


No. 22A445



---

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

---

CHRISTOPHER M. HUNT, SR.

APPLICANT,

v.

NATIONSTAR MORTGAGE, LLC  
DEUTSCHE BANK NATIONAL TRUST COMPANIES  
JAY BRAY, CEO Nationstar  
THE ALBERTELLI FIRM, P.C.

RESPONDENTS.

---


**EMERGENCY APPLICATION FOR WRIT OF INJUNCTION**

---

To the Honorable Honorable Clarence Thomas Circuit Justice for the  
Eleventh Circuit, with request to be granted before 11/17/2022

Rev. Christopher M. Hunt, Sr. Ph.D. Pro Se  
5456 Peachtree Blvd., Ste. 410  
Atlanta, GA 30341  
1cor13cmh@gmail.com 770-457-3300

November 11, 2022



## QUESTION PRESENTED

Instant case involves a matter of international importance effecting the very sovereignty of United States and all courts in the Judicial branch, federal and state. The essence of case question without hyperbole impacts not only millions of homeowners with mortgages but the entirety of United States free enterprise system for capitalism. The question appears to be specific for Court to answer because as of yet not one court has even attempted to address the elephant in the room and resultant conflict undermining Applicant's ("Homeowner") often cited Court's ruling in *AMERICAN BANK & TRUST CO. V. FEDERAL RESERVE BANK*, 256 U.S. 350 (1921) as Respondents ("Mortgagees") affirm in C-I-P Deutsche is a "national banking association" so admitted subject to:

A federal reserve bank is not a national banking association within § 24, cl. 16, of the Judicial Code, which declares that such associations, for the purposes of suing and being sued, shall (except in certain cases) be deemed citizens of the states where they are located. P. 256 U.S. 357.

The primary, foundational question, amongst several to presented in forthcoming Certiorari, as presented in the Homeowner's USCA11 21-10398 Brief, En Banc, Motion to Stay the Mandate, that all were denied (Exhibits 1-3) and Notice of Certiorari proves need for contemporary revisit of 1921 ruling to close the loophole so courts can

harmoniously uphold Sarbanes Oxley Act and The Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act congress passed so nothing like Great Recession and instant case and would ever occur again!

When and how does an international non-USA foreign company (instant case Deutsche, Germany) come into legal jurisdiction of USA and a state (instant case Georgia) and then per uncontested Mortgagees Removal from state into Federal Courts (DCN.GA & USCA11) when said corporation is operating in violation of U.S. Supreme Court rulings (*American Bank, Jesinoski*, etc.) violating Congressional Laws (Sarbanes-Oxley, Dodd-Frank, etc.) Federal Court rulings (*Malone, Robinson*, etc.) state laws (O.C.G.A, etc.), while not even properly registered in any way in any corporate headquarter state apparently to avoid taxes and accountability of state juries, breached contract, acted in brazen contempt of court orders, violated 28 US § 1450, violated Court jurisdiction, perpetrated fraud on courts to obtain nullity orders to steal 100% legally correct USA citizen's home in violation to U.S. Constitution right for homeownership?! See never contested Deutsche in C-I-P.

Worse, when Homeowner exposed the legal conflict to the lower courts, the Mortgagees resorted to yet another attempt of fraud on the courts! Homeowner diligently researched records in submission to honorable Court's ruling in *American Bank* concerning instant case USCA11 21-10398 C-I-P (see included C-I-P) claiming Deutsche is operating lawfully in USA with headquarters in California, but then after

Homeowner proved Deutsche is not properly registered in claimed headquarters California, which is a state that rightfully prioritizes homeowners - as Court ruled in favor of homeowners in applicable and Homeowner cited *JESINOSKI v. COUNTRYWIDE* - the Mortgagees in later arrived into USCA11 and currently ongoing No. 22-11463 C-I-P claimed that Deutsche is instead headquartered in New York. Homeowner again did diligent research and proved Deutsche is not registered in New York either, so that case has gone quiet ... (*another reason mandating the grant of Injunction! Yes, Homeowner is almost overwhelmed exhausted and stressed by solely defending his home against incorrigible and desperate Mortgagees illegal acts simultaneously in three Mortgagee caused cases: two USCA11 cases No. 21-10398 and No. 22-11463, and one case in Georgia Supreme Court No. S22C1331! All on same matters and due to severe unresolvable conflict described later, apparently all will be in this Court - so a third reason mandating granting the Injunction to Stay/Recall the Mandate*). Mortgagees change of Deutsche headquarters in C-I-Ps from false California to be false New York could be an understandable and graced error if properly registered in both, or if true in either state, but in light

of Mortgagees proven previous two counts of fraud on courts it is obvious this is another attempt to fraud the courts. Please see C-I-P concerning incorrigible white-collar criminal Mortgagees and counsel with senior partners in prison for compromising government officials and have lost cases as bad acting debt collectors.

The first fraud was to avoid legally mandated Default of service and consequential diversity adversely effected “the machinery of justice” with resultant rulings to Dismiss Without Prejudice instead of proper Mortgagees Default to proven done 100% correctly Secretary of State service being only way possible after attempted sheriff service was rejected per sheriff’s affidavit of employee who was instructed to refuse service “(Florida based but perjured sworn Georgia based registered agent/CEO Albertelli) He does not work here”. Those cases merits were never ruled on and Homeowner had appealed all the way to Court but after expensive printer made errors in Petition for Writ so was asked to resubmit and Homeowner realized all the new case rulings in his favor he could prevail without instant karma justice default while protected he abided by court’s instructions to refile and did so then ceased appeal and Writ on important issue of denied Default. The second fraud in a

desperate attempt to destroy pro se Homeowner personally to avoid losing in court was an illegal ruse to improperly get an ex parte hearing before state magistrate judge while jurisdiction was in federal courts. The improperly substituted, never court recognized plaintiff Deutsche via never court informed new counsel Aldridge Pite misrepresented and contradicted a federal judge's order on jurisdiction to deceive state magistrate judge into thinking she had jurisdiction via never done Remand to obtain a secret state eviction order that was never served on innocent Homeowner who was trusting the Federal Courts for protection until justice prevailed! Homeowner was never served notice of ex parte hearing nor fraudulently obtained Deutsche eviction order until Marshal presented at the onset of surprise eviction being illegally done for Deutsche by Nationstar supervisor and ten+ illegal immigrants! All his home office and belongings were being put on the street in subdivision Homeowner developed and named after his daughter, as Homeowner rushed down to state Superior Court presiding judge, who after seeing evidence properly granted mandated second TRO! *Another reason to grant Injunction is two state TROs proven improperly ignored and then second fraudulently voided!* State Marshals were first illegally misused

to abuse 100% legally correct Homeowner, were by second TRO rightfully protecting Homeowner moving belongings back into his home; albeit \$5,000+ damages and personal injury due heavy things to beat night rain and thieves, suffered humiliating reputation damage and psychological duress. Homeowner tried to protect USCA11's honor from third fraud: "fool me once shame on you, fool me umpteenth time shame on me":

...conflicts Supreme Court *Hazel-Atlas Glass Co. v. Hartford-Empire Co.*, 322 U.S. 238 wherein Panel II errors of Rule 60 in III pages 9-13 III is in conflict and fails to *Hazel*.

Homeowner has written his concern to the courts being so prejudiced/biased against pro se litigants Judge Richard Posner resigned in protest! Homeowner who never missed a mortgage payment is forced against desires to be pro se due to \$400,000 home equity unavailable due to Mortgagees own employees admitting breach of contract causing very damaging false negative credit reports to self-employed Homeowner, then entire home temporarily stolen by Mortgagees via illegal, contemptuous foreclosure! Homeowner apologies to honorable Court for being pro se but he cannot get an attorney even only to take this Emergency Application due to so many defensive cases! Homeowner remains respectful despite mistreated equivalent to being just a nigger

to prejudiced justices of infamous Dred Scott Decision (Homeowner is founder [www.MLKStoneMountain.org](http://www.MLKStoneMountain.org)). Per En Banc:

Homeowner empathizes with Court “An En Banc hearing or rehearing is not favored and ordinarily will not be ordered”... Homeowner is proven can afford proper mortgage amount but not illegally inflated demanded \$300,000 just to cure Mortgagees breach or be foreclosed! Court and Justice Carnes rightly ruled Royal Caribbean Cruise ship responsible to be more diligent in protecting passengers from horrendous gang rape, so Homeowner needs protection from being illegally ‘gang raped’ by Mortgagees and fraud on courts turning judges against him in error instead of them helping per law.

But the principle of party presentation, like any rule, has its exceptions. Chief among these is the threshold requirement of subject matter jurisdiction, which courts must raise on their own to protect their own jurisdiction. See, e.g., *Gonzalez v. Thayer*, 132 S. Ct. 641, 648 (2012) (as to subject matter jurisdiction, “courts are obligated to consider sua sponte issues that the parties have disclaimed or have not presented”). In addition to subject matter jurisdiction ... Reviewing courts have long raised these issues on their own, since they implicate a court’s competency to decide a case . . . AND ... At other times, reviewing courts may be more inclined to raise and decide an issue sua sponte if they believe that the issue involves an important public concern or is “in the interests of justice,” or even to protect pro se litigants. See, e.g., *Real Estate Bar Ass’n for Mass., Inc. v. Nat’l Real Estate Info. Servs.*, 608 F.3d 110, 125 (1st Cir. 2010) (emphasizing that the issue decided sua sponte was significant to the administration of justice in the federal courts); *Gramegna v. Johnson*, 846 F.2d 675, 677– 78 (11th Cir. 1988) (suspending the rules and raising a matter sua sponte to protect a pro se litigant).

Homeowner had no idea how to help millions of homeowners and save his home and with order denying Staying the Mandate and court holiday Friday. Clerks of Court have been amazingly helpful! But still lots of time lost as nothing can be



found by filing title. Finally learned how to properly file and next day mail requested injunction that does not require a fee (lost a day on that) must be granted seven days of order dated November 10<sup>th</sup> so Thursday November 17<sup>th</sup>. Homeowner is filing an Emergency Motion to Extend Release of Mandate in honor to allow Court to make a ruling on Injunction, also petitions honorable Court for a Recall the Mandate if required and more than likely sadly callous, prejudiced USCA11 denies Motion to Extend Time Releasing the Mandate even in respect to this Court.

#### PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING

Appellant is Christopher M. Hunt, Sr. homeowner of 20+ years.

Respondents are parties listed in the caption, Appellees/Defendants (other cases Plaintiffs) described in never denied or corrected C-I-P: Nationstar mortgage, Deutsche Bank National Trust Companies, Jay Bray, CEO Nationstar, the Albertelli Firm, P.C.

#### CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT PER C-I-P

Applicant is a private citizen homeowner.

Respondents per attached C-I-P are various corporate entities and officers.

## RELATED PROCEEDINGS BELOW

- HUNT v. DEUTSCHE No. 21-10398 (11th Cir.) Notice of Certiorari filed after En Banc and Stay the Mandate denied (Exhibits 1 2 3 ).
- DEUTSCHE v. HUNT No. 22-11463 (11th Cir.) Motion to Reconsider pending showing USCA11 boiler plate denial was ignorant of and erroneously in conflict to recent BP v. MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE per Homeowner's reference to 1442 for 1447(d) for appeal that has no legal means for justice in state so federal courts must enforce its jurisdiction correcting deceived state court nullity orders made without jurisdiction and in contradiction to federal court orders and rule Rule 28 US § 1450. DCN.GA erroneously claims "do not disturb state"! This is in conflict with the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Ohio which ruled they would implement a redistricting map that was declared unconstitutional by the Ohio Supreme Court!
- DEUTSCHE v HUNT (Supreme Court State of Georgia) S22C1331 question, "Which state court corrects a lower state court error so state upholds and honors federal court jurisdiction? Currently no state court can properly vacate a nullity, no jurisdiction,

fraudulently obtained eviction or subsequent improperly obtained Supersedeas Bond that is illegal in itself due to home having Mortgagees acknowledged super abundant equity to cover fraudulently inflated false debt with Mortgagees already improperly holding title, state not having jurisdiction after Removals, Deutsche not legal in USA and Mortgagees do NOT have standing in any court to enforce contract until they cure Mortgagee employee and closing attorney verified first breach per *MALONE!*

All these cases mandate Injunction for Stay of Mandate as Homeowner is senior citizen, 100% legally correct yet will be evicted from his home that is being well maintained and needlessly suffer irreparable harm and damage – just like a court would not prevent by Inunction the execution of prisoner on death row who has submitted DNA evidence proving innocence and another case the witness confess to crime. The Mortgagees admitted by Waiver all their bad acts (See Exhibit Timeline) when bound Rule 3.3 Candor to the Tribunal.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

(NOTE: apology Court must file! Lost day formatting i, ii Font, Fee.)

QUESTION PRESENTED.....2-11

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....13, 50

INTRODUCTION (*\*NOTE 40 PAGES LIMIT COUNT BEGINS\**)..... 17

JURISDICTION..... 30

DECISIONS BELOW.....10

Final Order, En Banc, Stay Mandate .....Exhibits

CONSTITUTIONAL, CONGRESSIONAL, COURT RULINGS ..... 30

FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND..... 30

ARGUMENTS..... 30

I. Applicant has Demonstrated a Clear Entitlement to Injunctive Relief  
Because the Legal Rights at Issue Are Indisputably Clear..... 3, 20, 24

A. Mortgagees Actions Violate USA Sovereignty, U.S. Supreme Court  
Rulings, Congressional Law, Federal Court Rulings, State Law and  
Create Irreconcilable Conflicts of Jurisdiction with No Remedy Unless  
Court Intervenes.....3, 20-24, 39

B. Nothing Prohibits Injunctive Relief and All Law Supports  
Intervention Under These Circumstances..... 34-40

II. Homeowner Satisfies Remaining Requirements For Injunctive  
Relief.....17, 18, 32  
There Are No Valid Reasons To Deny Injunctive Relief. .... 10

CONCLUSION..... 39

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

See after exhibits due changing #ing and out of time.

To the Honorable Clarence Thomas Circuit Justice for the Eleventh Circuit:

Predicting continuing and additional international violations of United States and Judicial Branch's sovereign jurisdiction, emboldened contemptuous abuses of homeowners across nation, impossible to reconcile jurisdictional conflicts between federal and state courts, and confusion on proper ways for courts to be unanimous and harmonious in implementing this Court's rulings in *AMERICAN BANK & TRUST CO. v. FEDERAL RESERVE BANK*, *JESONOSKI v. COUNTRYWIDE*, recent *BP v. BALTIMORE*, etc. has created a loophole in Congressional laws Sarbanes-Oxley and Dodd-Frank large enough to drive a semi-truck through per Homeowner's:

It is hard to believe this is occurring in modern times with computers and electronic filings and records easily proving Nationstar's foreclosure was illegally done with case in USCA11 and eviction attempted while the wrongful foreclosure case was in DCN.GA!!! *MALONE* states that Mortgagees have no standing to enforce the contract until first breach is cured! "Rut Row Scooby" here is yet another Homeowner cite Appellant's Brief p. 27 DCN.GA and Panel ignore!

**NOTICE OF APPEAL FATALLY FLAWED ORDER TO REMAND PER  
28 U.S. CODE § 1447 AND 14th AMENDMENT**

Court slanders as “fanciful language” cited U.S. Supreme Court,  
U.S. Court of Appeals, District Courts, Federal Laws, State O.G.G.A. §,  
etc. No federal officer working under color of authority can act in such  
conflict to law that it violates the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Section 1:

... nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, **or property,**  
**without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its**  
**jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.**

Order of Remand is as fatally flawed as Court’s previous misuse of  
Rule 72 in attempt to abort justice! When Homeowner proved in Motion  
to Reconsider that was fatally flawed false, Court similarly improperly  
refused to address any of the 100% valid Objections by then calling all  
cited authorities “frivolous”. Case shows change of venue mandated and  
why an honorable federal judge resigned in protest over abuses of pro se.

Pursuant to Supreme Court Rules 20, 22, and 23, and 28 U.S.C. §  
1651, Homeowner respectfully request an immediate, Emergency Writ  
of Injunction to Stay the Mandate in USCA11 during Certiorari and so  
prevent irreparable injury to Homeowner due to a nullity, illegally and  
contemptuously obtained, no jurisdiction eviction that will violate the  
promised protection of whistle blowers per Congressional laws Sarbanes

Oxley Act and The Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act congress passed to make sure nothing like instant case would ever occur again! More specifically, Homeowner seeks an injunction that prohibits USCA11, DCN.GA and state courts from enabling the violation of United States and Judicial Branch's sovereignty by an illegally operating international corporation that is proven incorrigible in violating USA laws, banking laws, congressional laws, state laws (see C-I-P) and in violation to U.S. Constitution to steal Homeowner's house and twenty years home-based ministry and businesses. Plaintiffs also asks Court to consider this Application as an introduction for his Petition for Certiorari and by granting the Writ for Injunction show the justices in other referenced cases the importance of upholding USA and Judicial Branch's sovereignty, the importance of Constitutional right for home ownership, the importance of Congressional laws enacted to prevent fraudulent practices that caused the Great Recession, make a ruling complimenting Spirit and intent of *JESINOSKI v. COUNTRYWIDE*, and end the bias/prejudice against pro se litigants so rule per blindfolded Lady Justice and Supreme Court:



The words of Chief Justice Marshall in *Marbury v. Madison*, 5 U.S. 137 (1803), must be heeded: “The very essence of civil liberty certainly consists in the right of every individual to claim the protection of the laws, whenever he receives an injury. One of the first duties of government is to afford that protection. The government of the United States has been emphatically termed a government of laws, and not of men. It will certainly cease to deserve this high appellation, if the laws furnish no remedy for the violation of a vested right.”

**Requested Injunction must be granted seven days of order dated November 10<sup>th</sup> Thursday November 17<sup>th</sup>. Or Please Recall the Mandate.**

## INTRODUCTION

Homeowner will simply quote verbatim filings made in 21-10398

Per Homeowner’s En Banc opening:

Canons 3A (1) A judge should be faithful to, and maintain professional competence in, the law and should not be swayed by partisan interests, public clamor, or fear of criticism

And

Wisdom “she” is Lady Justice for Court and per Proverbs 16:10: “Implementing Divine organization into creation is by words of the judge, therefore judges must not transgress with error” and Mortgagees Prov. 28:8; “One who increases his possessions by unethical practices gathers it for him who will pity the poor” and avers ...

Per Appellant's Brief USCA11 Case: 21-10398 Date Filed:

09/07/2021:

Homeowner is confident this Court will regain the Canons mandated honor and confidence by correcting its previous Mortgagees' induced error and will unify all the courts, so the Supreme Court does not have to again as it did in JESINOSKI with a ruling of "briefest and most terse", almost rebuke of lower circuit court of appeals and district courts erroneous rulings against homeowner of that case.

Remember the DCNG is calling the U.S. Supreme Court, this Court, DCNG Judge Story, DCMG and Maryland Greenbelt and Georgia OCGA§ so "frivolous" the DCNG never addressed the Homeowner's Objections and Corrections!

Homeowner built his home in subdivision he developed and named after his daughter twenty years ago, raised his now adult children, has had a home-based office, and always made timely mortgage payments. The matters of case began after Homeowner with perfect credit refinanced his home to access his home equity to buy out business partner who was in financial trouble during the Mortgagees caused Great Recession. Almost immediately the new mortgage company breached the

fixed rate loan contract by improperly raising interest rates and monthly premiums. Court previously correctly ruled the Mortgagees breached the contract and Mortgagees did not object, therefore that is established.

In Georgia, according to the first breach doctrine, “[i]f the nonperformance of a party to a contract is caused by the conduct of the opposite party, such conduct shall excuse the other party from performance.” Ga.Code Ann. § 13-4-23 (2013). The non-breaching party's performance, however, must have been rendered “useless or impossible” to be excused. *Progressive Elec. Servs. Inc. v. Task Force Constr., Inc.*, No. A140355, 2014 Ga.App. LEXIS 389, at \*13 (6/18/4)

Homeowner made three, breach of contract ever increasing interest rate and money demanded monthly payment with a letter of written protest with poof of breach until it became too much and was only enabling the breach, so then sent in the proper amount with all proof of breach and law supporting his action. (*Note: All this within six months of new loan.*) The proper mortgage payment with all documentation of breach was returned, and the mortgage company quit all communication. Literally no calls, no communication, all Homeowner's enquiries went unanswered. There was nothing to sue over. Years later a new mortgage

company contacted Homeowner, introduced itself with notice of intent to foreclose due to non-payment. Homeowner immediately sent the new mortgage company the proper monthly payment with all proof of breach. That mortgage company returned payment and information and went silent. A few years later another mortgage company contacted Homeowner, and all was repeated. A total of four mortgage companies! This is exactly why Congress passed laws to prevent reoccurring!

En Banc: Homeowner is a “whistle blower” federal banking violations:

The Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 came in response to financial scandals in the early 2000s involving publicly traded companies such as Enron ... auditors, and corporate officers and imposed more stringent recordkeeping requirements. ... disclosure requirements and fairly present in all material aspects ...

4/19/19 Will Kenton of Investopedia

The Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (the “Act”). The Act is meant to overhaul the United States financial oversight regime and is considered to effect the most sweeping change to financial sector regulation since the reforms following the Great Depression.

Appeals have been perpetuated and complicated by fraud on the courts and violations of (~~Rule 3.3~~ identical to) federal rules of ethics, Panels’ ruling are a Cat in the Hat attempt to clean up mess, instead

are creating a (inter)national mess so En Banc ruling is mandated so no one else or court ever have to go through all this again.

Brief: Yet here we are due to Mortgagees' greed. There was no one to sue as no one was curing the breach or trying to enforce the contract! The fourth mortgage company, Ocwen, sued to get a copy of contract and mortgage filed as original had been lost and never filed! Mortgage industry was crazy before and during their caused Great Recession. The judge in that case ruled since Homeowner was honest about copies being his signature, and even though he acknowledged in the order that Homeowner made defensive filings about fraud and breach, he was only going to rule about copies being verified to be filed. Then mortgage company did something that proves the movie The Big Short and why Mortgagees should be suing Ocwen, not Homeowner and cured their breach instead of trying to unethically enforce known improperly inflated amounts claimed due with true intent to steal home and all its equity! If Ocwen was so right, they would have foreclosed. Instead Ocwen, who now had recordable loan documents, also returned payments with information on breach and went quiet. Then Nationstar became Mortgagees. Mortgagees refused to cure breach and worse did bad faith

acts and negotiating for which they were fined \$90 million by all fifty states attorney generals! The following courts have ruled properly in favor of position the Homeowner has maintained from very first lawsuit against Mortgagees in 2014 for Breach of Contract and other issues of fraud, violations of lending laws, etc. and was affirmed by properly granted TRO. Why is it an officer supervising the illegally attempted eviction recited true judgment of instant case to Homeowner after a ten-minute explanation why TRO would be granted but courts cannot in years of filings? Because Mortgagees were not there interrupting with lies: "So your first mortgage company breached the contract and then illegally sold the beached mortgage to current mortgage company who instead of suing first mortgage company thought is easier to (mis)use courts to foreclose and evict you."

*JESINOSKI ET UX. v. COUNTRYWIDE HOME LOANS, INC., ET AL.*  
No. 13–684 January 13, 2015. U.S. Supreme Court shows how the courts are intervening per Spirit and intent of law against the Mortgagees wherein a written notice, not a lawsuit, protects homeowners. Homeowner has exhaustively referenced this case. Homeowner more than fulfilled *JESINOSKI* in very timely manner with notices of their

breach of contract affirmed by their own employees as proven by this Court ruling Mortgagees breached and the Mortgagees not objecting. Based on *JESINOSKI* case the DCMG made a ruling that even the DCNG and many other courts have upheld so there is unanimous court ruling and interpretation of all courts about First Breach and Homeowner only write a letter to Mortgagees in first year of mortgage as was done as Court previously affirmed.

*MALONE V. FED. HOME LOAN MORTG. CORP.*, DCMG. May 12, 2016) Homeowner has exhaustively cited is universally accepted by both Mortgagees and Mortgagors for statute of limitations for Sealed contracts being twenty years. *ROBINSON V. NATIONSTAR MORTGAGE LLC* (8:14-cv-03667) Homeowner was this year a winning member of class action lawsuit against Mortgagees in District Court Maryland Greenbelt. That case started in 2014 as did instant case. *ROBINSON* had attorneys for homeowner and without all the fraud, contempt, etc. as in instant case it still was only decided just this year for Homeowner member against Mortgagees. It was only a subcategory of matters of original lawsuit that was dismissed without prejudice due to Mortgagees' fraud, but with opinion "shotgun pleading". Robinson had five items in complaint

prepared by an attorney not as detailed and exhibited as Homeowner's, proving court's bias and prejudice against pro se. It is heart rending to read cases of guilty murderers getting freed from prison due to a technicality of court errors yet instant case grossest errors! As a side note Court needs to see all the new cases of homeowners with attorneys prevailing against mortgage companies. This proves Homeowner concerns of court bias against pro se litigants as Homeowner cited federal judge resigned over Courts prejudice and bias against pro se litigants. This Court can set the record straight and show rules per Spirit and intent of law as blindfolded Lady Justice with equal, unbiased scales. It seems the Mortgagees, with counsel who have senior partners in prison for corrupting government officials, make slanderous, false filings, incite the courts who in bias and prejudice blindly trust the Officers of the Court to such an extent no matter what law and exhibits the Homeowner files it is disregarded . . .

1. Conflicts all fifty states Attorney Generals who fined Nationstar
2. Conflicts U. S. Supreme Court ruling in Jesinoski v. Countrywide
3. Conflicts with "First Breach" of District Court Middle Georgia Malone v. Fed. Home and Court's DCNG Judge Story ruled first breach but



dismissed without prejudice no service due solely to proven fraud on courts by Mortgagees Default on proper Secretary of State service. It was timely appealed and Mortgagees counsel ~~Beleh~~-excuse, Balch knew it! The Mortgagees foreclosed in gross willful contempt of Federal Court jurisdiction and standing TRO so violated Rule 28 §1450!

4. Conflicts with District Court Maryland Greenbelt RESPA violations settlement *Robinson v. Nationstar* as Homeowner is winning member of that class action case. Homeowner submitted extorted via threat illegal foreclosure a \$3,000 payment when contract is \$1,800! Mortgagees violations of Forbearance with \$91Millions fine and restitution that Homeowner has not seen anything of \$57Million (worse, Court in error is enabling abuse!). \$3,000+ payment was returned because Nationstar greedily wanted to steal entire house with equity. Therefore, Judge Thrasher in bias slanders DCMG Malone is frivolous!!! The Court finds that the Malones' allegations that they have at least tried to tender the full amount due but that Bank of America has refused to accept their payments are sufficient to state a claim for equitable relief.

5. Conflicts State of Georgia laws O.C.G.A. breach of contract.

6. Conflicts DCNG Magistrate Recommendations recognized violations of Federal Laws of Sarbanes-Oxley Act and Dodd-Frank Act.

(USCA11 21-10398) " ... the officer supervising the illegally obtained, ex parte surprise no-notice, contemptuous eviction, after I explained in less than ten minutes what was going on, the officer, correctly replied: "Your mortgage company breached the contract, then fraudulently sold the breached mortgage to your current mortgage company. Your current mortgage company instead of suing the previous mortgage company for fraud thinks it's easier to misuse courts to evict you." Exactly! Why was an officer able to understand the basis for instant lawsuit in ten minutes while Court after years is still in severe conflict error? Because Mortgagees were not there to interrupt with lies and slander! Worse, Mortgagees in greed violated all the referenced banking laws, recent fines, settled cases, etc. and are still trying to trick second highest Court to be accomplices in their attempt to steal house instead of cure breach!

And USCA11 21-10398 Amended En Banc 8/25/22

**THE VERY APPEAL SHOWS PANEL ERROR AS PAGE 16 OF  
COPIED DOC 112 HAS NEW CASE ROBINSON HOMEOWNER WAS  
A WINNING MEMBER SO LEGALLY IMPOSSIBLE FOR  
HOMEOWNER TO LOSE HOME! EXTREME CONFLICT FOR  
DCMD.GREENBELT TO ORDER HOMEOWNER LEGALLY RIGHT  
AND DUE MONEY BUT PANEL AND DCN.GA ENABLE THE**

PROVEN NO JURISDICTION, CONTEMPTUOUS THEFT BY  
ILLEGAL FORECLOSURE IN VIOLATION TO SUPREME COURT  
*JESINOSKI* AND *DCMiddleGA MALONE*!!! And is Homeowner in  
threat of sanctions for showing this truth??!!

*(Note: Deutsche and Nationstar are using force of "largest clients" to  
make their counsel to violate Rule 3.3 for them!!!)*

All the Mortgagees incited erroneous orders are published before a  
final non-appealable order, but Homeowner's filings are not published  
so errant orders slander the Homeowner who has lost investors who  
solely referred to internet published orders for not investing! So,  
Homeowner has website (in respect to Court ordered his filing exposing  
all court corruption be sealed has not posted it):

<https://www.eleventhcircuitcourtappeals.us>.

Per C-I-P, all fifty states attorney generals and the U.S. Government  
have all come into agreement and fined and penalized Mortgagees for  
many of the matters the Homeowner listed in original 2014 lawsuit that  
was properly granted TRO! All has been affirmed by good court judges.  
The only matters left are proper interpretation of Statue of Limitations  
and asking DCNG to address Homeowner's timely filed Objections and  
Corrections to (the several and confusing number of) Magistrate  
Recommendations and Orders, all Orders carte blanche adopted

Mortgagees' filings were timely appealed and by this Court combined into this Brief. Homeowner abused by DCNG errors 1) mandating a bond for filing, 2) violated rules wherein an amended complaint was stricken, 3) not allowed filings, 4) Dismissed case!

Homeowner's NOTICE OF CERTIORARI TO U.S. SUPREME COURT  
11/1/22:

Undisputable facts are Mortgagees violated 28 U.S.C. § 1450, in contempt of standing state order TRO against Foreclosure, etc., in violation of federal court jurisdiction after Mortgagees partner in crime Nationstar removed from state the Homeowner's lawsuit, unauthorized changed plaintiffs and attorneys without even informing courts so original DCN.GA wrote in dismissing suit for wrongful foreclosure as obviously cared so little about pre se he did not read filing, Judge wrote in Dismissal he "could not ascertain how Deutsche was involved in lawsuit" because it was always Nationstar! Mortgagees violated RESPA laws as Homeowner is a Homeowner class action lawsuit member #FF64929439 winner in *ROBINSON V. NATIONSTAR*, During this protracted legal battle good courts have been ruling for Homeowner's

originally filed complaint properly granted the first of two TPOs.

*JESINOSKI v. HOMECOMING U.S. Supreme Court; MALONE v.*

*FEDERAL HOME LOAN MORTGAGE DCMiddleGA*; and most

recently U.S. Supreme Court *BP P. L. C. ET AL. v. MAYOR AND CITY*

*COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE* and Homeowner's clear reference to 1442

for 1447(d) for appeals in sister case 22-11463.

Homeowner's appeal per 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment and 28 U.S. CODE § 1447(d).

Supreme Court of the United States syllabus *BP P. L. C. ET AL. v. MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE* CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT No. 19-1189. Argued January 19, 2021—Decided May 17, 2021:

**The Fourth Circuit erred in holding that it was powerless to consider all of the defendants' grounds for removal under §1447(d).** In light of that error, the defendants ask us to consider some of those additional grounds ourselves. That task, however, **does not implicate the circuit split that we took this case to resolve and we believe the wiser course is to leave these matters for the Fourth Circuit to resolve in the first instance.** See *Brownback v. King*, 592 U. S. \_\_\_, \_\_\_, n. 4 (2021) (slip op., at 5, n. 4). **The judgment of the Fourth Circuit is vacated, and the case is remanded for further proceedings consistent with this opinion. So ordered.**

DCNG Orders did not even address one matter the Homeowner filed in Objections, and conflicts with cite of congressional law and jurisdiction.

Consideration by the U. S. Supreme Court is necessary to secure and maintain uniformity of the Court's decisions because more recent rulings by several courts uphold Homeowner's original legal positions in original filing in 2014 never yet

ruled on or clarified so conflict on even an international scale per Deutsche operating illegally in USA!

## JURISDICTION

This Court has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1254(1) and 28 U.S.C. § 1651(a) due to the denials of Brief, En Banc, Stay the Mandate (Exhibits 1, 2, 3,).

## DECISIONS BELOW

In all Denials, Dismissals, Recommendations not one decision below has addressed any of the core issues but only stated “frivolous” “res judicata” for cases dismissed without prejudice and instructed to serve again! Recently DCN.GA magistrate slanderously contradicted case facts and history and the Mortgagees never presented “Homeowner defaulted”!!

## ARGUMENTS

U.S. Supreme Court ruled in *Jesinoski v. Countrywide* for homeownership over greedy Mortgagees and *Hazel-Atlas Glass Co. v. Hartford-Empire Co.*, 322 U.S. 238 fraud upon the courts with orders to serve again and never any rulings on matters of case so moots any res judicata per Court’s two Panels I & II conflict each other, courts and

laws in *Hunt I* 18-1259 of 1:14-cv-03469 and instant interdependent *Hunt II* 18-12348 of 1:17-cv-02294; Panel II's cite *Stone Exch. Inc. Surface Tech Corp of GA* ("*Stone*") proves Homeowner correct Court never had jurisdiction and undoes Panel I errors caused by fraud upon the courts per "success in his appeal from *Hunt II* [I] will result in vacatur of the judgment in this case (instant is *Hunt II* so *Hunt I*) ..." true! No jurisdiction *Hunt I* Void Ab Initio *Hunt I & II* Remand into Default state so instant karma. Chase had a second mortgage and when learned of mortgage fraud, breach, interstate banking violations, etc. negotiated and Homeowner paid. Deutsche does not have standing per *Rogers v. Deutsche Bank National Trust Company* et al. A17A1256 (2017) and Panel II errs as the main issue of instant case is not *Hunt I* but wrongful foreclosure as Panel II confirms Homeowner complaint Contempt of this Court page 2 paragraph 2 "The instant case, *Hunt II*, was initiated while the first appeal from *Hunt I* was still pending"! This proves DCNG and Panel II would have ruled on behalf of Homeowner except for the fraud upon the court preventing. Panel cite *Travelers Indem. Co. v. Gore* 100% supports the Homeowner's contention fraud

upon the courts deceived Court(s) on jurisdiction; disallowing Rule 3.3 contradicts/violates ELEVENTH CIRCUIT RULE 1, laws, etc.

Since Panel II cites Georgia Court of Appeals supporting Homeowner, another cite proving Service per Secretary of State is binding (~~strike through~~ because Homeowner did properly hence binding service)

*THORBURN COMPANY v. ALLIED MEDIA*. No. A99A0637. Decided: 4/28/99

The trial court found that “by ~~not~~ serving a summons along with the complaint to either [Allied Media] or the Secretary of State [pursuant to OCGA § 9-11-4(d) and 14-2-1510], service was ~~not~~-properly perfected.” Accordingly, there was no error. Judgment affirmed.

Mortgagee should have sued the previous mortgage company instead of Homeowner. Instead, unauthorized substituted plaintiff Deutsche committed interstate mortgage fraud and violate banking accounting laws via wrongful in contempt foreclosure of known bad loan with improperly inflated value of illegally increased mortgage payments due, penalties, and with no competing bids bought in for more than advertised to further falsify accounting. Court is liable for participating in fraud if not cure by enforcing ethics. Homeowner is a “whistle blower” of federal banking violations and has filed complaints to proper authorities awaiting determination and will receive compensation so mandated protection:

The Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 came in response to financial scandals in the early 2000s involving publicly traded companies such as Enron ... auditors, and corporate officers



and imposed more stringent recordkeeping requirements. ... disclosure requirements and fairly present in all material aspects ...

4/19/19 Will Kenton of

Investopedia

The Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (the "Act"). The Act is meant to overhaul the United States financial oversight regime and is considered to effect the most sweeping change to financial sector regulation since the reforms following the Great Depression.

## CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

This case involves U.S. Constitution United States and Judicial Branch Sovereignty and right for homeownership, the Fourteenth Amendment's Equal Protection Clause, Congressional Laws and Constitutional Jurisdiction of Federal and State.

## FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

Undisputable facts are Mortgagees violated 28 U.S.C. § 1450, in contempt of standing state order TRO against Foreclosure etc., in violation of federal court jurisdiction after Mortgagees partner in crime Nationstar removed from state the Homeowner's lawsuit, unauthorized changed plaintiffs and attorneys without even informing courts so original Judge wrote he could not violated RESPA laws as Homeowner is a winning member of class action lawsuit *ROBINSON*, During this

protracted legal battle courts have been ruling for Homeowner's originally filed complaint properly granted the first of two TPOs. *JESINOSKI v. HOMECOMING U.S. Supreme Court; MALONE v. FEDERAL HOME LOAN MORTGAGE DCMiddleGA; Homeowner class action lawsuit member#FF64929439 winner in ROBINSON V. NATIONSTAR*, and most recently U.S. Supreme Court *BP P. L. C. ET AL. v. MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE* and Homeowner's clear reference to 1442 for 1447(d) for appeals in sister case 22-11463.

DCNG Orders did not even address one matter the Homeowner filed in Objections, and conflicts with cite of congressional law and jurisdiction. Consideration by the U. S. Supreme Court is necessary to secure and maintain uniformity of the Court's decisions because more recent rulings by several courts uphold Homeowner's original legal positions never yet ruled on or clarified so conflict on even an international scale per Deutsche operating illegally in USA!

Not "or" but AND (B) questions of exceptional importance,

QUESTIONS TO BE PRESENTED

1. JURISDICTION When there is admitted by courts conflict between the federal courts and state courts on such all-important matters of jurisdiction, which court – federal and/or state - are to enforce Supreme Court’s ruling in *Yellow Freight System, Inc. v. Donnelly*, (1990) and *ROBB v. CONNOLLY* (1884) to close the loophole of conflicting oppositional jurisdiction between federal and state court?

**Congress deprived state courts of the power they normally have - that is, the power to decide their own jurisdiction.** *E.g.*, *American Fire & Cas. Co. v. Finn*, 341 U.S. 6 (1951); *Landry v. Cornell Constr. Co.*, 87 R.I. 4, 137 A.2d 412 (1957). **Federal decisions usually speak of a duty of the court to raise the jurisdictional issue.** *E.g.*, *Clark v. Paul Gray, Inc.*, 306 U.S. 583, 588 (1939); *St. Paul. Mercury Indem. Co. v. Red Cab Co.*, 303 U.S. 283, 287, n.10 (1938).

Currently DCNGA and USCA11 are “federal courts do not impose itself into state courts” yet the state per law is powerless to correct itself.

There needs to be a Supreme Court overriding mandate per

*JESINOSKI v. COUNTRYWIDE and BP P. L. C. ET AL. v. MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE* so courts have unified clear directives how to intervene and enforce jurisdictional conflicts.

2. WHEN THERE IS PROVEN FIRST BREACH, do the Federal Courts have to proactively consider as the number one first priority over all others to be the First Breach because uncured First Breach makes all

other matters moot per case ruling made during instant case prolonged legal battle *PAUL E. MALONE, SR. & FAITH LANIER MALONE v. FEDERAL HOME LOAN and BANK OF AMERICA, N.A.*, 1:14-cv-193 (WLS) United States District Court, M.D. Georgia, Albany Division. May 12, 2016 “cannot enforce contract until cure first breach”? Does FIRST BREACH VOID AB INITIO ILLEGAL FORECLOSURE AND ALL NULLITY ORDERS IN CONFLICT WITH *MALONE, ETC.* AFTER PROPER TRO?

3. FIRST BREACH When a state court with no jurisdiction and dealing with an uncured first breach abuses its discretion by erroneously demanding a supersedeas bond on proven fraudulent excessive amount despite home undeniably having excess equity above debt, is it unconstitutional for there not to be an appeal mechanism within the Georgia Court system for federal courts to review the judge’s order when the federal courts have announced jurisdiction?

4. RULE 60(b)(2) needs clarity of implementation how to consider new evidence proving the fraud on the court created a legal monopoly that adversely effected machinery of justice preventing courts from considering anything presented.

5. FRAUD UPON THE COURTS. How does Court enforce  
ADDENDUM EIGHT RULES GOVERNING ATTORNEY DISCIPLINE  
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT RULE 1  
when conflicting circuit courts Panel “does not enforce Rule 3.3” so  
Court does not correct fraud on courts?

6. AUTHORIZED FOR SERVICE O.C.G.A. allows foreign corporations  
to be registered agents, but is it court error to rule these companies get  
unique privilege conflicting with all court rules and laws so “authorize  
whoever they want”? Instant case the original service corporation only  
had a mail slot, not even a person! Then later changed but only had  
non-descript employees with no verification to ascertain authority for  
binding service. What is the new standard for court recognized “position  
of authority” for service: Mentally impaired, minor, part-time janitor?  
Homeowner suggested they must hire court recognized process servers  
since de facto that is what they are. By having process servers removes  
all questions if service was correct. This provides unmistakable service  
and better paying jobs.

7. HOW DO THE COURTS APPLY U.S. SUPREME COURT  
*JESINOSKI V. COUNTRYWIDE* in similar cases to instant case

wherein the Homeowner has proven the Mortgagees violated congressional laws passed to prevent acts of instant case more than fulfilled all the criteria the U. S. Supreme Court ruled protected the Homeowners against greedy, unethical mortgage companies that caused the recent Great Recession. Homeowner timely complained in writing of First Breach and Fraud, etc. within first six months!

8. Homeowner informed courts of being a winning member of class action *ROBINSON v. NATIONSTAR* that was a very important effect in proper ruling for instant case, how do courts incorporate benefits of winning suit into instant case?

“To void a contract for fraud, it must be shown that the party attempting to prove fraud relied on the other party's fraudulent statements. It must also be shown that these statements were crucial to the bargain. In other words, *the bargain never would have been made* if the fraudulent statements had not been made.” ([lawhelp.org](http://lawhelp.org)) Georgia State Code Title 13, Chapter 5, Section 5 (13-5-5): “Fraud renders contracts voidable at the election of the injured party”

9. Defendant Albertelli was a bad acting debt collector so no way “fraudulently joined” because Albertelli, in violation to Homeowner forewarned bad acting debt collector acts, enabling interstate mortgage

fraud, violating bank accounting laws, etc., was undeniably liable  
having lost three other similar lawsuits and per:

**PART 3 - REVOCATION CERTIFICATE OF AUTHORITY § 14-2-1530**

(5) An incorporator, director, officer, or agent of the foreign corporation signed a document he knew was false in any material respect with intent that the document be delivered to the Secretary of State for filing; or ...”

10. QUESTION OF SERVICE being perfected and binding when an Officer of Corporation (CEO Jay Bray is sued as the officer) knowingly committed misconduct in his position and the corporate authorized person to receive service per process server affidavit should be sufficient. This fulfills the concern quoted of congressional hearings that officers of corporations were facilitating the bad loan sales that congressional laws were enacted to end. Bray definitely defaulted on service even by personal service standards per Texas and Georgia law.

And last but not least and probably most important:

11. Per filing: NOTICE OF FILING: SUPPLEMENT RECORD OF CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTION JURISDICTION OBJECTION TO MOTION TO DISMISS WITH NOTICE APPELLEES C-I-P DEUTSCHE IS ILLEGAL IN USA 21-10398 6 June 22

**CONCLUSION**

For these reasons, Applicant Homeowner respectfully requests the Court enjoin the USCA11 Eleventh Circuit to Stay the Mandate or Recall the

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I have sent a copy of this **EMERGENCY APPLICATION for WRIT INJUNCTION** by approved Electronic Service via Cross Filing USCA11 and if requested US mail after filing this 13th day of November 2022.

Christopher Anulewicz Balch and Bingham Counsel for  
Deutsche Bank Trust Company Americas  
Nationstar Mortgage LLC  
30 Ivan Allen Jr. Blvd. NW Suite 700  
Atlanta, GA 30308

  
//*Christopher M. Hunt, Sr.*// (electronic signature)

Christopher M. Hunt, Sr. Pro Se  
5456 Peachtree Blvd. 410  
Atlanta, GA 30341-2235  
(770) 457-3300 1cor13cmh@gmail.com



## **FRAP 26.1 Certifical Interested Parties (C-I-P)**

**Appeal 21-10398 Christopher M. Hunt, Sr. v. Nationstar, et al**

C-I-P for Christopher Hunt, Sr.

Pursuant to Eleventh Circuit Rule 26.1-1, Christopher M. Hunt, Sr. ("Homeowner"/Appellant) hereby certify that the following is a complete list of all trial judges, attorneys, persons, associations of persons, firms, partnerships, or corporations that have an interest in the outcome of the present appeal, including subsidiaries, conglomerates, affiliates, parent corporations, and publicly held corporations that own 10% or more of the party's stock:

- **Albertelli Law**: Counsel for Mortgagees who participated in crimes by via illegal, contemptuous wrongful foreclosure, was paid % of KNOWN fraudulent inflated debt, violated O.C.G.A. § 14-2-1530 (5) and has defaulted on service for a fourth time after Balch coached how and when to remedy the fraud on courts "Compliant" company, has lost three federal cases as bad acting debt collector. Albertelli is always in CIPs as Defendant and CIP party and Mortgagees admit most questions of case involve Mandated Joinder Party.

- **Anulewicz, Christopher Scott**: Counsel for Appellees Nationstar Mortgage, LLC and DeutscheBank National Trust Companies. "Christ?opher" apparently will do almost anything for bosses to keep "one of our largest clients" as he orchestrates everything from fraud on courts concerning case start of Albertelli's default after original TRO, falsifying "compliance", slandering Homeowner and knowingly citing bad law to bias courts, etc. Refuses to adhere to rules of ethics for federal and state courts.

- **JayBray CEO**: Defendant as CEO of Nationstar served 6/8/20 so also defaulted since Christ?opher admits has not answered Complaint. Jay

has acknowledged his braying and company so bad it has to be transformed beyond just name change.

- **Balch & Bingham LLP**: Law firm of Christopher S. Anulewicz (above), Brooke W. Gram (below), and Patrick N. Silloway (below), counsel for Appellees Nationstar Mortgage, LLC and Deutsche Bank National Trust Companies and have senior partners in prison for corrupting government officials.

- **Dear Jackson, LaTisha**: Judge Superior Court of DeKalb County, who as “court of equity” granted second proven proper TRO that ended Mortgagees conflict, contempt of federal courts, original TRO, **and has now by proper order ended subsequent conflict** caused by Mortgagees unethically tricking to void TRO and illegal Supersedeas.

- **Deutsche Bank National Trust Companies**: Deutsche Bank National Trust Companies is a national banking association organized under the law of the United States to carry on the business of a limited purpose trust company. Deutsche Bank is a wholly owned subsidiary of Deutsche Bank Holdings, Inc., which is a wholly owned subsidiary of Deutsche Bank Trust Corporation, which is a wholly owned subsidiary of Deutsche Bank AG, a banking corporation organized under the laws of the Federal Republic of Germany. No publicly-held company owns 10% or more of the Deutsche Bank AG's stock. Deutsche Bank's main office is in Los Angeles, California. Deutsche Bank's principal office of trust administration is in Santa Ana, California. As a national banking association, Deutsche Bank is operating illegally without being registered in headquarters state with registered agent in violation to U.S. Supreme Court *American Bank & Trust Co. v. Federal Reserve*

Bank, 256 U.S. 350 (1921) A federal reserve bank is not a national banking association within § 24, cl. 16, of the Judicial Code, which declares that such associations, for the purposes of suing and being sued, shall (except in certain cases) be deemed citizens of the states where they are located. P. 256 U.S. 357. Christopher never corrected Homeowner filing but still files ~~“may do business in all 50 states in the United States without having to be registered as a foreign corporation or otherwise be registered or licensed in any individual state in order to conduct business in the state”~~; Deutsche is one of main culprits causing “Great Recession”, featured bank in movie *The Big Short*, U. S. fined Deutsche \$7.2Billion, 60 minutes expose \$100+Billions money laundering, violated banking rules to obtain and maintain known child pedophile sex trading Epstein account, instant case violated federal banking laws, committed first breach, fraud, etc.

\*\*\*NOTE: CONTRADICTS Aldridge Pite’s 22-11463 Deutsche Bank Trust Company Americas, as Trustee: Appellee. DBTCA is a New York state chartered banking corporation with fiduciary powers duly organized under the laws of the State of New York. DBTCA is a wholly owned subsidiary of Deutsche Bank Trust Corporation, a New York corporation. Deutsche Bank Trust Corporation is a wholly owned subsidiary of DB USA Corporation, a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware. DB USA Corporation is a wholly owned subsidiary of Deutsche Bank AG. Deutsche Bank AG (DB:U.S.; DBK:GR) is a German multinational investment bank and financial services company headquartered in Frankfurt, Germany, and is dual listed on the Frankfurt Stock Exchanges and the New York

Stock Exchange. Deutsche Bank AG is not a subsidiary of any parent corporation, and no publicly held corporations own 10% or more of the stock of Deutsche Bank AG. Is also operating illegally without being registered in headquarters state of New York without a registered agent in violation to U.S. Supreme Court American Bank & Trust Co. v. Federal Reserve Bank, 256 U.S. 350 (1921) to avoid taxes and accountability of juries?!!

- **Gram, Brooke Walker:** Counsel for Appellees Nationstar Mortgage, LLC and Deutsche Bank National Trust Companies who conveniently used to work in federal court judge's office.

- **Hunt, Sr., Christopher M.:** Appellant; "Homeowner" has always been 100% honest, court honoring and legally right per U.S. Supreme Court, DCMG, DCNG, OCGA, federal bank laws, TROs.

- **KKR Wand Investors Corporation:** KKR Wand Investors Corporation, is a Delaware corporation which has no parent corporation and is not publicly held; SEC violations misallocating more than \$17 million in so-called "broken deal" expenses to its flagship private equity funds in breach of its fiduciary duty. KKR agreed to pay nearly \$30 million including a \$10 million penalty.

- **Mr. Cooper Inc.:** Mr. Cooper Inc. (NASDAQ ticker: COOP) is owned by KKR Wand Investors Corporation; is new rebranding attempt AKA Nationstar so corrupt and incompetent that still local Dallas paper was critical of name change without character and performance change.

- **Nationstar Mortgage LLC:** Nationstar Mortgage LLC is wholly

Mandate pending outcome of forthcoming Certiorari and inconsideration of other pending case the illegal eviction would then be the ultimate court judicial system insult for Mortgagees to misuse proven illegally obtained eviction to Moot the other cases as officer over the illegally obtained attempted eviction opined Mortgagees thought easier to misuse courts to destroy Homeowner by misusing courts instead of sue crony mortgage company who did the same as they did of illegally selling bad mortgages! Court is prayerfully requested to resolve case as it has JESINOSKI and enter any other relief it deems proper.

Respectfully submitted this 13<sup>th</sup> day November

  
//Christopher M. Hunt, Sr. // (electronic signature)

Christopher M. Hunt, Sr., Appellant Homeowner Pro Se.  
5456 Peachtree Blvd., Ste 410  
Atlanta, GA 30341-2235  
770-457-3300 1cor13cmh@gmail.com

### **CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE**

1. This petition complies with the type-volume limitation of Supreme Court, this filing contains 5,434 words.
2. This brief complies with the typeface requirements of Supreme Court because it has been prepared in a proportionally spaced typeface using a 14-point Century.

Dated 13th day of November 2022

  
//Christopher M. Hunt, Sr. // (electronic signature)

Christopher M. Hunt, Sr. Applicant

owned by Nationstar Sub1 LLC and Nationstar Sub2 LLC.

Nationstar Sub1 LLC and Nationstar Sub2 LLC are both wholly owned by Nationstar Mortgage Holdings, Inc., a publicly-traded company.


(NYSE ticker: NSM); so bad name change to Mr. Cooper cannot transform admitted bad culture and costumer abuse as recently lost \$3,000,000 case on RESPA violations to Homeowner (no compensation yet), \$90,000,000s in fines by fifty states attorney generals, etc.

- **Sewing, Christian:** ~~Named as Defendant below but did not receive service Plaintiff~~ voluntarily dismissed as a defendant on 8/17/20 after translating Complaint because instant case is won, and in so much trouble for other things more accountability not needed (See Deutsche)

- **Silloway, Patrick N.:** Counsel for Appellees Nationstar Mortgage, LLC and Deutsche Bank National Trust Companies, needs to start making an honest living. Attorneys need withdraw or stop bad filings.

- **Thrash Jr. Thomas W.:** District Judge for the Northern District of Georgia; severally prejudiced by misplaced trust in bad acting debt collector attorneys' slander, bad law cites and Magistrate's erroneous report...

- **Walker, Linda T.:** Magistrate Judge for the Northern District of Georgia – ~~motion~~ to reconsider proves something seriously wrong...



Respectfully submitted this 13th day of November, 2022.

// Christopher M. Hunt, Sr. // (electronic signature)

Christopher M. Hunt, Sr. forced Pro Se Appellant Homeowner

5456 Peachtree Blvd, #410

Chamblee GA 30341-2235

770-457-3300 1cor13cmh@gmail.com

# EXHIBITS 1, 2, 3 ORDERS

USCA11 Case: 21-10398 Date Filed: 10/19/2022 Page: 1 of 1

## UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

ELBERT PARR TUTTLE COURT OF APPEALS BUILDING  
56 Forsyth Street, N.W.  
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

David J. Smith  
Clerk of Court

For rules and forms visit  
[www.ca11.uscourts.gov](http://www.ca11.uscourts.gov)

October 19, 2022

### MEMORANDUM TO COUNSEL OR PARTIES

Appeal Number: 21-10398-JJ  
Case Style: Christopher Hunt, Sr. v. Nationstar Mortgage, et al  
District Court Docket No: 1:20-cv-02359-TWT

The enclosed order has been entered on petition(s) for rehearing.

See Rule 41, Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure, and Eleventh Circuit Rule 41-1 for information regarding issuance and stay of mandate.

Sincerely,

DAVID J. SMITH, Clerk of Court

Reply to: Tiffany A. Tucker, JJ/lt  
Phone #: (404)335-6193

REHG-1 Ltr Order Petition Rehearing

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 21-10398-JJ

---

CHRISTOPHER M. HUNT, SR.,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

NATIONSTAR MORTGAGE,  
DEUTSCHE BANK NATIONAL TRUST COMPANY,  
JAY BRAY,  
CEO Nationstar,  
CHRISTIAN SEWING,  
CEO Deutsche,  
ALBERTELLI LAW, et., al,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Northern District of Georgia

---

ORDER:

The motion of Appellant, Christopher M. Hunt, Sr., for stay of the issuance of the mandate pending petition for writ of certiorari is DENIED.

DAVID J. SMITH  
Clerk of the United States Court of  
Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit

ENTERED FOR THE COURT - BY DIRECTION



IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 21-10398-JJ

---

CHRISTOPHER M. HUNT, SR.,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

versus

NATIONSTAR MORTGAGE,  
DEUTSCHE BANK NATIONAL TRUST COMPANY,  
JAY BRAY,  
CEO Nationstar,  
CHRISTIAN SEWING,  
CEO Deutsche,  
ALBERTELLI LAW, et., al,

Defendants-Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Northern District of Georgia

---

Before: ROSENBAUM, GRANT, and MARCUS, Circuit Judges.

BY THE COURT:

Before this Court is Appellant's "Notice of Filing: Supplement Record of Constitutional Question Jurisdiction Objection to Motion to Dismiss with Notice Appellees C-I-P Deutsche is Illegal in USA." To the extent that this document requests any relief from this Court, the motion is DENIED.

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

<i>AMERICAN BANK &amp; TRUST CO. V. FEDERAL RESERVE BANK</i> , 256 U.S. 350 (1921) .....	2
§ 24, cl. 16, of the Judicial Code.....	2
Sarbanes Oxley Act.....	3
The Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act....	3
JESINOSKI ET UX. v. COUNTRYWIDE HOME LOANS, INC., ET AL. No. 13–684 January 13, 2015 .....	4
<i>PAUL E. MALONE, SR. &amp; FAITH LANIER MALONE v. FEDERAL HOME LOAN and BANK OF AMERICA, N.A.</i> , 1:14-cv-193.....	4
<i>ROBINSON V. NATIONSTAR MORTGAGE LLC</i> (8:14-cv-03667).....	4
HUNT v. DEUTSCHE No. 21-10398 (11th Cir.).....	4
DEUTSCHE v. HUNT No. 22-11463 (11th Cir.).....	4
DEUTSCHE v HUNT (Supreme Court State of Georgia) S22C1331.....	4
<i>Hazel-Atlas Glass Co. v. Hartford-Empire Co.</i> , 322 U.S. 238.....	7
Dred Scott Decision.....	8
Gonzalez v. Thayer, 132 S. Ct. 641, 648 (2012).....	8
Real Estate Bar Ass’n for Mass., Inc. v. Nat’l Real Estate Info. Servs., 608 F.3d 110, 125 (1st Cir. 2010).....	8
GRAMEGNA V. JOHNSON, 846 F.2d 675, (11th Cir. 1988).....	8
<i>BP P. L. C. ET AL. v. MAYOR &amp; CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE.</i>	10
District Court Ohio Southern District .....	10
14 <sup>th</sup> Amendment .....	15

Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S. 137 (1803).....	17
Canons 3A (1) .....	17
Proverbs 16:10 .....	17
Ga.Code Ann. § 13-4-23 (2013).....	19
Progressive Elec. v. Task Force Constr., Inc., No. A140355, 2014.....	19
Cat in the Hat Dr. Seuss (authority child clean moral conscience) .....	20
Rule 28 §145 .....	25
RESPA .....	25
Rule 3.3 .....	27
Statue of Limitations.....	27
fifty states attorney generals.....	27
Georgia State Code Title 13, Chapter 5, Section 5 (13-5-5).....	38
U.S. CODE § 1447(d).....	29
28 U.S. CODE § 1442.....	29
BROWNBACK V. KING, 592 U. S. ___, ___, n. 4 (2021).....	29
28 U.S.C. § 1254(1).....	30
28 U.S.C. § 1651(a).....	30
<i>Hazel-Atlas Glass Co. v. Hartford-Empire Co.</i> , 322 U.S. 238.....	30
<i>Hunt I</i> 18-1259 of 1:14-cv-03469.....	31
<i>Hunt II</i> 18-12348 of 1:17-cv-02294.....	31
<i>Stone Exch. Inc. Surface Tech Corp of GA</i> (“Stone”).....	31

<i>Rogers v. Deutsche Bank Natl Trust Co et al.</i> A17A1256 (2017) .....	31
<i>Travelers Indem. Co. v. Gore</i> .....	31
<i>THORBURN COMPANY v. ALLIED MEDIA</i> . No. A99A0637.....	32
OCGA § 9-11-4(d).....	32
OCGA § 14-2-1510.....	32
<i>American Fire &amp; Cas. Co. v. Finn</i> , 341 U.S. 6 (1951).....	35
<i>Landry v. Cornell Constr. Co.</i> , 87 R.I. 4, 137 A.2d 412 1957) .....	35
<u><i>Clark v. Paul Gray, Inc.</i></u> , 306 U.S. 583, 588 (1939).....	35
<i>St. Paul. Mercury Indem. Co. v. Red Cab Co.</i> , 303 U.S. (1938).....	35
FRAUD UPON THE COURTS .....	36
RULE 60(b)(2).....	36
AUTHORIZED FOR SERVICE O.C.G.A .....	37
Georgia State Code Title 13, Chapter 5.....	38
28 U.S.C. § 14-2-1530.....	39

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 21-10398-JJ

---

CHRISTOPHER M. HUNT, SR.,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

NATIONSTAR MORTGAGE,  
DEUTSCHE BANK NATIONAL TRUST COMPANY,  
JAY BRAY,  
CEO Nationstar,  
CHRISTIAN SEWING,  
CEO Deutsche,  
ALBERTELLI LAW, et., al,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Northern District of Georgia

---

ORDER:

The motion of Appellant, Christopher M. Hunt, Sr., for stay of the issuance of the mandate pending petition for writ of certiorari is DENIED.

DAVID J. SMITH  
Clerk of the United States Court of  
Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit

ENTERED FOR THE COURT - BY DIRECTION