

---

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR  
THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

• 300 Quarropas Street, White Plains, NY. 106011 •

---

**Unified United States Common Law Grand Jury;**<sup>1</sup>  
c/o NLA, 3979 Albany Post Road, Suite 107; Hyde Park, New York, 12539;

**Sureties of the Peace**<sup>2</sup>  
Fax: (888) 891-8977

---

AL, AK, AZ, AR, CA, CO, CT, DE, FL, GA, HI, ID, IL, IN, IA, KS, KY, LA, ME, MD, MA, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NE, NV, NH, NJ, NM, NY, NC, ND, OH, OK, OR, PA, RI, SC, SD, TN, TX, UT, VT, VA, WA, WV, WI, WY:

---

UNIFIED US COMMON LAW GRAND JURY, Sureties of  
the Peace,<sup>3</sup> on behalf of the People;

Plaintiffs

- Against -

Judge Seibel, et al

Defendant

**JURISDICTION:** Court of Record, under the  
rules of Common Law<sup>4</sup>

**TRIBUNAL:** Petit Jury  
Docket NO: 20CV5601

**WRIT OF ERROR**

**Copied:** President Trump, AG William Barr,  
and US Supreme Court

**THE COMMON LAW GRAND JURY COMES NOW** to review the facts, record, and process. The record shows that on September 25<sup>th</sup> 2020, without any Constitutional authority, U.S. District Judge Seibel self-appointed herself as the Tribunal of the case thereby, trespassing upon the case conducting her own court without notice or concurrence of the parties; without jurisdiction; without due process and under color of law<sup>5</sup> acted in an attempt to seize control of this court, an act of a tyrant, by manufacturing an UNLAWFUL ORDER to dismiss this action, thereby Concealing a Common Law Court of Record,

---

<sup>1</sup> **The UUSCLGJ** is comprised of fifty Grand Jurys each unified amongst the counties within their respective States. All fifty States have unified nationally as an assembly of Thousands of People in the name of We the People to suppress, through our Courts of Justice, subverts both foreign and domestic acting under color of law within our governments. States were unified by re-constituting all 3,133 United States counties.

<sup>2</sup> **SURETIES OF THE PEACE:** If anyone has been dispossessed without the legal judgment of his peers, from his lands, castles, franchises, or from his right, we will immediately restore them to him; and if a dispute arise over this, then let it be decided by the five and twenty jurors of whom mention is made below in the clause for securing the peace. Moreover, for all those possessions, from which anyone has, without the lawful judgment of his peers, been disseized or removed by our government, we will immediately grant full justice therein. Magna Carta Paragraph 52.

<sup>3</sup> **Sureties of the Peace, Grand Jury:** "If anyone has been dispossessed without the legal judgment of his peers, from his lands, castles, franchises, or from his right, we will immediately restore them to him; and if a dispute arise over this, then let it be decided by the five and twenty jurors of whom mention is made below in the clause for securing the peace. Moreover, for all those possessions, from which anyone has, without the lawful judgment of his peers, been disseized or removed by our government we will immediately grant full justice therein." - Magna Carta Paragraph 52.

<sup>4</sup> **"A Court of Record** is a judicial tribunal having attributes and exercising functions independently of the person of the magistrate designated generally to hold it, and proceeding according to the course of common law, its acts and proceedings being enrolled for a perpetual memorial." 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.

<sup>5</sup> **COLOR OF LAW** "The appearance or semblance, without the substance, of legal right." - State v. Brechler, 185 Wis. 599, 202 N.W. 144, 148; "Misuse of power, possessed by virtue of state law and made possible only because wrongdoer is clothed with authority of state, is action taken under "color of state law." - Atkins v. Lanning, 415 F. Supp. 186, 188.

Carrying the Common Law Grand Jury to Jurisdictions unknown, and committing Felony rescue, and Treason.

*"It is the duty of the courts to be watchful for the Constitutional rights of the citizen and against any stealthy encroachments thereon."* - Boyd v. United States, 116 U.S. 616, 635.

The genius of a court of record is not to be undermined. It is the unalienable right of every American to settle criminal and civil cases in a court of record; Federal District Courts are creatures of Congress, inferior to the "One Supreme Court" which is "vested by We the People ourselves via the Constitution for the United States of America. Federal District Court judges hold their office during good behavior, that is to say obedient to the "Law of the Land" under Article VI clause 2. The unalienable right of "free access" to the Peoples courts is settled law that "all judges are bound by oath to obey."

At a conference held on August 26<sup>th</sup>, Judge Seibel stated that Natural Law was abrogated hundreds of years ago when in fact that act of treason was on September 16, 1938. Plaintiffs then asked Judge Seibel if she was going to reveal to the plaintiffs what jurisdiction we were in. Judge Seibel answered "NO"!

At a 2<sup>nd</sup> conference held on September 25<sup>th</sup> Judge Seibel refused to recuse herself, refused to hear the Common Law Grand Jury, seized control of our Common Law Grand Jury Court of Record, and carried the Common Law Grand Jury to jurisdictions unknown, and walked out of the court while we were talking.

To claim the Common Law abrogated is to claim the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution and its capstone Bill of rights null and void and that would be High Treason. And to refuse to identify the jurisdiction that plaintiffs have been covertly moved under is a violation of her oath. In the US case of Cooper v. Aaron it was stated that; "*Any judge who does not comply with their oath to the Constitution of the United States wars against that Constitution and engages in acts in violation of the supreme law of the land. The judge is engaged in acts of treason.*"

Judge Seibel claimed that the Common Law Grand Jury is a corporation, partnership, or an association; whereas we are the People, under the authority of the Common Law Grand Jury because all federal juries have been seized by the judiciary into civil law courts into jurisdictions unknown. Judge Seibel clearly and surprisingly did not know what a court of record was. Judge Seibel thought that it was a court that maintains a record.

Judge Seibel also could not tell us what jurisdiction we were hijacked to but could only refer to 28 USC §1331 and §1441 which only provides for subject matter jurisdiction. No equity court has personam jurisdiction over the People. Such an action must be heard in a court of Law, which is a court of record, under the rules of the Common Law and not equity or unlawful civil law.

Self-appointed Judge Seibel made it clear, by her actions, that she believed she was the owner of the courtroom and not ~~We~~ the ~~People~~. She was not satisfied with the lawful rules of court; she became a loose cannon and imposed her own rules, and rules of another jurisdiction foreign<sup>6</sup> to this court of record.

The law provides that the judiciary is to respond and not conceal as was attempted by Judge Seibel, who is now in jeopardy of indictment for concealment of Common Law Court, carrying the Common Law Grand Jury to Jurisdictions unknown, felony rescue, denial of due process and treason. Furthermore, elected and appointed officials have a duty to speak<sup>7</sup> and ~~We~~ the ~~People~~ have an unalienable right of redress and remedy. This court will not permit one rogue judge to subvert that unalienable right of due process.<sup>8</sup>

Furthermore, without proper authority, self-appointed Judge Seibel trespassed upon the case and, by her actions and statements, figuratively assumed the cloak of a tribunal<sup>9</sup>. The record shows that the rules of the court were not followed, that self-appointed Judge Seibel attempted to function as a tribunal, and that the court was ineffective in furthering the goal of justice for all. These failures to follow the prescribed procedures are sufficiently disruptive to the goal of providing fair justice in that the sovereigns<sup>10</sup> of the court finds it necessary to sue Judge Seibel and her de facto court directly, as is our sovereign right.

---

<sup>6</sup> **Law of the case lines 399-401** - "'Sovereignty' means that the decree of sovereign makes law, and foreign courts cannot condemn influences persuading sovereign to make the decree." *Moscow Fire Ins. Co. of Moscow, Russia v. Bank of New York & Trust Co.*, 294 N.Y.S. 648, 662, 161 Misc. 903.; As independent sovereignty, it is State's province and duty to forbid interference by another state or foreign power with status of its own citizens. *Roberts v Roberts* (1947) 81 CA2d 871, 185 P2d 381. *Black's Law Dictionary*, 4th Ed., p 1300.

<sup>7</sup> "Silence can only be equated with fraud where there is a legal or moral duty to speak, or where an inquiry left unanswered would be intentionally misleading. . ." *U.S. v. Tweel*, 550 F.2d 297, 299. See also *U.S. v. Prudden*, 424 F.2d 1021, 1032; *Carmine v. Bowen*, 64 A. 932.

<sup>8</sup> Due course of law, this phrase is synonymous with "due process of law" or "law of the land" and means law in its regular course of administration through courts of justice. - *Kansas Pac. Ry. Co. v. Dunmeyer* 19 KAN 542.

<sup>9</sup> The tribunal is independent of the magistrate (judge) A "COURT OF RECORD" is a judicial tribunal having attributes and exercising functions independently of the person of the magistrate designated generally to hold it, and proceeding according to the course of common law, its acts and proceedings being enrolled for a perpetual memorial. *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. ....; A judicial tribunal having attributes and exercising functions independently of the person of the magistrate designated generally to hold it *Jones v. Jones*, 188 Mo.App. 220, 175 S.W. 227.

<sup>10</sup> "'Sovereignty' means that the decree of sovereign makes law, and foreign courts cannot condemn influences persuading sovereign to make the decree." *Moscow Fire Ins. Co. of Moscow, Russia v. Bank of New York & Trust Co.*, 294 N.Y.S. 648

Any judge resting in fiction of law proceeds under the color of law and loses all immunity. Decisions of such an inferior court are subject to collateral attack. In other words, in a superior court one may sue an inferior court directly, rather than resort to appeal to an appellate court.

Under federal Law, which is applicable to all states, the U.S. Supreme Court stated that: “If a court is without authority, its judgments and orders are regarded as nullities. They are not voidable, but simply void, and form no bar to a recovery sought, even prior to a reversal in opposition to them. They constitute no justification and all persons concerned in executing such judgments or sentences are considered, in law, as trespassers.”<sup>11</sup>

16<sup>TH</sup> AMERICAN JURISPRUDENCE, 2<sup>ND</sup> EDITION, SEC, 177, states that all judges are bound by the supremacy clause to obey states:

*The general misconception is that any statute passed by legislators bearing the appearance of law constitutes the law of the land. The U.S. Constitution is the supreme law of the land, and any statute, to be valid, must be in agreement. It is impossible for both the Constitution and a law violating it to be valid; one must prevail. This is succinctly stated as follows:*

*The general rule is that an unconstitutional statute, though having the form and name of law, is in reality no law, but is wholly void and ineffective for any purpose; since unconstitutionality dates from the time of its enactment, and not merely from the date of the decision so branding it.*

*An unconstitutional law, in legal contemplation, is as inoperative as if it had never been passed. Such a statute leaves the question that it purports to settle just as it would be had the statute not been enacted. Since an unconstitutional law is void, the general principles follow that it imposes no duties, confers no rights, creates no office, bestows no power or authority on anyone, affords no protection, and justifies no acts performed under it. A void act cannot be legally consistent with a valid one. An unconstitutional law cannot operate to supersede any existing valid law. Indeed, in so far as a statute runs counter to the fundamental law of the land, it is superseded thereby. No one is bound to obey an unconstitutional law and no courts are bound to enforce it. Any court, government or government officer who acts in violation of, in opposition to or contradiction to the foregoing, by his, or her, own actions, commits treason and invokes the self-executing Sections 3 and 4 of the 14th Amendment and vacates his, or her, office. It is the duty of every lawful American Citizen to oppose all enemies of this Nation, foreign and domestic.*

The sovereigns of the court, having reviewed the facts, the record, and the process by which the ruling was issued, and finding that Judge Seibel rendered a ruling under color of law by seizing control and applying rules from jurisdictions foreign to this court without leave of court; and finding that the orderly

---

662, 161 Misc. 903.; “The people of this State, as the successors of its former sovereign, are entitled to all the rights which formerly belonged to the King by his prerogative.” Lansing v. Smith, 4 Wend. 9 (N.Y.) (1829), 21 Am. Dec. 89 10C Const. Law Sec. 298; 18 C Em.Dom. Sec. 3, 228; 37 C Nav.Wat. Sec. 219; Nuls Sec. 167; 48 C Wharves Sec. 3, 7.

<sup>11</sup> Basso v. UPL, 495 F. 2d 906; Brook v. Yawkey, 200 F. 2d 633; Elliot v. Piersol, 1 Pet. 328, 340, 26 U.S. 328, 340 (1828).

decorum of the court was replaced by defective impromptu process and usurpation of legislative and court powers without leave of court.

American Jurisprudence (Constitutional Law) §326; Free Justice and Open Courts; Remedy for All Injuries - in most of the state Constitutions, there are provisions, varying slightly in terms, which stipulate that justice shall be administered to all without delay or denial, without sale or prejudice, and that the courts shall always be open to all alike<sup>12</sup>. These provisions are based largely upon the Magna Charta, chap. 40, which provides; "We will sell to no man. We will not deny to any man either justice or right." The chief purpose of the Magna Charta provision was to prohibit the King from selling justice by imposing fees on litigants through his courts and to deal a death blow to the attendant venal and disgraceful practices of a corrupt judiciary in demanding oppressive gratuities for giving or withholding decisions in pending causes. It has been appropriately said that in a free government the doors of litigation are already wide open and must constantly remain so. The extent of the constitutional provision has been regarded as broader than the original confines of Magna Charta, and such constitutional provision has been held to prohibit the selling of justice not merely by judges but by the State itself. Therefore, a denial of access into the Peoples courts' of justice would be a violation of plaintiff's unalienable right of due process protected under Amendment V.

The sovereigns of this court of record, reminding all officers of the court of record that any statute or rule repugnant to the Constitution is null and void<sup>13</sup> in a court of record and hereby sues Judge Seibel and her de facto court directly and issues a Writ of Error Coram Nobis, to wit; reversing the order by Judge Seibel of the inferior court not of record from jurisdictions unknown, thereby returning the court back to the tribunal.

The ability to sue courts, that is, may allow the law to improve while providing important relief to those most adversely impacted by the transitions. Suing courts, in short, is a form of transition relief. This is

---

<sup>12</sup> It is the unalienable right of every American to settle issues in a court of record, if he so chooses; The court is to take judicial notice of Federal Rules of Evidence 201(d) concerning Judicial Notice of Adjudicative Fact that Plaintiff has a lawful right to proceed without cost, based upon the following U.S. Supreme Court ruling that "a natural man or woman is entitled to relief for free access to its judicial tribunals and public offices in every State in the Union" 2 Black 620, see also Crandell v. Nevada, 6 Wall 35; "Plaintiff should not be charged fees, or costs for the lawful and constitutional right to petition this court in this matter in which he is entitled to relief, as it appears that the filing fee rule was originally implemented for fictions and subjects of the State and should not be applied to the Plaintiff who is a natural individual and entitled to relief" Hale v. Henkel 201 U.S. 43.

<sup>13</sup> **NULL & VOID** "All laws, rules and practices which are repugnant to the Constitution are null and void" -- Marbury v. Madison, 5th US (2 Cranch) 137, 180; "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; "... that statutes which would deprive a citizen of the rights of person or property without a regular trial, according to the course and usage of common law, would not be the law of the land." Hoke vs. Henderson, 15, N.C.15,25 AM Dec 677.

unquestionably an unorthodox view of judicial accountability and an unconventional take on judicial takings. But it is, unlike the error-correcting model, a more coherent way to understand suing courts and a more consistent gloss on the goal of the “Takings Clause.”

THE COURT IMPEACHES AND RESCINDS THE STATEMENT BY JUDGE SEIBEL IN THAT SHE DID MAKE AN UNLAWFUL DECISION AND ORDER, AND THIS COURT ORDERS JUDGE SEIBEL TO CEASE AND DESIST FROM ASSUMING THE ROLE OF TRIBUNAL.

Wherefore, we the Common Law Grand Jury grant the defendants 20 days to answer this Action at law or default. We grant Judge Seibel 30 days to respond. We also demand that all officers of the court are to provide a copy of their oath and bond on the record of this Action. Failure to comply will result in the Common Law Grand Jury request to the Tribunal for a finding of a contempt of court.

**SO ORDERED.**

SEAL

**DATED:** October 2, 2017

  
Grand Jury Foreman