

---

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**FOR ALL NINETY-FOUR DISTRICTS**

Address, City, State and Zip

---

**Tribunal:** **Unified United States Common Law Grand Jury:**<sup>1</sup>  
P.O. Box 59; Valhalla, New York 10595

We the People, UUSCLGJ,

Sureties of the Peace

Against

Chief Judge (94), Chief Clerk (94)

Defendants

**CORAM NOBIS**<sup>2</sup>

**CASE NO. 1776-1789-2015**, de jure

**Writ Mandamus<sup>3</sup> Order to Show Cause**  
**And Writ Certiorari<sup>4</sup>**

The Unified United States Common Law Grand Jury, the Sureties of the Peace,<sup>5</sup> a/k/a the judicial tribunal,<sup>6</sup> hereinafter known as UUSCLGJ, on behalf of We the People of the United States of America, in this court of record, under our own authority, Commands the above said Chief Judge and Chief Clerk to uphold their oaths by filing and processing all papers from the UUSCLGJ without cost and without performing tribunal decisions; or, show cause within seven (7) days by what authority you act contrary.

---

<sup>1</sup> “The grand jury is an institution separate from the courts over whose functioning the courts do not preside... 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 (3) Articles. It is a constitutional fixture in its own right. 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... 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. John H. Williams; 112 S.Ct. 1735; 504 U.S. 36; 118 L.Ed.2d 352; 1992.

<sup>2</sup> **CORAM NOBIS:** Before us ourselves (the King’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.

<sup>3</sup> **Writ of “Mandamus”** is Summary Writ issued from court of competent jurisdiction to command performance of specific duty which relator is entitled to have performed. People v. Nelson, 346 IL. 247, 178 N.E. 485, 487. It is legal, not equitable, remedy; and, when issued, is an inflexible peremptory command to do a particular thing. State ex rel. Onion v. Supreme Temple Pythian Sisters, 227 Mo. App. 557, 54 S.W. 2d 468, 469.

<sup>4</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 IA 1028, 295 N.W. 858.

<sup>5</sup> **Grand Jury:** The sureties of the peace of faithful service. Magna Carter, paragraph 49.

<sup>6</sup> **TRIBUNAL:** The whole body of judges who compose a jurisdiction; a judicial court; the jurisdiction which the judges exercise. Black’s 4<sup>th</sup>. See Foster v. Worcester, 16 Pick. MA 81.

## IGNORANCE OF THE LAW IS NO EXCUSE

In courts of record,<sup>7</sup> judges perform the duties of magistrates; and, the Tribunal adjudicates according to the course of “Common Law”. All court officers are expected to know the law; ignorance to the proceedings of a Court of Record will not be excused. “*Blackstone, in the third volume of his Commentaries, page 110, defines a Mandamus to be, ‘a command issuing in the King’s name from the Court of King’s Bench; [Coram Nobis, a/k/a Tribunal] and, directed to any person, corporation, or inferior court of judicature within the King’s dominions; requiring them to do some particular thing therein specified which appertains to their office and duty; and, which the Court of King’s Bench has previously determined to be right and just.’ Lord Mansfield, in 3 Burrows*”; *Marbury v. Madison*, 5 U.S. 137, 1803. The first Common Law Grand Jury was assembled by the People. See Magna Carta, paragraph 61; We the People proceed the same. CORAM NOBIS.

**COURT:** The person and suit of the sovereign; the place where the sovereign sojourns with his regal retinue,<sup>8</sup> wherever that may be. An agency of the sovereign; created by it directly or indirectly under its authority; consisting of one or more officers; established and maintained for the purpose of hearing and determining issues of law and fact regarding legal rights and alleged violations thereof; applying the sanctions of the law; and, authorized to exercise its powers in the course of law at times and places previously determined by lawful authority. Black’s 4<sup>th</sup>, Isbill v. Stovall, Tex. Civ. App., 92 S.W.2d 1067, 1070.

**HABEAS CORPUS:** Therefore, in the processing of Petitions addressed to the King’s Bench, we appoint the District Chief Judge to summarily hear and determine the facts; and, dispose of the matter as law and justice require under American Jurisprudence, a/k/a the Rules of Common Law, not chancery; and, send a Certified Copy of Decision to the Unified United States Common Law Grand Jury for Judicial Review. If the respondent default[s], the UUSCLGJ receives an Affidavit of Default from the Petitioner; and, the UUSCLGJ files the Affidavit of Default with the clerk under seal as per FRCP Rule 55(a); FRCP Rule 58(b)(2); 28 U.S.C. §2243; and, the defaulting respondent must abate at law under the “Law of the Land”. The right of Habeas Corpus is not to be denied; to derail the process is “high treason”; and, you are herein notified we will indict all who resist.

**SEDITIONOUS CONSPIRACY:** Because of the advocating of the overthrow of Government by the advising and teaching for law what is not law; with the intent to destroy the Law of the Land; such as taught and executed by the BAR; and, BAR-taught Judges and those who abet, such as Clerks, are equally guilty of treason under 18 USC §2385 by the wide-spread failure to file, concealing and removing of records, proceedings, documents and other things filed or deposited with the Clerk or Officer of any Court of the United States; and, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than three (3) years under 18 USC §2071; and, when a Judge and Clerk act together, seditious conspiracy under 18 USC §2384; and, it is for these reasons we file in all U.S. Federal District Courts; and, with our unique Case No.1776-1789-2015; to prevent such criminal, widespread expunging of our papers; and, command all Chief Clerks to accommodate our filing under said case number with proper judicial procedural recourse; or, face indictment for the same.

**INTIMIDATION:** Judges that engage in misleading conduct using intimidation, threats or corruptly persuading Clerks in misleading conduct with intent to prevent an official proceeding, alter, destroy, mutilate or conceal a

---

<sup>7</sup> **COURT OF RECORD:** A judicial tribunal having attributes and exercising functions independently of the person of the magistrate designated generally to hold it. Proceeding according to the course of common law. *Jones v. Jones*, 188 MO. App. 220, 175 S.W. 227, 229; *Ex parte Gladhill*, 8 Metc. MA, 171, per Shaw, C.J. See also: *Ledwith v. Rosalsky*, 244 NY. 406, 155 N.E. 688, 689; *Black’s Law Dictionary*, 4<sup>th</sup> Ed., 425, 426.

<sup>8</sup> **Regal Retinue:** A royal gathering, a/k/a King’s Bench.

record or document with the 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 twenty (20) years or both under 18 USC §1512b.

**CLERK IS TO FILE:** A Clerk of the Court, with a vested legal right through appointment, cannot be removed from office but by indictment; and, is to serve out the term of appointment under 5 U.S.137, 173. Marbury v. Madison, 1803. Therefore, Chief Clerks are not to be intimidated to perform criminal acts; Clerks are to file under 18 USC § 2076 without partiality; and, are to prevent and report to the Grand Jury any attempted criminal act of a Judge; ignorance of the law will not be excused; and, the filing of any Grand Jury papers under miscellaneous or some judicially inactive file is considered concealment because it does not cross the threshold of process of law; this is an indictable offense.

**SUMMARY PROCEEDINGS:** Judges are our servants, not our masters. They are not to Judge the People. That is why We the People, as jurists, from where all law derives, judge the People; and, hold Summary Proceedings unlawful and an indictable offense. **Summary Proceeding:** *“Any proceeding by which a controversy is settled, case disposed of, or trial conducted, in a prompt and simple manner, without the aid of a jury, without Presentment or Indictment, or in other respects out of the regular course of the Common Law. In procedure, proceedings are said to be summary ‘when they are short and simple in comparison with regular proceedings; e.g., in comparison with the proceedings which alone would have been applicable, either in the same or analogous cases, if summary proceedings had not been available.”* Sweet. Phillips v. Phillips, 8 NJ L. 122.

**FREE JUSTICE AND OPEN COURTS:** *“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 Charta, Chapter 40, which provides: ‘We will sell to no man. We will not deny to any man either justice or right.’ The chief purpose of this Magna Charta provision was to prohibit the King from selling justice by imposing fees on litigants through his courts; and, to deal a death blow to the attendant venal and disgraceful practices of a corrupt judiciary in demanding oppressive gratuities for giving or withholding decisions in pending causes. It has been appropriately said that in a free government, the doors of litigation are already wide open; and, must constantly remain so. The extent of the constitutional provision has been regarded as broader than the original confines of Magna Charta; and, such constitutional provision has been held to prohibit the selling of justice, not merely by magistrates, but by the State itself.”* American Jurisprudence Constitutional Law §326.

**FILING FEES APPLY TO DE FACTO COURTS:** *“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.

*“A constitutional provision that right and justice shall be administered according to such guarantees is mandatory upon the departments of government. Hence, it requires that a Cause shall not be heard before a prejudicial court; the word “prejudice”, however, in the constitutional provision that justice shall be administered without prejudice. These guarantees cannot be destroyed, denied, abridged or impaired by legislative enactments.”* Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S. 137, 1803.

**RIGHT TO COURT WITHOUT “FEES”:** As found in New York Ex rel. Bank of Commerce v. Commissioner of Taxes for City and County of New York, 2 Black 620, 1863, please take mandatory notice (Federal Rules of Evidence 201(d)) that Plaintiff has a lawful right to proceed without cost based upon the following law: The U.S. Supreme Court has ruled that: *“a natural individual entitled to relief is entitled to free access to its judicial tribunals [Grand Jury] and public offices in every State in the Union.”* 2 Black 620. See also Crandall v. Nevada, 6 Wall 35.

**EXTORTION:** Any requirement of a fee for justice will be considered extortion; and, we will indict without notice.

The Federal Chief Judge of each District is appointed and takes an oath; and, therefore, is responsible for the policies and actions of all Judges in each District; and, the UUSCLGJ, likewise, has given the Chief Judge the non-transferable appointment and responsibility of responding and processing all legal documents filed by the UUSCLGJ within each District. Likewise, the Chief Clerk is appointed and takes an oath; and, therefore, has the responsibility for the policies and actions of all Clerks receiving in his name.

**THEREFORE:** The UUSCLGJ will hold the Chief Clerk liable for all of the aforesaid U.S. Code Violations if any UUSCLGJ Actions, Writs and/or Indictments are not filed. The UUSCLGJ will hold the Chief Judge liable for the enforcement of our documents; and, if both Judge and Clerk fail in their duties, the UUSCLGJ will consider the dereliction of duty as Conspiracy and High Treason; and the UUSCLGJ will indict without further notice.

**WHEREFORE:** it has been adjudicated by the UUSCLGJ that any/all clerks and/or any/all judges in this District who do not perform their duties by appropriately and immediately filing and processing this Writ and all UUSCLGJ documents; and, who do not return proof by mailing a copy of the “time-stamped” front page of this and all documents within three (3) days to the UUSCLGJ in the enclosed, self-addressed envelope; will cause that the Chief Judge and/or the Chief Clerk of this District be indicted forthwith on the aforesaid USC violations and other appropriate charges to the fullest extent. It is further commanded that the Chief Clerk distribute to all clerks and all judges in this District a copy of this Writ as notification to all clerks and all judges within this District.

**THE COURT**, November 13, 2015.

(seal)

---

Grand Jury Foreman