

FILE ON DEMAND

COMES NOW Unified United States Common Law Grand Jury to Demand that the clerk perform only a ministerial function, that the clerk not perform any tribunal functions, and that the clerk file the attached. Any clerk who fails to obey the law shall be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law. Any attorney or judge advising or intimidating clerks to violate the law will also be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law. Clerks, attorneys, judges and other officers of the court are expected to know the law. – Clerk is to file. **18 USC § 2076** Whoever, being a clerk of a district court of the United States, willfully refuses or neglects to make or forward any report, certificate, statement, or document as required by law, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

18 USC §1512 (b) Whoever knowingly uses intimidation, threatens, or corruptly persuades another person, or attempts to do so, or engages in misleading conduct toward another person, with intent to - (1) influence, delay, or prevent the testimony of any person in an official proceeding; (2) cause or induce any person to -- (A) withhold testimony, or withhold a record, document, or other object, from an official proceeding; (B) alter, destroy, mutilate, or conceal an object with intent to impair the object’s integrity or availability for use in an official proceeding; ... shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than 20 years, or both. (3) ... (c) Whoever corruptly—(1) alters, destroys, mutilates, or conceals a record, document, or other object, or attempts to do so, with the intent to impair the object’s integrity or availability for use in an official proceeding; or (2) otherwise obstructs, influences, or impedes any official proceeding, or attempts to do so, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than 20 years, or both.

18 USC § 2071 - Concealment, removal, or mutilation generally – (a) Whoever willfully and unlawfully conceals, removes, mutilates, obliterates, or destroys, or attempts to do so, or, with intent to do so takes and carries away any record, proceeding, map, book, paper, document, or other thing, filed or deposited with any clerk or officer of any court of the United States, or in any public office, or with any judicial or public officer of the United States, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than three years, or both. (b) Whoever, having the custody of any such record, proceeding, map, book, document, paper, or other thing, willfully and unlawfully conceals, removes, mutilates, obliterates, falsifies, or destroys the same, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than three years, or both; and shall forfeit his office and be disqualified from holding any office under the United States. As used in this subsection, the term “office” does not include the office held by any person as a retired officer of the Armed Forces of the United States.

Unified Florida State Common Law Grand Jury:

P.O. Box ??; ????????, Florida, ?????

FILED August ??th 2014 in the district court of the United States,
northern district of Florida;
United States Courthouse
401 SE First Ave. Rm 243
Gainesville, FL 32601

SERVED Upon Magistrate/Judge Cynthia Munkittrick for Action

Prov 29:2 When the righteous are in authority, the people rejoice: but when the wicked beareth rule, the people mourn.

PRESENTMENT UNDER COMMON LAW

A TRUE BILL, BY THE PEOPLE¹

COMES NOW THE CONSTITUTED² UNIFIED³ COMMON LAW GRAND JURIES⁴ of Florida; including Alachua County, Baker County, Bay County, Bradford County, Brevard County, Broward County, Calhoun County, Charlotte County, Citrus County, Clay County, Collier County, Columbia County, DeSoto County, Dixie County, Duval County, Escambia County, Flagler County, Franklin County, Gadsden County, Gilchrist County, Glades County, Gulf County, Hamilton County, Hardee County, Hendry County, Hernando County, Highlands County, Hillsborough County, Holmes County, Indian River County, Jackson County, Jefferson County, Lafayette County, Lake County, Lee County, Leon County, Levy County, Liberty County, Madison County, Manatee County, Marion County, Martin County, Miami-Dade County, Monroe County, Nassau County, Okaloosa County, Okeechobee County, Orange County, Osceola County, Palm Beach County, Pasco County, Pinellas County, Polk County, Putnam County, Santa Rosa County, Sarasota County, Seminole County, St. Johns County, St. Lucie County, Sumter County, Suwannee County, Taylor County, Union County, Volusia County, Wakulla County, Walton County and Washington County.

¹ **PEOPLE.** People are supreme, not the state. [Waring vs. the Mayor of Savannah, 60 Georgiaat 93]; The state cannot diminish rights of the people. [Hertado v. California, 100 US 516]; Preamble to the US and NY Constitutions - We the people ... do ordain and establish this Constitution...; ...at the Revolution, the sovereignty devolved on the people; and they are truly the sovereigns of the country, but they are sovereigns without subjects...with none to govern but themselves... [CHISHOLM v. GEORGIA (US) 2 Dall 419, 454, 1 L Ed 440, 455, 2 DALL (1793) pp471-472]: 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.]

² **CONSTITUTED** - The People of each county have come together to agreed and declared a return to Common Law Juries.

³ **UNIFIED** - Every county in the state has constituted the Common Law Juries.

⁴ **COMMON LAW GRAND JURY** - Amendment V No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a Grand Jury...; The Court of Appeals' rule would neither preserve nor enhance the traditional functioning of the grand jury that the "common law" of the Fifth Amendment demands. UNITED STATES v. WILLIAMS, Jr.112 S.Ct. 1735; 504 U.S. 36; 118 L.Ed.2d 352

COMES NOW WE THE PEOPLE of Florida, concurred by the People of Florida to present this “True Bill” against State Attorney Jeffrey Siegmeister in the Northern District of Florida with the following:

A TRUE BILL
~ PRESENTMENT UNDER COMMON LAW ~

Concerning the pseudo Florida State, Dixie County Grand Jury, reported by Grand Jury Foreman Terry Trussell, that:

On **Thursday August 14th** the Unified Florida Common Law Grand Jury convened to hear the sworn statement of Dixie County Grand Jury Foreman Terry Trussell, Grand Jury Foreman of the Pseudo Florida State Dixie County Grand Jury. And, hereby present this true bill for trial against State Attorney Jeffrey Siegmeister for conspiracy to overthrow the government of the United States, high treason, 18 USC §1961-68 RICO, 18 USC §4 - Misprision of felony, 18 USC §241 Rights, conspiracy against, 18 USC §242 Rights, deprivation, 18 USC §872 Extortion by officers, 18 USC §1001 Conceals, or covers, 18 USC §1346 Scheme or defraud, 18 USC §1512b engages in misleading conduct, 18 USC §2071 Concealment, 18 USC §2382 Misprision of treason, 18 USC §2384 Seditious conspiracy, 42 USC §1985 Rights, conspiracy to interfere, 42 USC §1986 neglect to prevent and Jury Tampering. Supported by the following statements of facts and the attached affidavit.

Terry Trussell Foreman of the Pseudo Florida State Dixie County Grand Jury, hereinafter Jury Foreman, reported to Judge Cynthia Munkittrick the following concerns and frustrations:

On or about July 28, 2014 Jury Foreman directly contacted Levy and Gilchrist County Clerks of Court requesting contact information to the grand jury forepersons of their respective counties, and ask them to make contact on a matter of official business but there was no response from either County’s Clerk or Grand Jury foreman. Said action was initiated by the following rule from the Grand Jury Instructions:

4.10 - This grand jury has a duty to cooperate with any other grand jury investigations being conducted in this county or elsewhere in the state if the administration of justice requires it, including making reports of your investigation available to any subsequent grand jury of the county.

On July 21st Jury Foreman requested a scheduled session of the Grand Jury with Court Clerk Dana Johnson.

On July 22nd Court Clerk Dana Johnson forwarded the request to State Attorney Jeffrey Siegmeister and that he would call the Jury Foreman on July 23rd 2014.

On July 23rd State Attorney Jeffrey Siegmeister informed Jury Foreman that he notified the Jurors by mail of their need to appear forthwith.

Jury Foreman required that a copy of the Jury Instructions, the Grand Jury Handbook, and the U.S. Constitution, along with a simple instruction be provided.

State Attorney Jeffrey Siegmeister sent out a notification along with the Jury Instructions, Handbook but omitted the Constitution and Jury Foreman's instructions.

On July 30 Jury Foreman informed Court Clerk Dana Johnson of the need of the following items:

- 1) Inspection of the meeting room
- 2) Use of copier for Jury materials
- 3) Review of jury budget indicated in handbook
- 4) List of jurors' names and contact info
- 5) Inquire concerning procedure if less than a quorum

After viewing the courtroom Jury Foreman voiced concerns of recording equipment and the potential conflict with requiring the proceedings secret. Court Clerk Dana Johnson assured Jury Foreman that the microphones would be turned off. Court Clerk Dana Johnson also stated that the Grand Jury has no budget.

On July 31st 2014 queried the jury list again, receiving excuses and no results.

On Friday, August 1st 2014 the morning of the Grand Jury session Jury Foreman told the clerk it was imperative I have the Jury list. No one seemed to know what was going on.

At 12:30 PM State Attorney Jeffrey Siegmeister arrived and the microphones were turned on. A woman walked in the courtroom and greeted State Attorney Jeffrey Siegmeister. Jury Foreman asked who she was. State Attorney Jeffrey Siegmeister replied, she was his court reporter; Jury Foreman told him according to the instructions, the decision to have a reporter was up to the jury. State Attorney Jeffrey Siegmeister then stated this was his jury and he had made the decision. Jury Foreman responded, this was the People's jury and it is independent of the court and the state attorney. State Attorney Jeffrey Siegmeister agreed it was independent, but he was statutorily responsible for it. Jury Foreman asked if he was in charge, why was I there. State Attorney Jeffrey Siegmeister response was, "I wonder that, myself."

After a couple of opening remarks the proceeding was turned over to the Jury Foreman, who proceeded to have all state employees to leave the room. Attorney Jeffrey Siegmeister responded firmly that he his assistant, bailiff, and court reporter were required to be present and would not leave quoting:

4.3 - The state attorney (or the statewide prosecutor) and assistants are your legal advisers on all matters that come before the grand jury. It is your duty to give weight and careful consideration to this advice. State attorney (or the statewide prosecutor) or an assistant shall be present at all times when you are making investigations, and will interrogate the witnesses and administer the necessary oaths.

Jury Foreman pointed out, there were no investigative proceedings at this time, no witnesses to be interrogated, and no oaths to be administered, but he refused to leave.

There was a bailiff present as the jury took their seats in the jury box, the court reporter took her seat at the table and began taking short-hand notes; a voice recorder on the table beside her. Four armed deputies stood outside the door to the courtroom, in view of the jurors.

State Attorney Jeffrey Siegmeister then took orchestration of the jury.

As the Jury Foreman began his presentation it was observed that the jurors' eyes kept shifting from Jury Foreman to State Attorney Jeffrey Siegmeister. Instead of focusing on what was being presented, they were clearly distracted by him. At one point when the jury turned to look at State Attorney Jeffrey Siegmeister the Jury Foreman noted that he saw State Attorney Jeffrey Siegmeister turn his head and roll his eyes, it was then realized State Attorney Jeffrey Siegmeister was assuming complete control of the jury as he stood behind Jury Foreman. It was further observed State Attorney Jeffrey Siegmeister making a hand gesture, as though prompting the proceedings to move faster and one juror began heckling the Jury Foreman

Because State Attorney Jeffrey Siegmeister failed to give the jury the information the Jury Foreman requested, they were not equipped to receive the case presentation.

Additionally, within the limited timeframe allowed by Mr. Siegmeister, Jury Foreman was prevented from providing the background and foundation of the matter. One Juror voiced her concern the subject matter of the case might be 'political'. Several of the Jurors assumed an antagonistic attitude, heckling or challenging points, and talking among themselves as Jury Foreman spoke; Jury Foreman began to understand how well Mr. Siegmeister had 'prepared' them for the meeting.

Jury Foreman handed out the booklet containing information requisite to the case. Mr. Heckler leafed quickly through the booklet, then tossed the booklet from the jury box, back on the table. Other jury members also stated they didn't need to know what was in the booklet. Jury Foreman asked the jury if any were familiar with a key, well-publicized element in the case. Not a single hand was raised.

Jury Foreman repeated the subject matter of the case before us, and one woman raised her hand stating she had seen something on TV news concerning the subject, and her grandson had mentioned it, once, but she couldn't tell me anything about the subject. The case involved allegations of, among other violations, bribery of local officials to provide benefit to others for instituting certain policies.

Mr. Heckler demanded to know who was involved in the bribery, to which Jury Foreman responded by listing various state and county officials. One juror stated he didn't think it was possible for a little county grand jury to even consider a case of such stature, to which State Attorney Jeffrey Siegmeister responded the case was outside his jurisdiction and he couldn't prosecute it, which is a convenient way of ignoring it. State Attorney Jeffrey Siegmeister turned to Jury Foreman before the jury and said, "I told you they'd revolt if you didn't give them all the information right away."

After the jury left the courtroom, Jury Foreman approached State Attorney Jeffrey Siegmeister, and told him that his manipulation of the jury was not appreciate. State Attorney Jeffrey Siegmeister denied he did anything other than follow the law - just doing his job. He then committed to me, if I could get a 12-vote for a True Bill, he would promise to prosecute the case. Jury Foreman told him he would hold him to his commitment.

State Attorney Jeffrey Siegmeister prompting the jury behind Jury Foreman's back was sophomoric, destructive, and well beneath even a minimum standard of professionalism.

His repeated and uninvited interruptions and comments during Jury Foreman's presentation were unsolicited, distracting, and counterproductive. He wasted time and disrupted the proceedings.

His unwarranted and unauthorized testifying about facts of the case, inserting his opinions, and giving his views about the how the law applies, was not helpful, confused the jury, and it undermined the Jury Foreman.

State Attorney Jeffrey Siegmeister insistence that a court reporter, bailiff and his assistant be present, along with four armed Sheriff's deputies loitering at the courtroom door, especially

during highly-sensitive disclosures of critical information, was clearly meant to intimidate the Jury Foreman, reckless, distracting, and an unnecessary threat to the secrecy of the case.

His dominance of every step in the process compromised the Jury's function and Jury Foreman's responsibility to manage the procedure.

The County Clerk's lack of competence in matters related to how the Grand Jury must operate and how to provide for its needs was an obstacle to our secrecy and efficiency. Her dependence on State Attorney Jeffrey Siegmeister for every minor decision was frustrating and impeded progress.

State Attorney Jeffrey Siegmeister had repeated conversations outside the body of the Grand Jury with Jury Members:

State Attorney Jeffrey Siegmeister admitted to having phone conversations with each of the Jury Members, where he obtained information from them, which he refused to share with the Jury Foreman, and gave them 'special information and instruction' in preparation for the meeting.

He usurped the Jury Foreman's authority by excusing Members from attending, without the knowledge of the Jury Foreman.

State Attorney Jeffrey Siegmeister had a conversation with one of the female Jurors outside the courthouse following the session, after which the Juror came to Jury Foreman, asked for an additional copy of the handout, and took it back out to State Attorney Jeffrey Siegmeister. Jury Foreman had specifically told State Attorney Jeffrey Siegmeister during the session, the documents were intended only for the Jury.

State Attorney Jeffrey Siegmeister violated the spirit, and every principle, of the Grand Jury concept as described in US v Williams.

The Jury was not permitted to function free of State Attorney Jeffrey Siegmeister's control or influence at every step, contrary to the independent nature of the Grand Jury.

State Attorney Jeffrey Siegmeister sabotaged the role of Jury Foreman, by directing the process; countering, and over-riding decisions in the process, inserting his opinions, 'witnessing' to the subjects at hand, and 'preparing' the Jurors, a direct violation of US v Williams.

State Attorney Jeffrey Siegmeister blocked access and communications between public officials (Grand Jury Foremen) in different counties and separate jurisdictions, over matters clearly outside his scope, responsibility, and authority.

CONCLUSION: It is the conclusion of the Unified Florida Common Law Grand Jury that the present statutory system that plagues the People in virtually every county of America stifles dissent and breeds tyranny. Because this case is just one example that is repeated thousands of times a week in all 3,142 American counties we believe it is appropriate to make the charge conspiracy to overthrow the government of the United States and high treason, seeing that only a conspiracy can create the conditions capable for sowing such destructive conditions in virtually every courthouse in every county wherein:

- It denies the People their unalienable right to have an unfettered Grand Jury.
- It denies necessary investigations.
- It selects people who are easily led to do the will of the state.
- It places repugnant rules and statutes above law.
- It serves criminals in high places by hiding and insulating them from justice.
- It serves as the foundation for subversion against the United States of America and thereby high-treason against the People.
- It prevent the People access to their Grand Jury by hiding it and preventing any interaction that is not orchestrated thereby totally controlled by the state, and in this fashion achieves the proverbial ham sandwich indictment.

Without an unfettered Grand Jury which is separate from government and the judges, secured by the 5th, 6th and 7th Amendments, Liberty simply is not possible.

Furthermore neither Judge Parker nor Judge Munkittrick, who are both aware of the gross constitutional violations, has yet to act. Therefore it has been agreed by the Common Law Grand Jury, the unfettered Grand Jury, that we are to continue its investigation and have pre-determined to view any elected or appointed official, which have a duty to speak, who continue in silence and/or avoids questioning as co-conspirators.

BY WHAT AUTHORITY WE THE PEOPLE ACT

“We [*posterity of the founders*] hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.--That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, **deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed...**” Declaration of Independence.

The following was quoted in the 1992 case UNITED STATES v. WILLIAMS, Jr.112 S.Ct. 1735; 504 U.S. 36; 118 L.Ed.2d 352; Justice Antonin Scalia, writing for the majority, confirmed that “the American grand jury is neither part of the judicial, executive nor legislative branches of government, but instead belongs to the people. It is in effect a fourth branch of government

"governed" and administered to directly by and on behalf of the American people, and its authority emanates from the Bill of Rights".

"[R]ooted in long centuries of Anglo-American history," *Hannah v. Larche*, 363 U.S. 420, 490, 80 S.Ct. 1502, 1544, 4 L.Ed.2d 1307 (1960) (Frankfurter, J., concurring in result), the grand jury is mentioned in the Bill of Rights, but not in the body of the Constitution. It has not been textually assigned, therefore, to any of the branches described in the first three Articles. It " 'is a constitutional fixture in its own right.' " *United States v. Chanen*, 549 F.2d 1306, 1312 (CA9 1977) (quoting *Nixon v. Sirica*, 159 U.S.App.D.C. 58, 70, n. 54, 487 F.2d 700, 712, n. 54 (1973)), cert. denied, 434 U.S. 825, 98 S.Ct. 72, 54 L.Ed.2d 83 (1977). In fact the whole theory of its function is that it belongs to no branch of the institutional government, serving as a kind of buffer or referee between the Government and the people. *Stirone v. United States*, 361 U.S. 212, 218, 80 S.Ct. 270, 273, 4 L.Ed.2d 252 (1960); *Hale v. Henkel*, 201 U.S. 43, 61, 26 S.Ct. 370, 373, 50 L.Ed. 652 (1906); *G. Edwards*, *The Grand Jury* 28-32 (1906). Although the grand jury normally operates, of course, in the courthouse and under judicial auspices, its institutional relationship with the judicial branch has traditionally been, so to speak, at arm's length. Judges' direct involvement in the functioning of the grand jury has generally been confined to the constitutive one of calling the grand jurors together and administering their oaths of office. *United States v. Calandra*, 414 U.S. 338, 343, 94S.Ct. 613, 617, 38 L.Ed.2d 561 (1974); *Fed.Rule Crim.Proc* 6(a)

The grand jury's functional independence from the judicial branch is evident both in the scope of its power to investigate criminal wrongdoing, and in the manner in which that power is exercised. "Unlike [a] [c]ourt, whose jurisdiction is predicated upon a specific case or controversy, the grand jury 'can investigate merely on suspicion that the law is being violated, or even because it wants assurance that it is not.' " *United States v. R. Enterprises*, 498 U.S. ----, ----, 111 S.Ct. 722, 726, 112 L.Ed.2d 795 (1991) (quoting *United States v. Morton Salt Co.*, 338 U.S. 632, 642-643, 70 S.Ct. 357, 364, 94 L.Ed. 401 (1950)). It need not identify the offender it suspects, or even "the precise nature of the offense" it is investigating. *Blair v. United States*, 250 U.S. 273, 282, 39 S.Ct. 468, 471, 63 L.Ed. 979 (1919). The grand jury requires no authorization from its constituting court to initiate an investigation, see *Hale*, *supra*, 201 U.S., at 59-60, 65, 26 S.Ct., at 373, 375, nor does the prosecutor require leave of court to seek a grand jury indictment. And in its day-to-day functioning, the grand jury generally operates without the interference of a presiding judge. See *Calandra*, *supra*, 414 U.S., at 343, 94 S.Ct., at 617. It swears in its own witnesses, *Fed.Rule Crim.Proc.* 6(c), and deliberates in total secrecy, see *United States v. Sells Engineering, Inc.*, 463

U.S., at 424-425, 103 S.Ct., at 3138; see Memorandum of Law on Authorities, attached

Because this is a conspiracy that crosses State lines and rampant across America this case is also being filed in New York in the United States District Court for the northern district of New York, bu the Unified United States Common Law Grand Jury.

Sealed and Delivered⁵

Common Law Grand Jury Foreman

⁵ **SEALED AND DELIVERED.** These words, fol. rowed by the signatures of the witnesses, constitute the usual formula for the attestation of conveyances.