

STATE WARRANT AND MITTIMUS
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

April, 2018

Affiant

[Signature]
SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE
Hon. Brenda Holbert Trammell

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 11, 2018

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

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 _____ next term or session next after this day of the _____ Court of _____ 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 Bill
Dennis Paul 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 18th day of Sept, 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

520874

ATT

1 IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF WALTON COUNTY
2 STATE OF GEORGIA
3
4 STATE OF GEORGIA
5 vs.
6 MICHAEL ALONZA RUFUS,
7 Defendant.
8
9 CASE NO.
10 2011-CR-0354-3
11 MOTIONS HEARING
12
13 ORIGINAL
14
15 Nonjury proceedings before the HONORABLE SAMUEL D.
16 O'BURN, JUDGE, commencing August 29, 2011, Walton
17 Superior Court.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

1 record, Mr. Thomas is represented by
2 Mr. Barrow, and Mr. Rufus is represented by
3 Mr. Frost, and they are present here with
4 their attorneys of record.
5
6 Let's take first Mr. Thomas's case.
7
8 MR. BARROW: Judge, just to be clear, we
9 were at status the last court date. We
10 announced ready for trial. But Ms. Greene,
11 who's actually handling this case, asked
12 that we reset it so both co-defendants could
13 be brought up at once to address the joinder
14 issue.
15
16 I have no objection to the joinder.
17
18 THE COURT: So from Mr. Thomas's
19 perspective, then, there are no other
20 issues, motions, discovery disputes or
21 anything further that needs to be addressed
22 apart from going forward with the selection
23 of a jury?
24
25 MR. BARROW: That's correct, Judge.
26
27 THE COURT: And he does not object to
28 the joinder of the trial of his case with
29 that of Mr. Rufus?
30
31 MR. BARROW: Correct.
32
33 THE COURT: As I understand it, we're

3

778

1 MR. MCNEASE: Your Honor, I call the
2 cases of state versus Vincent Ronald
3 Thomas. He's No. 23 on your calendar. He
4 is in custody. And Michael Alonza Rufus,
5 No. 19 on your calendar. And this is for a
6 motion.
7
8 I'm sorry, Your Honor. These two have
9 gotten together. Mr. Rufus and --
10
11 THE COURT: Are they co-defendants?
12 What are they being brought up for?
13
14 MR. MCNEASE: For a joinder issue, Your
15 Honor, and motions status. We've also got
16 motions status and...
17
18 Your Honor, this is Case No. 11-CR-0354-
19 3, and we're here for motions status. And
20 this is also Vincent Ronald Thomas and
21 Michael Alonza Rufus.
22
23 They are being charged with possession
24 of marijuana with intent to distribute,
25 Count 1; and possession of a firearm during
26 commission of a felony, here for motions
27 status and trying to work out a joinder
28 issue. The state is planning to file a
29 motion to join co-defendants.
30
31 THE COURT: All right. And for the

2

1 also here with reference to a status
2 conference on Mr. Rufus's case, and
3 Mr. Rufus is represented by Mr. Frost.
4
5 Is that correct, Mr. Frost.
6
7 MR. FROST: Yep. That's correct, Judge.
8
9 THE COURT: Yes, sir.
10
11 MR. FROST: Yes, sir.
12
13 THE COURT: All right. Now, does
14 Mr. Rufus have any evidentiary disputes,
15 discovery disputes, unresolved motions or
16 anything further that needs to be addressed
17 before he can announce ready for trial?
18
19 MR. FROST: Yes. I think he has a great
20 many, Judge.
21
22 THE COURT: For the record, what are we
23 looking at?
24
25 MR. FROST: Well, for starters,
26 Mr. Rufus does not believe that this court
27 has any jurisdiction over him. He objects
28 to the proceedings, the joinder. He has a
29 habeas petition filed and several other
30 issues outstanding. And quite frankly, I'm
31 not sure that, I'm not convinced Mr. Rufus
32 has a grasp on what he's doing here today.
33
34 THE COURT: You're his attorney. Have

4

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

7

782

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 to talk.

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

6

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

MR. BARRON: Thank you, Judge.

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

THE COURT: Yes.

(Bench conference)

(Proceedings adjourned)

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

And good afternoon, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Good afternoon.

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

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

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

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

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
9
legis, which is actually a creature of the

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

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

10 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Frost.

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

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

20 MR. FROST: Yes, Judge.

21 THE COURT: Now, I don't know what's
22 being appealed. But what is the position of
23 counsel concerning the effect of that notice
24 of appeal on the ability of this court to
25 hear these motions at this moment? 11

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
10
he address the fact that when you do

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

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

21 THE COURT: With who?

22 MR. FROST: With the Clerk of Superior
23 Court of Walton County. And it's apparently
24 been given to Judge Ott. And I'm not sure
25 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.

MS. 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

13

794

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

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

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

Is that correct, Mr. Rufus?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

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

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

MR. FROST: Certainly.

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

MR. FROST: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: So the habeas corpus is

15

15

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

14

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

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

MR. FROST: No, sir.

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

MR. FROST: May I allow him --

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

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

THE COURT: We seem to be running into cases today that, it's like herding cats. I want to get cases resolved, believe it or not. And we've already given him, released the public defender's office because of this same issue, and now we've got you as his new 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. 17

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

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
25 I speak of the ans legis, under Social 19

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 THE COURT: Of what?

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

21 Well, looking at those classes of persons,
22 I found that within Article 1, Section 1,
23 those citizens are just identified as
24 residents. These citizens cannot hold high
25 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

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

21

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 it comes to this, when it comes to legal

22

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

23

298

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

* 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 the... if the

26

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

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

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

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

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

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. FROST: To be quashed or by demurrer.

* THE COURT: Well, I will pull the exact

27

27

800

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

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

(Off-the-record conversation)

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

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

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

THE COURT: All right.

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

28



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

Date of Request 11/15/11

Client

Michael Alonza Rufus

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 Distribute, Possession of a firearm during commission of a felony.

Client CPD is keeping and why None.

Last Court Date/Type

11/14/11

/ Motion hearing

Next Court Date/Type

11/28/11

/ Motion/Status

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

Benson R. Thomas - Chadler Barrow

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: Approved ☒ Disapproved ☐ By: [Signature] Date 11/16/11

Name of Assigned Attorney: Reginald W. Wigglesworth

CP / C3 (circle one) Pre-negotiated rate: \$ JCATS Verification:

Email this form to conflict@georgiapublicdefender.org; mail or deliver the complete original file to the new attorney upon acceptance of the conflict.

P-3
4/1/12

82

**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
Totals	\$ 1,500	-	-	\$ 90,000			\$ 23,976	\$ 113,976

* 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. Massey

Baldwin County Sheriff's Office

Inmate Grievance Form

Inmate's Name Michael Alonzo Ruffus

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 Rinkin v Lyndin 2 A.R. Massey, 457, 476; Scott v Southwest 60 US 562 definition of "denizen." Insurance of the law excuses no one. OGA § 1-3-6. This Department and its employees are participating in an illegal and criminal custom of regulating and restraining me and others of the citizenry UNIVERSALLY as a NEW Form of NEGROES without regards to and in violation of the UNIFORMITY of OGA § 50-2-21(C) January 8 15 202. Clearly in that O.G.A. § 50-2-21(C) still identifies "denizens," help given to NEGROES not only requires them to be a dual system of laws but commonsense that distinct notifications be provided the warrant, attachment, judgment sentence, and contacts with the citizenry under the dual system as said incidents are illegal and void. The practice has been established under the principles embodied Bony v Bd of Ed of Tellico Co. 203 Ga 152, 156-157 as adopted from the Common Law. The system ~~is~~ FRAUDULENTLY is used to illegally unjust Rich a 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 (C) in disregarding and depriving the People of their true status Art 3, Sec 6, Par 4(C) and POWER under the law. Art 1, Sec 2, Part without DUE PROCESS.

DESIRED RESOLUTION:

False imprisonment under color of legal process is a crime § 18-5-48 and asking if I am requesting an explanation of how this facility has ONE UNIVERSAL set of rules and restraining multiple similarly when THE LAW states you have 2 communities demanding 2 set of laws. EVERY OFFICER HERE SHOULD KNOW THIS. Tellico v State 93 Ga App 98, 49

Inmate's Signature Michael A Ruffus

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. Collins

Date

3-16-2021

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

Inmate's Signature

Michael Ruffus

Date

6 April 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. Mount

O.C.G. 16-5-16-10(a) permits this facility to enforce court orders "if not void." Similarly to continue the restraint of a person's liberty §42-1-4(b) provides "except as provided by law." On 1-7-2020 I submitted my 3rd and on 9 March 2021 my 4th grievance claiming that this facility is conceivably unconstitutionally restraining my and others liberty and restricting its ~~university~~ as "citizens" a little remark given to NEGROES with no lawful authority under O.C.G. 16-5-2-2(10). Without giving any valid response to these grievances both Lt Governor Major Robins are not only failing to acknowledge and report the custom unconstitutional and illegal under the precedents of Gairie v. McClellan, 760 362, 384 and similar authorities but they are also concealing these illegal acts from their employees to continue their supervisory role in the custom. Rights to work §16-2-20. False Imprisonment §16-2-41. False Imprisonment Under Color of Process §16-2-42. and Violation of Oath of Public Officers §16-10-1 are all crimes.

THE LAW requires public servants, Go Const Art. 1, Sec. 2, Par. 1, to act accordingly. Your position that I am a "3rd" is required & requested to be withdrawn under the law of §50-2-2(10) in addition to "indorse until proven guilty." I am requesting a response that you will use of my kind. YOU WILL BE SUBSEQUENCED.
Michael Ruffs
1 April, 2021