

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

Unified New York Common Law Grand Jury: [UNYCLGJ]

TRIBUNAL MAGISTRATE GLENN T SUDDABY

-a-

Holly Tanner, Richard Mabee, Jonathan Lippman,
Fern A. Fisher, Lawrence K. Marks, C. Randall Hinrichs,
Allan, D Scheinkman, Charles M. Tailleur, Terry Wilhelm,
Raymond J. Elliott, Terence L Kindlon, Michelle Carrol,
Carol Stevens Barry Kamins, Ronald Younkins,
A. Gail Prudenti, Michael V. Coccoma,

1:14-CV-0552

DEFENDANTS

WRIT OF ERROR

Obsta Principiis¹ against Nisi Prius², that is to say “We the Jury resists the first encroachment” and proceed according to the supreme³ common law of the land⁴, **Coram Nobis**⁵.

We thought the paperwork clear, let us be redundant and explicit, this is a COURT OF RECORD proceeding according to common law in an Article III Court, “not equity”, “not admiralty”, “not maritime” and certainly “not chancery”. Additionally, your law clerk must have become confused we are not pro se (we did not use this term) that we should represent some fraudulent

¹ **OBSTA PRINCIPIIS. Lat.** Withstand begin-nings; resist the first approaches or encroach-ments. Bradley, J., Boyd v. U. S., 116 U.S. 635, 6 Sup.Ct. 535, 29 L.Ed. 746.

² **NISI PRIUS COURT** "Nisi prius" is a Latin term (Black's 5th) "Prius" means "first." "Nisi" means "unless." A "nisi prius" procedure is a procedure to which a party FIRST agrees UNLESS he objects. A rule of procedure in courts is that if a party fails to object to something, then it means he agrees to it. A nisi procedure is a procedure to which a person has failed to object A "nisi prius court" is a court which will proceed unless a party objects. The agreement to proceed is obtained from the parties first.

³ Supremacy Clause - 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. Article VI

⁴ "Law of the land," "due course of law," and "due process of law" are synonymous. People v. Skinner, Cal., 110 P.2d 41, 45; State v. Rossi, 71 R.I. 284, 43 A.2d 323, 326; Direct Plumbing Supply Co. v. City of Dayton, 138 Ohio St. 540, 38 N.E.2d 70, 72, 137 A.L.R. 1058; Stoner v. Higginson, 316 Pa. 481, 175 A. 527, 531.

⁵ [Blacks Law] Before us ourselves, (the king, i. e., in the king's or queen's bench.) [tribunal pre-trial] **CORAM NOBIS.** [Blacks Law] Before us ourselves, (the king, i. e., in the king's or queen's bench.) Applied to writs of error directed to another branch of the same court, e. g., from the full bench to the court at *nisi prius*. 1 Archb. Pr. K. B. 234. See Writ of Error.

fiction, we are self in law. We are not the plaintiff (we did not use this term) that we are suing someone, we are the Tribunal (Common Law Grand Jury), the judge has no tribunal powers in a Court of Record. The judge is the magistrate and has no authority to enter an order without leave of the court and we have given no such leave, see Law of the Case previously filed.

Attached you will find an order by writ of mandamus from We the Tribunal, that we order you to sign forthwith (24 hours from receipt of this writ and returned overnight). If you fail to do so you are to set a date immediately (within 8 days of receipt of this writ) and We the Unified New York Common Law Grand Jury shall assemble at the courthouse to hear your cause and will determine for you the consequences of your action.

The defendants are under indictment by the Common Law Grand Jury and have seized control of the Judicial system of New York, RICO. We took the extraordinary action of acquiring an index number in order to file our presentments and informations which the defendants also blocked and denied due process, if you read the papers you are aware of the crimes and you are now bound by oath to take action. There should be no need for the People of a Constitutional Republic to have to go to such extraordinary measures. Presently your actions are bordering obstruction of justice, misprision of treason and will not be tolerated.

This is not a civil action but criminal, therefore 28USC §1914(a) is irrelevant, and 28USC §1915 (a) pertains to prisoners of which clearly we are not. Furthermore we are not suing we are charging judges and clerks with bad behavior, crimes! And we remind you of your oath to act.

We the People are not fictional corporations but flesh and blood that have pre-paid your compensation through taxation already collected, we built the building you work in, we pay the electric, phones, computers fax machines, paper, salaries, etc. And we gave you the authority by

which you act upon so long as you maintain the security of our rights and thereby be in good behavior, you may keep it. We find the paying of a fee for our unalienable right protected by the constitution repugnant. We the People will not be extorted in order to report a crime.

The U.S. Supreme Court has ruled that a natural man or woman is entitled [right] 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).

“There can be no sanction or penalty imposed upon one because of his exercise of Constitution rights”. -- Sherar vs. Cullen 481 F 2D 946, (1973).

"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

IMPEACHMENT AND WRIT

THE COURT, HAVING REVIEWED THE FACTS, THE RECORD, AND THE PROCESS BY WHICH THE RULING WAS ISSUED, finding that the magistrate ignored the “Writ of Prohibition”, did not read the filed papers, and decided by his own will that he was going to render rulings and proceed according to statutes without leave of court; and finding that the orderly decorum of the court was replaced by defective impromptu process and usurpation of legislative and court powers without leave of court.

NOW THEREFORE, THE COURT ISSUES THIS WRIT OF ERROR, CORAM NOBIS, to wit: The court impeaches and rescinds the actions and statements made by the Magistrate, so stated within his illegal order dated May 23rd 2014, We the Tribunal of this court of record order's Magistrate Glenn T Suddaby, being a recognized a superior court to the State, to obey his oath, and sign the attached Writ of Mandamus in order to return a Constitutional Republic to the State without delay.

SIGNED UNDER SEAL of the COURT

DATED: May 27, 2014



Unified New York Common Law Grand Jury