

No. \_\_\_\_\_

---

**In the  
Supreme Court of the United States**

---

houston, lasean dejong,  
Moor beneficiary *and the* SEAN HOUSTON EL  
FOUNDATION TRUST *a private people called*  
*Moors, aboriginal illinoisian national, and Subject of*  
*the Al Maroc Shereefian Empire,*

*Petitioners,*

v.

Janet Louise Yellen, et al., secretary of the treasury  
of the United States; Merrick Brian Garland, et al., attorney  
general of the United States; Antony John Blinken et al.,  
secretary of state of the United States,

*Respondents.*

---

**On Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the  
court of appeals of the united states for the sixth circuit**

---

**PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI**

---

houston, lasean dejong, *grantee/beneficiary*  
*Petitioner In Propia Persona Sui Juris*  
% 3079 S BALDWIN ROAD SUITE 1006  
ORION, MICHIGAN RFD NEAR: 48359  
(248) 981-5175

---

AUGUST 4, 2022

---

## QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Show good cause whether petitioners equitable primary rights are not destroyed by any People bound by oath to be Persons worthy of trust, who presume that petitioners “is not” a People called Moors, americas aboriginal illinoisan national, *and Subject of the Al Maroc Shereefian Empire*, “*but not citizen of the united states for the district of columbia, nor a Citizen of the united states of america in congress assemble*; that a trust relation “does not” exist between petitioners, as *Subjects of the Al Maroc Shereefian Empire*, and the *united states of america in congress assemble*;

2. Show good cause whether the petitioners, as a People called Moors, and *Subject of the Al Maroc Shereefian Empire*, “do not” have a **special and particular political status**; “is not” entitled to his inviolate equitable primary rights protected by the *Maxims of Equity*, and stipulated in the *Treaty of Marrakech 1787 ARTICLE XXI.*, the *Treaty of Marrakech 1836 ARTICLE XXI.*, the *Treaty of Tunis 1824 ARTICLE XII.*, and all the *Barbary Treaties through 1880 Madrid, still in full force and effect as of this date*; the *Article III, § 2§§ 1, of the 1789 constitution for the united states of america in Congress assembled*, the *Judiciary Act of 1789 1 stat 73 § 9. § 11, § 16, § 20, § 25., and § 26.* and equity jurisprudence;

3. Show good cause whether, as People bound by oath to be Persons worthy of trust, the lower court’s and agent’s decision to dismiss petitioners claim, as the *cestui que/beneficiary* of the Trusts/treaties, “does not” destroy the equitable primary rights of the petitioners as a People called Moors; “is not” contrary to equity, good conscience, and good reason; and “is not”

repugnant to the stipulations of the various treaties entered into with the *Al Maroc Shereefian Empire*, the Constitution, and laws of the *united states of america in Congress assembled*.

4. Show good cause why if the respondent fiduciary/defendant(s) in error fail to appear when the case is called for trial, the court "shall not" proceed to hear an argument on the part of the petitioners and to give judgment according to the right of the case.

5. Show good cause whether petitioners as a People called Moors; and *Subject of the Al Maroc Shereefian Empire*, "do not" have a right that grows out of, or is protected by, a treaty; the treaty "does not" prevail against all laws, or decisions of the courts of the states; and she/he "is not" protected, if she/he makes her/his claim under the treaty.

6. Show good cause whether a trust "has not" arisen, and a fiduciary relation "does not" exists between the petitioners and respondents, their heirs and assigns, as People bound by oath to be Persons worthy of trust; and whether petitioners rights are not destroyed if she/he "cannot" rely strictly on reciprocity and the proper and complete good faith treatment of their fiduciaries in the absence of any guardian/ward relation; as the beneficial party entitled, in consequence of such relations various sums of money or other property of the petitioners that went, or should have gone, into the possession, or under the control, of the respondents, with a demand for specific performance, by due particularity, to produce a full accounting pursuant to the treaty; whether petitioners "cannot" be granted a list of all real, personal, and equitable assets or other property in which the petitioners have an interest; to pay over whatever may be due or belong

to petitioners, or the balance due petitioners on a full accounting, to be taken by the Clerk and Master, of such credits, money, property and the profits thereof; release any and all collateral and return all remaining trust res by reconversion to petitioners; and issue a decree for the amount found due concerning said debts due to my estate(s);

7. Show good cause whether any delay will prejudice petitioners (a defrauded party) as long as she/he was ignorant of the fraud; especially, if the respondent concealed the facts which it was her/his duty to disclose, or deceived the petitioners by misstatements, or otherwise lulled petitioner's suspicions; and whether the sleep of the petitioners can be used as a defense by her/him who caused that sleep, taking advantage of the trust or confidence reposed in her/him by petitioners, and thereby benefiting herself/himself to the petitioner's injury, by blocking, clogging, or depriving of property, rights and liberties, without their consent, and otherwise prohibiting petitioner's private enjoyment, use, possession, and benefit of her/his lands, tenements, goods and chattels, reputation, ability to labor and her/his senses, being guilty of the grossest possible breach of good faith;

8. Show good cause whether there "does not" exist a conflict and variance between the rules of law and the rules of equity that destroys the equitable primary rights of the petitioners, born of special private fiduciary trust relations between the parties, either expressed, resulting, constructive, or executory, upon which petitioners have relied for fair dealings, equitable treatment, good faith, without unclean hands, leaving no room for casuistry, as a People called Moors and *Subjects of the Al Maroc Shereefian Empire*; which "is

not” wholly without adequate remedy at-Law—and thus has an inherit conflict with the rules;

9. Show good cause whether the petitioners “is not” entitled to **equal justice being rendered towards her/him**; an adequate, complete, and certain equitable remedy, and equitable relief, for the destruction of her/his equitable primary rights, interests, or estates as the *cestui que/beneficiary* of the subject matter; and the restoration of her/his property for which she/he has made a rightful claim, under the jurisdiction of exclusive equity jurisprudence, as stipulated, with intent and purpose, in the treaties *with the Al Maroc Shereefian Empire*;

10. Show good cause whether petitioners, equitable primary rights are “not” being destroyed if any People bound by oath to be Persons worthy of trust, and all others of a similar class, subject petitioners, “*under legal compulsion*” to any statutes, codes, ordinances, provisions, prohibitions, penalties, and deprivation of property, rights and liberties, without her/his consent; having been heavily prejudiced by the presumption that the *complainant* was “*a citizen of the united states for the district of columbia, or Citizen of the united states of america in congress assemble,*” and subject to their laws;

11. Show good cause whether the petitioners cause of action “is not” of a purely equitable nature; is cognizable at law; and whether petitioners “cannot” rely exclusively on the recognition and enforcement of purely equitable primary rights, as a matter of trust, with intent and purpose to fulfill an obligation, good conscience, good reason, and the *Maxims of Equity*;

12. Show good cause whether the petitioners can be made to be surety; have a secondary liability imposed upon her/him for another; or called upon for indemnity or satisfaction of another's debts, either by way of operation of law, mistake, error or accident, by presumption, under legal compulsion, or fraudulent concealment by respondents;

13. Show good cause whether petitioners "cannot" have all her/his effects, including, but not limited to, the body, the name, the sum of all their attachments, all interest, credits emitted, monies borrowed, lands, rents, leases, derivatives, profits, proceeds, and reserves, of the estates, during such time as petitioners was deprived thereof, be restored to petitioners after petitioners have made a rightful claim and deposited in the hands of a confidential Persons worthy of Trust;

14. Show good cause whether there is notice, cause, evidence or proof that there is a superior legal cause by nature that excludes petitioners from a *Court of Equity* under the rules of Chancery, where equal Justice shall be rendered, towards petitioners.

15. Show good cause whether petitioners shall be treated as a Subject national of a designated enemy country; and "shall not" have all clouds over real, personal, equitable assets, of the named estate(s) terminated, or the titles be divested and vested with the petitioners, that petitioners have made equitable claim to; and a permanent equitable estoppel "shall not" be granted against any and all non-bona fide parties.

16. Show good cause whether petitioners, as a People called Moors and *Subjects of the Al Maroc Shereefian Empire*, can be subjected to any forms, proceedings and modes purely legal for acquiring

jurisdiction, that are martial in character, and under the interpretation of works, doctrines, ideas, principles of, or any authority exercised, inconsistent with and repugnant to any treaties made or that shall be made by the *united states in congress assembled*, or the powers granted to the Committee of States, in the *Articles of Confederation*, while in the recess of congress.

17. Show good cause whether petitioner's primary equitable rights, as a private Moor Subject of the *Al Maroc Shereefian Empire*, a special and particular political status, "cannot" be acknowledged; said special and particular political status can be altered by any state or federal contracts or statutes, be it expressed or implied, public or private; and therefore, petitioners being reduced to an inferior grade of volunteer surety "U.S. citizenship" status by any woman/man, People who are bound by oath to be Persons worthy of Trust, state, or instrumentality.

18. Show good cause whether petitioners, being *sui juris*, as a private Moor Subject of the *Al Maroc Shereefian Empire*, with the intent and purpose to receive complete justice, "does not" have an equitable primary right to have all matters decided upon, settling the rights of all persons interested in the subject-matter of the suit, so that the performance of the decree of the Court may be perfectly safe to those who are compelled to obey it; and also, that future litigation may be prevented. Hence the maxims, that Courts of Equity *delight to do complete justice, and not by halves; Equity will not suffer a wrong to be without a remedy; and Equity sees that as done what ought to be done.*

19. Show good cause whether petitioner's primary equitable rights are "not" being destroyed, if any of the parties refuse to submit to the authority of the court, or to appear or defend their claim or cause, the court "does not" proceed to pronounce the decree of the petitioners, which shall in like manner be final and decisive, the decree and other proceedings being in either case transmitted to Congress, and lodged among the acts of Congress for the security of the parties concerned; ***Qui tacet cum loqui debet consentire videtur*** (He who is silent seems to consent, when they ought to speak).

20. Show good cause whether the petitioners, as a People called Moors, and *Subject of the Al Maroc Shereefian Empire*, "shall not" be extremely prejudiced by respondents who have made unsubstantiated claims and statements of a redundant, impertinent or scandalous nature tending to prejudice, embarrass your petitioners, heretofore contriving to harm and oppress your petitioners in the premises.

21. Show good cause whether petitioners, equitable primary rights are "not" being destroyed by respondents, whereby respondents are using the Courts of law to obtain or enforce judgements contrary to Equity, good conscience and good reason. Wherein any said respondents have an unfair advantage at law, whereby she/he may make the Court of law an instrument of injustice.

22. Show good cause whether petitioners, equitable primary rights are "not" being destroyed by the senators and representatives, members of the several state legislatures, and all executive and judicial officers, both of the United States and of the several states bound thereby to support the constitution and



all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, who have neither Affirmed nor Denied a fiduciary trust relation exists with the petitioners, nor rendered specific performance by ensuring that equal justice was done toward petitioners, nor put a stop to injuries which were being inflicted upon petitioners, her/his heirs and beneficiaries; based on *malum prohibitum* (conduct that constitutes an unlawful act only by virtue of statute) claims, without proof of harm, or violations of the stipulations of treaties by petitioners.

23. Show good cause whether petitioners, equitable primary rights are “not” being destroyed as the maternal grandfather, *parens patriae*, and next friend, for houston skyler isaac, beneficiary of the registered organization names SKYLER ISAAC HOUSTON and SKYLAR HOUSTON, by respondents, whereby respondents are using the Courts of law to obtain or enforce judgements contrary to Equity, good conscience and good reason. Wherein any said respondents have made the Court of law an instrument of injustice. I gave him his name. I redeem him and have a just right to claim him (*propria vigore*) on my own authority, he is mine. He is born through promise. He is a child of the Most-High.

24. Show good cause whether petitioners “do not” hold superior equitable or legal title to houston, skyler isaac, *beneficiary* of the registered organization names SKYLER ISAAC HOUSTON, and SKYLAR HOUSTON, and that it’s “not” a sacred trust.

25. Show “good” cause why any presumed administration of houston, skyler isaac, beneficiary of the registered organization names SKYLER ISAAC HOUSTON and SKYLAR HOUSTON estate is “not”

absolute void, and as *Moor grantee/grantor/beneficiary/guardian*, I am “not” entitled, by due particularity, a full accounting list of real, personal, and equitable assets and debts due to his estate and why I “cannot” recover the body, the name, the sum of all their attachments, all rents, credits emitted, monies borrowed, lands, assets, acquisitions, proceeds, and profits of the estate during such time as I was deprived thereof, with lawful interest, due to him.

26. Show good cause whether petitioners, equitable primary rights are “not” being destroyed by the *united states of america in Congress assembled*, the legislative, executive and judicial officers, both of the United States and of the several states, any People bound by oath to be Persons worthy of trust, and all others of a similar class, who collect any kind of rent, tribute, impost, duty or tax whatever, from petitioners on any real or personal property which petitioners have tendered all valuable and sufficient consideration to acquire, or otherwise exercise any functions of rule over her/him as a People called Moor/beneficiaries;

27. Show good cause whether petitioners, equitable primary rights are “not” being destroyed by blocking, clogging, depriving, invading, disturbing, or prohibiting petitioner’s private enjoyment, use, possession, and benefit of her/his rights, lands, property, both real and personal, tenements, goods and chattels, reputation, labor and senses, without her/his consent;

28. Show good cause whether petitioners, equitable primary rights are “not” being destroyed by any People bound by oath to be Persons worthy of trust, and all others of a similar class, if they detain, molest, interrupt or deprive her/him of her/his ability to pass

x

and repass or otherwise impeding petitioner's free  
ingress and regress to and from;

## **PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDINGS**

### **Petitioners**

---

SEAN HOUSTON EL FOUNDATION TRUST d/b/a houston, lasean dejong was the Plaintiff in the district court of the united states, eastern michigan district proceedings and appellant in the court of appeals of the united states, sixth circuit proceedings.

### **Respondents**

---

#### **Federal Respondents**

Janet Louise Yellen, et al., U.S. Sec. Treasury  
Merrick Brian Garland, et al., U.S. Atty. General  
Antony John Blinken et al., U.S. Sec. State  
Debra Anne Haaland, et al., U.S. Sec. Interior  
Andrew Marshall Saul, et al., Comm. Social  
Security Admin.  
Charles Paul Rettig, et al., Comm. Internal Revenue  
Major General Duane R. Miller, et al., Army U.S.  
Alejandro Nicholas Mayorkas, et al.,  
U.S. Sec. Homeland Sec.

#### **State of Illinois Respondents**

Jay Robert Pritzker, et al., Governor  
Kwame Raoul, et al., Atty. General  
Karen A. Yarbrough, et al.,  
Cook County Clerk/Rec. Deeds  
Marc D. Smith, et al., Dir. Dept. Child Fam Serv.  
Larrisa Redfield, et al., Sup. Lutheran Soc. Serv.

**State of Michigan Respondents**

Dana Nessel, et al., Atty. General  
Jocelyn Benson, et al., Sec State  
Robert S Wittenberg, et al.,  
Oakland County Treasurer  
Lisa Brown, et al., Oakland County Clerk/Reg. Deeds  
Phyllis C. McMillen, et al.,  
Oakland County Circuit Judge  
John Michael Chmura, et al., 37th Dist. Ct. Judge  
Annette Gattari-Ross, et al.,  
37th Dist. Ct Admin. Mag.  
Anthony M. Wickerham, et al.,  
Macomb County Sheriff  
Jackeline Buchanan, et al., Chief Executive,  
Genisys Credit Union  
Douglas Brenner, et al., Chief Executive,  
Brenner Oil Company  
Christopher J. Trainor, et al., Chief Executive,  
Christopher Trainor & Assoc.  
Krystina Rose Doss, et al., Attorney,  
Christopher Trainor & Assoc.  
Richard G. Roosen, et al., Attorney,  
Roosen, Rachetti, Olivier, PLLC.  
Kimberlee Basha, et al., Executive Principle,  
Autovest, LLC  
Thomas A. Moore Jr., et al., Chief Executive,  
First Investors Financial Svc.

(The suit is brought against the particular defendants,  
as representatives of the numerous class to which  
they belong.)

**Relators**

LaSean DeJong Houston, et al.,  
 LaSean DeJong Houston Estate, et al.,  
 Kimberly Denise Houston, et al.,  
 Kimberly Denise Ellsworth Estate, et al.,  
 Kayla Renee Houston, et al.,  
 Kayla Renee Houston Estate, et al.,  
 Skyler Isaac Houston, et al.,  
 Skyler Isaac Houston Estate, et al.,  
 Terajai Armond Houston et al.,  
 Terajai Armond Houston Estate, et al.,  
 Izoha Monea Houston, et al.,  
 Izoha Monea Houston Estate et al.,  
 Amari Amir Tucker, et al.,  
 Amari Amir Tucker Estate, et al.,  
 Aidan Antrell Ware, et al.,  
 Aidan Antrell Ware Estate, et al.,  
 Symone Monique Houston, et al.,  
 Symone Monique Houston Estate, et al.,  
 Romaine Kritini Davenport, et al.,  
 Romaine Kritini Aliah Morgan-Hobson  
 Davenport El Estate, et al.,  
 Omari Qamar Ibn E.M. Bostick, et al.,  
 Omari Qamar Ibn Bostick-Davenport El Estate,

(All other parties named in the initial complaint, *relators*, are materially interested, either legally or beneficially, in the subject-matter of this suit, are too numerous to be all brought before the Court, and as such, petitioners are *sui juris* and suing in behalf of their entire class as a People called Moor/beneficiaries so that they may come in under the decree and take the benefit of it.)

## LIST OF PROCEEDINGS

In the court of appeals of the United States for the Sixth Circuit No. 21-1656 houston, lasean dejong, Moor beneficiary aka SEAN HOUSTON EL FOUNDATION TRUST d/b/a Lasean Houston, SEAN HOUSTON EL FOUNDATION TRUST *Plaintiff-Appellant v. Lasean Houston, Et Al., Defendants-Appellees.*

Filed Date: December 8, 2021.

Final Order Date: June 1, 2022.

We review de novo a district court's decision to dismiss a complaint for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. A complaint is subject to dismissal if the facts, accepted as true and viewed in the light most favorable to the plaintiff, show that the court lacks subject-matter jurisdiction. Federal courts have subject-matter jurisdiction in cases arising under the Constitution, laws, or treaties of the United States. A claim invoking federal-question jurisdiction under [28 U.S.C. § 1331] . . . may be dismissed for want of subject-matter jurisdiction. . . . if it is 'immaterial and made solely for the purpose of obtaining jurisdiction' or is 'wholly insubstantial and frivolous.' Houston also failed to demonstrate diversity jurisdiction under [28 U.S.C. § 1332] because he is domiciled in Michigan, the same state as multiple defendants. To the extent that plaintiff may be said to assert federal question jurisdiction under [28 U.S.C. § 1331], based on various United States treaties and constitutional provisions, dismissal is warranted not on jurisdictional grounds but because plaintiff's assertion of a federal-law cause of action was frivolous. Federal district courts

generally have jurisdiction to make frivolity determinations regarding whether federal law provides a cause of action.

For the reasons discussed above, we **AFFIRM** the district courts judgment.

---

In the court of appeals of the United States for the Sixth Circuit No. 21-1656 houston, lasean dejong, Moor beneficiary aka SEAN HOUSTON EL FOUNDATION TRUST d/b/a Lasean Houston, SEAN HOUSTON EL FOUNDATION TRUST *Plaintiff-Appellant v.* Lasean Houston, Et Al., *Defendants-Appellees*.

Filed Date: June 17, 2022.

Final Order Date: July 5, 2022.

Lasean Dejong Houston has filed a petition for rehearing of this court's June 1, 2022, order affirming the district court's dismissal of his civil complaint as frivolous.

Upon consideration, this panel concludes that it did not misapprehend or overlook any point of law or fact when it issued its order. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 40(a)(2).

We therefore **DENY** the petition for rehearing.

---

In the district court of the United States  
for the Eastern District of Michigan  
No. CV-21-11888-SJM-APP

Lasean Houston, Trust *Plaintiff v.*  
Lasean Houston, Et Al., *Defendants*.

Final Order Date: September 21, 2021



Considering the analysis above, the Court will *sua sponte* dismiss the complaint [under Rule 12(h)(3)] for lack of subject matter jurisdiction and will deny Plaintiff's request to seal the pleadings. **WHEREFORE, it is hereby ORDERED that the complaint [1] is DISMISSED. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the request to seal the pleadings is **DENIED**. This is a final order that closes the case. **SO ORDERED**. See Order for complete details. Signed by Judge Stephen J. Murphy, III on 09/21/2021. (DPP) (Entered: 09/09/2021).

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	Page
QUESTIONS PRESENTED .....	i
PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDINGS .....	xi
LIST OF PROCEEDINGS .....	xiv
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....	xix
PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI .....	1
OPINIONS BELOW .....	2
JURISDICTION .....	4
STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED .....	5
INTRODUCTION .....	6
STATEMENT OF THE CASE .....	8
I. Factual history .....	8
II. Proceedings below .....	16
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION .....	25
CONCLUSION .....	27

**TABLE OF CONTENTS – Continued**

Page

**APPENDIX TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**OPINIONS AND ORDERS**

Order of the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit (June 1, 2022) .....	1a
Order of the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit (January 21, 2022) .....	6a
Opinion and Order Sua Sponte Dismissing the Case and Denying Plaintiff's Request to Seal the Pleadings (September 21, 2021) .....	7a

**REHEARING ORDER**

Order of the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit Denying Petition for Rehearing (July 5, 2022) .....	22a
---	-----

**CONSTITUTIONAL, STATUTORY, AND  
PROCEDURAL PROVISIONS INVOLVED**

Constitutional, Statutory Provisions and Judicial Rules Involved .....	24a
---	-----

**OTHER DOCUMENTS**

Docket Report of the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.....	33a
Docket Report of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan.....	38a

# TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

## CASES

<i>United States v. Schooner Peggy</i> , 5 U.S. (1 Cranch) 103 (1801).....	14
---	----

## CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS

U.S. Const. Art. III (1789) .....	4, 11
U.S. Const. Art. VI (1789) .....	4, 11, 12

## STATUTES

28 U.S.C. § 1251.....	5
28 U.S.C. § 1254.....	4, 5
28 U.S.C. § 1331.....	5
28 U.S.C. § 1332.....	5
28 U.S.C. § 2101.....	6
28 U.S.C. § 2106.....	6
28 U.S.C. § 2201.....	6
28 U.S.C. § 2202 .....	6
Emergency War Power Act.....	21
Judiciary Act of (1789) 1 stat 73 .....	5
Trading with the Enemy Act of 1933 .....	21

## JUDICIAL RULES

Fed. R. Civ. P. 12.....	3, 5, 15
Sup. Ct. R. 10 .....	5

# TABLE OF AUTHORITIES – Continued

Page

## TREATIES

Al Maroc Shereefian Empire Treaties .....	passim
Treaty of Algiers 1795 .....	4, 11
Treaty of Marrakech 1786.....	4, 11
Treaty of Marrakech 1787 .....	i
Treaty of Marrakech 1836 .....	i, 5, 11
Treaty of Tripoli 1796 .....	4, 11
Treaty of Tunis 1797.....	4, 11
Treaty of Tunis 1824.....	i, 4, 11

## OTHER AUTHORITIES

Henry R. Gibson,	
A TREATISE ON SUITS IN CHANCERY:	
SETTING FORTH THE PRINCIPLES,	
PLEADINGS, PRACTICE, PROOFS AND	
PROCESSES OF THE JURISPRUDENCE OF	
EQUITY .....	11, 18, 27
John Norton Pomeroy,	
A TREATISE ON EQUITY JURISPRUDENCE..	7, 12, 17
Richard Peters, Esq.,	
STATUTES AT LARGE, COPIUS NOTES OF THE	
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES	
ON TREATIES .....	16, 26



## PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Petitioner houston, lasean dejong, a private People called Moors, beneficiary respectfully petitions for a *writ of certiorari* to review the judgement of the court of appeals of the united states, sixth circuit. I contend that the Judges of the court of appeals of the united states, sixth circuit, and the Judge of district court of the united states, for the Eastern District of Michigan are a contravention and a palpable error by both courts. The judgements of both courts were entered without any objection to the admissibility of any deposition, deed, grant, or other exhibit found in the record, in the court, as evidence, and otherwise deemed to have been admitted by consent. Petitioners contend that both courts have committed palpable errors against petitioners, and it is also *prima facie* evidence that our primary equitable rights are “not” cognizable and are being destroyed in the “at law” jurisdiction. Petitioners are without equal justice being rendered towards them or a full and adequate relief in at law jurisdiction. The petitioners have brought an equitable cause, containing the truth and facts, as appears on the face of the record, fairly stated, before either of the courts of the United States to recover the forfeiture annexed to any articles of agreement, covenant, bond, or other specialty, where the forfeiture, breach or non-performance shall appear, by the default or confession of the defendant, or upon demurrer, the court before whom the action is. The Judges of the court of appeals of the united states, sixth circuit, and the Judge of district court of the united states, for the Eastern District of Michigan “did not” render judgment therein

for the plaintiff to recover so much as is due according to equity.

No Respondent parties have made an appearance, entered in as parties in the lower courts, entered any defenses, or denied specifically any of the substantive claims of the Petitioners. Petitioner has tendered to the Judges of the court of appeals of the united states, sixth circuit, a bill of exceptions of all presumptions made by the Judges of both lower courts at the proper time and place, containing the truth and facts, as appears on the face of the record, of the case fairly stated, and is entitled to a Bill of Exceptions. The Judges of the court of appeals of the united states, sixth circuit, have decided an important question of federal law that has not been, but should be, settled by this Court, or has decided an important federal question in a way that conflicts with relevant decisions of this Court "that a right that grows out of, or is protected by, a treaty; it prevail against all laws, or decisions of the courts of the states; and is protected, if he makes his claim under the treaty." Petitioner respectfully petitions the appellate Court to award an alternative writ of mandamus to compel the Judges of court of appeals of the united states, sixth circuit to sign the Bill of Exceptions, or show good cause to the contrary.



### OPINIONS BELOW

The court of appeals of the united states, sixth circuit opinion (App.1a) stated that this case has been referred to a panel of the court that, upon examination,

unanimously agrees that oral argument is not needed. [See Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)]. We review de novo a district court's decision to dismiss a complaint for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. Federal courts have subject-matter jurisdiction in cases arising under the Constitution, laws, or treaties of the United States. "A claim invoking federal-question jurisdiction under Public Law 80-773 62 Stat 930 § 1331 [28 U.S.C. § 1331] . . . may be dismissed for want of subject-matter jurisdiction . . . if it is 'immaterial and made solely for the purpose of obtaining jurisdiction or is wholly insubstantial and frivolous.'" Houston also failed to demonstrate diversity jurisdiction under Public Law 80-773 62 Stat 930 §1332 [28 U.S.C. § 1332] because he is domiciled in Michigan, the same state as multiple defendants. To the extent that plaintiff may be said to assert federal question jurisdiction under Public Law 80-773 62 Stat 930 § 1331 [28 U.S.C. § 1331], based on various United States treaties and constitutional provisions, dismissal is warranted not on jurisdictional grounds but because plaintiff's assertion of a federal-law cause of action was frivolous. For the reasons discussed above, we **AFFIRM** the district court's judgment.

The opinion of the district court of the united states, for the Eastern District of Michigan (App.7a) stated that there is no subject matter jurisdiction and will therefore dismiss this complaint and this action sua sponte [under Rule 12(h)(3)] for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

The Court will also deny Plaintiff's request to seal the pleadings. **WHEREFORE, it is hereby ORDERED that the complaint [1] is DISMISSED. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the request to



seal the pleadings is **DENIED**. This is a final order that closes the case. **SO ORDERED**. See Order for complete details. Signed by Judge Stephen J. Murphy, III on 09/21/2021. (DPP) (Entered: 09/09/2021).



### JURISDICTION

The opinion of the sixth circuit was entered on June 1, 2022. (App.1a). This court has jurisdiction under Public Law 80-773 62 Stat 928 § 1254(1) [28 U.S.C. § 1254].

The court of appeals of the united states, sixth circuit, as People bound by oath to be Persons Worthy of Trust, have appellate jurisdiction of all civil actions wherein the matter in controversy arises under the Constitution, laws or treaties of the United States and is between; Citizens of a State and foreign states or citizens or Subjects thereof. houston, lasean dejong, as one of the People called Moors, and *Subject of the Al Maroc Shereefian Empire*, making his uncontroverted claims under treaty rights, invokes this court's judicial jurisdiction under the *Treaty of Marrakech 1786 Article XXI.* , the *Treaty of Algiers 1795 Article V. and XV.*, the *Treaty of Tripoli 1796 Article X.*, the *Treaty of Tunis 1797 Article II, IV, XVIII, and IXX.*, and *Treaty of Tunis 1824 Article XII.*, the *Treaty of Marrakech 1836 Article XXI.*, and the *1789 constitution for the united states of america in congress assembled Article III, § 2. §§ 1. and Article VI, §1, §2, and §3.*



### **STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED**

- **Judiciary Act of (1789) 1 stat 73 § 13, § 25., and § 26. (App.24a-26a)**
- **New Equity Rules 1912**  
**Sec 1. The distinction between law and equity (App.26a)**
- **Article III, Sec 2. Constitutional recognition of the distinction between law and equity. (App.27a)**
- **Revised Statutes of the United States Section 913 (App.27a-28a)**
- **Rule 10. Considerations Governing Review on Certiorari (App.28a)**
- **Federal Rules of Civil Procedure Rule 12 (App.28a-29a)**
- **Public Law 80-773**
  - **62 Stat 927 § 1251. Original jurisdiction (App.29a)**
  - **62 Stat 928 § 1254. Courts of appeals; certiorari; appeal; certified questions (App.29a-30a)**
  - **62 Stat 930 § 1331. Federal question; amount in controversy (App.30a)**
  - **62 Stat 930 § 1332. Diversity of citizenship; amount in controversy (App.30a)**

- 62 Stat 961 § 2101. Supreme Court; time for appeal or certiorari; docketing; stay (App.30a-31a)
- 62 Stat 963 § 2106. Determination (App.31a)
- 62 Stat 964 § 2201 Creation of remedy (App.31a)
- 62 Stat 964 § 2202. Further relief (App.32a)



## INTRODUCTION

I contend that the original ruling, September 21, 2021, initiated in the district court of the united states, eastern district of michigan and now appealed to the court of appeals of the united states, sixth circuit; we AFFIRM said initial ruling is “in fact” in error; is contrary to Equity, good conscience and good reason; is repugnant to the various treaties with the *Al Maroc Shereefian Empire*, the constitutional provisions, and the laws of the *united states of america in congress assembled*; and in “fact,” as one of the People called Moors, and *Subject of the Al Maroc Shereefian Empire*, petitioner’s primary equitable rights are “not” cognizable and are being destroyed in the at law jurisdiction and the lower courts, “in fact” continue to destroy the petitioner’s primary equitable rights. Petitioner’s cause of action is of a purely equitable nature and “is not” cognizable at law. Petitioners rely exclusively on the recognition and enforcement of purely equitable rights. At law does not recognize the primary rights and duties, estates and interests which it creates, and the remedial rights and duties enforced by the various remedies which it confers, and at law does not present

the principles, doctrines, and rules concerning these primary rights, estates, and interests (John Norton Pomeroy § 128);

All *respondents*, as People bound by oath to be Persons worthy of Trust, including but not limited to, all legislative, executive and judicial officers, both of the United States and of the several states, bound to support all treaties made, or which shall be made, the constitutions, and the laws of the United States, who have taken advantage of the trust and confidence reposed in her/him by another, and thereby benefiting her/himself to the petitioner's injury, by blocking, clogging, depriving of property, rights and liberties, or otherwise prohibiting petitioner's private enjoyment, use, possession, and benefit of his lands, tenements, goods and chattels, reputation, ability to labor and his senses, without their consent, is guilty of the grossest possible breach of good faith. Due to said exigent circumstances petitioners are unequivocally and undeniably without adequate, complete, and certain remedy "at law," sufficient to meet all the demands of justice owed and due to petitioners by virtue of his **private special and particular political status** as a People called Moors, beneficiary and *Subject of the Al Maroc Shereefian Empire*.

The remedies sought are of a purely equitable and substantive nature, and the petitioners elects to apply for equitable relief and notices that it is established principle that when there is a conflict between the rules of law and the rules of equity, over the same subject matter, the rules of equity shall prevail.

There exists a clear Conflict and Variance of Law concerning the same matter that causes destruction to

the petitioner's equitable rights as a People called Moors, beneficiaries/heirs.



## STATEMENT OF THE CASE

### I. Factual history

I, houston, lasean dejong, a private People called Moors, beneficiary/heir, *in Propria Persona Sui Juris majoris aetatis suae*, (in my proper person, in my own right, who have attained the Age of Majority), the Petitioner of this **WRIT OF CERTIORARI** to the supreme court of the united states, comes now by special restricted appearance, *amicus curiae* "friend of the court" and affiant herein, declare that the statements in this affidavit "Petition for a **WRIT OF CERTIORARI**" are true, of my own first-hand personal knowledge, except as to matters therein stated to be on information and belief, and these matters I believe to be true and contend that the original ruling that started from district court of the united states, eastern michigan district (21st) day of september two thousand twenty one and appealed to the court of appeals of the united states, sixth circuit, who **AFFIRM** the district court's judgment, the (1st) day of June, two thousand twenty two, is "in fact" in error and is contrary to Equity, good conscience and good reason; and repugnant to the various treaties with the *Al Maroc Shereefian Empire*, the constitutional provisions, and the laws of the *united states of america in congress assembled* including, but not limited to, the **Judiciary Act of (1789) 1 stat 73 §25., and §26.**

I contend that petitioners as a People called Moors; and *Subject of the Al Maroc Shereefian Empire*, have a right that grows out of, or is protected by, a treaty; it prevails against all laws, or decisions of the courts of the states; and petitioners are protected, if petitioners makes a claim under the treaty.

I contend the cause of action I require to be reviewed, as beneficiary, one of the People called Moors, and *Subject of the Al Maroc Shereefian Empire*, is of a pure equitable nature, is cognizable in Equity, and my primary equitable rights are "not" cognizable at law and are being destroyed in the at law jurisdiction and will in "fact" continue to be destroyed beyond repair. I rely exclusively on the recognition and enforcement of my primary equitable rights.

I contend that all named fiduciary/defendant(s) to this cause of action have failed to appear, enter any evidence, or demurred before this cause was called to trial at either district court of the united states, eastern michigan district and the court of appeals of the united states, sixth circuit. I require it to be reviewed, and the court shall proceed to hear the argument on the part of the Petitioners and the court shall give judgment according to the right of the cause. (see Rule 17 Supreme Court Rules 1912)

*Equity will not suffer a wrong  
to be without a remedy*

Petitioners, as your Orator, has been subjected to a Legal mode of Proceedings by the district court of the united states, eastern michigan district and the court of appeals of the united states, sixth circuit, as well as, every respondent who is a People bound by oath to be a Person worthy of Trust, that have dismissed

my special cause *sua sponte*, for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

My *privata specialis causa aequo dirimat* (special private equitable cause) was in "fact" initiated in the Chancery Court at the district court of the united states, eastern michigan district, then made appealed to the Chancery Court in the court of appeals of the united states, sixth circuit and now make appealed to the supreme court of the united states. I houston, lasean dejong Moor beneficiary have "tendered" valuable and sufficient consideration for the appointment of the Chancery Court, a trust arises; to hear my *privata specialis causa aequo dirimat* (special private equitable cause) "***Ex Parte,***" as a private People called Moors, americas aboriginal *illiniwe* (illinoisan) national, and *Subject of the Al Maroc Shereefian Empire*, "*but not citizen of the united states for the district of columbia, nor a Citizen of the united states of america in congress assembled,*" on and for the record. To take advantage of a People by the betrayal of his confidence, is a sort of treason against good faith and shocks the conscience of all mankind. The doors of the Chancery Court are open to every person who has suffered a wrong cognizable in Equity. (*Henry R. Gibson*)

*Equity will take jurisdiction  
to avoid a multiplicity of suits*

The decisions so ordered by the district court of the united states, eastern michigan district, and AFFIRMED by the court of appeals of the united states, sixth circuit, and is undeniably in error and a betrayal of my confidence, is a shock to my conscience, and is inconsistent with the reciprocity provided by the private treaty protections of the *Treaty of Marrakech 1786 Article XXI.*, the *Treaty of Algiers 1795 Article*

XV., the *Treaty of Tripoli 1796-Article X*, the *Treaty of Tunis 1797 Article XVIII.*, the *Treaty of Tunis 1824 Article XII.*, the *Treaty of Marrakech 1836 Article XXI.*, as well as, the *1789 constitution for the united states of america in congress assembled Article III, § 2. and Article VI, § 1, § 2, and § 3.*

A trust arises from those said treaties for which I am a beneficiary/heir by way of my ancestors expressed intent and purpose as *Subject of the Al Maroc Shereefian Empire. (Equity imputes an intent to fulfill an obligation; "the heir and his ancestor are one and the same person"; "Equity regards the beneficiary as the true owner".)*

Under the rules of Chancery due and owing to the petitioner by way of his **special and particular political status** and primary equitable rights to the same said Estate, that were intended for your orator, as the sole exclusive heir and beneficiary, by maxims ("*only God can create an heir,*") and has continued to be my rightful claim as a People called Moors, from the beginning of my "special cause" complaint.

The decisions so ordered by the district court of the united states, eastern michigan district, and that of court of appeals of the united states, sixth circuit, undeniably in error and prima facie evidence my petitioners primary equitable rights are "not" cognizable and are being destroyed in the "at law" jurisdiction. Petitioners are without equal justice being rendered, with full and adequate relief at law given; that at law does not recognize the primary rights and duties, estates and interests which it creates; and the remedial rights and duties enforced by the various remedies which it confers, and at law does not present the principles, doctrines, and rules concerning these



primary rights, estates, and interests (John Norton Pomeroy § 128);

Petitioners, contend that my ancestor's intent and purpose established multiple Trust relations such as all the Treaties with the *Al Maroc Shereefian Empire* negotiated and concluded with the *President and Citizens of the United States of North America*, the supreme law of the land, is for the protection of its Moor beneficiaries/ heirs for which I am an heir.

As expressed in your constitutional indenture, the *1789 constitution for the united states of america in congress assembled* Article VI, § 2 & § 3. which reads:

- § 2. This constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every state shall be bound thereby, any thing in the constitution or laws of any state to the contrary notwithstanding.
- § 3. The senators and representatives before-mentioned, and the members of the several state legislatures, and all executive and judicial officers, both of the United States and of the several states, shall be bound by oath or affirmation, to support this constitution; but no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States.

***“Equity imputes an intent to fulfill an obligation”***

***“Equity Acts in Personam”***

*I houston, lasean de jong*, Moor beneficiary appears *in personam*, without an administrator, a personal representative, an executor, or a trustee to defend his primary equitable rights, titles, and interests in the same said estate(s) and must guard his good name, against the destruction of his reputation, and his rights to equal Justice being rendered on his behalf, which are protected by his privity as an heir to the treaties already decided and the written constitution, intended for him, by its makers as an equitable mortgage/compact, which in “fact” a trust arises. Your Honors would expect no less privity as co-heirs to said mortgage/compact. Petitioners call a Court of Equity into activity by good conscience, good faith and by his own reasonable diligence.

Petitioners is *sui juris*, now having knowledge of his own rights, with opportunity to assert them, he does not delay unreasonably so to do. Each appellate judge, district court judge and respondent who are People bound by oath to be Persons worthy of Trust are appointed and qualified as either implied administrators, constructive or expressed fiduciaries, and at once entered upon the discharge of their duties a trust arises. Petitioners further, show unto your Honors that he has called upon the court of appeals of the united states, sixth circuit, as People bound by oath to be Persons worthy of trust, to either AFFIRM or DENY the trust; to acknowledge and enforce the treaties and the constitutional provisions; to render a specific performance, by due particularity; as fiduciaries of this trust relation; to provide petitioners with a full accounting of all accounts whether Open, Stated or

Settled; to provide petitioners a list of real, personal, and equitable assets; to provide petitioners with a list of all debts due to petitioners estates during such time as petitioners were deprived, as an incident to the right of redemption; to release any and all collaterals, and return all remaining trust *res*, by *reconversion* of said Account, to petitioners, as a People called Moors, and *beneficiaries*.

***"Equity aids the vigilant, not those who slumber on their rights."***

- Petitioners require your Honors, as the conscience of the Queen/King, and People bound by oath to be Persons worthy of Trust to show "good" cause why any People bound by oath to be Persons worthy of Trust have been granted the discretion to "not" honor the treaties made under the authority of the United States which they shall be bound thereby; or to rule that "the court lacks subject matter jurisdiction," over claims cognizable in Equity, made by a People called Moors, as beneficiaries, and *Subject of the Al Maroc Shereefian Empire*.

The obligations of a treaty, made under the authority of the United States, the supreme law of the land, must be admitted. The execution of the contract between the two nations is to be demanded from the executives of each nation; but where a treaty affects the rights of parties litigating in court, the treaty as much binds those rights, and is as much regarded by the Supreme Court as an act of Congress, *United States v The Schooner Peggy*, 1 Cranch, 103; 1 Cond. Rep. 256 (Richard Peters, ESQ.,)

Whenever a right grows out of or is protected by, a treaty, it prevails against laws, or decisions of the courts of the states, and whoever may have the right under the treaty, is protected, if she/he makes her/his claim under the treaty. (Richard Peters, ESQ.,)

May it please your Honors, the said respondents who are People bound by oath to be Persons Worthy of Trust have failed to answer, or make defense to the claims; after being granted reasonable time so to do; render to petitioners, under oath, make discovery any statement of account of their acting's and doings as administrators or fiduciaries aforesaid, to the destruction, injury and loss of the petitioners; make the discovery called upon by the bill and render over to petitioners a full accounting of all accounts whether Open, Stated or Settled of the said estates as in good conscience and equity they ought to have done or be equitably attached and compelled to answer. Petitioners desire an order taking her/his bill for confessed, the failure of the respondents, as People bound by oath to be Persons worthy of Trust to make any defense being deemed *prima facie* evidence that she/he has no defense to make, but, on the contrary, admits the material allegations of the bill to be true.

***“Qui tacet, cum loqui detet, consentire videtur”***

(He who is silent, though he  
had foreseen them, seems to agree).

Therefore, the judgment from the district court of the united states, eastern michigan district, [to use Federal Rules of Civil Procedure Rule 12(h)(3) as a grounds for dismissal], were entered without any objection to the admissibility of any deposition, deed, grant, or other exhibit found in the record, in the court

below, as evidence, and otherwise deemed to have been admitted by consent, and the subsequent AFFIRMATION by the court of appeals of the united states, sixth circuit, I contend, are a contravention and a palpable error by both courts and is also prima facie evidence that my primary equitable rights are "not" cognizable and are destroyed in the "at law" jurisdiction. Petitioners are without equal justice being rendered towards them or a full and adequate relief in at law, given that at law does not recognize the primary rights and duties, estates and interests which it creates, and the remedial rights and duties enforced by the various remedies which it confers, and at law does not present the principles, doctrines, and rules concerning these primary rights, estates, and interests (John Norton Pomeroy § 128);

*No delay will prejudice a defrauded party as long as he was ignorant of the fraud; and, especially, if the defendant concealed the facts which it was his duty to disclose, or deceived the petitioner by misstatements, or otherwise lulled his suspicions. The sleep of the petitioner cannot be used as a defense by him who caused that sleep, for that would be to take advantage of his own wrong. (Henry R. Gibson § 70 Latches).*

## **II. Proceedings below**

The remedies sought are of a purely equitable nature, and the petitioner elects to apply for equitable relief and notices that it is established principle that when there is a conflict between the rules of law and the rules of equity, over the same subject matter, the rules of equity shall prevail. Further, the petitioner states that no equal justice, adequate, sufficient, or speedy remedy "at law" can provide complete justice.

Petitioners therefore attach a "Table of Authorities" that are based upon well-established inherent principles and equity jurisprudence. The maxims in support of petitioner's *writ of certiorari* are attached herewith by reference and attached hereto in Table of Authorities. Further, the petitioner does notice that this cause is in accordance with the soul, intent and purpose of the rules of the supreme court of the united states "former Equity rules" number 48, and that Respondents are believed to be governed exclusively in accordance with the intent of Rule 47 of same.

***Stare Decisis et Non Quieta Movere***

(Stand by What Has Been Decided,  
and Do Not Disturb What Is Settled)

Wherefore the foregoing, petitioners therefore requires that the Justices of this honorable court, as Chancellors, and the conscience of the Queen/King, issue a decree for the petitioner's special request for Declaratory Relief of the rights, duties, powers, privileges and immunities between the parties.

a. Acknowledge houston, lasean dejong Moor beneficiary, as sole exclusive heir to the same subject matter the named and Estate(s), including, but not limited to, "LASEAN DEJONG HOUSTON," establishing my equitable rights, powers and relation to said estate(s); to the private enjoyment, use, possession, and benefit of all property attachments including, but not limited to, all rents, bills of credit emitted, monies borrowed, assets, lands, acquisitions, proceeds, profits, houses, goods and chattels, rights and credits, his person, his wife and minor offspring, his right to work and trade, to sell and acquire property, to engage in lawful business without restriction, to pass and repass

among the Christians and Jews, being perfectly secure in their person and property, and his and their reputation, health and capacity to labor;

b. Acknowledge petitioner's **special and particular political status**, is in "fact," a private People called Moors, americas aboriginal illinoisan national, and *Subject of the Al Maroc Shereefian Empire*, "*but not a citizen of the united states for the district of columbia, "nor a Citizen of the united states of america in congress assembled"*"; and decree that petitioners shall be treated as friendly, *amicus curiae*, respected; esteemed by all respondents and all People bound by oath to be Persons worthy of Trust, as that of the **most-favored-nation**, with a regime of economic liberty without any inequality, and that due process and equal Justice shall be rendered towards them in all disputes; and petitioners shall be excepted from all statutes, codes, ordinance, prohibitions, rules, regulations of the Code of the District of Columbia and the laws of the *united states of america in congress assembled or anything* repugnant to the constitution, the various treaties with the *Al Maroc Shereefian Empire* or contrary to Equity, good conscience and good reason.

c. Decree that the petitioners shall have any other General and Special Relief from all matters complained of with due particularity, including, but not limited to, petitioner's Preposed Decree in their entirety, entered affirmatively into the record, "and that petitioners may have such further and other relief in the premises as the nature of his cause shall require and as to your Honors shall deem just."

d. Decree that the petitioners shall be issued a *pro confesso* for all respondents as an admission of all

the facts and allegations stated in the bill, and the proof and proper evidence that the said respondents have been regularly served by actual notice duly made, and all respondents having failed to appear to make any defense being deemed *prima facie* evidence that he/she has no defense to make, on the contrary, he/she admits the material allegations of the bill to be true; that the matters of account in controversy be and are referred to the Clerk and Master to take and state an account between the petitioners and respondents concerning all transactions relating to or growing out of the same. The Master shall compel the production of all such books, papers, documents and other writings as may be in the possession or power of the parties, or either of them, he shall think proper to be produced before him in taking such account. The Master shall require each party, restore to petitioners, all the names, the sum of all their attachments, all bills of credits emitted, monies borrowed, rents, assets, lands, proceeds, issues, derivatives, derivations, collaterals, and produce and file with the Master said account as to show the balance which either party may owe the petitioners, and he will report hereon to the next term of the Court, until which time all other matters are reserved. The Master shall have liberty to state any special circumstances;

e. Decree that the petitioners shall recover all, including, but not limited to, the names, the sum of all their attachments, the bills of credit emitted, monies borrowed, rents, assets, lands, proceeds, titles, interests, issues, derivatives, derivations, equitable lien attachments and collaterals, be accounted for, and other rights he sues for, or right, title or interest that petitioners are entitled to claim be restored to petitioners;



f. Decree that the petitioners shall have protection of all rights to subrogation of the equitable surety involving the subject matter obligation/debts;

g. Decree that the petitioners shall be Exonerated from all liability as secondarily liable to the Estate(s); and shall “**not**” be called upon for indemnity or satisfaction of debts on behalf of another;

h. Decree that the petitioners shall be declared as *Moor grantee/grantor/beneficiary/guardian* for and on behalf of houston, skyler isaac, *beneficiary* of the registered organization names SKYLER ISAAC HOUSTON estate, and SKYLAR HOUSTON, and that the body, the name, the sum of all their attachments, all rents, bills of credits emitted, monies borrowed, lands, assets, acquisitions, proceeds, and profits of the estate during such time as he was deprived thereof, with lawful interest, due to houston, skyler isaac, *beneficiary*; and he, shall be restored to the petitioners as his guardian;

i. Decree that all People who are bound by oath to be Persons worthy of Trust, shall render upon request by the petitioners, specific performance, to produce an annual a full accounting and non-commingling, of all real, personal, and equitable assets, all the rents, profits, proceeds, debts due to petitioner’s estates of said real property while in her/his possession or under her/his control, and that a reference to the Master shall be had to ascertain the amount due petitioners during such time as petitioners were deprived; and that a fiduciary be appointed for each life estate in those assets; the trustee(s) of the private trust established settle and close the matter; release any and all collateral, and return all remaining trust *res*, by *reconversion* of said “Trust Account(s)” interest, (in USD species), to

petitioners houston, lasean dejong *Moor beneficiary* and the SEAN HOUSTON-EL FOUNDATION TRUST, including but not limited to all relators; and extinguish all state, local, tax, duty, impost, obligation, reprisal, remuneration, indemnification, or debts, if any; exhibit and account for the funds or other property in which the complainant has an interest, and to pay over whatever may be due or belong to petitioners, or the balance due petitioners on a full accounting to be held by the Clerk and Master of this court on Special Deposit;

j. Decree that the petitioners shall have any cloud be removed from any real, personal, equitable assets, or named estate(s) or the title be divested and vested, that Petitioners makes equitable claim to; and a permanent equitable estoppel be granted against any and all non-bona fide parties.

k. Decree that perpetual Injunctive relief shall issue, in the form of the preposed, *Quia Timet*, in its entirety, entered affirmatively into the record, be issued against all classes of respondents, including, but not limited to, all executive, legislative, or judicial officers, and fiduciaries, whether implied or expressed, of the *united states of america in congress assembled, the united states for the district of Columbia*, or any of the several states, subject to their treaties and constitutions, shall acknowledge the petitioner's special and particular political status"; and the petitioners shall "**not**" be treated as a Subject national of a designated enemy country, or be made subject to the Trading with the Enemy Act of 1933, nor the Emergency War Power Act or any other act that is repugnant to the said treaties; and that petitioners shall be excepted from any act, law, statute, ordinance, regulation,

prohibition, or mandate that is in any way repugnant to the treaties between the *Citizens of the United States of North America* and the *Subjects of the Al Maroc Shereefian Empire*;

l. Decree that perpetual Injunctive relief shall issue to prevent any *citizen of the united states for the district of columbia, nor Citizen of the united states of america in congress assembled* from using the Courts of law to obtain or enforce any judgements contrary to Equity, good conscience and good reason against the petitioners. Wherein, any said plaintiff has an unfair advantage at law over the petitioners, whereby he may make the Court of law an instrument of injustice towards petitioners, his heirs or beneficiaries;

m. Decree that perpetual Injunctive relief shall issue to inhibit any class of respondents from the assertion of any presumed right, and perpetually restrain respondents from the commission of any act towards petitioners, his heirs or beneficiaries, which would be contrary to Equity, good conscience, and good reason, the treaties, constitution, laws of the *united states of america in congress assembled* or in violation of their charters;

n. Decree that perpetual Injunctive relief shall issue on behalf of petitioners, as an "implied equitable surety," to enjoin any suit at law by creditors whenever the creditor delays to sue the principal debtor after notice or demand by petitioners;

o. Decree that perpetual Injunctive relief shall issue to perpetually inhibit respondents, including, but not limited to, any People who are bound by oath to be Persons worthy of Trust, from the assertion of any form of unlawful detainment, molestation, legal

compulsion, forced medical treatment, vaccinations, examination, forced use of protective apparel or any differentiating mark or sign to be placed upon the petitioners, or anyone of her/his heirs/beneficiaries, without her/his expressed written consent; the petitioners, all of her/his heirs/beneficiaries, known and unknown, shall be party to this decree; shall be exempt from being visited or quarantined, under any pretense whatever, by any People who are bound by oath to be Persons worthy of Trust. Any respondents, their heirs and assigns, or People who are bound by oath to be Persons worthy of Trust in violation of said injunction shall have an equitable lien attached to their estates, surety bonds, and collaterals, for any breach of faith, if any equitable grounds for attachment exist;

p. Decree that perpetual Injunctive relief shall issue enjoin any People who are bound by oath to be Persons worthy of Trust from subjecting petitioners to any future inconvenience, probable or even possible to happen by the neglect, inadvertence or culpability of another, by guarding petitioners against possible or prospective injuries, and to preserve the means by which petitioner's existing rights may be protected from future or contingent violations;

q. Decree that petitioner's right to redeem said real property shall be declared and enforced not subject to tax or duty whatever, and the title, use, possession, benefit, and private enjoyment thereof be restored to petitioners as fully as though no foreclosure or forfeiture had ever been made;

r. Decree that all other matters are reserved, and either party is to be at liberty to apply to this Court as occasion may require; and that the petitioners have

such other relief as petitioners pray for, and may be entitled to, and that the proper final process shall issue;

This Court was established to do justice, regardless of any and all law. The King deemed it a duty imposed upon his conscience, both by his oath and by religion, to "decree justice," and in decreeing justice he deemed himself bound rather by the Divine Law than by human law; and, when the Chancellor acted in his stead, he based his decisions, not upon the law of the land, but upon honesty, equity and conscience, for so was he commanded to do in exercising the King's prerogative of Grace. (*Henry R. Gibson*)



## REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

*A judge ought always to have  
Equity before her/his eyes*

Petitioners requires this *Writ of Certiorari* be granted on proper grounds and in keeping with good conscience and good reason.

Upon consideration petitioners to the bill, upon the pleadings and proof in the cause, entered affirmatively into the record, and the *pro confesso* heretofore entered against the respondents. The stipulations in a treaty between the United States and a foreign power, are paramount to the provisions of the constitution of a particular state, or the confederacy. (Richard Peters, ESQ.,)

All People bound by oath to be Persons worthy of Trust, including but not limited to, all legislative, executive and judicial officers, both of the United States and of the several states, bound by oath or affirmation to support all treaties made, the constitutions, and the laws of the United States, shall be indemnified by fulfilling their fiduciary duties.

The Great Duties of the Supreme Court: (1) To see that the rights and privileges reserved to themselves by the People in their constitution are maintained inviolate; (2) To keep Legislature, the courts, municipal corporations, and all other creatures of the law, within their constitutional and lawful jurisdiction;

- To revise and correct, or remand for corrections, every error made by any inferior court., Whereby the complaining litigant was in any way injured,

or deprived of his equitable rights; and 4. To issue all processes, and make all orders, rules, judgements, and decrees necessary to fully effectuate its appellate jurisdiction, or to fully enforce its own mandate. (*Henry R. Gibson*)

- Everyone is presumed to know the law and the defendant is presumed to know that his failure to make defense is equivalent to an admission, on his part, that the facts set forth in the bill are true. Acting on these presumptions, the court, accordingly, treats the bill as confessed, and decrees the relief the confession warrants. (*Henry R. Gibson*)
- The law requires that good faith be observed in all transactions between man and man.
- Equity considers the real and the substantial, and allows no rule of evidence at law, no fiction of Courts of law, and no acts or subterfuges of parties, to tie its hands, or shackle its feet, or dim its sight, in searching for the real truth of the transaction under investigation. Courts of Equity act upon the circumstances and justice of the particular case, whereas Courts of law rather regard precedents, forms, rules of procedure and the strict letter of the law. (*Henry R. Gibson*)



## CONCLUSION

I respectfully petition this court for a *Writ of Certiorari* to review the dismissal entered from the district court of the united states, eastern michigan district judge; and review the AFFIRMATION by the court of appeals for the united states, sixth circuit to the said district court's judgment after the filing of the Notice of Appeal, on the grounds that both the district court of the united states, eastern michigan district dismissal for lack of subject matter jurisdiction and the AFFIRMATION of court of appeals for the united states, sixth circuit is contravention and in conflict with all the treaties made with the *Al Maroc Shereefian Empire*, the laws of the *united states of america in congress assembled*, are in violation of their fiduciary duties, and charters.

As People bound by oath to be Persons worthy of trust, the lower court's and agent's decision to dismiss petitioners claim, as the *cestui que/beneficiary* of the Trusts/treaties, destroys the equitable primary rights of the petitioners as a People called Moors; is contrary to equity, good conscience, and good reason; is repugnant to the stipulations of the various treaties entered into with the *Al Maroc Shereefian Empire*, the Constitution, and laws of the *united states of america in Congress assembled*.

A fiduciary relation exists between the petitioners and respondents, their heirs and assigns, as People bound by oath to be Persons worthy of trust. Petitioner's rights are being destroyed if they "cannot" rely strictly on reciprocity and the proper and complete good faith treatment of their fiduciaries in the absence of any



guardian/ward relation. Respondents are taking advantage of the trust or confidence reposed in her/him by petitioners, and thereby benefiting her/himself to the petitioner's injury, by blocking, clogging, or depriving of property, rights and liberties, without petitioner's consent, and otherwise prohibiting petitioner's private enjoyment, use, possession, and benefit of his lands, tenements, goods and chattels, reputation, ability to labor and her/his senses, being guilty of the grossest possible breach of good faith.

There does exist a conflict and variance between the rules of law and the rules of equity that destroys the equitable primary rights of the petitioners, born of special private fiduciary trust relations between the parties. Petitioners are wholly without adequate remedy at-Law—and thus has an inherit conflict with the rules. As a People called Moors and *Subjects of the Al Maroc Shereefian Empire*, a trust relation, either expressed, resulting, constructive, or implied, exists upon which petitioners have relied for fair dealings, equitable treatment, good faith, good conscience, good reason, by the *Maxims of Equity*, with intent and purpose to fulfill an obligation, without unclean hands.

Petitioners as a People called Moors; and *Subject of the Al Maroc Shereefian Empire*, do have rights that grows out of, or are protected by, a treaty. The Supreme Court of the United States itself has acknowledged in its' own Treatise on Treaties, that said rights shall prevail against all laws, or decisions of the courts of the states; and said rights are protected, if she/he makes her/his claim under the treaty. Petitioners look to the Maxims, *legum leges*—(the laws of the laws), and are entitled to **equal justice being rendered towards her/him**; an adequate, complete, and certain

equitable remedy, and equitable relief, for the destruction of her/his equitable primary rights, interests, or estates as the *cestui que/beneficiary* of the subject matter; and the restoration of her/his property for which she/he has made a rightful claim, under the jurisdiction of exclusive equity jurisprudence, as stipulated, with intent and purpose, in the treaties *with the Al Maroc Shereefian Empire*.

Respectfully submitted,

houston, lasean dejong  
*Petitioner In Propia Persona Sui Juris*  
 C/O 3079 S BALDWIN ROAD SUITE 1006  
 ORION, MICHIGAN RFD NEAR. [48359]  
 (248) 981-5175

houston, lasean dejong, *grantee/grantor/heir/beneficiary* a private People called Moor americas aboriginal illinoisian national, and *Subject of the Al Maroc Shereefian Empire* "but not citizen of the united states for the district of columbia, nor a Citizen of the united states of america in congress assembled." in *Propria Persona Sui Juris majoris aetatis suae*, (in proper person, in his own right who have attained the Age of Majority)

August 4, 2022