appears to the state, is attempting to allege that he is a private person and a natural born citizen of the United States. Now, he's claiming his authority in that would be the 14th Amendment, Section 1, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

Now, natural born citizen is not specifically defined in the 14th Amendment, and that is what Mr. Rufus is basing his argument on. However, Mr. Rufus continuously refers to himself as an ens legis, which is actually a creature of the

9

commit a crime in a particular jurisdiction, that jurisdiction, no matter if it is your name or your person, does have authority to hear that particular case and the facts of that case and determine if this individual did commit that crime or not.

And that, Your Honor, is the state's understanding of the motions that were filed.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Frost.

MR. FROST: I have discussed it with my client, Judge, and I think it would probably be -- I think he would probably prefer that he be able to articulate his position. And I'll just leave it at that, if that please the Court.

THE COURT: Let me ask about one threshold issue here. In the file is a notice of appeal.

MR. FROST: Yes, Judge.

THE COURT: Now, I don't know what's being appealed. But what is the position of counsel concerning the effect of that notice of appeal on the ability of this court to hear these motions at this moment? //

11

79/

law. He's basically, in his motions, alleging that the person that exists, the name Michael Rufus is different from the person, the natural human being standing before you, Michael Rufus, and because of that and because of the 14th Amendment natural born citizen language, he is not subject to the laws of the United States of America. Further, he is alleging through his motions that he is actually a citizen of South Carolina.

Now, the state's problem with all of this is that, no matter if it is the corporation that he is alleging the name Michael Rufus is or the actual human being Michael Rufus, the man standing before you is the individual who is alleged to have committed a crime, not only in the United States of America but also in state of Georgia and Walton County, Georgia, and in Social Circle. And that is the crime that he is here before Your Honor on, and all these motions that are alleging that he is a natural born citizen, in none of them does he ... address the fact that when you do

10

MS. GREENE: I actually spoke with the clerk's office about the notice of appeal, Your Honor. At this moment, there has been no payment for the actual appeal, so the appeal cannot be filed with the actual Court of Appeals until some type of payment or some type of allegation of indigency is provided by the defendant, and none has been provided at this time, and no payment has been provided at this time. So in accordance with the rules of the Court of Appeals, there is no actual appeal at this time.

MR. FROST: I think he's waiting on his pauper's affidavit for that, which the Court can understand that. But she is correct to date. However, he has filed a petition for a writ of habeas corpus. And I believe he's waiting on the outcome of that. I understand --

THE COURT: With who?

MR. FROST: With the Clerk of Superior Court of Walton County. And it's apparently been given to Judge Ott. And I'm not sure how that works legally. But that's what I

12

understand. And beyond that, Judge, I'm afraid that, I think like, as I said, I think it might be best if Mr. Rufus addresses you.

THE COURT: All right. I want to go back to that threshold issue, then. The habeas corpus, I mean, that can continue to go forward unabated by this.

MR. GREENE: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: This will go forward subject to whatever ruling may be made on that.

Now, concerning the notice of appeal, however, everyone's comfortable, then, with us going forward at this point since all the conditions for the filing and transmittal of an appeal to the Court of Appeals have not been met. So we are not stayed at this point from going forward to hear whatever we are going to hear.

MR. FROST: I would prefer Mr. Rufus to have the opportunity to answer that for the record.

THE COURT: You're his lawyer, though. I want to ask you, on that particular issue without getting into all this about natural

13

700

person and jurisdiction, the hearing of this matter, can we do that?

MR. FROST: I don't think my client agrees with that, so ergo, I cannot go on the record as saying that I'm going to waive that right for him because I don't want to be the next person in the habeas.

THE COURT: But you're his lawyer, though, and you want him to argue what it is he's arguing?

MR. FROST: Judge, I have talked with Mr. Rufus, and we have come to an understanding that I do not share the same belief system he does in the understanding, in my understanding of constitutional law. He has his understanding of it. I have mine, and never the twain are going to meet.

So I'm kind of in a precarious situation, and I am hesitant to say anything for the record as to whether we can move forward, be it stay the proceedings because I know he does not believe that this court has jurisdiction for various reasons, and to answer the Court's initial question, that we can move forward with the proceedings as we

14

1 habeas, which is apparently being heard by  
2 Judge Ott, I don't know when.

3 THE COURT: I'm more concerned with the  
4 notice of appeal.

5 MR. FROST: Well, I think that, I would,  
6 he says he's confirmed for me that that's  
7 not an issue.

8 Is that correct, Mr. Rufus?

9 THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

10 THE COURT: All right. So based on his  
11 acknowledgment that that's not an issue, I  
12 think those were his words, we'll go forward  
13 now to hear the issues.

14 Now, the habeas corpus, again, is not  
15 assigned to me, and Judge Ott can go forward  
16 with it, and he may be writing an order  
17 right now. He may have a hearing next  
18 week. That's on a separate track.

19 MR. FROST: Certainly.

20 THE COURT: Okay. And unless and until  
21 a ruling is made, which may or may not  
22 impact this case, then we can go forward,  
23 and that is my ruling.

24 MR. FROST: Yes, sir.

25 THE COURT: So the habeas corpus is

15

15

1 still viable. It's still going forward, but  
2 so is this case, subject to whatever is  
3 entered in that case.

4 Now, is what Ms. Greene proffered the  
5 argument that Mr. Rufus is making?

6 MR. FROST: No, sir.

7 THE COURT: Well, what is the argument  
8 that Mr. Rufus is making?

9 MR. FROST: May I allow him --

10 THE COURT: Do you want to let him speak  
11 for himself on that?

12 MR. FROST: Judge, I can't make heads  
13 or, it's not something -- his understanding,  
14 again, is different from my understanding of  
15 constitutional law, Judge. I can't put it  
16 any other way. I can't possibly stand here  
17 --

18 THE COURT: We seem to be running into  
19 cases today that, it's like herding cats. I  
20 want to get cases resolved, believe it or  
21 not. And we've already given him, released  
22 the public defender's office because of this  
23 same issue, and now we've got you as his new  
24 counsel now, Mr. Frost. We've got to deal

16

1 if it can ever be explained to me what it is  
2 that we've got to deal with.

3 Now, do you want to have your client  
4 explain his position?

5 MR. FROST: I think it's necessary,  
6 Judge. I think that's what he wants.

7 Is that correct, Mr. Rufus?

8 THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

9 THE COURT: All right. Well, we'll  
10 allow him to do that as long as it's with  
11 the understanding that you're his attorney  
12 and it's being done with your permission.

13 MR. FROST: And we discussed that, and  
14 he understands that.

15 Is that correct, Mr. Rufus?

16 THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

17 MR. FROST: I told him -- to further  
18 perfect the record, I told him that I  
19 traditionally do not like to let my clients  
20 say anything at a pretrial position, but  
21 that given the nature of his arguments, I  
22 don't feel that there's, that I can make  
23 those arguments. And quite frankly, I'm not  
24 so sure I understand them, Judge.

25 THE COURT: Okay. Well, let's do this. 17

1 endowed rights as the legislature give them.  
2 Only the citizens of this state that can  
3 hold office, which is a different class of  
4 people subject to a different class of laws,  
5 is legal residents in this state. And that  
6 goes for attorney general, Secretary of  
7 State, all the high offices.

8 Well, the third class of person that I  
9 notice in this state are those that falls  
10 within Article 3, Section 4, Paragraph No. 2  
11 where it speaks that the state and its  
12 political subdivision will deal with federal  
13 programs. That's strictly Social Security.

14 Well, my problem is, knowing that the  
15 true government interest in this case --  
16 because if she's bringing up the case under  
17 a legal presumption I'm within a community  
18 that I'm not, it would deprive me of my  
19 equal protection rights and due process  
20 rights within protection as a citizen of the  
21 state as provided in the United States  
22 Constitution under Article 4, Section 2,  
23 Clause 1.

24 The citizens of the state -- well, when 19  
25 I speak of the ~~ans~~ legis, under Social

19

704

1 Mr. Rufus, unless you object, and apparently  
2 with the permission of your attorney, please  
3 feel free to just explain your position.

4 THE DEFENDANT: First of all, I do  
5 apologize for the disturbance I have caused.  
6 The issue is complicated. But what I found  
7 is that the actual, my actual question is,  
8 the true -- what I've found is the attorney  
9 for the government will say that they  
10 represent one set of laws for one set of  
11 people in this state. But contrary to that  
12 under Article 3, Section 6, Paragraph 4 --  
13 under Article 3, Section 6, Paragraph 4 --  
14 under Article 3, Section 6, Paragraph 4 --  
15 under Article 3, Section 6, Paragraph 4 --  
16 under Article 3, Section 6, Paragraph 4 --  
17 under Article 3, Section 6, Paragraph 4 --  
18 under Article 3, Section 6, Paragraph 4 --  
19 under Article 3, Section 6, Paragraph 4 --  
20 under Article 3, Section 6, Paragraph 4 --  
21 under Article 3, Section 6, Paragraph 4 --  
22 under Article 3, Section 6, Paragraph 4 --  
23 under Article 3, Section 6, Paragraph 4 --  
24 under Article 3, Section 6, Paragraph 4 --  
25 under Article 3, Section 6, Paragraph 4 --

THE COURT: Of what?

THE DEFENDANT: The Georgia  
Constitution. It states that the state, in  
interpreting the statute, the Supreme Court  
has stated that this state legislature has  
the authority to create a separate class of  
persons with separate classes of laws  
applied only to them.

Well, looking at those classes of persons,  
I found that within Article 1, Section 1,  
those citizens are just identified as  
residents. These citizens cannot hold high  
offices in this state. They are only

1 Security, they are not -- once you in the  
2 Social Security, you become an incorporated  
3 being, therefore you're not a citizen. So  
4 my problem is, knowing the true instances of  
5 the government in this case -- because if  
6 she's bringing it up that I'm one of these  
7 members of these three separate communities  
8 which the legislature of this state has  
9 clearly said that they have authority to do,  
10 she is depriving me of my individual right  
11 as a natural born citizen of the state of  
12 South Carolina.

13 THE COURT: All right.

14 Ms. Greene, did you follow that?

15 MS. GREENE: Kind of, Your Honor.  
16 Basically it goes into what he rose in his  
17 motion, that he is a citizen of South  
18 Carolina. He's a resident of South  
19 Carolina. His domicile is there. He's not  
20 a resident here. He doesn't live here.  
21 He's not subject to our constitution because  
22 he's saying that our constitution only has  
23 three levels of citizens that are subject to  
24 their laws, and he's not one of those three  
25 categories. And basically because he lives

18

20

in South Carolina, he's part of South Carolina.

That's what he says here, and that's what I understood that argument just to be.

THE DEFENDANT: No, sir.

MR. FROST: Maybe you can enlighten us.

THE DEFENDANT: The constitution speaks of, the United States Constitution speaks of two different citizens with two different types of persons. If I am the, allow her to proceed under the presumption that I am a citizen under the 14th Amendment created by the 14th Amendment or any of those type citizens protected by that privilege, I will not have the ability to protect myself under the citizen immunity clause under the constitution, which are for citizens that have God-given rights endowed within the sovereignty of the state.

Well, under that article, it also states that by me passing through this state, I have protection under that through due process and 14th, due process and equal protection clause under this state and, under this state constitution and the United

21

22

States constitution. But the attempt to say that it's only one class of citizen and one class alone is easily rebutted by the statute and the Supreme Court of this state interpretation of that statute, that uniform laws does not mean universal. And they have specifically been allowed to create separate classes of persons. Undoubtedly if a person only a resident in this state, they would not have the same rights as a legal resident, which can hold high office.

THE COURT: Let me ask you one question. Assuming your argument is true, is it your position that when you're physically located within the bounds of the state of Georgia, you cannot be prosecuted for anything that you do?

THE DEFENDANT: No, sir. It's my position that they have a certain set of laws that are applicable to the citizens of my character. For instance, Your Honor, the so-called issue with a driver license, it's a myth. When it comes to legal residents of this state -- and we can research the law if

residents of this state, their rights are endowed by God. God give us the right to do a lot of things that these laws are not applicable to. And you have a section of your constitution which speaks of the special laws relating to the rights and statuses of private persons. Well, when I looked up that term, special laws, it means that it's laws that basically, to a set of persons that cannot protect their rights, and that goes to the residents of this state, not the legal residents, Your Honor.

MS. GREENE: Your Honor, may --

THE COURT: Well, is there any other argument that you wish to present? And the motion that you have filed that you're presenting argument in support of, what are you asking me to do?

THE DEFENDANT: If this is true that the government has three different class of people to protect with three different sets of laws that it's applicable to, well, the first issue that must be resolved is, in order to protect my interest is, what class of person that she's protecting. She says

23

24

25

798

1 there's one class. But the constitution is  
2 saying that they have the authority to  
3 create different classes, and they have. At  
4 least three.

5 THE COURT: The bottom line, though, is  
6 that, are you saying that you are not  
7 subject to the laws of Georgia, or are you  
8 saying that they have got to charge you with  
9 certain laws before they will apply to you?

10 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. I'm subject  
11 to laws of my class of citizen.

12 THE COURT: Okay. And now, it's the  
13 state's burden to prove their case against  
14 you. But now, what class of citizens are  
15 you saying that you are a member of?

16 THE DEFENDANT: Those that are protected  
17 under Article 4 of the United States  
18 Constitution:

19 THE COURT: And if you're a member of  
20 that class of citizen, is it your position,  
21 then, that you can't be prosecuted in  
22 Georgia because you're a resident of South  
23 Carolina for certain laws that apply in  
24 Georgia?

22

24

not, because that constitutional provision states that I will be protected by those privileges. The problem with this, Your Honor, is, under those privileges, they speak of God-given rights. If you read the Slaughter-House case, Your Honor, a guy spoke of God-ordained rights in attempting to litigate them and vindicate them under the privilege and immunity for citizens of the United States under the 14th Amendment.

Well, the court, specifically ruling on that issue, stated that they are not within that provision of the constitution; therefore, they couldn't get no remedy. Well, if I am in a proceeding that's governed by those privileges and immunities instead of a citizen under Article 4, well, the problem is, I will not be, my issues will not be seen because of the rules of evidence. This Court will be bound by the laws applicable for those persons, which is clearly distinct. And that's an issue of the jurisdiction of the court that must be resolved properly.

THE COURT: Okay. Anything else?

25

25

800

27

802

THE DEFENDANT: No.

THE COURT: So you're saying you want the indictment thrown out because it is based on laws that don't apply to you?

THE DEFENDANT: But that's an issue --

THE COURT: I'm just saying, is that the basis of your motion? Is that what you're asking for?

THE DEFENDANT: If that fits within the challenge of the, if the finder of the jurisdiction of the court appropriate, I'm a private person.

THE COURT: You lost me there. I mean, the whole thing is, you're saying that as you're charged in this case with possession of marijuana with intent to distribute and possession of a firearm during the commission of a felony, that that indictment against you, you want it to be dismissed because the Court does not have power over you based on the laws that were relied on in that? Is that what you're saying?

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor --

THE COURT: Am I getting close? the defendant. If that's if the

26

1 prosecution is charging me in two of the  
2 class of persons that I'm not a member, I'm  
3 saying that I'm not a part of that body  
4 politic so I can't be liable to those  
5 crimes.

6 THE COURT: Okay. All right. And so  
7 you're asking, based on that, you want the  
8 indictment dismissed? Is that what you're  
9 asking for?

10 THE DEFENDANT: I wish that the  
11 procedures appropriate for the resolving  
12 this issue to be followed.

13 THE COURT: Okay. Well, and Mr. Frost,  
14 do you, is he basically seeking to quash the  
15 indictment based on your understanding?

16 MR. FROST: It sounds like a quash or a  
17 demurrer, Judge. But I sense that there  
18 might be something else in there other  
19 than -- well, I think that would be the  
20 vehicle by which the indictment would go  
21 away.

22 THE COURT: Okay.

23 MR. FROST: To be quashed or by  
24 demurrer.

25 THE COURT: Well, I will pull the exact

27

1 motion. We've had the argument on it as you  
2 have, I guess, endorsed or more or less  
3 allowed him to present. And I just want to  
4 get everything in the record so that he  
5 can't say, well, I never was allowed to  
6 present this.

7 MR. FROST: I understand. And if I may,  
8 Judge, he has a question.

9 (Off-the-record conversation)

10 MR. FROST: Judge, he's asked me a  
11 question I don't know the answer to.

12 THE COURT: All right. Well, I tell you  
13 what, if you and he want to get together and  
14 amend, to make sure everything is in the  
15 record that he wants to argue, then I'll  
16 give you leave to amend, if there's  
17 something in writing he's filed, that he  
18 wants to be sure something is in there so  
19 that it's in the record and he's not waiving  
20 anything, I'll give you that opportunity.

21 MR. FROST: If I may just ask him,  
22 Judge.

23 THE COURT: All right.

24 MR. FROST: I believe he's got some  
25 things he'd like to do to perhaps...

28

I believe Mr. Rufus is going to supply me with some things that he wishes for me to put into a possible amended motion.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. FROST: If the Court will indulge us.

THE COURT: Will a further hearing be required? Or in other words, if you want to file a brief or whatever with it, if we are dealing with issues of law, I don't see that there are any facts here that are in dispute in terms of this. It's just a matter of the law, the Constitution of the United States and Georgia. And he said the Georgia Supreme Court. He referred to, I think he said the Slaughter-House case.

If he wants to put, if we are dealing with issues of law as opposed to fact, then if you wish to amend your motion with a brief, you may do so.

MR. FROST: May we approach just for a minute, Judge.

THE COURT: All right.

(Bench conference)

THE COURT: All right, counsel. Just do

29

806

what we discussed in the bench conference here.

Mr. Frost, you and Mr. Rufus will have a couple of weeks to get your brief together to put in the record these arguments that were stated today with a little more clarity and referring to the specific provisions of the U.S. and state constitutions and any case law -- he mentioned the Slaughter-House case, you know, with citations so it's clear what court and so forth so it can be looked at to see if it stands for what he says it stands for.

And then Ms. Greene will have two weeks to prepare a response, and then it will be placed on the calendar so we can move forward with a status conference. If y'all could copy me with those so that I can be prepared at that time at the next hearing to hopefully issue a ruling at that time instead of having to look at it for the first time.

Okay. We're adjourned.

(Proceedings concluded)

30

C E R T I F I C A T E

STATE OF GEORGIA  
COUNTY OF NEWTON

I hereby certify that the foregoing transcript was taken down, as stated in the caption, and the questions and answers thereto were reduced to print under my direction; that the foregoing Pages 1 through 30 represent a true, correct and complete transcript of the evidence given upon said hearing, and I further certify that I am not of kin or counsel to any of the parties in said cause, nor interested in the outcome thereof.

This 12th day of October, 2011.



31

806

GEORGIA PUBLIC DEFENDER STANDARDS:  
NOTICE OF DECLARATION OF CONFLICT  
REQUEST FOR APPOINTMENT OF CONFLICT

Date of Request: 10/12/11  
Client Name: Client Name: 4075-8  
Client Address: 1000 Peachtree Street, N.E.  
Court # 3104-2011-3  
Court Attorney: Brian Fowlkes (770-577-4721, 404-572-0000)

Client CPD is keeping and why: \_\_\_\_\_

Last Court Date/Type: 10/12/11 Next Court Date/Type: 10/12/11  
Attorney: / Client Name: /  
Co-defendants and their attorneys (attach additional sheets if necessary):  
Gwen A. Greene - Client Name: /

Remarks for potential conflict (list specific facts and circumstances surrounding the potential conflict, including whether the attorney may become an actual conflict at a specific stage, e.g. trial; and whether circumstances may lead to another attorney within the office or agency, have better knowledge)

This client has an attorney which paid a retained attorney. Per Judge Greene, he is now being represented by trial and trial attorney on the same case. Both attorneys are the same. This trial attorney is in no way obligated to make the argument that the trial attorney may have done while paid a retained attorney. Per Judge Greene, he is now being represented by trial and trial attorney on the same case. Both attorneys are the same. Both attorneys have different law firms. Both attorneys have different trial attorneys and different trial attorneys are not related to each other. Both attorneys have different law firms. Both attorneys have different trial attorneys and different trial attorneys are not related to each other.

Client's Status: Currently  Bond  Client Contact Information: Fulton County Jail

CPD Conflict Declaration: Approved  Disapproved  By: Anthony S. Carter Date: 10/12/11

Conflict Office: Approved  Disapproved  By: *Reagan Murphy* Date: 11/16/11  
Name of Assigned Attorney: *Reagan Murphy* CPD/CJA (check one) Pre-requested rate: \$ 100's Verification: \_\_\_\_\_

Email this form to [cpdconflict@state.ga.us](mailto:cpdconflict@state.ga.us); mail or deliver the complete original file to the new attorney upon acceptance of the conflict.



GEORGIA PUBLIC DEFENDER STANDARDS COUNCIL  
NOTICE OF DECLARATION OF CONFLICT &  
REQUEST FOR APPOINTMENT OF CONFLICT COUNSEL

Client <u>Michael Alonza Rufus</u>	Date of Request 11/15/11	JCATS # 1100700084FnCP	Court # 11CR-0354-3
Circuit Alcovy	County Walton	Judge Ozburn	CPD Attorney Bryan Frost W12-027 (W12-003)
Charges Possession of Marijuana with Intent to Deliver			

Client CPD is keeping and why. None.

Last Court Date/Type 11/14/11 Next Court Date/Type

**Co-defendants and their attorneys (attach additional sheets if necessary)** \_\_\_\_\_

Grounds for potential conflict (list specific facts and circumstances surrounding the potential conflict, including whether the conflict may become an actual conflict at a specific stage, e.g. trial; and whether alternatives to declaration of potential conflict, such as seeking a waiver of conflict from the client, or reassigning the case to another attorney within the office or circuit, have been considered)

This client has had significant issues with his past 2 appointed attorneys. Per Judge Ozburn, he is now being appointed his third and final attorney so that his case may move forward. Judge Ozburn explained on the record that this new attorney is in no way obligated to make the arguments that Mr. Rufus seems determined to address. Both previous counsel have listened to the theories of these arguments and determined that they are not grounded in applicable GA law.

Client's Status: Custody  Bond  Client Contact Information: Walton County Jail

CPD Conflict Declaration: Approved  Disapproved  By: Anthony S. Carter Date 11/16/11

Conflict Office Use Only

Conflict Office Use Only  
Conflict Office: Approved  Disapproved  By: AS Date 11/16/11  
Name of Assigned Attorney: Reginald Wimbley  
CP / C3 (circle one) Pre-negotiated rate: \$ \_\_\_\_\_ IATTS Verification: \_\_\_\_\_

Email this form to [conflict@californiaprobono.org](mailto:conflict@californiaprobono.org); mail or deliver the complete original file to the new attorney upon acceptance of the conflict.

P-3  
DLM  
11/11/15

89

**Ocmulgee Judicial Circuit Budget**  
**Fiscal Year 2020**  
**Superior Court Active and Sr. Judge Supplements**

County	Per Judge	# of Judges	# of Months	Sitting Judges *	# Sr. Judges	# Months	Sr. Judge **	Total Supplements
Baldwin	\$ 250	5	12	\$ 15,000	2	12	\$ 3,996	\$ 18,996
Greene	\$ 150	5	12	\$ 9,000	2	12	\$ 2,398	\$ 11,398
Hancock	\$ 150	5	12	\$ 9,000	2	12	\$ 2,398	\$ 11,398
Jasper	\$ 150	5	12	\$ 9,000	2	12	\$ 2,398	\$ 11,398
Jones	\$ 250	5	12	\$ 15,000	2	12	\$ 3,996	\$ 18,996
Morgan	\$ 150	5	12	\$ 9,000	2	12	\$ 2,398	\$ 11,398
Putnam	\$ 250	5	12	\$ 15,000	2	12	\$ 3,996	\$ 18,996
Wilkinson	\$ 150	5	12	\$ 9,000	2	12	\$ 2,398	\$ 11,398
<b>Totals</b>	<b>\$ 1,500</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>\$ 90,000</b>			<b>\$ 23,976</b>	<b>\$ 113,976</b>

\* Judge's supplement amounts are set by SB 731 Act 324 (Ga. L. 1990, p5255). Baldwin, Jones and Putnam counties are instructed to pay each superior court Judge \$250 per month, other counties in the circuit are instructed to pay each superior court Judge \$150 per month.

\*\* O.C.G.A 47-8-62 states that "... a senior judge shall receive from the counties of the circuit of which he had lately been judge a salary equal to two-thirds of the amounts which had been paid to him as judge by those counties at the time of his resignation as judge of the superior court and his appointment as senior judge."

1. Prior  
2. Mossey

# Baldwin County Sheriff's Office

## Inmate Grievance Form

Inmate's Name Michael A. Riffos

DOB 30 June 1976

Cell/Dorm EE Dorm

Date 8 March, 2021

(NOTE: You must use specific information concerning your grievance including damages, names of persons involved and witnesses.)

**COMPLAINT:**

See Rankin v. Hyatt 2 A.M. Marsh, 457,476, Scott v. Simms et al 60 U.S. 562 definition of "citizen."  
Ignorance of the law excuses no one. OGA § 1-3-6. This Department and its employees are discriminating in an illegal and criminal custom of segregation and restraining me and others of the citizens UNIVERSALLY as a NEW class of NEGROES with all regards to and in violation of the EQUALITY of OGA § 50-2-1(G) Remmey § 15-202. Clearly in Part O.C.G.A § 50-2-2(G) still identifies "citizens" with given to NEGROES not only requires there to be a dual system of laws but commands that distinct notifications be provided the warrant, indictment, judgment, sentence, and contacts with the citizens or Justice the dual system avoid incidents are illegal and void. The practice has been established under the previous embattled *Boone v. Bd. of Ed. of Tellico* (6. 203 Ga 152, 156-157 as adopted from the Common Law. The system ~~of~~ ~~of~~ FRAGILITY is used to legally unjust & few motivators of the illegality, Ga Const Art. 6, Sec. 7 Par. 5. Art. 6 Sec. 8 Par. 1(C). Art. 9, Sec. 1, Par. 3 (a) (c) in Disregarding and depriving the people of their due status Art. 3, Sec. 6, Par. 4(C) and Power under the law. Art. 1, Sec. 3, Par. 1 without DUE PROCESS.

**DESIRED RESOLUTION:**

False imprisonment under color of law/ process is a crime § 18-5-42 and aiding it. I am requesting an explanation of how this facility has ONE UNIVERSAL set of rules and restraining my liberty similarly with THE LAW states you have 2 communities demanding 2 set of laws. EVERY OFFICER HERE SHOULD KNOW THIS. *Telton v. State* 93 Ga 499, 48, 49

Inmate's Signature Michael A. Riffos Date 9 March, 2021

Received by Officer/Staff Member \_\_\_\_\_ At \_\_\_\_\_ On \_\_\_\_\_

Received by Jail Admin Designee \_\_\_\_\_ At \_\_\_\_\_ On \_\_\_\_\_

Jail Admin Designee's Findings and Recommendations:

I will investigate this situation

Jail Admin Designee Signature Major R. Columns Date 3-16-2021

**I (DO) or (DO NOT) Desire to appeal the Designee's decision.**

Inmate's Signature X Michael Riffos Date 6 MUR, 2021

Date grievance received by Administrator \_\_\_\_\_

Jail Administrator's Findings and recommendations:

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Administrator's Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Inmate(GIVEN A COPY) or (ALLOWED TO READ) on (Date) \_\_\_\_\_

In the presence of Officer/Staff member B. Bryant \_\_\_\_\_

O.R. 1315-16-10(a) permits this Facility to enslave court workers "if not void." Similarly, to continue the restraint of a person's liberty, § 842-4-4(b) provides "except as provided by law." On 17-2020 I submitted my 3rd and on 9 March 2021 my 4th, a public charging that this Facility is constitutionally unconstitutional restraining my and others liberty and reputation as UNIVERSITY as "from 2015 & till now they agree to NEGATE with no laws of authority under O.C.G.A § 5D-2-2(a). Without giving any valid response to these damages both of them Major Robins are not only failing to acknowledge and report the custom unconstitutional and illegal acts of the perpetrators of *Garcia v Melendez*, 760 362, 364 and similar authorities but they are also committing illegal acts from their employers to continue their supervisory role in the victimization of workers to violate § 162-20; False imprisonment § 16-2-44; False imprisonment under color of Process § 16-2-42; and Violation of Art. 1 of Public Officer § 1640-1 for all crimes.

THE LAW requires public servants, Go Const Art 1, Sec. 2, Par 1, to act according to their position that I am a free is required to be validated under the law of § 5D-2-2(a) in addition to "impeached until proven guilty." I am requesting response that you will use of my mind. YOU WILL BE SUBPOENA'D.

*Michael B. Jr.*

1 April, 2021