
26-5950



IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

In re MJV, Minor

MI SC No. 372337

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

Michigan Court of Appeals

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Jason Van Coillie

(Following contact only, NOT DOMICILE)

6221 Brush St

APT 223

Detroit, MI 48202

(586) 224-1324

Jason.VanCoillie@gmail.com

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

1. Did the appellant timely challenge jurisdiction with evidence?

Trial court: No. Appellant: Yes.

2. Did the court prove on the record all facts related to the jurisdiction asserted?

Trial court: Yes. Appellant: No.

3. When jurisdiction is timely challenged with evidence and the court does not prove on record all facts related to the jurisdiction asserted, does the court have jurisdiction?

Trial court: Yes. Appellant: No.

LIST OF PARTIES

Mother
Father

RELATED CASES

None

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW.....1

JURISDICTION.....1

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED.....2

STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....3

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT.....3

CONCLUSION.....4

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A Decision of the Michigan State Court

APPENDIX C Decision of the Michigan State Supreme Court Denying Review

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

1. Black's Law Dictionary, 4th Ed., 425, 426.....2
2. Cochrane v. W. F. Potts Son & Co. (C.C.A. 5th) 47 F. (2d) 1026.....2
3. Constitution of the United States, Amendment V.....2
4. Constitution of the United States, Amendment XIV.....2
5. Ex parte Gladhill, 8 Metc. Mass., 171, per Shaw, C.J.....2
6. Jones v. Jones, 188 Mo. App. 220, 175 S.W. 227, 229.....2
7. Joyce v. US, 474 F2d 215 (1973).....2
8. Lantana v. Hopper, 102 F2d 188; Chicago v. New York, 37 F Supp 150 (1939).....2
9. Ledwith v. Rosalsky, 244 N.Y. 406, 155 N.E. 688, 689.....2
10. Melo v. US, 505 F2d 1026 (1974).....2
11. Merritt v. Hunter, C.A. Kansas 170 F2d 739 (1948).....2
12. Middleton v. Low (1866), 30 C. 596, citing Prosser v. Secor (1849), 5 Barb.(N.Y) 607, 608....2
13. People v. Shaw, 81 Cal. App. 312, 253 P. 747.....2
14. Piper v. Pearson, 2 Gray 120, cited in Bradley v. Fisher, 13 Wall. 335, 20 L.Ed. 646 (1872)....2
15. Rosemond v. Lambert, 469 F2d 416 (1972).....2
16. Wuest v. Wuest, 127 P2d 934, 937 (1944).....2

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Petitioner respectfully prays that a writ of certiorari issue to review the judgment below.

OPINIONS BELOW

[X] For cases from **state courts**:

The opinion of the Michigan State Court of Appeals appears at Appendix A to the petition and is unpublished.

The opinion of the 16th Judicial Circuit Court appears at Appendix B to the petition and is unpublished.

JURISDICTION

[X] For cases from **state courts**:

The date on which the highest state court denied discretionary review of my case was 29 Aug 2025. A copy of that decision appears at Appendix C.

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1257(a).

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

One of the five characteristics of a court of record is that it is proceeding according to the course of the common law (Jones v. Jones, 188 Mo. App. 220, 175 S.W. 227, 229; Ex parte Gladhill, 8 Metc. Mass., 171, per Shaw, C.J. See, also, Ledwith v. Rosalsky, 244 N.Y. 406, 155 N.E. 688, 689; Black's Law Dictionary, 4th Ed., 425, 426). "Once jurisdiction is challenged, the court cannot proceed when it clearly appears that the court lacks jurisdiction, the court has no authority to reach merits, but, rather, should dismiss the action." Melo v. US, 505 F2d 1026. "There is no discretion to ignore that lack of jurisdiction." Joyce v. US, 474 F2d 215. "The burden shifts to the court to prove jurisdiction." Rosemond v. Lambert, 469 F2d 416. "Court must prove on the record, all jurisdiction facts related to the jurisdiction asserted." Lantana v. Hopper, 102 F2d 188; Chicago v. New York, 37 F Supp 150. "Whenever a want of jurisdiction is suggested...it is the duty of the court to consider it, for if the court is without jurisdiction, it is powerless to act in the case." Cochrane v. W. F. Potts Son & Co. (C.C.A. 5th) 47 F. (2d) 1026, citing R. C. L.; People v. Shaw, 81 Cal. App. 312, 253 P. 747, citing R. C. L.; 14 Am. Jur. 385. "No officer can acquire jurisdiction by deciding he has it. The officer, whether judicial or ministerial, decides at his own peril." Middleton v. Low (1866), 30 C. 596, citing Prosser v. Secor (1849), 5 Barb.(N.Y) 607, 608. "Where a court failed to observe safeguards, it amounts to denial of due process of law, court is deprived of juris." Merritt v. Hunter, C.A. Kansas 170 F2d 739. "Where there is no jurisdiction, there can be no discretion, for discretion is incident to jurisdiction." Piper v. Pearson, 2 Gray 120, cited in Bradley v. Fisher, 13 Wall. 335, 20 L.Ed. 646 (1872). "A departure by a court from those recognized and established requirements of law, however close apparent adherence to mere form in method of procedure, which has the effect of depriving one of a constitutional right, is an excess of jurisdiction." Wuest v. Wuest, 127 P2d 934, 937.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

1. Jason Van Coillie (appellant) made a special appearance for case 2023-000712-AY at the 16th Judicial Circuit Court on 07 Dec 2023 and declared the immunity of a foreign state (07 Dec 2023 Transcripts, Page 12, Lines 15-23).

2. The court provided no evidence to prove jurisdiction and appellant objected to proceeding without jurisdiction (Transcripts, 07 Dec 2023, Page 13, Lines 12-16).-

3. Appellant moved the court for dismissal based on a lack of jurisdiction through written motion delivered on 20 Dec 2023 (Opinion and Order Regarding Respondents Motion to Dismiss, 02 Apr 2024, Page 2).

4. Appellant objected to proceeding without the evidence on the record used to prove jurisdiction (Transcripts, 01 Feb 2024, Page 3, Lines 8-11; Page 6, Lines 20-23; Pages 7-8, Lines 23-24, 1).

5. The court determined jurisdiction with no evidence on the record (Opinion and Order Regarding Respondents Motion to Dismiss, 02 Apr 2024, Page 6).

6. Appellant was served with the evidence used to prove jurisdiction (Transcripts, 12 June 2024, Page 9, Lines 6-14).

7. Appellant stood upon his objection (Transcripts, 31 June 2024, Page 58, Lines 9-16).

8. The court entered orders which deprive appellant of protected rights (Opinion and Order, 15 Aug 2024, Page 6).

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

THE 16TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT COURT LACKS JURISDICTION

The 16th Judicial Circuit Court violated appellant's right to procedural due process (V and XIV Amendment, Constitution of the United States), when Terri Lynn Dennings issued final orders in case 2023-000712-AY on 15 Aug 2024; after appellant was denied his day in court with regards to jurisdiction. This situation allows any court to extend its jurisdiction over any individual regardless of circumstances and places everyone under slavery.

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Jason Van Coillie

Christ Jason David Van Coillie, Kingdom of God

Date: 08 Nov 2025