

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS**

• Everette McKinley Dirkson United States Courthouse,  
219 S. Dearborn Street, Chicago, Illinois 60604 •

**Unified United States Common Law Grand Jury;**  
P.O. Box 59, Valhalla, NY 10595; Fax: (888) 891-8977.



**Sureties of the Peace  
WE THE PEOPLE**

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. WY. WI. WY.

**COVER SHEET**

**JURISDICTION NATURAL LAW**

**COURT OF RECORD:** Judicial Oversight – Unified United States Common Law Grand Jury  
United States District Court for the Northern District of New York  
445 Broadway, Albany, NY. 12207-2936  
Law Case No. 1776-1789-1791-2019; Depository Case No. 1:16-CV-1490

**TO:** Chief Judge Rebecca R. Pallmeyer

**RE:** Habeas Corpus

**AUTHORITY:** “*The judicial power shall extend to all cases, in law and equity, arising under this Constitution,*”<sup>1</sup> whereas; the originating court has violated petitioners right of Due Process.<sup>2</sup>

**28 U.S.C.§2242:** Every person unlawfully committed, detained, confined or restrained of his Liberty or Property, under any pretense whatsoever, may prosecute a Writ of Habeas Corpus to inquire into the cause of such imprisonment or restraint.

**SO ORDERED:** You are ordered to summarily hear and determine the facts and dispose of the matter as law and justice require under the rules of common law as provided for under 16 American Jurisprudence 2d., Sec. 114, and not chancery, and shall mail by United States Post Office a certified copy of decision immediately (within 24 hours) to the petitioner/next friend, and fax a copy of the same to the Grand Jury at (888) 891-8977.

SEAL

November 12, 2019

Tribunal, Jury Foreman

<sup>1</sup> United States Constitution Article III Section 2

<sup>2</sup> Bill of Rights Amendment V: No person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; And, Bill of Rights Amendment VII: In suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed twenty dollars, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved,

*“The most celebrated writ in the English law, and the great and efficacious writ in all manner of illegal confinement.”* - Sir William Blackstone. The "*great writ of liberty*," issuing at common law out of courts of Chancery, King's Bench, Common Pleas, and Exchequer. Ex parte Kelly, 123 N.J.Eq. 489, 198 A. 203, 207.

ORIGINATING COURT: 19<sup>th</sup> Judicial Circuit Court; Statutory No: 17CM4210  
18 N. County Street, Waukegan, Illinois 60085

Petitioner Anthony Stefan Szach  
7559 Mellon Court, Gurnee, Illinois 60031

Next Friend Gary B. Will  
P.O. Box 494, Wadsworth, Illinois 60083

**- AGAINST -**

Respondents Judge Jay W. Ukena  
18 N. County Street, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, Waukegan, Illinois 60085

Elgin Mental Health Center  
750 South State Street, Elgin, Illinois 60123

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>COVERSHEET</b> - - - - -	<b>2 PAGES</b>
<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b> - - - - -	<b>1 PAGE</b>
<b>WRIT HABEAS CORPUS</b> - - - - -	<b>6 PAGES</b>
• Writ of Habeas Corpus Ad Testificandum	
• Order to Show Cause And Writ Certiorari	
• Jurisdiction	
• Judicial Notice	
• Applicant is entitled thereto	
<b>PETITION FOR HABEAS CORPUS</b> - - - - -	<b>10 PAGES</b>
• Petitioner may prosecute a writ of habeas corpus to inquire into the cause of the restraint.	
• Because the respondents' court should have been a court of record but instead fraudulently concealed its jurisdiction under color of law a writ of habeas corpus should issue.	
• Because no jurisdictional basis for custody has been proffered or stated a writ of habeas corpus should issue	
• A writ of habeas corpus is a proper remedy because petitioner was deprived of his liberty without due process.	
• Because petitioners were the victims of barratry, maintenance and champerty a writ of habeas corpus should issue	
• A writ of habeas corpus is a proper remedy because custodians have engaged in prosecutorial vindictiveness; burden is upon respondents to rebut presumption	
<b>PETITIONERS AFFIDAVIT</b> - - - - -	<b>2 PAGES</b>

---

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS**

• Everette McKinley Dirkson United States Courthouse,  
219 S. Dearborn Street, Chicago, Illinois 60604 •

---

---

UNIFIED U.S. COMMON LAW GRAND JURY on behalf of  
Anthony Stefan Szach

Petitioner

- against -

Judge Jay W. Ukena, Elgin Mental Health Center

Respondents

---

**JURISDICTION:** Court of Record  
Federal Case No. 1776-1789-1791-  
2019

Chief Judge Rebecca R. Pallmeyer

**ACTION AT LAW<sup>1</sup>  
WRIT HABEAS CORPUS**

Originating Court      19<sup>th</sup> Judicial Circuit Court; Originating Court No: 17CM4210  
Court of Record:      Judicial Oversight – Unified United States Common Law Grand Jury  
United States District Court for the Northern District of New York  
445 Broadway, Albany, NY. 12207-2936  
Law Case No. 1776-1789-1791-2019; Depository Case No. 1:16-CV-1490

**Writ of Habeas Corpus Ad Testificandum<sup>2</sup>  
Order to Show Cause And Writ Certiorari<sup>3</sup>**

**NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN** to the Court and all interested parties that above Court of Origin is removed to the above said United States District Court of Record for Habeas Corpus for Cause in violation of Amendments IV, V, VI & VII. All said violations arose from the Bill of Rights and therefore, the proper venue for hearing a Habeas Corpus is an Article III Court that was vested with the jurisdiction via the Constitution for the United States of America.

---

<sup>1</sup> **AT LAW:** [Bouvier's] This phrase is used to point out that a thing is to be done according to the course of the common law; it is distinguished from a proceeding in equity.

<sup>2</sup> **HABEAS CORPUS AD TESTIFICANDUM:** At common law, the writ, meaning “you have the body to testify,” used to bring up a prisoner detained in a jail or prison to give evidence before the court. Hottle v. District Court in and for Clinton County, 233 Iowa 904, 11 N.W.2d 30, 34; 3 Bl. Comm. 130; 2 Tidd, Pr. 809. Ex parte Marmaduke, 91 Mo. 250, 4 S.W. 91, 60 Am.Rep. 250.

<sup>3</sup> **Writ Certiorari:** Latin meaning to be informed of; to be made certain in regard to; the name of a Writ of Review or Inquiry. Leonard v. Willcox, 101 Vt. 195, 142 A. 762, 766; Nissen v. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Stablemen & Helpers of America, 229 Iowa 1028, 295 N.W. 858.

Respondents violated petitioners unalienable Right<sup>4</sup> of Due Process,<sup>5</sup> unalienable Right to an untainted Grand Jury, unalienable Right to an Untainted Petit Jury, and unalienable Right to be heard in a Natural Law<sup>6</sup> Court of Record.

## JURISDICTION

Each federal judicial district court shall be a court of record known as the United States District Court for the district.<sup>7</sup> A court of record<sup>8</sup> is a judicial tribunal having attributes and exercising functions independently of the person of the magistrate designated generally to hold it and proceeds according to the course of common (natural) law.” Because the petitioner is detained by an inferior court “not of record” that has no subject matter or personam jurisdiction over the petitioner being unlawfully restrained by said court, without a lawful warrant from a competent court. Whereas, the petitioners’ restraint, under the color of law, by said inferior court violated petitioners’ unalienable right of due process protected under Amendment V.<sup>9</sup> Therefore the above said United States District Court of Record has jurisdiction in this case in “law” that arose under the Constitution,<sup>10</sup> petitioner has the unalienable right of habeas corpus.<sup>11</sup> The Common Law so permits the destruction of the abatement of nuisances by summary proceedings.<sup>12</sup>

## COURT IS TO TAKE JUDICIAL NOTICE

---

<sup>4</sup> **Declaration of Independence:** We 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.

<sup>5</sup> **Amendment V:** *No person shall be... deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law;*

<sup>6</sup> **Common Law** a/k/a Natural Law - As distinguished from law created by the enactment of legislatures [admiralty], the common law comprises the body of those principles and rules of action, relating to the government and security of persons and property, which derive their authority solely from usages and customs of immemorial antiquity, or from the judgments and decrees of the courts recognizing, affirming, and enforcing such usages and customs; and, in this sense, particularly the ancient unwritten law of England. [1 Kent, Comm. 492. *Western Union Tel. Co. v. Call Pub. Co.*, 21 S.Ct. 561, 181 U.S. 92, 45 L.Ed. 765; *Barry v. Port Jervis*, 72 N.Y.S. 104, 64 App. Div. 268; *U. S. v. Miller*, D.C.Wash., 236 F. 798, 800].

<sup>7</sup> **USC Title 28 §132:** Creation and composition of district courts: (a) There shall be in each judicial district a district court which shall be a court of record known as the United States District Court for the district.

<sup>8</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;

<sup>9</sup> **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, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the Militia, when in actual service in time of War or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offence to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.

<sup>10</sup> **Article III Section 2:** *The judicial power shall extend to all cases, in law and equity, arising under this Constitution...*

<sup>11</sup> **Article I Section 9 Clause 2:** *“The privilege of the writ of habeas corpus shall not be suspended, ...”*

<sup>12</sup> **DESTRUCTION OF THE ABATEMENT OF NUISANCES:** 16Am Jur 2d., Sec. 114 - As to the construction, with reference to Common Law, an important canon of construction is that constitutions must be construed to reference to the Common Law.” The Common Law, so permitted destruction of the abatement of nuisances by summary proceedings and it was never supposed that a constitutional provision was intended to interfere with this established principle and although there is no common law of the United States in a sense of a national customary law as distinguished from the common law of England, adopted in the several states. In interpreting the Federal Constitution, recourse may still be had to the aid of the Common Law of England. It has been said that without reference to the common law, the language of the Federal Constitution could not be understood.

This is a Natural Law Proceeding under the rules of common law and not a civil law proceeding. Rules are not law; rules are nothing more than prescribed conduct in a particular area. Furthermore, Congress wrote legislation under §2072(b) rendering rule 2 is of no force or effect and thereby null and void.

§2072(b) such rules shall not abridge, enlarge or modify any substantive right. All laws in conflict with such rules shall be of no further force or effect after such rules have taken effect.

The Rules Enabling Act and all construction of law upon it is TREASON, governments are instituted among Men, by the People, to secure rights. Whereas, neither congress nor the judiciary has the power or authority to abrogate the unalienable right of Natural Law, this would be Absolute Despotism!

Indictment of a 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, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law;*

Infamous crime - *“A crime punishable by imprisonment in the state prison or penitentiary, with or without hard labor, is an infamous crime, within the provision of the fifth amendment of the constitution that “no person shall be held to answer for a capital or otherwise infamous crime unless on a presentment or indictment of a grand jury.”<sup>13</sup> It is not the character of the crime but the nature of the punishment which renders the crime “infamous.”<sup>14</sup> “Whether an offense is infamous depends on the punishment which may be imposed therefor, not on the punishment which was imposed.”<sup>15</sup>*

Common Law Impartial Jury - Amendment VI: *In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury...* Amendment VII *In suits at common law ... the right of trial by jury shall be preserved...*

Law of the Land - Article VI Clause 2: *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.*

Fiction of Law - The 41<sup>st</sup> Congress acted without constitutional authority an act of fraud, conspiracy and subversion against the United States of America. Only the People can ordain and establish Law<sup>16</sup> and government.<sup>17</sup> Only the People are endowed by the Creator with certain unalienable rights, governments are not! Consequently all latter construction upon the Organic Act of 1871 is as null and

---

<sup>13</sup> Mackin v. U. S., 117 U.S. 348, 6 S.Ct. 777, 29 L. Ed. 909; Brede v. Powers, 263 U.S. 4, 44 S.Ct. 8, 68 L.Ed. 132.

<sup>14</sup> Weeks v. United States, C.C.A.N.Y., 216 F. 292, 298, L.R.A. 1915B, 651. But see Drazen v. New Haven Taxicab Co., 95 Conn. 500, 111 A. 861, 864.

<sup>15</sup> United States v. Moreland, 258 U.S. 433, 42 S.Ct. 368, 370, 66 L.Ed. 700; De Jianne v. U. S., C.C.A.N.J., 282 F. 737, 740; Le Clair v. White, 117 Me. 335, 104 A. 516, 517.

<sup>16</sup> **PREAMBLE:** “We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.”

<sup>17</sup> **GOVERNMENT:** “Republican Government; one in which the powers of sovereignty are vested in the people and are exercised by the people” In re Duncan, 139 U.S. 449, 11 S.Ct. 573, 35 L.Ed. 219; Minor v. Happersett, 88 U.S. (21 Wall.) 162, 22 L.Ed. 627. Black's Law Dictionary, Fifth Edition, p. 626,

void as the Act itself, any court resting upon the same is a de facto court<sup>18</sup> and any judge acting under such fiction of law<sup>19</sup> denies due process<sup>20</sup> and is acting in excess of their judicial authority<sup>21</sup> under color of law<sup>22</sup> thereby losing judicial immunity<sup>23</sup> and therefore, any judicial reliance upon the said act is injudicious.

Denial is Treason: The denial of Habeas Corpus is a denial of due process, protected by the 5<sup>th</sup> Amendment and specifically ordained and demanded by Article I Section 9 Clause 2 “*The privilege of the writ of habeas corpus shall not be suspended*” This is the well-known remedy for deliverance from illegal confinement, called by Sir William Blackstone “*the most celebrated writ in the English law, and the great and efficacious writ in all manner of illegal confinement.*” 3 Bl. Comm. 129. The “*great writ of liberty,*” issuing at common law out of courts of Chancery, King's Bench, Common Pleas, and Exchequer. Ex parte Kelly, 123 N.J.Eq. 489, 198 A. 203, 207.

### IT APPEARING THAT THE APPLICANT IS ENTITLED THERETO

Respondents are directed, in accordance with 28 USC §2243, to forthwith release Petitioner(s) from custody. If Petitioner(s) are not forthwith released from custody, then within **THREE (3) CALENDAR DAYS** after service of this Writ, Respondents shall make a Return, certifying the true nature and cause of the detention; and, shall show cause why the Writ should not be granted; faxing the same to (888) 891-8977 no later than 5pm on the last day of the above-stated, three-day (3) period allowed for response.

---

<sup>18</sup> **DE FACTO GOVERNMENT**: One that maintains itself by a display of force against the will of the rightful legal government and is successful, at least temporarily, in overturning the institutions of the rightful legal government by setting up its own in lieu thereof. *Wortham v. Walker*, 133 Tex. 255, 128 S.W.2d 1138, 1145.

<sup>19</sup> **FICTION OF LAW**: Something known to be false is assumed to be true. *Ryan v. Motor Credit Co.*, 130 N.J.Eq. 531, 23 A.2d 607, 621. 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]. A rule of law which assumes as true, and will not allow to be disproved, something which is false, but not impossible. *Best, Ev.* 419.

<sup>20</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>21</sup> **EXCESS OF JUDICIAL AUTHORITY**: Acts in excess of judicial authority constitutes misconduct, particularly where a judge deliberately disregards the requirements of fairness and due process. [*Cannon v. Commission on Judicial Qualifications*, (1975) 14 Cal. 3d 678, 694]; Society's commitment to institutional justice requires that judges be solicitous of the rights of persons who come before the court. [*Geiler v. Commission on Judicial Qualifications*, (1973) 10 Cal.3d 270, 286].

<sup>22</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).

<sup>23</sup> **JUDICIAL IMMUNITY**: “.. the particular phraseology of the constitution of the United States confirms and strengthens the principle, supposed to be essential to all written constitutions, that a law repugnant to the constitution is void, and that courts, as well as other departments, are bound by that instrument.” ... “In declaring what shall be the supreme law of the land, the Constitution itself is first mentioned; and not the laws of the United States generally, but those only which shall be made in pursuance of the Constitution, have that rank.” ... “All law (rules and practices) which are repugnant to the Constitution are VOID.” ... Since the 14th Amendment to the Constitution states “NO State (Jurisdiction) shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the rights, privileges, or immunities of citizens of the United States nor deprive any citizens of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law, ... or equal protection under the law,” this renders judicial immunity unconstitutional. *Marbury v. Madison*, 5 U.S. (2 Cranch) 137, 180 (1803); There is a general rule that a ministerial officer who acts wrongfully, although in good faith, is nevertheless liable in a civil action and cannot claim the immunity of the sovereign. *Cooper v. O'Conner*, 99 F.2d 133.

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. These provisions are based largely upon the Magna C[h]arta, 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 C[h]arta 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 C[h]arta; and, such constitutional provision has been held to prohibit the selling of justice, not merely by magistrates, but by the State itself.

Respondents shall mail the Return by United States Post Office their response within three days to the petitioner/next friend and fax a copy of the same to the Grand Jury at (888) 891-8977. The Return must be signed, and sworn to by the person making the same; and, except when such person is a sworn public officer, and makes such Return in his official capacity, it must be verified by their oath. The applicant, or the person detained, may, under oath, deny any of the facts set forth in the Return, or allege any other material facts. Respondents must each state in their Return under oath, plainly and unequivocally:

- 1) Whether or not they have the party, herein-named as petitioner, in their custody, or under their power, or restraint.
- 2) If they have the party in their custody, or power, or under his restraint, they must state the authority, and cause of such imprisonment, or restraint.
- 3) If the party is detained by virtue of any sworn Writ, Warrant, or other written authority, a sworn copy thereof must be annexed to the Return; and, the original produced, and exhibited to the Court, or Magistrate on the Hearing of such Return. All unsworn documentary evidence will be refused for cause as hearsay.
- 4) If the person upon whom the Writ is served had the party in their power, or custody, or under their restraint at any time prior, or subsequent to the date of the Writ of Habeas Corpus; but, has transferred such custody, or restraint to another, the Return must state particularly to whom, at what time and place, for what cause, and by what authority such transfer took place.
- 5) The Return, and all suggestions made against it, may be amended, by leave of court, before, or after being filed.
- 6) When the Writ or Order is returned, a day shall be set for a Hearing that is not more than three (3) days after the Return, unless for good cause additional time is allowed.
- 7) Provide proof of jurisdiction for the originating court.
- 8) Does the originating court proceed by statutes and rules or does the originating court proceed according to natural law?



- 9) Because the Petition presents issues of fact, as well as issues of law, if Petitioner(s) are constrained by actual physical force, then the Jailer is required to produce, at the Hearing, the body of the person detained.
- 10) Was an Indictment procured without the signature of a Grand Jury Foreman?
- 11) Did a Grand Jury answer a questionnaire before being chosen? If so, provide a copy.
- 12) Was a petit jury instructed that statute violations are law?
  - a. Was documented proof of a crime submitted to a jury? If so, provide a copy.
  - b. Was a petit jury advised of their unalienable right of nullification?
  - c. Did jury members answer a questionnaire before being chosen? If so, provide a copy.
- 13) Are there any Affidavits from a witness? If so, provide a copy.
- 14) Are there any Affidavits from an injured party? If so, provide a copy.
- 15) Answer all charges in petitioner's Petition, attached.
- 16) Rebut petitioners Affidavit, attached.
- 17) True or false concerning the originating court:
  - a. proceeded according to equity and not Natural Law,
  - b. is holding the petitioner to answer without an indictment,
  - c. the petitioner was tried by a untainted common law petit jury of 12 People,
  - d. a Petit Jury answer a questionnaire before being chosen? If so, provide a copy,
  - e. the court proceeded in jurisdictions unknown, if not state the jurisdiction,
  - f. is a Court of Record,
  - g. is an equity court,

The Court is to notify petitioner/next friend by mail and phone and the Grand Jury by fax (888) 891-8977 to inform them as to the time and date of the Hearing to be held at the above-said courthouse.


At the Hearing, the Chief Judge shall summarily hear and determine the facts, shall dispose of the matter as law and justice require under the rules of common law as provided for under 16 American Jurisprudence 2d., Sec. 114, and not chancery, and shall mail by United States Post Office a certified copy of decision immediately (within 24 hours) to the petitioner/next friend, and fax a copy of the same to the Grand Jury at (888) 891-8977.

The Chief Judge shall state clearly on the record proving a court of record jurisdiction.

If respondents default and therefore no hearing then the Chief Judge shall confirm release of petitioner(s) and abatement of the originating court and inform by United States Post Office a certified copy of decision immediately (within 24 hours) to the petitioner/next friend and fax a copy of the same to the Grand Jury at (888) 891-8977.

Seal

November 12, 2019



Grand Jury Foreman

---

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

• 445 Broadway, Albany, NY. 12207-2936 •

---

**TO:** Administrator Grand Jury Foreman  
Unified United States Common Law Grand Jury  
P.O. Box 59; Valhalla, New York 10595; Fax: (888) 891-8977;

Court of Record: Judicial Oversight – Unified United States Common Law Grand Jury  
Law Case No. 1776-1789-1791-2019; Depository Case No. 1:16-CV-1490

Anthony Stefan Szach, Petitioner  
7559 Mellon Court, Gurnee, Illinois 60031,

Gary B. Will, Next Friend acting on behalf of petitioner, Rule 17, 28 U.S.C.  
P.O. Box 494, Wadsworth, Illinois 60031; Phone: 847-903-4561

**RE:** 19<sup>th</sup> Judicial Circuit Court, de facto  
Lake County Courthouse, 18 County Street, Waukegan, Illinois 60085  
Case No: 17CM4210

**PETITION FOR HABEAS CORPUS FOR CAUSE<sup>1</sup>**

**COMES NOW** Anthony Stefan Szach, one of the People of Illinois, hereinafter petitioner, in this court of record under Article III, Section 2, of the Constitution, whereby the judicial power shall extend to all cases in law arising under the Constitution; and, Article IV, Section 4, whereby the United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a Republican Form of Government; and, shall protect each of them against invasion of rights. The jurisdiction being the SUPREME LAW OF THE LAND under Article VI, Clause 2, petitioner hereby petitions the Unified United States Common Law Grand Jury,<sup>2</sup> hereinafter judicial tribunal,<sup>3</sup> for the right of Writ of Habeas Corpus<sup>4</sup> to inquire into the cause of imprisonment and restraint of Liberty of said petitioner who is not subject to the jurisdiction of the aforementioned respondents/custodians:

---

<sup>1</sup> **FOR CAUSE:** Means for reasons; which law and public policy recognize as sufficient warrant for removal; and, such cause is “legal cause”; and, not merely a cause which the appointing power in the exercise of discretion may deem sufficient. State ex rel. Nagle v. Sullivan, 98 Mont. 425, 40 P.2d 995, 998, 99 A.L.R. 321.

<sup>2</sup> The sureties of the peace of faithful service: Magna Carta, paragraph 49.

<sup>3</sup> 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, 229; Ex parte Gladhill, 8 Metc. Mass., 171, per Shaw, C.J.; Ledwith v. Rosalsky, 244 N.Y. 406, 155 N.E. 688, 689; Black's 4<sup>th</sup>, 425, 426.

<sup>4</sup> The privilege of the Writ of Habeas Corpus shall not be suspended.

## **PETITIONER MAY PROSECUTE A WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS TO INQUIRE INTO THE CAUSE OF THE RESTRAINT**

- 1) Application for a Writ of Habeas Corpus shall be in writing, signed, and verified by the person for whose relief it is intended; or, by someone acting on his behalf. 28 U.S.C. §2242.
- 2) Every person unlawfully committed, detained, confined, or restrained of his Liberty or Property, under any pretense whatsoever, may prosecute a Writ of Habeas Corpus to inquire into the cause of such imprisonment or restraint.

*“In the United States Habeas Corpus exists in two forms: Common Law and Statutory. The Constitution for the United States of America acknowledges the Peoples’ right to the common law of England as it was in 1789. It does not consist of absolute, fixed and inflexible rules; but, broad and comprehensive principles based on justice, reason, and common sense...” Miller v. Monsen, 37 N.W.2d 543, 547, 228 Minn. 400.*

**28 U.S.C. §2243:** Issuance of Writ; Return; Hearing; Decision: A court justice, or court judge [tribunal] entertaining an Application for a Writ of Habeas Corpus, **shall forthwith award the Writ**; or, issue an Order directing the respondents to show cause why the Writ should not be granted; unless it appears from the Application that the applicant, or person detained, is not entitled thereto. The Writ, or Order to Show Cause, shall be directed to the person having custody of the person detained. It shall be returned within three (3) days.

The privilege of the Writ of Habeas Corpus shall not be suspended... United States Constitution, Article I, Section 9.

- 3) This Habeas Corpus is prosecuted because the taking of the People into custody was without due process in a court of law, a/k/a court of record. The respondents’ court acted under statutes; and, therefore, was not a court of record; but, rather, a nisi prius court. Thereby jurisdiction was fraudulently acquired without petitioner volunteering, or knowingly agreeing to the proceeding.
- 4) Petitioner was not indicted by an unbiased common law grand jury, if Respondents gathered a biased statutory jury; a jury not under common law; a jury under a court not of record, i.e., not at law<sup>5</sup> it would be a jury which has no power to fine or imprison.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> **AT LAW:** This phrase is used to point out that a thing is to be done according to the course of the common law; it is distinguished from a proceeding in equity. Blacks 4<sup>th</sup>.

<sup>6</sup> **COURTS OF RECORD and COURTS NOT OF RECORD:** “...the former [Courts of Record] being those whose acts and judicial proceedings are enrolled, or recorded, for a perpetual memory and testimony; and, which have power to fine or imprison for contempt. Error lies to their judgments; and, they generally possess a seal. Courts Not of Record are those of inferior dignity, which have no power to fine or imprison; and, in which the proceedings are not enrolled or recorded.” 3 Bl. Comm. 24; 3 Steph. Comm. 383; The Thomas Fletcher, C.C.Ga.,

- 5) No State can deprive any person of life, Liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor, deny any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws. Any court that ignores due process is not a common law court. Such action of a court that deprives or denies due process of law proves that court to be unlawful; and, consequently, having no legal authority over the petitioner without his consent.

Pursuant to Supreme Court Annotated Statute: *“The State citizen is immune from any and all government attacks and procedure.”* Dred Scott v. Sanford, 60 U.S. 19 How. 393. The Supreme Court has stated clearly: *“...every man is independent of all laws, except those prescribed by nature. He is not bound by any institutions formed by his fellowmen [fellowman] without his consent.”* Cruden v. Neale, 2 N.C. 338 2 S.E. 70.

- 6) The nisi prius court is, in fact, a nisi prius court falsa because respondents have taken unlawful dominion of petitioner so as to deprive him of his court of law. Petitioner should be immediately released so that he may return to the jurisdiction of his own court. Any charges of incompetence are fraud on the court. See Affidavit(s) attached.
- 7) Petitioner herein declares: He has seen no sworn documentary evidence from a competent fact witness to lawfully assert a challenge to his competency as one of the People; no servant has the authority to declare differently without evidence in a court of law; government servants cannot restrain or incarcerate people because they disagree with them.

Any constitutional provision intended to confer a benefit should be liberally construed in favor of the clearly intended and expressly designated beneficiary. *“Then [that] a constitution should receive a literal interpretation in favor of the Citizen is especially true with respect to those provisions which were designed to safeguard the Liberty and security of the Citizen in regard to person and property.”* 16Am Jur 2d, Sec. 97; Byars v. United States, 273 U.S. 128.

- 9) <sup>8)</sup> Petitioner has been subjected to unlawful imprisonment or restraint. Petitioner is thus petitioning [through his authorized agent, his next friend], for a Writ of Habeas Corpus to demand that his Liberty be restored.

---

24 F. 481; Ex parte Thistleton, 52 Cal 225; Erwin v. U.S., D.C.Ga., 37 F. 488, 2 L.R.A. 229; Heininger v. Davis, 96 Ohio St. 205, 117 N.E. 229, 231.

**BECAUSE THE RESPONDENTS' COURT SHOULD HAVE BEEN  
A COURT OF RECORD BUT INSTEAD FRAUDULENTLY  
CONCEALED ITS JURISDICTION UNDER COLOR OF LAW  
A WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS SHOULD ISSUE**

- 10) The Constitution for the United States of America, Article III, Section I, grants that judges, both of the Supreme and inferior courts, shall hold their offices during good behavior.<sup>7</sup> No judge may act without jurisdiction; and, all lawful jurisdictions must be ordained and established<sup>8</sup> by the People.
- 11) The Constitution for the United States of America, Article IV, Section 4, guarantees a Republican Form of Government,<sup>9</sup> and protection against domestic Violence. When a judge enforces acts beyond his authority under color of law,<sup>10</sup> judicial immunity is lost.<sup>11</sup> Such actions are nothing less than lawless violence.<sup>12</sup> Likewise, legislative jurisdiction that is not authorized by the United States Constitution is as inoperative as though it had never been passed;<sup>13</sup> and, judges proceeding without jurisdiction are indictable for treason.<sup>14</sup> Judges are expected to know the law.
- 12) The Constitution for the United States of America, Article III, Section 2, authorizes two (2) jurisdictions: Law and Equity.<sup>15</sup> A court of equity follows the forms and procedure of

---

<sup>7</sup> **GOOD BEHAVIOR:** “Good behavior” means conduct that is authorized by law. “Bad behavior” means conduct such as the law will punish. *State v. Hardin*, 183 N.C. 815, 112 S.E. 593, 594; *Orderly and Lawful Conduct*. *Huysler v. Com.*, 25 Ky.L. Rep. 608, 76 S.W. 175; *In re Spenser*, 22 Fed.Cas. 921; “Good behavior” means conduct conformable to law; or, to the particular law theretofore breached. *Ex parte Hamm*, 24 N.M. 33, 172 P. 190, 191, L.R. A.1918D, 694; *Baker v. Commonwealth*, 181 Ky. 437, 205 S.W. 399, 401.

<sup>8</sup> **U.S. CONSTITUTION, PREAMBLE:** “*We the people of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.*”

<sup>9</sup> **U.S. CONSTITUTION, ARTICLE IV, SECTION 4:** “*The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a Republican Form of Government; and, shall protect each of them against Invasion; and, on Application of the Legislature, or of the Executive (when the Legislature cannot be convened) against domestic Violence.*”

<sup>10</sup> **COLOR OF LAW:** The appearance or semblance of legal right without the substance. Black's 4<sup>th</sup>; *State v. Brechler*, 185 Wis. 599, 202 N.W. 144, 148; “*Misuse of power [is power] possessed by virtue of State law; and, [is] made possible only because [the] wrongdoer is clothed with authority of State; [and,] is action taken under ‘color of State law’.*” *Atkins v. Lanning*, 415 F. Supp. 186, 188.

<sup>11</sup> “*When a judge knows that he lacks jurisdiction, or acts in the face of clearly valid statutes expressly depriving him of jurisdiction, judicial immunity is lost.*” *Rankin v. Howard*, (1980) 633 F.2d 844, cert. den.; *Zeller v. Rankin*, 101 S.Ct. 2020, 451 U.S. 939, 68 L.Ed 2d 326.

<sup>12</sup> “*No judicial process, whatever form it may assume, can have any lawful authority outside of the limits of the jurisdiction of the court or judge by whom it is issued; and, an attempt to enforce it beyond these boundaries is nothing less than lawless violence.*” *Ableman v. Booth*, 21 Howard 506 (1859).

<sup>13</sup> “*An unconstitutional act is not law; it confers no right; it imposes no duties; it affords no protection; it creates no office; it is, in legal contemplation, as inoperative as though it had never been passed.*” *Norton v. Shelby County*, 118 U.S. 425 p.442.

<sup>14</sup> “*We (judges) have no more right to decline the exercise of jurisdiction which is given, than to usurp that which is not given. The one or the other would be treason to the Constitution.*” *Cohen v. Virginia* (1821) 6 Wheat. 264; *U.S. v. Will*, 449 U.S. 200.

<sup>15</sup> **U.S. CONSTITUTION, ARTICLE III, SECTION 2:** 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.

chancery as distinguished from common law.<sup>16</sup> A “court of equity” and a “court of chancery” are synonymous.<sup>17</sup> A court of law means court of common law,<sup>18</sup> a court for the People. In alleged<sup>19</sup> criminal cases, when judges claim that they are bound by legislation authorized by the Constitution as they act under equity, rather than law, they commit fraud on the court. The Law of the Land is common law,<sup>20</sup> not equity; and, judges in every State are bound thereby.

13) Statutory courts are nisi prius<sup>21</sup> courts; courts not of record; courts proceeding according to statutes. They have no power to fine or imprison; and, to do so is a crime. Courts of law are courts of record and proceed according to common law. Petitioner was falsely charged; petitioner objects to the nisi prius court herein on the record in writing, thereby rejecting statutory jurisdiction; and, proceeds according to common law.

14) Under Common Law the following maxims apply:

*“For there to be a crime, there must to be a victim (corpus delicti). In the absence of a victim there can be no crime.”*

*“For a crime to exist there must be an injured party. There can be no sanction or penalty imposed upon one because of this exercise of Constitutional rights.”*  
Sherar v. Cullen, 481 F. 945.

15) Constitutions must be construed to reference the common law; summary proceedings are null and void.<sup>22</sup> *“As to the construction with reference to Common Law, an important canon of*

---

<sup>16</sup> **COURT OF EQUITY:** A court which has jurisdiction in equity; which administers justice and decides controversies in accordance with the rules, principles, and precedents of equity; and, which follows the forms and procedure of chancery; as distinguished from a court having the jurisdiction, rules, principles, and practice of the common law. Thomas v. Phillips, 4 Smedes & M., Miss., 423.

<sup>17</sup> **“EQUITY” and “CHANCERY”:** “Court of Equity” and “Court of Chancery” are constantly used as synonymous in the United States. It is presumed that this custom arises from the circumstance that the equity jurisdiction, which is exercised by the courts of the various States, is assimilated to that possessed by the English courts of chancery. Indeed, in some of the States, it is made identical therewith by statute, so far as conformable to our institutions. Wagner v. Armstrong, 93 Ohio St. 443, 113 N.E. 397, 401.

<sup>18</sup> **AT LAW:** Is used to point out that a thing is to be done according to the course of the common law; it is distinguished from a proceeding in equity. Black’s 4<sup>th</sup>.

<sup>19</sup> *“The law itself is on trial quite as much as the cause which is to be decided.”* Harlan F. Stone, 12<sup>th</sup> Chief Justice U.S. Supreme Court, 1941.

<sup>20</sup> **U.S. CONSTITUTION, ARTICLE VI:** 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.

<sup>21</sup> **NISI PRIUS:** Where courts bearing the name “nisi prius” exist in the United States, they are instituted by statutory provision. “Nisi prius” is a Latin term. “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 prius 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. Bouvier’s Law; Black’s 5<sup>th</sup>.

<sup>22</sup> **SUMMARY PROCEEDINGS:** Summary proceedings are those matters, which when in dispute, are decided without the intervention of a jury. Summary proceedings must be authorized by the legislature; except, perhaps, in cases of contempt, because summary proceedings are unknown to the common law. When cases are to be adjudged

*construction is that constitutions must be construed to reference to the Common Law.’ The Common Law permitted destruction of the abatement of nuisances by summary proceedings; and, it was never supposed that a constitutional provision was intended to interfere with this established principle; and, there is no common law of the United States in a sense of a national customary law as distinguished from the common law of England, adopted in the several States. In interpreting the Federal Constitution, recourse may still be had to the aid of the Common Law of England. It has been said that without reference to the common law, the language of the Federal Constitution could not be understood.” 16Am Jur 2d, Sec. 114.*

16) Respondent Judge acted without constitutional authority, thereby without jurisdiction and under color of law, using unconstitutional statutes and summary proceedings that are null and void under common law. Furthermore, respondent Judge refused to identify the jurisdiction he was operating under, which clearly was not under common law; and, therefore, was under statute, a court not of record, a court without the power to imprison, a court without the consent of petitioner, a court thereby acting under fraud; therefore, a Writ of Habeas Corpus should issue.

**BECAUSE NO JURISDICTIONAL BASIS FOR  
CUSTODY HAS BEEN PROFFERED OR STATED  
A WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS SHOULD ISSUE**

17) Broad Meaning of Jurisdiction on Habeas Corpus: For purposes of the Writ of Habeas Corpus, as for purposes of prohibition or certiorari, the term “jurisdiction” is not limited to its fundamental meaning; and, in such proceedings, judicial acts may be restrained or annulled if they are determined to be in excess of the court’s powers, as defined by constitutional provision, statute, or rules developed by courts.

18) The Liberty of the People is restrained by the CUSTODIANS:

- a. Petitioner is in custody by color of the authority of the de facto court, and/or the custodians; and, is or was committed for trial before some court thereof. 28 U.S.C. §2241(c)(1).
- b. Petitioner is in custody, in violation of the Constitution or laws of the United States. 28 U.S.C. §2241(c)(3).

19) Although the true cause of custody of petitioner has not been stated by the respondents, petitioner, on information received, believes that the claim of authority is under color of law, in violation of the constitutions of the State, and the United States of America. The true basis for jurisdiction by the custodians has never been proffered or stated. Petitioner, as one of the People, has never knowingly or voluntarily agreed to such jurisdiction. Petitioner has disputed, and continues to dispute, any false allegation that he has so agreed.

---

promptly, without any unnecessary form, the proceedings are said to be summary. In no case can the party be tried summarily, unless such a proceeding is authorized by legislative authority; except, perhaps, in the case of contempt, because the common law is a stranger to such a mode of trial. Bovier’s Law; 4 Bl. Com. 280; 20 Vin. Ab. 42; Boscawen on Conv.; Paley on Convict.; vide Convictions.

- 20) The jurisdictional facts leading up to the custody and restraint are unknown to the petitioner. The jurisdictional facts by which the custodians presume authority to continue to deprive the petitioner of his court are unknown to the petitioner.
- 21) The petitioner, on information and belief, alleges that the custodians are funded in whole or in part by the STATE. Thus motivated, they are acting under color of law as contractual agents of their principal, the STATE.
- 22) The court lacks Personam Jurisdiction because it proceeds under statutes; is, therefore, a nisi prius court not of record; and, does not have petitioner's consent.
- 23) Petitioner did not consent; and, therefore, is immune from any and all government attacks and procedures.<sup>23</sup>
- 24) Petitioner is independent of all laws, except those prescribed by nature; and, is not bound by any institutions formed by his fellowman without petitioner's consent.<sup>24</sup>
- 25) The custodians do not state, and the proceedings do not show, any lawful authority or jurisdictional facts enabling the custodians to lawfully take dominion over a People of this State. Lacking such jurisdiction, their actions can only be under color of law, violating due process, in order to execute their own private agendas, whatever those may be. Therefore, a Writ of Habeas Corpus should issue.

**A WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS IS A PROPER REMEDY BECAUSE  
PETITIONER WAS DEPRIVED OF HIS LIBERTY WITHOUT DUE PROCESS**

- 26) Respondents proceeded as a court of equity, which is not a court of record; and, therefore, had no power to imprison petitioner.

**Confirmatio Cartarum:**<sup>25</sup> *"...sovereign People shall not be taken, or imprisoned, or disseised, or outlawed, or exiled, or anywise destroyed... but by lawful judgment of his peers or by the law of the land."* Magna Carta, Chapter 39, sometimes referred to as Chapter 29.

- 27) Petitioner responded *obsta principiis*<sup>26</sup> from the beginning; and/or, continues the same, against said first of all courts not of record, state or federal.
- 28) Petitioner was denied due process of law, which denial of due process of law, violated petitioner's unalienable rights as protected by the 5<sup>th</sup> Amendment:

---

<sup>23</sup> **SUPREME COURT ANNOTATED STATUTE:** *"The state citizen is immune from any and all government attacks and procedure."* Cruden v. Neale, 2 N.C. 338 2 S.E. 70; Dred Scott v. Sanford, 60 U.S. 19 How. 393.

<sup>24</sup> *"...every man is independent of all laws, except those prescribed by nature. He is not bound by any institutions formed by his fellowman without his consent."* Cruden v. Neale, 2 N.C. 338 May Term 1796.

<sup>25</sup> **CONFIRMATIO CARTARUM 1297:** The Magna Carta must be accepted as the common law by government. The Magna Carta is the supreme law. All other contrary law and judgments are void.

<sup>26</sup> **OBSTA PRINCIPIIS:** (Latin) Withstand beginnings; resist the first approaches or encroachments. J. Bradley, Boyd v. U.S., 116 U.S. 635, 6 S.Ct. 535, 29 L.Ed. 746.



*“No person shall be... deprived of life, Liberty, or property, without due process of law. 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; *“Law in its regular course of administration through courts of justice [courts of record] is due process.”* Leeper v. Texas, 139 U.S. 462, 11 S.Ct. Rep 577, 35 L.Ed 225.

29) Petitioner was deprived of his unalienable right of due process in a “court of law”, a/k/a common law, as secured by the 5<sup>th</sup> Amendment; and, therefore, a Writ of Habeas Corpus should issue.

**BECAUSE PETITIONERS WERE THE VICTIMS OF  
BARRATRY, MAINTENANCE AND CHAMPERTY  
A WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS SHOULD ISSUE**

30) Petitioners charge all respondents with conspiracy to execute common barratry<sup>27</sup>, maintenance<sup>28</sup> and champerty.<sup>29</sup>

**A WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS IS A PROPER REMEDY BECAUSE  
CUSTODIANS HAVE ENGAGED IN PROSECUTORIAL VINDICTIVENESS;  
BURDEN IS UPON RESPONDENTS TO REBUT PRESUMPTION**

- 31) The incarceration, detainment, confinement, or restraint was vindictive because petitioner refused to cooperate statutory proceedings and demands common law.
- 32) Respondents conspired to break him through restraint or incarceration.
- 33) The court not of record that has no power to restrain, imprison, take property or fine and/or is holding petitioner for the action of the statutorily instructed and reactive grand jury.
- 34) Petitioner objects to the jurisdiction and process of the court not of record.
- 35) The court not of record that has no power to restrain, imprison, take property or fine; and, in violation of its own corporate charter, has, therefore, unlawfully restrained the liberty or property of petitioner.

---

<sup>27</sup> **BARRATRY:** In criminal law. Also spelled "Barretry." The offense of frequently exciting and stirring up quarrels and suits, either at law or otherwise. 4 Bla.Com. 134; State v. Batson, 220 N.C. 411, 17 S.E.2d 511, 512, 513.; "Common barratry is the practice of exciting groundless judicial proceedings." Pen.Code Cal. § 158; Lucas v. Pico, 55 Cal. 128; Corn. v. McCulloch, 15 Mass. 229; Ex parte McCloskey, 82 Tex.Cr.R. 531, 199 S.W. 1101, 1102.

<sup>28</sup> **MAINTENANCE:** consists in maintaining, supporting, or promoting the litigation of another.; "Act of maintaining, keeping up, supporting; livelihood; means of sustenance." Federal Land Bank of St. Louis v. Miller, 184 Ark. 415, 42 S.W.2d 564, 566.

<sup>29</sup> **CHAMPERTY:** is a bargain to divide the proceeds of litigation between the owner of the liquidated claim and a party supporting or enforcing the litigation. Draper v. Lebec, 219 Ind. 362, 37 N.E.2d 952, 956.; A bargain by a stranger with a party to a suit, by which such third person undertakes to carry on the litigation at his own cost and risk, in consideration of receiving, if successful, a part of the proceeds or subject sought to be recovered. Small v. Mott, 22 Wend., N.Y., 405; Gilman v. Jones, 87 Ala. 691, 5 So. 785, 7 So. 48, 4 L.R.A. 113; Jamison Coal & Coke Co. v. Goltra, C.C.A.Mo., 143 F.2d 889, 895, 154 A.L.R. 1191.; The purchase of an interest in a thing in dispute, with the object of maintaining and taking part in the litigation. 7 Bing. 378.

- 36) Respondents, in violation of 18 U.S.C. §241,<sup>30</sup> 18 U.S.C. §242,<sup>31</sup> 42 U.S.C. §1983,<sup>32</sup> and, 42 U.S.C. §1985,<sup>33</sup> exceeded their jurisdiction; acted under color of law, using statutes to willfully subject petitioner to retaliatory incarceration and/or restraint while conspiring to deprive petitioner of his rights; and, acted to injure, oppress, threaten, and intimidate petitioner in an attempt to prevent the free exercise and enjoyment of petitioner's unalienable rights of Liberty and due process.
- 37) Respondents, in violation of 18 U.S.C. §2382,<sup>34</sup> acted treasonously when they imprisoned or restrained petitioner and concealed both their actions and the hidden-court, bond-chattel, moneymaking enterprise operating under color of law; all acting knowingly in concert, with none dissenting.
- 38) Demand is now made to make full material fact disclosure; to see financial books of the Court Registry Investment System; make disclosure of the bid bond, payment bond, and the performance bond underwritten against this case; and, make an offer of proof in the aforesaid matters. Demand is also made to show how the court is not profiteering by way of petitioner's incarceration; show with clean hands how it does not have a strong financial interest to incarcerate the petitioner, and deprive petitioner of his constitutionally-protected due process rights; and, further explain how the court is not operating constitutionally infirm, and committing honest services fraud against We the People.
- 39) Respondents exceeded their authority, thereby acting under color of law to injure petitioner.
- 40) Petitioner has not waived common law venue; and, insists on proceeding in a court of record, which is petitioner's unalienable right.
- 41) Petitioner maintains his position as a natural [wo]man, and not a person or corporation.

---

<sup>30</sup> **18 U.S.C. §241 CONSPIRACY AGAINST RIGHTS:** If two (2) or more persons conspire to injure, oppress, threaten, or intimidate any person, in any State, in the free exercise or enjoyment of any right, they shall be fined under this title, or imprisoned not more than ten (10) years, or both.

<sup>31</sup> **18 U.S.C. §242 DEPRIVATION OF RIGHTS UNDER COLOR OF LAW:** Whoever, under color of any law, statute, ordinance, regulation, or custom, willfully subjects any person, in any State... to the deprivation of any rights... shall be fined under this title, or imprisoned not more than one (1) year, or both.

<sup>32</sup> **42 U.S.C. §1983 CIVIL ACTION FOR DEPRIVATION OF RIGHTS:** Every person who, under color of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage, of any State... subjects, or causes to be subjected, any... person within the jurisdiction thereof, to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws, shall be liable to the party injured in an action at law.

<sup>33</sup> **42 U.S.C. §1985 CONSPIRACY TO INTERFERE WITH CIVIL RIGHTS:** If two (2) or more persons in any State or Territory conspire for the purpose of depriving, either directly or indirectly, [of] any rights, the party so injured or deprived may have an action for the recovery of damages against any one (1) or more of the conspirators.

<sup>34</sup> **18 U.S.C. §2382 MISPRISION OF TREASON:** Whoever having knowledge of treason, conceals, and does not make known the same to some judge, is guilty of treason for contempt against the sovereign; and, shall be fined under this title, or imprisoned not more than seven (7) years, or both.

This application for a Writ of Habeas Corpus is signed by petitioner or on behalf of petitioner by Next Friend, acting on petitioners' behalf.<sup>35</sup> 28 U.S.C. §2242.

**Next Friend:** *"A next friend is a person who represents someone who is unable to tend to his or her own interest."* Federal Rules of Civil Procedures Rule 17, 28 U.S.C.A.

---

Date: November 5, 2019

---

<sup>35</sup> **NEXT FRIEND:** Based on Title 28 U.S.C. §454 1940 ed. (R.S. §754). Words *"or by someone acting in his behalf"* were added. This follows the actual practice of the courts, as set forth in *United States ex rel. Funaro v. Watchorn*, C.C. 1908, 164 F. 152; *Collins v. Traeger*, C.C.A. 1928, 27 F.2d 842, and cases cited.

## **Affidavit of Gary B. Will**

I, Gary B. Will, Affiant, being of lawful age, qualified and competent to testify to, and having firsthand knowledge of the following facts, do hereby swear that the following facts are true, correct and not misleading:

On or about November 4, 2015, Anthony Stefan Szach was stopped by officer Kelly of the Lake Villa Police Department for traveling in his 1989 Ford F-150 on an Illinois roadway without license plates. Officer Kelly asked Anthony why there were no license plates on his vehicle and asked for proof of insurance and his drivers' license, Anthony stated that he did not follow said policies. Anthony stated that he did not use plates or license for non-commercial use. Officer Kelly after some discussion asked Anthony to step out of the vehicle. Anthony refused and stated "does not consent" and asked Kelly why he had stopped him and for what crime. Officer Kelly, responded for not having plates, license, and insurance. Other officers started arriving and blocked his vehicle and after further discussion with officer Lindberg requesting the same information Anthony was again asked to get out of his vehicle. When Anthony refused to step out of his vehicle Officer Lindberg swung a baton night stick and broke out the driver's side window. Anthony then submitted under duress and the truck was searched and towed away. In the police report they used the term "Sovereign Citizen".

On or about November 30, 2015, Anthony Stefan Szach had his first court date with Judge Charles D. Johnson. After Anthony stated he was not a fiction citizen and not making a plea; Judge Johnson made a plea of not guilty without his consent. Anthony Stefan Szach stated the judge did not have authority to make that decision and demanded a continuance. Judge Johnson stepped down on his own will and was not present in any other appearance by Anthony.

On or about December 10, 2015 to around May 21, 2016, Judge John D. Skully presided.

On or about May 21, 2016, Judge Skully stated in open court that he recognized Anthony's right to travel but denied his Writ of Error and stated would reconsider the Motion for Dismissal.

On or about June 5, 2016 until about July 14, 2016, Judge Mark L. Levitt presided.

On or about June 5, 2016, Anthony moved for dismissal for no sworn complaint from the prosecutor. The prosecutor requested a continuance to consult with the state. Anthony objected citing undue delay. Judge Levitt overruled/denied. At the next court date, the prosecutor asked for continuance and Judge Levitt granted it.

On or about July 30, 2016 until present; Deputy Chief Judge Jay W. Ukena has presided.

On or about January 6, 2017. a warrant was issued.

On or about March 23, 2017, officers from Gurnee Police Department came to Anthony's place of residence to arrest him as a result of Anthony missing a court appearance.

On or about March 23. 2017 at around 8:30 P.M., three Gurnee Police Department officers and a canine showed up at Anthony Stefan Szach's parents' residence. Anthony opened the door and during discussion asked to see the arrest warrant. The officers stated that Anthony Stefan Szach matched the appearance on the

driver's license and asked Anthony to step outside. Anthony stated he didn't consent and asked to see the warrant. Officer Yencich, stated he didn't have the warrant with him and that they did not have to show it. Officer Yencich stated it was a bench warrant for missing a court date and could view it at the station. Anthony then ordered them to leave the premises as he did not consent because they did not produce the warrant. Anthony then attempted to shut the door and Officer Yencich put his foot in the open door and forced his way in and the other officers followed. A scuffle ensued that created minor injuries for Anthony Stefan Szach and one or more of the officers. After being hit with a night stick, sprayed with a pepper type spray, and being blinded for a short period of time Anthony submitted under duress. When Anthony arrived at the police station and requested to see the warrant, they still would not produce it.

On or about March 23, 2017 until around September 19, 2017, Anthony Stefan Szach was incarcerated in the Lake County Jail in Waukegan, Illinois.

On or about May 3, 2017 and May 19, 2017, after Anthony was found fit by Psychologist Sophia Jaeger-Manson of Court Services (not DHS), Anthony and his attorney at the time, Lawrence Wade appeared in Fitness Court with Judge Stride. Attorney Wade stated that the psychologist report stated "we concur defendant is fit for trial".

On or about June 1, 2017, the case was set for pre-trial. According to the trial transcript, Anthony's attorney at the time, Lawrence Wade stated "he was sent for evaluation and found fit. Keep it on trial call

On or about June 6, 2017, a bond review hearing was held and bail was reduced from \$15,000 to \$10,000

On or about June 30, 2017, Anthony filed a motion to dismiss not guilty plea entered without his consent by the Judge. Another evaluation was ordered and Anthony's attorney, Lawrence Wade, stated that Anthony had agreed to go along with another fitness evaluation.

On or about July 14, 2017, fitness evaluation report was completed by Psychologist Dr. Janelle Shinhoster.

On or about August 9, 2017, a discharge hearing was held and three of the four charges were dropped. The obstructing an officer, resisting arrest, and damage to police camera were dropped with the only charge remaining being a battery charge.

On or about August 24, 2017, a hearing was held with Judge Stride and Anthony was found unfit to stand trial.

On or about September 19, 2017 Anthony was transferred from the Lake County Jail to the Elgin Mental Health Center, after being found unfit to stand trial by Judge Christopher Stride.

On or about September 19, 2017, Anthony Stefan Szach was sent to the above location after adjudicated by Psychologist, Dr. Janelle Shinhoster as unfit to stand trial at the Unfit for Trial and Fitness Hearing.


On or about September 19, 2017 until present, Anthony Stefan Szach has been incarcerated at the Elgin Mental Health Center, located at 750 State Street, Elgin, Illinois, without his consent and against his will.

*Gayle J. ...*

Petitioner

**NOTARY**

In IL State, lake County, on this 5 day of November, 2019, before me, the undersigned Notary Public, personally appeared GARY B WILL, to me known to be the living (wo)man described herein, who executed the forgoing instrument, and has sworn before me that he/she executed the same as his/her free-will act and deed.



*Cassandra Torres*

Notary

My commission expires: 10/27/21