



**THE MOORISH NATIONAL REPUBLIC  
THE MOORISH DIVINE AND NATIONAL MOVEMENT OF THE WORLD  
Aboriginal and Indigenous Natural Peoples of North-West Amexem North America**

**Affidavit of Fact**

Exhibit AH

(Exercise of Constitution / Treaty – Secured Right)

December 31 2010

SUPREME COURT OF CONNECTICUT  
Office of the Clerk  
231 Capitol Avenue  
Near Corporate HARTFORD CONNECTICUT  
[06106] uSA

Enclosed is a “Writ” along with an “Affidavit of Financial Statement” submitted In Lieu of “Application to Proceed without prepayment of fees”.

Be advised, this is NOT Pro Se Litigant – This Litigation is “In Propria Persona”.

I demand, as is my Secured Constitutional / Treaty Rights, that this court accept and honor the documentation that was submitted in good faith and process them accordingly.

A response if required within 10 days from receipt of this Suit at which time if not received default judgment will apply.

Notice to the Agent is Notice to the Principal – Notice to the Principal is notice to the Agent.

I Am: \_\_\_\_\_

Anaid A. EL, member of Consul  
Natural Person, In Propria Persona:  
All Rights Reserved:  
U.C.C. 1-207/ 1-308; U.C.C. 1-103  
Quinnehtukqut Territory  
[c/o 78 Ridge Street]  
[ Near Corporate MANCHESTER CONNECTICUT 06040]  
Northwest Amexem

Exhibit V – Writ of Error – Dated December 24, 2010

Exhibit W – Averment of Jurisdiction to SUPERIOR COURT HOUSING SESSION

Exhibit AA – #2 Demand to Appear for Nocie of Court Hearing re: Writ of Error/Mandamus

Exhibit AI – Certificate of Mailing 123110

Cc: United Nations  
Geneva Switzerland

International Justice Court  
The Hague, The Netherlands

Honorable Barak Obama  
White House Washington DC

United States Justice Department  
United States Attorney General  
Eric H. Holder

International Criminal Court  
The Hague, The Netherlands

Great Seal National Association of Moorish Affairs  
Minister A. El

SUPREME COURT OF CONNECTICUT  
Chief Justice Chase T. Rogers



**THE MOORISH NATIONAL REPUBLIC  
MOORISH DIVINE AND NATIONAL MOVEMENT OF THE WORLD  
Aboriginal and Indigenous Natural Peoples of Northwest Amexem / North America**

**Affidavit of Financial Statement**

(Exercise of Constitution – Secured Right)

Exhibit AF-1

December 31, 2010

**Zilliah S. El**, Authorized Representative, Natural Person, In Propria Persona:

Ex Relatione **Zilliah Kenion**: All Rights Reserved:

U.C.C. 1-207/ 1-308; U.C.C. 1-103

Not a Corporate Person or Entity, Misrepresented by Fraudulent Construct of ALL CAPITAL LETTERS

Quinnehtekqut Territory

[c/o 78 Ridge Street]

[Near Corporate MANCHESTER CONNECTICUT 06040]

Northwest Amexem

To:

United States Supreme Court of Connecticut

Office of the Clerk

231 Capitol Avenue

Near Corporate HARTFORD CONNECTICUT 06106

**Notice of Judges and Officials' Oath – Bound Obligations and Fiduciary Duties**

**Article VI**

“All debts contracted and engagements entered into, before the adoption of this Constitution, shall be as valid against the United States under this Constitution, as under the Confederation. 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, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding. 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.”

**Article 1, Section X**

“All debts shall be payable in gold or silver coin”

**Amendment V**

“ No Person shall be deprived of due process of law”

I Affirm, for the Record, that I do not have, or possess, any gold or silver coins, as prescribed by United States Constitution Law, which is the lawful money to pay the restricting demands, conditionally commanded by Employees and Contractors of the Court. The said restrictions (unconstitutional) are arbitrarily (hindering Due Process) and imposed for processing these Documents, as stipulated in the United States Constitution noted above. Therefore, I submit this Writ “In Forma Pauperis”, being an enjoyment and exercise of my unconditional and Constitutionally - Secured Rights (and not a feudal - fee - burdened privilege) to timely and speedily enforce Due Process of Law, as noted above.

Your demand for a “Financial Statements” is used as an instrument to deny me due process of law and my right to free access to the courts. I introduced evidence in the form of an Affidavit of Fact and marked as Evidence. Someone in the courts tampered with that evidence, which is a Federal Violation, and misrepresented it as a Motion which is discretionary and an assumption that permission must be requested to exercise my Constitutional Rights and an exercise of a right is a Constitutional Right, not a Request and this office knows that. This is a direct violation of my “Secured Constitutional / Treaty Rights which is the Supreme Law of the Land and “Stare Decisis” and a violation of your “Oath of Office”. Furthermore as there is no law as prescribed in the United States Constitution stating a “Financial Statement, “Financial Fee (Feudal Law)”, or a “Motion” requesting permission must be submitted in order to exercise my Constitutional Rights, your demand is a violation of Amendment IX of the United States Constitution and a violation of your fiduciary duties.

**Amendment IX**

“ The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people”

*Where rights secured by the Constitution are involved, there can be no rule-making or legislation, which would abrogate them. Miranda v. Arizona 384 US 436, 125:*

As an Officer(s) of the Court, you and your assigns are bound (or have taken) a solemn Oath (See Article VI) to uphold and Support the Constitution for the United States Republic. Refusal of this 'Affidavit of Financial Statement' is construed to deny me timely 'Due Process' and will be a 'Colorable Act' to violate my secured exercise of a Right. Such an act and imposition is a violation of your Official Oath of office. This can result in additional lawful remedy actions filed against those violating Officers of the Court, Under Title 18 and Title 42, in their official and private capacities. The Law always gives a remedy for the people against color of law actions committed by those who violate their Oaths of Office colluding to abridge the Rights secured for the Natural Beings and the citizens.

I Respectfully, with 'Good Faith' and with Honor, by right to unhindered Due – Process, submit this 'Affidavit of Financial Statement' and Evidence.

Thank You,

I Am: \_\_\_\_\_

Zilliah S. El, Authorized Representative

Natural Person, In Propria Persona:

Ex Relatione Zilliah Kenion

All Rights Reserved:

U.C.C. 1-207/ 1-308; U.C.C. 1-103

Quinnehtekqut Territory

[C/o 78 Ridge Street]

[Near Corporate MANCHESTER CONNECTICUT 06040]

Northwest Amexem



**THE MOORISH NATIONAL REPUBLIC  
THE MOORISH DIVINE AND NATIONAL MOVEMENT OF THE WORLD  
Aboriginal and Indigenous Natural Peoples of North-West Amexem North America**

In The  
United States Supreme Court  
For Connecticut Republic  
Exhibit AF

Zilliah S. El  
Quinnehtekqt Territory  
[C/O 78 Ridge Street]  
[Near Corporate Manchester Connecticut 06040]  
Northwest Amexem

Gabriel O. Bey  
Quinnehtekqt Territory  
[C/O 78 Ridge Street]  
[Near Corporate Manchester Connecticut 06040]  
Northwest Amexem

Anaid A. El  
Quinnehtekqt Territory  
[C/O 78 Ridge Street]  
[Near Corporate Manchester Connecticut 06040]  
Northwest Amexem

**LEGAL NOTICE OF REMOVAL**  
**FROM MUNICIPAL COURT TO FEDERAL COURT**  
**PURSUANT TO TITLE 28 § 1441- §1446**  
**PROPER ARTICLE III JURISDICTION**  
File#7009 0080 0001 3575 4928

**Plaintiff(s),**

PUBLIC SERVANT SUPERIOR COURT HOUSING SESSION  
80 WASHINGTON STREET HARTFORD CONNECTICUT 06106  
PUBLIC SERVANT HOUSING SESSION CLERKS and spouses  
80 WASHINGTON STREET HARTFORD CONNECTICUT 06106  
PUBLIC SERVANT JEFFREY HAMMER [Jeffrey Hammer] and spouse  
80 WASHINGTON STREET HARTFORD CONNECTICUT 06106  
PUBLIC SERVANT CLAIMS SHARED COMPUTER  
80 WASHINGTON STREET HARTFORD CONNECTICUT 06106  
PUBLIC SERVANT VERNON D. OLIVER [Vernon D. Oliver] and spouse  
80 WASHINGTON STREET HARTFORD CONNECTICUT 06106  
STATE OF CONNECTICUT  
210 Capitol Avenue HARTFORD CONNECTICUT 06106  
STATE OF CONNECTICUT GOVERNOR M. JODI RELL [M. Jodi Rell] and spouse  
210 Capitol Avenue HARTFORD CONNECTICUT 06106

**ORIGINAL JURISDICTION**  
**“MINISTERSCONSULS**  
**DIPLOMATS”**  
**Article III, Section 2; Article VI**  
**United States Republic Constitution**

**Treaty of Peace and Friendship  
'Established Law of the Land'**

v.

**Federal Question(s):  
Constitutional / Treaty violations;  
Religious Liberty;  
Due Process, etc.,  
Supreme Court Rulings**

Zilliah S. El Heiress, Natural Divine Being Manifest In Human Flesh, In Propria Persona, Sui Juris (not to be confused with nor substituted with Pro Se); and not a Statutory Person.

Gabriel O. Bey Heir, Natural Divine Being Manifest In Human Flesh, In Propria Persona, Sui Juris (not to be confused with nor substituted with Pro Se); and not a Statutory Person.

Anaidah A. El Heiress, Natural Divine Being Manifest In Human Flesh, In Propria Persona, Sui Juris (not to be confused with nor substituted with Pro Se); and not a Statutory Person.

Chalinka A. El Heiress, Natural Divine Being Manifest In Human Flesh, In Propria Persona, Sui Juris (not to be confused with nor substituted with Pro Se); and not a Statutory Person.

Nafayia A. El Heiress, Natural Divine Being Manifest In Human Flesh, In Propria Persona, Sui Juris (not to be confused with nor substituted with Pro Se); and not a Statutory Person.

Latasha A. El Heiress, Natural Divine Being Manifest In Human Flesh, In Propria Persona, Sui Juris (not to be confused with nor substituted with Pro Se); and not a Statutory Person.

Keisha A. El Heiress, Natural Divine Being Manifest In Human Flesh, In Propria Persona, Sui Juris (not to be confused with nor substituted with Pro Se); and not a Statutory Person.

Shaneque A. El Heiress, Natural Divine Being Manifest In Human Flesh, In Propria Persona, Sui Juris (not to be confused with nor substituted with Pro Se); and not a Statutory Person.

NaShawn A. Bey Heir, Natural Divine Being Manifest In Human Flesh, In Propria Persona, Sui Juris (not to be confused with nor substituted with Pro Se); and not a Statutory Person.

Clayton A. Bey Heir, Natural Divine Being Manifest In Human Flesh, In Propria Persona, Sui Juris (not to be confused with nor substituted with Pro Se); and not a Statutory Person.

JaMaal A. Bey Heir, Natural Divine Being Manifest In Human Flesh, In Propria Persona, Sui Juris (not to be confused with nor substituted with Pro Se); and not a Statutory Person.

Kaliel A. Bey Heir, Natural Divine Being Manifest In Human Flesh, In Propria Persona, Sui Juris (not to be confused with nor substituted with Pro Se); and not a Statutory Person.

Azariah A. El Heiress, Natural Divine Being Manifest In Human Flesh, In Propria Persona, Sui Juris (not to be confused with nor substituted with Pro Se); and not a Statutory Person.

**Petitioner/ Heiress/Heirs / Alleged Accused,**

(Hereinafter Petitioner)

Official Notice is hereby served on the STATE OF CONNECTICUT SUPERIOR COURT HOUSING SESSION; all Judicial Sub-Divisions; Officials; Agents; all clerks; and above named Plaintiff-all cases and Jurisdiction / Venue shall be the Federal Court. All Matters, Complaints, Suits, Citations / Bills of Exchange (misrepresented as lawful warrants, etc.), must be filed with Federal Court, pursuant to Jurisdiction named hereinafter.

**I.**

**JURISDICTION**

Jurisdiction / Venue are hereby placed in one Supreme Court, pursuant to Article III Section II for The United States Republic, and the several States, under the Constitution; Article VI; and reaffirmed by obligatory Official Oaths.

“The Judicial Power shall extend to all cases, in law and equity, arising under this Constitution, the laws of the United States, and treaties made, or which shall be made, under their authority;--to all cases affecting ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls; --to all cases of admiralty and maritime jurisdictions;--to controversies to which the United States shall be a party;--to controversies between two or more states;--between a state and citizens of another state;--between citizens of different states;--between citizens of the same state claiming lands under grants of different states, and between a state, or the citizens thereof, and foreign states, citizens or subjects.”

In all cases affecting ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, and those in which a state shall be a party, the Supreme Court shall have original jurisdiction. In all the other cases before mentioned, the Supreme Court shall have appellate jurisdiction, both as to law and fact, with such exceptions, and under such regulations as the Congress shall make.

COMES NOW, Zilliah S. El, Anaid A. El and accompanying Petitioners, In Propria Persona, Sui Juris (not to be confused with Pro se), Aboriginal Indigenous Moorish-American; possessing Free-hold by Inheritance status; standing squarely affirmed and bound to the Zodiac Constitution, with all due respect and honors given to the Constitution for the United States Republic, North America. Being a descendant of Moroccans and born in America, with the blood of the Ancient Moabites from the Land of Moab, who received permission from the Pharaohs of Egypt to settle and inhabit North-West Africa / North Gate. The Moors are the founders and are the true possessors of the present Moroccan Empire; with our Canaanite, Hittite and Amorite brethren, who sojourned from the land of Canaan, seeking new homes. Our dominion and inhabitation extended from Northeast and Southwest Africa, across the Great Atlantis, even unto the present North, South and Central America and the Adjoining Islands-bound squarely affirmed to THE TREATY OF PEACE AND FRIENDSHIP OF SEVENTEEN HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-SEVEN (1787) A.D. superseded by THE TREATY OF PEACE AND FRIENDSHIP OF EIGHTEEN HUNDRED and THIRTY-SIX (1836) A.D. between Morocco and the United States (<http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/diplomacy/barbary/barl866t.htm> or at **Bevines Law Book of Treaties**) the same as displayed under Treaty Law, Obligation, Authority as expressed in Article VI of the Constitution for the United States of America (Republic):

**THE TREATY OF PEACE AND FRIENDSHIP OF 1836 A.D.**  
**Between Morocco and the United States**

**Article 20**

“If any of the Citizens of the United States, or any Persons under their Protection, shall have any disputes with each other, the Consul shall decide between the Parties, and whenever the Consul shall require any Aid or Assistance from our Government, to enforce his decisions, it shall be immediately granted to him.”

**Article 21**

“If any Citizen of the United States should kill or wound a **Moor**, or, on the contrary, if a **Moor** shall kill or wound a Citizen of the United States, the Law of the Country shall take place, and equal Justice shall be rendered, the Consul assisting at the Trial; and if any Delinquent shall make his escape, the Consul shall not be answerable for him in any manner whatever.”

**II**

**PARTIES**

**Plaintiffs**

1. STATE OF CONNECTICUT SUPERIOR COURT HOUSING SESSION, private corporation; foreign to the United States Republic; and all CONNECTICUT CITY Employees; Agents; Officers; Contractors; Assignees, etc., being Plaintiffs, Claimants, or Parties of Interest in the ‘Color-of-Law’ processes instituted by them, or any one of them, against Zilliah S. El and accompanying Petitioners.
2. HOUSING SESSION CLERKS and spouses, private corporation; foreign to the United States Republic; and all HOUSING SESSION employees; Agents; Officers; Contractors; Assignees, etc., being Plaintiffs, Claimants, or Parties of Interest in the ‘Color-of-Law’ processes instituted by them, or any one of them, against Zilliah S. El and accompanying Petitioners.
3. JEFFREY HAMMER [Jeffrey Jammer] and spouse, foreign European colonist foreign to the United States Republic; and foreign to the organic Connecticut Republic.

4. VERNON D. OLIVER [Vernon D. Oliver] and spouse, foreign European colonist foreign to the United States Republic; and foreign to the organic Connecticut Republic.
5. CLAIMS SHARED COMPUTER , private corporation; foreign to the United States Republic; and all CLERKS associated with it, employees; Agents; Officers; Contractors; Assignees, etc., being Plaintiffs, Claimants, or Parties of Interest in the ‘Color-of-Law’ processes instituted by them, or any one of them, against Zilliah S. El and accompanying Petitioners.
6. M. JODI RELL [M. Jodi Rell] and spouse, foreign European colonist foreign to the United States Republic; and foreign to the organic Connecticut Republic.

The private European foreign corporate UNITED STATES OF AMERICA its enclave, THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT, its subsidiary HOUSING SESSION, CLAIMS SHARED COMPUTER, its agents all CLERKS of the HOUSING SESSION, Jeffrey Hammer, Claims Shared Computer, Vernon D. Oliver, M. Jodi Rell, shall henceforth be known in this Writ as the “European Foreign Colonist”.

Petitioner

Zilliah S. El, Anaid A. El and accompanying Petitioners, In Propria Persona, Sui Juris (not to be confused with Pro se) Aboriginal, Indigenous Moorish American National, Quinnehtekqt Territory [C/O 78 Ridge Street, near CORPORATE MANCHESTER CONNECTICUT 06040] Northwest Amexem.

I, Zilliah S. El, Anaid A. El and accompanying Petitioners, In Propria Persona, Sui Juris; Aboriginal, Indigenous Moorish American National, Freehold by Inheritance with Birthrights and protected and secured Inalienable Rights, makes with this NOTICE OF REMOVAL of the unconstitutional Complaint – Summons – Suit / Bill of Exchange / Action. Petitioner is with reasonable expectation that the Officers / Agents, and Officials, holding any position of Public Trust, or political office, are prohibited, under Official Oath, under the authority of The Law of the Land, from the use of the official position(s) or office(s) to violate the Constitution for the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA; and thus, by the abuse of authority, and the practice of superseding their ‘limited’ jurisdictional powers, violate and abridge the Natural, Divine, Unalienable, and Secured Rights of the People; terminating with the cause of damage to this Petitioner / Plaintiff.

**III**

**CAUSE OF ACTION**

On or around December 12, 2010 a Suit was received with a demand reply by December 23, 2010. See suit filed December 18<sup>th</sup>, 2010 with Supreme Court of Connecticut sent Certified Mail#7009 0080 0001 3575 4799

On December 18, 2010, a Writ of Removal was filed with the Supreme Court of Connecticut file#7009 0080 0001 3575 4799 effectively removing this from the administrative venue dba SUPERIOR COURT HOUSING SESSION.

On December 23, 2010, a threat was received via United States Postal Service summoning the Petitioner to SUPERIOR COURT HOUSING SESSION, which has no judicial authority and is in fact not a court of record, in violation of Petitioners Constitutional / Treaty secured rights. See Exhibit U

On December 24, 2010 a Writ of Error, Averment of Jurisdiction, and a copy of the Writ of Mandamus filed with the Supreme Court of Connecticut file#70090080000135754850. See Exhibit V and Exhibit W.

On December 29, 2010 a new or revised threat was received via United States Postal Service summoning the Petitioner once again to SUPERIOR COURT HOUSING SESSION, which has no judicial authority and is in fact not a court of record, this time as noted on the threat, to discuss the “Writ of Error, and the Writ of Mandamus. See Exhibit AA

As I am a Moorish American National and the SUPERIOR COURT HOUSING SESSION is an administrative venue I am under no obligation to comply with a demand much less a threat from a public servant who has taken an “Oath” to preserve, protect, and secure the rights of the People.

Per the **United States Republic Constitution Article XI of the Bill of Rights** it affirms that no Corporation/public servant can suit “the People”. The SUPERIOR COURT HOUSING SESSION has further violated the United States Republic Constitution and “Oath of Office”.

As of December 30, 2010 no response has been received from the SUPERIOR COURT HOUSING SESSION nor its officers regarding the “Averment of Jurisdiction” and the required time frame for producing the Averment of jurisdiction has expired.

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 U.S., 505 F2d 1026.**

The law requires proof of jurisdiction to appear on record of the administrative agency and all administrative proceedings. **Hagans v Lavine 415 U.S. 533.**

The SUPERIOR COURT HOUSING SESSION does not have any jurisdiction to hear any issues of a judicial nature as affirmed by the Supreme Court.

"When acting to enforce a statute and its subsequent amendments to the present date, the judge of the municipal court is acting as an administrative officer and not in a judicial capacity; courts in administering or enforcing statutes do not act judicially, but merely ministerally" **Thompson v Smith 154 SE 583**

The SUPERIOR COURT HOUSING SESSION actions in scheduling any meeting/hearing/trial is evidence of incompetence as affirmed by the Supreme Court stare Decisis that “Ministerial officers are incompetent to receive grants of judicial powers” and to continue is further violation of the SUPERIOR COURT HOUSING SESSHION and all its officers “Oath of Office”.

Ministerial officers are incompetent to receive grants of judicial power from the legislature, their acts in attempting to exercise such powers are necessarily nullities.  
**Burns v Sup Ct. SF, 140 Cal 1.**

All officials are required by federal, state, and municipal law to provide the name, address and telephone number of their public hazard and malpractice bonding company and the policy number of the bond and, if required, a copy of the policy describing the bonding coverage of their specific job performance. Failure to provide this information constitutes corporate and limited liability insurance fraud (15 USC) and is prima facie evidence and ground to impose a lien upon the official personally to secure their public oath and service of office. The Superior Court Housing and its officers have failed to comply and provide the Averment of Jurisdiction related to Oath and Bond.

As the “**Oath of Office**” has not been provided the SUPERIOR COURT HOUSING and all its officers are charged with warring against this Petitioner(s) who is one of “The People” which is Treason.

**The Agents** of THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA commanded that the Petitioner adhere to an unlawful venue allegedly being operated by the PUBLIC SERVANTS to “The People” by Imposed under threat, duress, and coercion with a ‘man-of-straw’ / misnomer word, misrepresented as implying my name, and typed upon the Order / Instrument, and was improperly spelled, “ZILLIAH KENION” in ALL CAPITAL LETTERS. That misnomer and CORPORATE - NAME, “ZILLIAH KENION” is clearly (an artificial – person / entity); is not me, the Natural Person; is a deliberate grammatical error, intended for injury to me; and is clearly not of consanguine relationship to me or to my nationality, in any form, truth, or manner;; nor to my Moorish Family Bloodline. This is in violation of my secured rights to my name and nationality; a violation of National and International Law; and a violation of the Obligations of the Officers of the Court; and a violation of their fiduciary duties and Official Oaths to uphold and to support Article VI of the United States Constitution; and thus, violating my Substantive Rights, and the Articles of Part 1 of ‘*The Rights of Indigenous People*’ ([http://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Draft:United\\_Nations\\_Declaration\\_on\\_the\\_Rights\\_of\\_Indige...](http://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Draft:United_Nations_Declaration_on_the_Rights_of_Indige...)) as follows:

“Indigenous People have the right to a full and effective enjoyment of all human rights and fundamental freedoms recognized in the Charter of the United Nations; The Universal Declaration of Human Rights; And International Human Law.”

Article 5 of the *Rights of Indigenous People*

“Every Indigenous individual has the Right to a Nationality.”,

Article 15 of the *Declaration of Human Rights* (<http://www.un.org/Overview/rights.html>)



everyone has a right to a nationality. (2) No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his nationality nor denied the right to change his name.”

This Petitioner made a “Reservation of Rights” as stated in Judicial Proclamation and Name Correction and signed for the record; name, correct spelling of name.

Plaintiffs, European Foreign Colonist is with the ‘want of jurisdiction’ by knowingly and willingly conspiring (under a Color-of-Authority) to deny this Petitioner, Zilliah S. El, (after this Petitioner made a reservation of rights and stating for the record; name, correct spelling of name, and national status) her Inalienable Rights, the right to a Name and Nationality of her choosing, etc. The European Foreign Colonist alleged and assumed the Petitioner of being a Corporate Ward-ship 14th Amendment Artificial Negro Person / citizen, which resulted in an unlawful arrest-of-rights, immunities and liberties; which is in direct contradiction to, and a violation of, the Fourth (IV) Amendment of the Constitution for the United States (Republic); violating Article VI of the Constitution, by way of violating The Treaty of Peace and Friendship of EIGHTEEN HUNDRED-THRITY-SIX (1836) A.D.; Congressional Resolution # 75, Philadelphia Pennsylvania; a violation of Article 15 of ‘The Universal Declaration of Human Rights’ of Nineteen Hundred and Forty-Eight (1948) A.D. – General Assembly, United Nations; a violation of ‘The Declaration of the Rights of The Child’ of Nineteen Hundred and Fifty-Nine(1959) A.D(<http://www.un.org/cyberschoolbus/humanrights/resources/child.asp>); and violating ‘The Rights of Indigenous Peoples’; and that the European Foreign Colonist knowingly committed ‘fraud’ against the Petitioner (Zilliah S. El) by abusing their authority, in that they failed to correct a known violation; and did not aid in preventing said such abuse of authority, while having (by law) the obligation to do so; and violated the Fifth Amendment of The Bill of Rights of Seventeen Hundred and Ninety-One (1791) A.D.; impeding the Peoples’ **right to due process under the Law, and equal protection of the Law**, Article 1 Section 10 of The Constitution for The United States of America (Republic) which secures this Petitioner the right.

#### IV

#### CONCLUSION

- 1) It is a sin for any group of people to violate the Constitutional Laws of a Free National Government.
- 2) The Delegates, which comprise the majority of Aboriginal and Indigenous Freeholders, by Birthright, Inheritance, and Primogeniture, and declared ‘for the record’ and known by the consanguine / Pedigree of their / our Forefathers, as Moors / Muurs; and the European Colonial Settlers of the United States of America, did, on the fifteenth day of November in the year Seventeen Seventy-seven (1777), and in the second year of the Independence of The United States of America, agreed to certain *Articles of Confederation* and perpetual Union between the States of New Hampshire, Massachusetts Bay, Rhode Island, and Providence Plantations, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina and Georgia; wherein they did declare that the style of the Confederacy shall be the United States of America.
- 3) All parties to the *Articles of Confederation* of 1778 did also agree that *Article IX* shall set forth the procedure for resolving a dispute brought before the Congress of the United States by a freely associated compact State of the United States of America.
- 4) All parties to the *Articles of Confederation* of 1778 did also agree that no Congress shall thereafter alter *Article IX* of the *Articles of Confederation* unless it has received confirmation to do so by every State in the Union (*Article XIII* of the *Articles of Confederation*).
- 5) The United States, pursuant to an "Act" of the States sitting in Congress under the *Articles of Confederation* of Seventeen Hundred and Seventy-Eight (1778) A.D., authorized a Constitutional Convention for the purpose of forming a more perfect Union, to establish justice, to insure domestic tranquility, to provide for the common defense, to promote general welfare, and to secure the blessings of liberty, did ordain and established a Constitution for the United States. The Constitution for the United States was declared to be a "revision" to the *Articles of Confederation* of 1778 (*REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS IN CONGRESS*, Wed., Feb.21, 1787 [*Journals of the Continental Congress*, vol. 38]).
- 6) The Constitution for the United States was established by the People of the United States of America, and not by the States in their sovereign capacity (*In reg Opinion of the Justices*, 107 A. 673, 674, 118 Me. 544, 5 A.L.R. 1412) and was ratified by the People sitting in Convention of the Original 13

States of the United States of America (*United States Constitution, VII: 1:1*).

7) The Constitution for the United States is a Compact which constitutes a binding trilateral Contract between the People, the freely associated compact States of the United States of America, and the United States [e.g. *Article 10* of the *Bill of Rights* to the *Constitution of the United States*] (*In reg Opinion of the Justices, 107 A. 673, 674, 118 Me. 544, 5 A.L.R. 1412*).

8) By the wording of *Article VI* of the *Constitution for the United States*; the Congress is required to review its legislation from time to time to determine if the legislation was made pursuant to the provisions of that Constitution.

9) The parties to the Compact of the United States Constitution further agreed that the enumeration in the Constitution of certain Rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the People (*Article 9* of the *Bill of Rights* to the *Constitution for the United States*).

10) The parties to the Compact also agreed that the Powers not delegated to the United States under the U.S. Constitution are reserved to the States or to the People (*Article 10* of the *Bill of Rights* to the *Constitution for the United States*).

11) On February 24, 1855; the Congress of the United States created the United States Court of Claims. The Court of Claims was authorized to execute the mandates of *Article IX* of the *Articles of Confederation* of 1778 and *Article I* of the *Bill of Rights* to the *Constitution for the United States* (*10 Stat. 612, sec. 1, sec. 7*)

12) The Congress of the United States also enacted the "*Bowman Act*" of March 3, 1883 (*22 Stat. 485*) and the "*Tucker Act*" of March 3, 1887 (*24 Stat. 505*) to clarify the jurisdiction of the Court of Claims. Under these Acts, either House of Congress may submit any claim or matter to the United States Court of Claims for investigation and determination of facts. The Court was to report its findings back to Congress for Congressional determination.

13) Notwithstanding the limitations imposed upon the United States Claims Court by *P.L. 97-164* and its subsequent United States Court of Federal Claims by *P.L. 102-572*; the Congress of the United States is barred by *Article IX* and *Article XIII* of the *Articles of Confederation* and by *Article I* of the *Bill of Rights* to the *Constitution for the United States* to limit its investigations to moneyed claims.

14) The continual refusal of the United States Congress to resolve the Petitions of Grievances that were submitted to it, by the several States of the Union, violates the "*Good Faith*" agreement that all grievances submitted would be expeditiously resolved as mandated by the *Articles of Confederation* of 1778.

15) Between the years of 1866 and 1868 (and other years); several states within the United States known as "States" submitted Petitions to the Congress of the United States for Redress of Grievances. These Petitions have passed from Congress to Congress for over one hundred years, with the Congress refusing to take any action to resolve the disputes as required by *Article IX* of the *Articles of Confederation* of 1778 and *Article I* of the *Bill of Rights* to the *Constitution for the United States*. These Petitions challenged the procedure by which the Congress used to amend the Constitution for the United States. The Amendments in question are the unlawfully - ratified 13<sup>th</sup>, 14<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> Amendments (hereinafter referred to as the "Three Dead Badges of Law").

16) "No change in ancient procedure can be made which disrupts those fundamental principles, which protect the citizen in his private right and guard him against the arbitrary action of the government." *Ex Parte Young, 209 US 123*.

17) The Constitution for the United States of America binds all judicial officers at *Article 6*, wherein it does say, "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 of every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of any state to the Contrary, notwithstanding," see *Clause 2*.

18) *Black's Law Dictionary 4<sup>th</sup> Ed.* Defines "Law of the land", - When first used in *Magna Charta*, the phrase probably meant the established law of the kingdom, in opposition to the civil or Roman law. It is now generally regarded as meaning general public laws binding on all members of the community. *Janes v. Reynolds, 2 Tex 251; Beasley v. Cunningham, 171 Tenn. 334. 103 S.W.2d 18, 20110 A.L.R. 306.* It means due process of law warranted by the constitution, by the common law adopted by the constitution, or by statutes passed in pursuance of the constitution *Mayo v. Wilson, 1 N.H. 53*.

- 19) Clause 3, clarifies the scope of this requirement when it states that "...All judicial officers, both of the United States and of the several states shall be bound to support this Constitution..."
- 20) The 5<sup>th</sup> Amendments require that all persons within the United States must be given due process of the law and equal protection of the law.
- 21) The unconstitutional charges being applied to this Petitioner are not in pursuance of the Constitution for the United States of America, wherein it does guarantee, and this Petitioner does declare the equal protection of the right to "life liberty and the pursuit of happiness" in the 1<sup>st</sup> Amendment.
- 22) The Petitioner claims full and equal protection of the Law in *Marbury v. Madison* 5 US 137 – "The Constitution of these United States is the Supreme Law of the Land. Any law, that is repugnant to the Constitution, is null and void of law."
- 23) The unconstitutional charges being applied to the Petitioner are repugnant to the Constitution because they deny a right established and guaranteed in the 1<sup>st</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup>, 5<sup>th</sup>, 6<sup>th</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup>, 8<sup>th</sup>, 9<sup>th</sup>, and 10<sup>th</sup> Amendments, and in United States Supreme Court '**Stare Decisis**' so noted above, where this court has no authority to adjudicate contrary.
- 24) The unconstitutional charges under which the Petitioner is being forced to answer are non-constitutional on their face and unconstitutional when applied to the Petitioner because they do not have an enacting clause or single subject title, thereby denying due process of law.
- 25) Due Process of law is not necessarily satisfied by any process which the Legislature may prescribe. See: *Abrams v. Jones* 35 Idaho 532, 207 P. 724.
- 26) "Due Process of Law in each particular case means such an exercise of the powers of the government as the settled maxims of law permit and sanction; and under such safeguards for the protection of individual rights as those maxims prescribe for the class of cases to which the one in question belongs." *Cooley, Const. Lim.* 441.
- 27) Due Process as defined in H. C. Black's Law Dictionary, 4<sup>th</sup> Edition. "Whatever difficulty may be experienced in giving to those terms a definition which will embrace every permissible exertion of power affecting private rights, and exclude such as is forbidden, there can be no doubt of their meaning when applied to judicial proceedings. They then mean a course of legal proceedings according to those rules and principles, which have been established in our systems of jurisprudence for the enforcement and protection of private rights."
- 28) "To give such proceedings any validity, there must be a tribunal competent by its constitution—that is by the law of its creation—to pass upon the subject-matter of the suit; and if that involves merely a determination of the personal liability of the defendant, he must be brought within its jurisdiction obey service of process within the state or his voluntary appearance. *Pennoyer v. Neff*, 95 U.S. 733, 24 L.Ed. 565."
- 29) "Due process of law implies the right of the person affected thereby to be present before the tribunal which pronounces judgment upon the question of life liberty, or property, in its most comprehensive sense; to be heard, by testimony or otherwise, and to have the right of controverting, by proof, every material fact which bears on the question of right in the matter involved."
- 30) "If any question of fact or liability be conclusively presumed against him, this is not due process of law, *Zeigler v. Railroad Co.*, 58 Ala. 599.
- 31) These phrases in the Constitution do not mean the general body of the law, common and statute, as it was at the time the Constitution took effect; for that would seem to deny the right of the Legislature to amend or repeal the law. They refer to certain fundamental rights which that system of jurisprudence, of which ours is a derivative, has always recognized. *Brown v. Levee Com'rs* 50 Miss. 468."
- 32) All orders or judgments issued by a judge in a court of limited jurisdiction must contain the findings of the court showing that the court has subject-matter jurisdiction, not allegations that the court has jurisdiction. *In re Jennings*, 68 Ill.2d 125, 368 N.E.2d 864 (1977) ("in a special statutory proceeding an order must contain the jurisdictional findings prescribed by statute.")
- 33) *In Interest of M.V.*, 288 Ill.App.3d 300, 681 N.E.2d 532 (1st Dist. 1997). Without subject-matter jurisdiction, all of the orders and judgments issued by a judge are **void** under law, and are of no legal force or effect. *In Interest of M.V.*, 288 Ill.App.3d 300, 681 N.E.2d 532 (1st Dist. 1997) ("Every act of the court beyond that power is void").

- 34)** The Petitioner assert, *Midland Coal Co. v. Knox County*, 268 Ill.App.3d 485, 644 N.E.2d 796 (4th Dist. 1994) ("Special statutory jurisdiction is limited to the language of the act conferring it, and the court has no powers from any other source"...)
- 35)** The "language of the act" the complainants confer upon "has no powers from any other source" *Midland Coal Co. v. Knox County*, *Ibid*, no evidence on it's face of valid law, as it lacks the mandatory enacting clause,
- 36)** That the purpose of thus prescribing an enacting clause — "the style of the acts" — is to establish it; to give it permanence, uniformity, and certainty; to identify the act of legislation as of the general assembly; to afford evidence of its legislative statutory nature; and to secure uniformity of identification, and thus prevent inadvertence, possibly mistake and fraud. *State v. Patterson*, 4 S.E. 350, 352, 98 N.C. 660 (1887); 82 C.J.S. "Statutes," § 65, p. 104; *Joiner v. State*, 155 S.E.2d 8, 10, 223 Ga. 367 (1967).
- 37)** "That the almost unbroken custom of centuries has been to preface laws with a statement in some form declaring the enacting authority. The purpose of an enacting clause of a statute is to 'identify' it as an act of legislation by expressing on its face the authority behind the act." 73 Am. Jur.2d, "Statutes," § 93, p. 319, 320; *Preckel v. Byrne*, 243 N.W. 823, 826, 62 N.D. 356 (1932).
- 38)** That for an enacting clause to appear on the face of a law, it must be recorded or published with the law so that the People can readily identify the authority for that particular law.
- 39)** That "It is necessary that every law should show on its face the authority by which it is adopted and promulgated, and that it should clearly appear that it is intended by the legislative power that enacts it that it should take effect as a law." *People v. Dettenthaler*, 77 N.W. 450, 451, 118 Mich. 595 (1898); citing *Swann v. Buck*, 40 Miss. 270.
- 40)** This Plaintiff (a court of limited jurisdiction), lacks the power to act and have proceeded beyond the strictures of the statutes, and that the statutes being applied are created from revised statutes and codes of a foreign and unidentified source, as they fail to show from what authority in law they exist, where they fail to show on their face, the mandatory enacting clause.
- 41)** Said revised statutes and codes fail to show a necessary and mandatory enacting clause on their face, giving them lawful force and effect. Said revised statutes and codes are private codes and statutes and are not law, do not compel this Petitioner to perform and do not apply to him, and fail to show "authority for the court to make any order." *Levy. Industrial Common Ibid, Midland Coal Co. v. Knox County, Ibid*.
- 42)** The Petitioner, demand all rights under the common law based upon the status as a matter of due process of law and to determine what legal rights the Petitioner has in this court and what rights will be denied, if any, to determine what jurisdiction the Plaintiff is attempting to apply to this Natural Divine Being Manifested in Human Flesh.
- 43)** The Petitioner is not subject to the jurisdiction of this Plaintiff.
- 44)** This Petitioner has no contract with 'Foreign European Colonist'; or with any other segment of the United States of America that can grant jurisdiction over human rights; or over political, economic, social and cultural rights of Indigenous Peoples.
- 45)** The Petitioner is Aboriginal / Indigenous within the meaning of the description of the Draft Declaration of the Inter-American Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples at Article 1 Definition:
- 46)** "In this Declaration Indigenous Peoples are those who embody historical continuity with societies which existed prior to the conquest and settlement of their territories by Europeans..."
- 47)** Indigenous People are separate and distinct; alien to this administration; and have a separate and distinct status from the administrators of the colonial occupiers of the land; as recognized in the Declaration on Principles of International Law of Friendly Relations and Cooperation Among States; wherein it does say under the Principles of Equal Rights and self determination of Peoples (B5): "The territory of a colony or other Non-Self Governing Territory has, under the Charter, a status separate and distinct from the territory of the State administering it..."

- 48) Colonial legislatures were divested of their legislative powers, and required to transfer jurisdiction and all powers over the cultural rights of indigenous and minority peoples to those peoples and prohibited from making any law that effects the rights of indigenous people to fully and effectively enjoy their right to **self-determination in Article 5 of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, Adopted by General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960**. See Article 5 to wit: **“Immediate steps shall be taken, in Trust and Non-Self Governing Territories or all other territories which have not yet attained independence, to transfer all powers to the peoples of those territories, without any conditions or reservations, in accordance with their freely expressed will and desire...”**
- 49) Colonial courts were divested of, and required to, transfer the judicative power and all power to the people of this territory, *ibid*.
- 50) See ‘The American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man’ (Adopted by the Ninth International Conference of American States Bogota, Colombia, 1948 at Article 5, Article 17, Article 26)
- 51) The United States of America is required to obey the requirements of the Declaration on the Principles of International Law and to obey the principles of international law enumerated therein.
- 52) The Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties requires that the United States of America fulfill its obligations incurred thereunder.
- 53) The United States of America is a member of the United Nations, and is bound by the Charter of the United Nations to promote and protect the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.
- 54) The Declaration of the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and People UN GA #1514 specifically required the United States of America to transfer *all power* to the peoples of this land, and this specifically includes all legislative, executive and judicial powers.
- 55) The UNITED STATES OF AMERICA through its commercial agents/agencies, has committed ‘fraud’ to accomplish what is called in legal contemplation, “Capitis Diminutio Maxima”, which is that my natural name has been murdered and I was resurrected as a non-natural, created entity subject to regulation and denied the protections of national and international law. This constitutes Fraud and denies due process of the law and the Freedom from the Practices and Policies of Apartheid described in the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of *Apartheid* Adopted and opened for signature, ratification by General Assembly resolution 3068 (XXVIII) of 30 November 1973 at Articles 1, 2 and 3, and the right not to be compelled to perform under any contract or agreement not entered into voluntarily, intentionally and knowingly.
- 56) **Executive Order Number: 13107**, 63, Federal Register, 68,991 (1998)- Implementation of Human Rights Treaties, which states “It shall be the policy and practice of the Government of the United States, being committed to the protection and promotion of human rights and fundamental freedoms, fully to respect and implement its obligations under the international human rights treaties to which it is a party including the ICCPR, the CAT and the CERD.”. THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, by way of its enclave, the CORPORATE STATE OF CONNECTICUT, and its Officers/Agencies/Agents, violated ‘Due Process’ and, conspired to deprive rights of the Petitioner; and did neglect to prevent deprivation of rights at Title 18, U.S.C. 241 and Title 18, U.S.C. 242.
- 57) *Maine v. Thiboutot* 448 US 1, 100 SCT 2502 – Officers of the court have no immunity, when violating a constitutional right from liability. For they are deemed to know the law.
- 58) Note that the presiding judge, and any judge acting as organ of the court, is aware that 42 USC 1986 requires the person(s) adjudicating legal processes, to correct wrongs, and that their failure to correct the wrongs that were addressed constitutes Fraud under Rule 9(b) of the FRCP, cross referenced to 28 USC 1746, and that this Fraud constitutes a Perjury on the Oath of Office at 18 USC 1621, deprives us of rights, at 18 USC 241, and 242, Conspires to deprives rights at 42 USC 1985; is an extortion of rights at 18 USC 872, and is actionable under 42 USC 1983.
- 59) Judicial officers have no immunity when they have no jurisdiction over subject matter.
- 60) This court shall take mandatory Judicial Notice of the adjudged decision of the Supreme Court of the United States of *Bradley v Fisher* 80 U.S. 335 (1871), 351,352 that officers of the court have no

immunity when they have no jurisdiction over the subject-matter. And further in *Bradley v Fisher* on page 352 and 352 is as follows:

"Where there is clearly no jurisdiction over the subject matter any authority exercised is a usurped authority, and for the exercise of such authority, when the want of jurisdiction is known to the judge, no excuse is permissible." This evidence of *Bradley v Fisher* 80 U.S. 335 (1871).

**61)** Either subject-matter jurisdiction exists, or it doesn't. Subject-matter jurisdiction has been denied, it must be proved by the party claiming that the court has subject-matter jurisdiction as to all of the requisite elements of subject-matter jurisdiction

**62)** "Where rights secured by the Constitution are involved, there can be no rule-making or legislation, which would abrogate them. *Maranda v. Arizona* 384 US 4336, 125:"

**63)** "The claim and exercise of Constitutional Rights cannot be converted into a crime. *Miller v. Kansas* 230 F 2<sup>nd</sup> 486, 489:"

**64)** "If any Tribunal (court) finds absence of proof of jurisdiction over a person and subject matter, the case must be dismissed. *Louisville v. Motley* 2111 US 149, 29S. CT. 42. "The Accuser Bears the Burden of Proof Beyond a Reasonable Doubt."

**65)** "In light of my status the complaint against me must be brought before an Article III court as per the rules governing the Treaty of Peace and Friendship of 1787."

Therefore in accord with the official oath of the officers of this court et al that all fraudulently presented improperly serviced instruments as per bill of exchange / suits / complaint be dismissed, discredited and expunged from the record, etc.

**66)** "Lack of Federal Jurisdiction can not be waived or overcome by agreement of parties". *Griffin v. Matthews*, 310 F supra 341, 342 (1969): "

**67)** "Want of Jurisdiction may not be cured by consent of parties". *Industrial Addition Association v. C.I.R.*, 323 US 310, 313."

**68)** "Petitioner asserts "*Where rights secured by the Constitution are involved, there can be no rule making or legislation, which would abrogate them*" *Miranda v. Arizona* 384 U.S. 436, 491.

**69)** "An unconstitutional statute has been held to confer no authority on, and to afford no protection to, an officer acting thereunder." Also, "Officers cannot be punished for refusing to obey unconstitutional statute." (CJS 16, sec. 101, p. 479) "Such laws are in legal contemplation, as inoperative as though ' they had never been passed or as if the enactment had never been written, and are regarded as invalid or void from the date of enactment, and not only from the date on which it is judicially declared unconstitutional. Such a law generally binds no one, confers no rights, affords No Protections, and imposes no duties, and compliance therewith is unnecessary." (CJS 16, p. 469).

**70)** "No one is bound to obey an unconstitutional law and no courts are bound to enforce it." – 16 Am Juris 2<sup>nd</sup>, Sec 177 late 2d, Sec 256.

**71)** "The State cannot diminish rights of the People." – *Hurtado v. California*, 110 U.S. 516

**72)** "The state is a people and not the created form of government." – *Texas v. White*, 7 Wallace, 700-74.

**73)** "The individual may stand upon constitutional rights. He is entitled to carry on his private business in his own way. His power to contract is unlimited. He owes no duty to the state or to his neighbors to divulge his business or to open his door to an investigation, so far as it may tend to incriminate him. He owes no such duty or the state, since he receives nothing therefrom, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the Law of the Land, long antecedent to the organization of the state... He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights." *Hale v. Henkel*, 201 U.S. 43 (1905).

**74)** "The makers of the Constitution conferred, as against the government, the Right to be let alone; the most comprehensive of rights, and the right most valued by civilized men." – United States Supreme Court Justice Brandeis in *Olmstead v. Unites States* (1928).

75) Based on customary international laws, the 5<sup>th</sup> Amendment of the Constitution for the United States of America, which guarantees due process of the law and Article IV of same Constitution Section 1; Full Faith and Credit shall be given in each State to the public Acts, Records and judicial proceedings of every other state...

76) No person shall be denied the enjoyment of any civil or military right, nor be discriminated against in the exercise of any civil or military right, nor be segregated in the militia or in the public schools, because of religious principles, race, color, ancestry or national origin...

## V

### RELIEF

1. **The Enforcement of the following:** The Divine Constitution and By-Laws of the Moorish Science Temple of America; The Moorish Nation of North America; Act VI: By Being Moorish American, you are Part and Parcel of this said government and Must Live the Life Accordingly; Article VI of the United States Constitution Republic / The Treaty of Peace and Friendship of EIGHTEEN HUNDRED and THIRTY-SIX (1836) A.D., Classifies Moorish Americans as Federal Citizens Possessing Freehold by Inheritance Status-Truth A-1. See Article 3, Section 2 of 'The Constitution for the United States of America'.

1) I, Zilliah S. El., Anaid A. El and accompanying Petitioners, demand Due Process as protected by the Fourth (4<sup>th</sup>) and Fifth (5<sup>th</sup>) Amendments of the Constitution for the United States of America (Republic).

2) I, Zilliah S. El, Anaid A. El and accompanying Petitioners, demand this United States Supreme Court stop these abuses of the colorable authority by the Plaintiff as it pertain to this Petitioner.

3) I, Zilliah S. El, Anaid A. El and accompanying Petitioners, demand if any criminal charges be found, let them be placed upon the Plaintiffs.

4) I, Zilliah S. El, Anaid A. El and accompanying Petitioners, demand this United States Supreme Court view this Petitioner (in my Proper Person) as a Moorish American National (Natural Born Citizen of the Land) and not as a (brand) NEGRO, BLACKMAN (person), COLORED, AFRICAN-AMERICAN, or any other SLAVE TITLE or 'nom de guerre' imposed upon me for misrepresentation 'Actions' or other acts of 'Misprision' that a misdirected society may "believe" to be true.

5) I, Zilliah S. El, Anaid A. El and accompanying Petitioners, do not, under any condition or circumstance, by threat, duress, or coercion, waive any rights Inalienable or Secured by the Constitution or Treaty, and, hereby requests the United States Supreme Court to fulfill their obligation to preserve the rights of this Petitioner (A Moorish Americans) and carry out their Judicial Duty in 'Good Faith' by ordering Plaintiff to be brought before the Law to answer for their criminal and unjust actions.

6) All UNCONSTITUTIONAL Citations – Summons – Suit / (misrepresented) Bill of Exchange, and any other 'Order' or 'Action' associated with it / them, to be dismissed and expunged for the record on it's face and merits; or, otherwise, be brought before a legitimately - delegated, and competent 'Court of Law' of International jurisdiction / venue.

7) All City, County and State Officials and their Agents/Agencies are to be informed of the Law of the Land (Constitution) and their obligation to uphold the same and to no longer be excused without action on the part of the Sheriff for violating the same. And to be made cognizance of the recompense of colorable actions on their part, by not adhering to the Law.

8) Any Plaintiff, Corporate or Natural, Party-Claimants; Involvements be found guilty of the charges and shall result in immediate Recusal of Office.

9) Plaintiff STATE OF CONNECTICUT is being sued for \$750,000 for compensatory damages and \$750,000 for punitive damages in its official capacity. Payable in lawful money.

10) Plaintiff SUPERIOR COURT HOUSING SESSION is being sued for \$750,000 for compensatory damages and \$750,000 for punitive damages in its official capacity. Payable in lawful money.

11) Plaintiff HOUSING SESSION CLERKS and spouses are being sued for \$750,000 for compensatory damages and \$750,000 for punitive damages in his personal and private capacity. Payable in lawful money

**12)** Plaintiff JEFFREY HAMMER [Jeffrey Hammer] and spouse, is being sued for \$750,000 for compensatory damages and \$750,000 for punitive damages in his personal and private capacity. Payable in lawful money.

**13)** Plaintiff CLAIMS SHARED COMPUTER, is being sued for \$750,000 for compensatory damages and \$750,000 for punitive damages in his personal and private capacity. Payable in lawful money.

**14)** Plaintiff VERNON D. OLIVER [Vernon D. Oliver] and spouse, is being sued for \$750,000 for compensatory damages and \$750,000 for punitive damages in his private capacity. Payable in lawful money.

**15)** Plaintiff WILLIAM J. MCGURK [William J. McGurk] and spouse, is being sued for \$750,000 for compensatory damages and \$750,000 for punitive damages in his personal and private capacity. Payable in lawful money.

**16)** Plaintiff M. JODI RELL [M. Jodi Rell], is being sued for \$750,000 for compensatory damages and \$750,000 for punitive damages in his personal and private capacity. Payable in lawful money.

### **TRIAL BY JURY OF MY OWN PEERS WAS, AND IS, DEMANDED**

I declare under the Zodiac Constitution and the United States Republic Constitution that the above is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and honorable intent.

Day 31, December, 1430 M.C. (2010 C.C.Y.)

**I Am: Zilliah S. El**

Authorized Representative Natural Person, In Propria Persona: All Rights Reserved; U.C.C. 1-207 / 308; U.C.C. 1-103

**I Am: Anaid A. El member of Consul**

Authorized Representative Natural Person, In Propria Persona: All Rights Reserved; U.C.C. 1-207 / 308; U.C.C. 1-103

**I Am: Gabriel O. Bey**

Authorized Representative Natural Person, In Propria Persona: All Rights Reserved; U.C.C. 1-207 / 308; U.C.C. 1-103

**I Am: Chalinka A. El**

Authorized Representative Natural Person, In Propria Persona: All Rights Reserved; U.C.C. 1-207 / 308; U.C.C. 1-103

**I Am: Nafayia A. El**

Authorized Representative Natural Person, In Propria Persona: All Rights Reserved; U.C.C. 1-207 / 308; U.C.C. 1-103

**I Am: LaTasha A. El**

Authorized Representative Natural Person, In Propria Persona: All Rights Reserved; U.C.C. 1-207 / 308; U.C.C. 1-103

**I Am: Keisha A. El**

Authorized Representative Natural Person, In Propria Persona: All Rights Reserved; U.C.C. 1-207 / 308; U.C.C. 1-103

**I Am: Shaneque A. El**

Authorized Representative Natural Person, In Propria Persona: All Rights Reserved; U.C.C. 1-207 / 308; U.C.C. 1-103

**I Am: Azariah A. El**

Authorized Representative Natural Person, In Propria Persona: All Rights Reserved; U.C.C. 1-207 / 308; U.C.C. 1-103

**I Am: NaShawn A. Bey**

Authorized Representative Natural Person, In Propria Persona: All Rights Reserved; U.C.C. 1-207 / 308; U.C.C. 1-103

**I Am: Clayton A. Bey**

Authorized Representative Natural Person, In Propria Persona: All Rights Reserved; U.C.C. 1-207 / 308; U.C.C. 1-103

**I Am: JaMaal A. Bey**

Authorized Representative Natural Person, In Propria Persona: All Rights Reserved; U.C.C. 1-207 / 308; U.C.C. 1-103

**I Am: Kaliel A. Bey**

Authorized Representative Natural Person, In Propria Persona: All Rights Reserved; U.C.C. 1-207 / 308; U.C.C. 1-103



STATE OF CONNECTICUT  
**SUPERIOR COURT HOUSING SESSION**  
OFFICE OF THE CLERK  
[www.jud.ct.gov](http://www.jud.ct.gov)



Zilliah Kenion a/k/a Zilliah S. EL  
45 Olmsted Street  
Unit 18  
East Hartford, CT

**NOTICE OF COURT HEARING**  
JD-CL-9H2 Rev. 7-00 VAF&RAG

NAME OF CASE Woodside Apts., LLC v Kenion a/k/a Zilliah S. EL et al		DOCKET NO. HDSP-159248
ADDRESS OF COURT 80 Washington Street, Hartford, CT 06106		COURT PHONE (860) 756-7920
DATE OF HEARING 01/10/2011	TIME OF HEARING 11:30 AM	COURTROOM Court Room B
ADDRESS OF PREMISES 45 Olmsted Street, Unit 18, East Hartford, CT		

**This case has been assigned for a court hearing for the reason given below:**

Trial - Summary Process

"Affidavit of Fact Writ of Error and Writ of Mandamus"

All parties are required to appear at the place and time given above. If you are unable to attend the hearing you should notify the opposing party and obtain an agreement before you notify the court.

Please notify your witnesses, if any, so they can be in court with you. Bring all other evidence you wish to present, such as bills, receipts, invoices, etc. If a party not represented by an attorney seeks to compel attendance of a witness with a subpoena, an Application for Subpoena must be submitted to the Clerk's Office at least three business days prior to the Hearing Date.

If a motion to open judgment is granted, your case may proceed to trial that same day.

The parties must be prepared to go to trial on the Hearing Date as indicated above.

**FAILURE TO APPEAR FOR YOUR HEARING MAY CAUSE YOU TO BE EVICTED AND/OR LOSE YOUR CASE.** Attorney fees over \$500 require an affidavit and Court approval. CONTINUANCE REQUESTS MUST BE on Form JD-CV-21 (NO PHONE MARKINGS).

Assistance may be provided upon request by a qualified individual with a disability under the provisions of the Americans With Disabilities Act.

CLERK OF COURT, BY Claims Shared Computer DATE 12/28/2010



**THE MOORISH NATIONAL REPUBLIC  
THE MOORISH DIVINE AND NATIONAL MOVEMENT OF THE WORLD  
Aboriginal and Indigenous Natural Peoples of North-West Amexem North America**

**Affidavit of Fact  
Writ of Error - Exhibit V**

December 24, 2010

SUPERIOR COURT HOUSING SESSION  
80 Washington Street  
Corporate HARTFORD CONNECTICUT 06106

Re: Summons to Zilliah S. El regarding HDSP-159248

I am in receipt of your threat dated 12/22/2010 with no lawful signature referencing some entity as a “CLERK OF COURT, BY Claims Shared Computer”.

For the Record, On the Record, and Let the Record show, I am a Moorish National Aboriginal, Indigenous Natural Diving Being Manifested in Human Form and not a nom-de-guerre, straw man or any other artificial corporate construct as written in all capital letters as written in the unclean hands of others. I am Sovereign to this land and as such this administrative court does not have jurisdiction to hear, present, or pass judgment in any matter concerning my affairs under a quasi criminal non sanctioned tribunal of foreign private law process.

As you are aware per United State Postal confirmation number: 7009 0080 0001 3575 4812 received by your office on December 21, 2010.

This has been “**Removed to the Supreme Court of Connecticut**” and this administrative Venue has no jurisdiction.

Enclosed is your certified copy of the “Writ of Mandamus” and enclosed is an “Averment of Jurisdiction”.

I, Zilliah S. El, do not, under any condition or circumstance, by threat, duress, or coercion, waive any rights Unalienable or Secured by the Constitution or Treaty, and, hereby requests this Court fulfill their obligation to preserve the rights of this Petitioner (A Moorish Americans) and carry out their assumed Judicial Duty in ‘Good Faith’.

All UNCONSTITUTIONAL Citations – Summons / Ticket – Suit / (misrepresented) Bill of Exchange: Docket Number HDSP-159248, and any other ‘Order’ or ‘Action’ associated with it / them, to be dismissed and expunged for the record on it’s face and merits.

Notice to the Agent is Notice to the Principal – Notice to the Principal is notice to the Agent.

Thank You,  
I Am: \_\_\_\_\_  
Zilliah S. EL, Authorized Representative  
Natural Person, In Propria Persona:  
Ex Relatione Zilliah Kenion  
All Rights Reserved: U.C.C. 1-207/ 1-308; U.C.C. 1-103  
Quinnehtukqut Territory  
[c/o 45 Olmsted Street]  
[Near Corporate MANCHESTER CONNECTICUT]  
Northwest Amexem

Exhibit W – Averment of Jurisdiction to SUPERIOR COURT HOUSING SESSION

Exhibit X – Writ of Mandamus – Dated December 24, 2010

Exhibit Z – Confirmation of HOUSING SESSION received Removal

Cc:	United Nations Geneva Switzerland	Connecticut Republic Governor M. Jodi Rell
	International Criminal Court The Hague, The Netherlands	Federal Bureau of Investigation New York
	International Court of Justice The Hague, The Netherlands	International Police Lyon France
	Great Seal National Association of Moorish Affairs Minister A. El	
	United States Justice Department United States Attorney General Eric H. Holder	



**THE MOORISH NATIONAL REPUBLIC  
THE MOORISH DIVINE AND NATIONAL MOVEMENT OF THE WORLD  
Aboriginal and Indigenous Natural Peoples of North-West Amexem North America**

**A f f i d a v i t O f F a c t  
A v e r m e n t O f J u r i s d i c t i o n**  
For The Record, To Be Read Into The Record  
Exhibit w

December 24, 2010

SUPERIOR COURT HOUSING SESSION  
80 Washington Street  
Corporate HARTFORD CONNECTICUT 06106

Re: Summons to Zilliah S. El regarding HDSP-159248

This is a formal Request and Demand for SUPERIOR COURT HOUSING SESSION, CLERKS, CLAIMS SHARED COMPUTER to produce for the record, the physical documented 'Delegation of Authority', as Proof of Jurisdiction, as required by Law, per Article III, Section 1 of the Untied States Republic Constitution.

**Notice to Agent is Notice to Principal – Notice to Principal is Notice to Agent.**

Thank You,  
I Am: \_\_\_\_\_  
Zilliah S. El, Authorized Representative  
Natural Person, In Propria Persona  
Ex-Relatione Zilliah Kenion  
All Rights Reserved: U.C.C. 1-207/1-308; U.C.C.1-103  
Quinnehtukqut Territory  
[c/o 45 Olmsted Street Apartment 18]  
[Near Corporate EAST HARTFORD CONNECTICUT]  
Northwest Amexem

Cc: United Nations  
Geneva Switzerland

International Criminal Court  
The Hague, The Netherlands

International Court of Justice  
The Hague, The Netherlands

Great Seal National Association of Moorish Affairs  
Minister A. El

United States Justice Department  
United States Attorney General  
Eric H. Holder

Connecticut Republic Governor  
M. Jodi Rell

Federal Bureau of Investigation  
New York

International Police  
Lyon France



**THE MOORISH NATIONAL REPUBLIC  
THE MOORISH DIVINE AND NATIONAL MOVEMENT OF THE WORLD  
Aboriginal and Indigenous Natural Peoples of North-West Amexem North America**

**Affidavit Of Fact  
Averment Of Jurisdiction**  
For The Record, To Be Read Into The Record  
**Exhibit AB – Second Request**

December 31, 2010

SUPERIOR COURT HOUSING SESSION  
80 Washington Street  
Corporate HARTFORD CONNECTICUT 06106

Re: Summons to Zilliah S. El regarding HDSP-159248

This is a formal Request and Demand for SUPERIOR COURT HOUSING SESSION, CLERKS, CLAIMS SHARED COMPUTER, ALL OFFICERS to produce for the record, the physical documented 'Delegation of Authority', as Proof of Jurisdiction, as required by Law, per Article III, Section 1 of the United States Republic Constitution.

**Notice to Agent is Notice to Principal – Notice to Principal is Notice to Agent.  
A response is required in writing within 24 hours of receipt.**

Thank You,  
I Am: \_\_\_\_\_  
Zilliah S. El, Authorized Representative  
Natural Person, In Propria Persona  
Ex-Relatione Zilliah Kenion  
All Rights Reserved: U.C.C. 1-207/1-308; U.C.C.1-103  
Quinnehtukqut Territory  
[c/o 45 Olmsted Street Apartment 18]  
[Near Corporate EAST HARTFORD CONNECTICUT]  
Northwest Amexem

Cc: United Nations  
Geneva Switzerland

International Criminal Court  
The Hague, The Netherlands

International Court of Justice  
The Hague, The Netherlands

Great Seal National Association of Moorish Affairs  
Minister A. El

United States Justice Department  
United States Attorney General  
Eric H. Holder

Connecticut Republic Governor  
M. Jodi Rell

Federal Bureau of Investigation  
New York

International Police  
Lyon France