



---

**FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION – TRESPASS**

---

**PARTIES**

1. Comes now, Kimberly Shields, (“Kim”); Bruce Doucette, (“Bruce”); Steven Byfield, (“Byfield”); Stephen Nalty, (“Nalty”); Harlan Smith, (“Smith”); People of The United States of America, (“U.S.A.”) and the Colorado state (unincorporated) of sound mind, and The United States of America (“U.S.A.”), (unincorporated), hereinafter claimants, in this court of record and complains of each of the following: United States, corporation 1 with Duns #048163723, (“U.S.”); Donald John Trump, (“Trump”), CEO of corporation 1; Federal Bureau of Investigations, (“FBI”), a corporation with DUNS #878865674; State of Colorado, a corporation with DUNS #076438621; Cynthia Coffman, (“Coffman”), a foreign agent; Colorado BAR Association, (“CBA”), a foreign corporation; Michael A. Martinez, (“Martinez”), a foreign agent; Patricia M. Jarzowski, (“Jarzowski”) a foreign agent; Martin F. Egelhoff, (“Egelhoff”) a foreign agent; Robert S. Shapiro, (“Shapiro”) a foreign agent; Chris Byrne, Federal Bureau of Investigation Agents Doe 1 – 50, foreign agents; Kim Doe, (“Kim”) last name was withheld to be corrected; Stanley L. Garnett, (“Garnett”); Internal Revenue Service; (“IRS”) any other defendants to be named upon evidence of said defendants participation; hereinafter defendants and criminal impersonators who are each summoned to answer said action in a plea of trespass and trespass on the case to wit:

**INTRODUCTION**

Actions for Trespass,  
Actions for Trespass on the Case

**United States of America et. al.**  
**v.**  
**United States et. al.**

Page 2 of 26

2. As detailed herein, each defendant exceeded his jurisdiction under color of law<sup>1</sup> by either directly, or through an agent both foreign and/or domestic, or in concert with another, did cause claimants to be unlawfully and forcefully carried away and imprisoned<sup>2</sup> against his will, without jurisdiction or good cause.
3. For clarification, in this action at law the U.S.A. or “continental” refers to that entity created by The Constitution for the United States of America and governed under the common law<sup>3</sup> as guaranteed by The Constitution for the United States of America. U.S. refers to the United States federal corporation<sup>4</sup> created by an act of Congress in February 21<sup>st</sup>, 1871<sup>5</sup> under the authority of Article I, Section 8, Clause 17 of The Constitution for the United States of America which limits said corporation to the District of Columbia. The former is that entity restricted and governed by The Constitution for the United States of America and the later is merely a corporation operating outside that controlling document

- 1 Color of Law: The appearance or semblance, without the substance, of legal right. 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*, D.C.Okla., 415 F. Supp. 186, 188.
- 2 Imprison: To confine a person or restrain his liberty in any way. Black's Law Dictionary, 5<sup>th</sup> Edition Imprisonment: ...it may be in a locality used only for the specific occasion; or it may take place without the actual application of any physical agencies of restraint (such as locks or bars), as by verbal compulsion and the display of available force. Black's Law Dictionary, 5th Edition
- 3 Due process of law is process according to the law of the land .... . . . Due process of law in the latter [the Fifth Article of Amendment to the Constitution) refers to that law of the land which derives its authority from the legislative powers conferred upon Congress by the Constitution of the United States, exercised within the limits therein prescribed and interpreted according to the principles of the common law .... Mr. Justice Matthews, delivering the opinion of the court in *Hurtado v. California*, 110 U.S. 516, 3 Sup. Ct. 111, 292, 28 L. Ed. 232 (1884).]
- 4 28 USC § 3002 (15) “United States means – (A) a federal corporation
- 5 The District of Columbia Act of 1871, Chapter 62, 16 Statutes at Large, 419

established for the deceptive relieving of the agents of the federal government of any Constitutional<sup>6</sup> infringements on the rights of the people.

4. Claimants named herein were acting lawfully and constitutionally in their official capacity as grand jury administrators and superior court justices in rooting out government corruption and lawlessness.
5. This action is a direct challenge to the jurisdiction<sup>7</sup> of the defendants named herein.
6. As detailed herein and will be proven in this case, defendants conspired and participated in a foreign criminal enterprise, produced "charges" against claimants named herein on perjured testimony in retaliation against the grand jury, superior court justices and continental marshals, participated in jury and evidence tampering, conspired against claimants' rights, deprived claimants of said rights, conspired to overthrow the government of the USA, conspired to "get rid" of the courts of record in Colorado and stole the private property of claimants.
7. From the moment they were taken away, claimants, under color of law, have been kept in actual or constructive imprisonment.
8. As documented herein, each defendant conspired to obstruct the natural and constitutionally protected rights of claimants in violation of 18 USC 241.

6 "The idea prevails with some, indeed it has found expression in arguments at the bar, that we have in this country substantially two national governments; one to be maintained under the Constitution, with all of the restrictions; the other to be maintained by the Congress outside and independently of that instrument, by exercising such powers as other nations of the earth are accustomed to...I take leave to say that, if the principles thus announced should ever receive the sanction of a majority of this court, a radical and mischievous change in our system of government will result. We will, in that event, pass from the era of constitutional liberty, guarded and protected by a written constitution into an era legislative absolutism...It will be an evil day for American liberty if the theory of government outside the Supreme law of the land finds lodgement in our Constitutional jurisprudence. No higher duty rests upon this court than to exert its full authority to prevent all violation of the principles of the Constitution." *Downes v. Bidwell*, 182 U.S. 244

7 *Basso v. Utah Power & Light Co.*, 495 F.2d 906, 910; *Joyce v. US*, 474 F.2d 215; *Bradbury v. Dennis*, 310 F.2d 73 (10th Cir. 1962); *Rosemond v. Lambert*, 469 F.2d 416; *Latana v. Hopper*, 102 F.2d 188; *Melo v. United States*, 505 F.2d 1026; *Middleton v. Low* (1866), 30 C. 596, citing *Prosser v. Secor* (1849), 5 Barb.(N.Y) 607, 608; *Elliott v. Peirsol*, 1 Pet. 328, 340, 26 U.S. 328, 340, 7 L.Ed. 164 (1828) *Rescue Army v. Municipal Court of Los Angeles*, 171 P.2d 8; 331 US 549, 91 L. ed. 1666, 67 S.Ct. 1409

9. As documented herein, each defendant deprived claimants of claimants' natural and constitutionally protected rights in violation of 18 USC 242.
10. All defendants have or are required by statutes to have a sole and sworn duty to secure claimants' inalienable rights. It is not possible for the defendants to secure claimants rights and violate them.

#### PROPER VENUE

11. As detailed herein, this court is the proper venue, because state and U.S. employees are using their positions of authority, under color of law, to impede and obstruct due process of law from claimants, tamper with evidence, and tamper with the grand jury. The state employees are infringing on and depriving the people's rights under color of law and violating numerous articles of The Constitution for the United States of America and U.S. code and violating the Colorado constitution.
12. Damages exceed \$150,000.00.
13. Additionally, defendants are in violation of multiple federal statutes including but not limited to those mentioned above.

#### SPECIFICS

14. At all times mentioned in this action, each defendant is the agent of the other, and in doing the act alleged in this action, each is acting in course and scope of said agency. The following paragraphs describe what the defendants, under color of law, either acted or failed to act as obligated.
15. Each defendant exceeded his jurisdiction under color of law. Each defendant acted in concert with the remaining defendants to effect the unlawful loss of liberty of claimants.
16. Each defendant acted in such a way, or failed to act in such a way, that claimants have been deprived of their liberty, reputation, and right to assemble, right to travel, right of free locomotion.

17. Claimants are not U.S. citizens, U.S. persons, corporations or “tax payers”. Claimants are people and not things owned by any corporation. Claimants are not in custody of custodians.
18. Claimants are not residents of State<sup>8</sup> of Colorado, Washington, District of Columbia or any other territory of Washington DC. Claimants are domiciled in the union member nation of Colorado.
19. Claimants are general executors and general guardians of all claimants’ affairs including those under discussion in this action at law.
20. Claimants are immune from prosecution in the inferior statutory courts.
21. All claimants except claimant USA, which is a governing body created by the people to oversee the will of the people, are people and not subjects of any fictitious entity. The people being the highest authority in these united states came to the determination that the representatives of the people have failed to protect the rights of the people and have instead, through the above mention foreign criminal enterprise, conspired against the people and have repeatedly caused injuries to the people under the guise of “governing”.
22. However, under a republican form of government, “in which the powers of sovereignty are vested in the people and are exercised by the people, **either directly**, or through representatives chosen by the people, to whom those powers are specially delegated.” 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.

8 The US (corporation) redefined the term state on June 30<sup>th</sup>, 1864 to include the “territories and District of Columbia”. Colorado is not a territory of the district of Columbia. See Exhibit K.

23. The people of Colorado, seeing that the representatives hired to serve the people were instead, using fraud and deception, ruling over the people, the government servants' masters, decided in the Colorado Assembly to form the grand jury as permitted by law.
24. The superior court is that court of record that meets the definition of the court of record as provided in Black's Law dictionary 4<sup>th</sup> edition. It excludes all inferior courts which are courts that proceed with statutes rather than the common law.
25. The Colorado Assembly, participating in the national assembly of people from across these united states, also decided to elect superior court justices to serve the people in their courts of record.
26. The Colorado assembly members participating in a national assembly with people from across these united states, also decided to create a new law enforcement agency titled the Continental united States of America Marshals, a.k.a, CuSA marshals, or continental marshals. This was warranted since none of the law enforcement agencies still in existence today work for and protect the people, but rather enforce statutes that only apply to fictitious entities such as corporations and "persons".
27. The oaths of offices for the grand jury administrators, superior court justices and CuSA marshals are on file on at least one county recorder's office, with the Secretary of State in at least one state, and with the Department of State in Washington DC. As such, the public has been noticed of the creation of these positions.
28. This is an action at law proceeding in a court of record wherein "judicial proceedings are enrolled, or recorded, for a perpetual memory and testimony." (3 Bl. Comm. 24; 3 Steph. Comm. 383; The Thomas Fletcher, C.C.Ga., 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) for the public to view.

29. Although some of the defendants are members of the private BAR guild, all defendants have presented themselves as public servants and as such are public servants subordinate to the people of Colorado and the United States of America as formed and governed by The Constitution for the United States of America.
30. The people of these united states are the highest sovereign<sup>9</sup> authority and are not subjects of the government agencies created to serve them.
31. By birthright the people have the right to form the grand jury.
32. Upon witnessing numerous unlawful activities from the public servants, including the defendants named herein, the people of Colorado assembled and selected from among themselves a grand jury.
33. Real grand juries are selected from among the people by the people and are 25<sup>10</sup> in number.
34. The defendants so called grand jury is a fake grand jury, because it is selected and controlled by foreign agent “esquires” under the court system contrary to law<sup>11</sup>.
35. Esquire is a title of nobility that falls between gentleman and knight.
36. Article 1, Section 9, Clause 8 of The Constitution for The United States of America disallows the United States from granting a title of nobility.
37. Article 1, Section 10, Clause 1 of The Constitution for the United States of America disallows any of the States from granting a title of nobility. As such, all BAR member “esquires” are foreign agents

<sup>9</sup> In our country the **people are sovereign** and the Government cannot sever its relationship to the people by taking away their citizenship. Our Constitution governs us and we must never forget that our Constitution limits the Government to those powers specifically granted or those that are necessary and proper to carry out the specifically granted ones. (emphasis added) AFROYIM V. RUSK, 387 U.S. 253 (1967) ...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 @DALL (1793) pp471-472.

<sup>10</sup> See Magna Carta Article 52, 61

<sup>11</sup> “whereas the grand jury is an institution separate from the courts” U.S. v. Williams, (90-1972), 504 U.S. 36 (1992)



required to register with the United States of America as such as required by the Foreign Agent Registration Act.

38. None of the defendant BAR member esquires have registered as required by the Foreign Agent Registration Act.

39. Once the Colorado grand jury was established, it investigated the oaths of office of many public servants in Colorado.

40. This investigation revealed an international criminal enterprise perpetrated by the defendant members of the BAR.

41. The grand jury in each instance of discovery of a public official or officer failing to follow the strict requirements of taking his oath of office<sup>12</sup> and filing a bond<sup>13</sup>, noticed said official or officer of his invalid oath and/or bond and allotted 40 days to rectify the inadequacy as required by law<sup>14</sup>, as any public official or officer not on a valid oath or bond as required by law is merely impersonating said official or officer.

42. After the failure of the officer or official to cure the deficiency, the grand jury added said impersonating official or officer to the notice of fraud<sup>15</sup> and levied a fine against said unlawfully seated official or officer and filed a lien against said official or officer. As previously mentioned, each

12 General Laws 555. Sec. 128 Every county officer named in this article shall, before entering upon the duties of his office, on or before the day of commencement of the term for which he was elected, execute and deposit his official bond, as prescribed by law; and any officer shall also take and subscribe the oath of office prescribed by law, before some officer authorized to administer oaths, and deposit the same with his official bond, to be filed and preserved therewith.

13 A person chosen to fill a term of office is not permitted to assume the duties of the office until he files a bond and oath of office, which must be done before the commencement of the term, or the office shall be deemed vacant. People v Quimby, 152 Colo. 231, 381 P.2d 275 (1963).

14 See Magna Carta Article 48, 52, 61

15 See Exhibit B 1-12

official or officer was granted 40 days to cure the deficiency brought to the official's or officer's attention.

43. Said officers or officials in retaliation against the grand jury and other de jure officers, created a fake indictment from the fake grand jury that is under control of the above mentioned foreign agents.

44. Some of the defendant BAR members who are participating in the attack on claimants herein are named in the Notice of Fraud filed for public record. This serves as evidence of the retaliation of defendants named herein against the people of Colorado in their attempt at holding public servants accountable to law.

45. Said indictment was a fake indictment as the grand jury did not present a True Bill of Presentment, the fake grand jury was not selected by the people, but was selected by the aforementioned foreign agents and the people sitting on said fake grand jury do not number 25 as required by law.

46. Defendants do not have sovereign immunity or immunity as public servants. The people are sovereign and all public servants and government agents only have immunity so long as they are carrying out their official duties as prescribed by law. The moment that a public servant oversteps his authority against a people of Colorado or the USA, said public servant no longer has the protection of immunity and must suffer severe penalties.

47. The law of the case is decreed in Exhibit A.

#### **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION – TRESPASS**

48. Paragraphs 1 through 45 are included as though fully stated herein.

49. The defendants in an effort to conceal the facts regarding the notification of the 40 day notice granted to cure the deficiencies in their oaths and bonds, broke into a grand jury administrator's domicile to steal the evidence of the notices.
50. The grand jury administrator's domicile from which the evidence was stolen was that of grand jury administrator claimant Nalty.
51. The evidence included the return receipts for the notices that had been mailed to the public officials or officers not on a valid oath and/or bond through the United States Postal Service.
52. Said theft of evidence taken from the Colorado grand jury was to conceal the crimes committed by defendants named herein.

**THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION – TRESPASS**

53. Paragraphs 1 through 51 are included as though fully stated herein.
54. On April 5<sup>th</sup>, 2017, criminal impersonators named herein, in retaliation against the people of Colorado for exposing the crimes committed by said criminal impersonator defendants, imprisoned claimants without just cause under the guise of claimants participating in a "criminal enterprise".
55. In fact, it is the defendant criminal impersonators named herein who are in fact participating in an international criminal enterprise.
56. Claimants have been kept in actual or constructive imprisonment without cause based on a fake indictment by a fake grand jury controlled solely by foreign agents.
57. All of the defendants named herein are not on a valid oath of office as required by The Constitution at Article VI, Clause 3<sup>16</sup>.

16 The Senators and Representatives before mentioned, and the Members of the several State Legislatures, and all executive and judicial Officers, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by Oath or

58. All of the officers named as defendants herein and those officers named in the Notice of Fraud presented by the Colorado grand jury took a religious Test when taking their respective oaths of office by stating “so help me God”.
59. The oath of office provided in 28 U.S.C. § 453 which states, *“Each justice or judge of the United States shall take the following oath or affirmation before performing the duties of his office : ‘I, \_\_\_\_\_, do solemnly swear (or affirm),that I will administer justice without respect to persons, and do equal right to the poor and to the rich, and that I will faithfully and impartially discharge and perform all the duties incumbent upon me as \_\_\_\_\_according to the best of my abilities and understanding, agreeably to the Constitution and laws of the United States. So help me God.’”*
60. The oath was materially changed on December 1<sup>st</sup>, 1990 to take affect on March 1<sup>st</sup>, 1991 to state, “Each justice or judge of the United States shall take the following oath or affirmation before performing the duties of his office: ‘I, \_\_\_\_\_, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will administer justice without respect to persons, and do equal right to the poor and to the rich, and that I will faithfully and impartially discharge and perform all the duties incumbent upon me as \_\_\_\_\_ under the Constitution and laws of the United States. So help me God.’”
61. So while, in each case, the oath is not Constitutional due the the religious test, the material change to the oath removed the Constitution in its entirety by changing the words, *‘according to the best of my abilities and understanding, agreeably to’* and replacing them with *‘under’*.

Affirmation, to support this Constitution; but no religious Test shall ever be required as a Qualification to any Office or public Trust under the United States.

62. The only duties incumbent on officers such as judges and justices to discharge and perform are provided in statutes. The Constitution provide none. As such, the oath is not “support this Constitution” as required in Article VI, Clause 3.

**FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION – TRESPASS**

63. Paragraphs 1 through 61 are included as though fully stated herein.
64. The criminal impersonators stole private property from claimants. The private property<sup>17</sup> included titles to private property, electronics and other items.
65. Claimant Kimberly Shields had private property stolen by defendants from her domicile and claimant Kim is not listed on any search warrant.
66. The inventory presented to claimant from defendants reveal defendants intent to keep some of the private property as some of the private property stolen was not included on the written inventory provided by defendants.
67. The search warrant was invalid as it was not sealed as stated on the search warrant itself.

**FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION – TRESPASS ON CASE**

68. Paragraphs 1 through 66 are included as though fully stated herein.
69. All defendants named herein are not on a Constitutionally required oath of office.
70. All defendants named herein have breached their duty to the people to secure their rights as required by the Constitution for the United States of America.

<sup>17</sup> See exhibit L – List of stolen property.

71. The government agencies at all levels from the federal government to the lowest level municipalities have replaced the de jure government with corporations without the delegated authority or consent of the people.
72. The American BAR Association, (“ABA”) and the Colorado Bar Association, (“CBA”) have conspired with actors in government to overthrow the republican form of government as guaranteed in Article IV, Section 4 of the Constitution for the United States of America.
73. The Colorado BAR, as evidenced by Exhibit F, reveals a conspiracy between Governor Edwin C. Johnson and the Colorado BAR Association in a letter from the Colorado BAR to the governor wherein the author admitted to Governor Johnson’s inquiry to the Colorado Bar to the “abolishment of the county courts.” The letter, dated January 18, 1933 shows the collusion between government actors and the BAR to overthrow the courts of record and as a result, the original jurisdiction government.
74. The United States corporation has replaced the de jure government of the United States of America.
75. All public servants who have taken an oath of office to serve the people are required by law to divulge any other oaths they have taken, such as that taken by members of the private and foreign BAR.
76. The Constitution does not permit the granting of a title of nobility.
77. Members of the BAR have been granted the title of nobility that falls between gentleman and knight.
78. The title of nobility is granted by the crown of England through the corporation “Northern Trust Company” formed under the crown of England.
79. The original 13<sup>th</sup> article of amendment<sup>18</sup> to the Constitution for the United States of America, which has never been repealed, does not permit anyone with a title of nobility to serve in public office. It

<sup>18</sup> See exhibit G, certified copy of the original 13<sup>th</sup> Amendment.

additionally revokes the citizenship of anyone who has accepted a title of nobility from a foreign entity of any kind. “If any citizen of the United States shall accept, claim, receive, or retain any title of nobility or honor, or shall, without the consent of congress, accept and retain any present, pension, office, or emolument of any kind whatever, from any emperor, king, prince, or foreign power, such person shall cease to be a citizen of the United States, and shall be incapable of holding any office of trust or profit under them, or either of them.”

80. As such, all defendants who are members of the Colorado Bar OR the American BAR Association are not permitted to serve in public office. The Constitution for the United States of America has made it abundantly clear that anyone with a title of nobility was not welcomed to participate in the government of the USA. It is through deception and fraud that the foreign agent BAR members have usurped the authority of the USA and replaced it with the US, “a federal corporation<sup>19</sup>”.

81. Defendants cannot have the best interests of the American people at heart when they have sworn allegiance to a foreign entity.

82. The Colorado BAR Association is a non-governmental private Association (corporation) and an unconstitutional monopoly. It is an illegal and criminal enterprise that violates Article 2, Section 1, Separation of Powers clause of the Constitution for the United States of America. There is no power or authority for joining of Legislative, Judicial, or Executive within a state as the BAR is attempting in Colorado. The Colorado BAR Association is a legal monopoly and violates of Article V Section 25 Colorado Constitution 1876. In doing so they have changed the jurisdiction of the constitutional

<sup>19</sup> 28 USC § 3002 (15) “United States means – (A) a federal corporation

“courts of justice” used by the people under common law into non constitutional statutory “justice courts” for persons enforced as color of law on the people.

83. The Colorado Bar Association is “deeply interested” because the people designated county courts as courts of record and the people's tribunals in the Colorado Constitution 1876. No statutory or constitutional court (whether it be an appellate or supreme court) can second-guess the judgment of a court of record. “The judgement of a court of record whose jurisdiction is final, is as conclusive on all the world as the judgement of this court would be. It is as conclusive on this court as it is on other courts. It puts an end to inquiry concerning the fact, by deciding it." Ex parte Watkins, 3 Pet., at 202-203. SCHNECKLOTH v. BUSTAMONTE, 412 U.S. 218, 255 (1973). The BAR Association along with the three Departments of Government wanted to strip the people of their power.
84. The people created the county courts which is absolute and unalterable except by the authority from which it emanated. The BAR association nor the Executive, Legislative or the Judicial Branches are authorized to abolish any part of the Colorado Constitution only the people who created it may. This was an attempt to abolish the law by all departments of the government colluding against the people with a unjust monopoly, the Colorado BAR Association, whose actions in Colorado are inoperative and void. The Constitution is the fundamental law of the state, in opposition to which any other law or any direction or order must be inoperative and void. Asplund v. Harnett, 31 N.M. 641, 249 P. 1074, 58 A.L.R. 573.
85. There is no Legislative Authority for the International B.A.R., or the American B.A.R., the British Accreditation Registry, to be created. Nor is there authority to work in the courts, and to monopolize the courts. BAR members issue their own union cards, deceptively leading the people to believe they



are “Licenses.” Imagine a private Carpenter’s Union issuing their own licenses. This type of monopoly is against the Taft-Hartley Act, The Clayton Trust Act, the Sherman Antitrust Act, and the Smith Act. Bar members are a SELF-APPOINTED monopoly.

86. “No state legislator or executive or judicial officer can war against the constitution without violating his undertaking to support it. The constitutional theory is that we the people are the sovereigns, the state and federal officials only our agents.” *Cooper v. Aaron*, 358 U.S. 1, 78 S.Ct. 1401 (1958). *Southern Pacific Co. v. Porter*, 160 Tex 329, 331 SW2d 42), and no new powers contrary to our Common Law Rights/Immunities were "granted" to the state.
87. The House journal January 22, 1937 states “They have developed a “No Man's Land” of jurisdiction.” Have declared their legislation above the people by creating inferior statutory courts or unconstitutional “justice courts” with Colorado Bar Association members on both sides of the Bench. These courts are not only unconstitutional they violate the Taft Hartley Act by running a closed union shop with BAR members on both sides of the bench using statutes for persons as color of the peoples law.
88. “In this connection it is pertinent to observe that section 1, article VI, Constitution of the state of Colorado, reads: “The judicial power of the state as to all matters of law and equity, except as in the constitution otherwise provided, shall be vested in the supreme court, district courts, county courts, and such other courts as may be provided by law. \* \* \*” (Italics ours.) “Justice courts are not constitutional courts and exist under authority and by permission of the legislative branch of the government. Section 2, article VI of the Constitution of the state of Colorado, is as follows: “The supreme court, except as otherwise provided in this constitution, shall have appellate jurisdiction only,

which shall be co-extensive with the state, and shall have a general superintending control over all inferior courts, under such regulations and limitations as may be prescribed by law.” “Justice courts are unquestionably inferior courts, Such a statute is in its effect a limitation by the legislature on the superintending control that may be exercised by the Supreme Court over a purely statutory court. But slight consideration is required to convince one of the soundness of the distinction that has been made in our statutes between courts of record and justice courts, which are not courts of record. Justice courts are courts of limited jurisdiction. With few exceptions the justices of the peace who preside at the trials are men with no legal training whatsoever, nor are they required by law to have such training. No record is made of the proceedings in justice courts, nor are such proceedings ever reviewed by any court to which the cause may be appealed.” *United Securities Corp. v. Pantex Pressing Machine Inc.*, 53 P.2d 653, 98 Colo. 79 (Colo.11/25/1935).

89. The BAR Association members have not only declared their legislation is above the people, the use their legislation as color of law against the people in inferior courts they owe their allegiance to in the administration of justice not to the people. “Inferior courts” are those whose jurisdiction is limited and special and whose proceedings are not according to the course of the common law.” *Ex Parte Kearny*, 55 Cal. 212; *Smith v. Andrews*, 6 Cal. 652; Criminal courts proceed according to statutory law. Jurisdiction and procedure is defined by statute. Likewise, civil courts and admiralty courts proceed according to statutory law. Any court proceeding according to statutory law is not a court of record (which only proceeds according to common law); it is an inferior court.”

90. “Statutes are enactments and rules for the government of civil conduct, promulgated by the legislative authority of a state. It is an important characteristic of such laws that they are tentative, occasional, and in the nature of temporary expedients.” 11 Am Jurisdiction.
91. Two types of courts, Courts of record or “courts of justice” created by the people and proceed according to the constitution or common law, and inferior courts not of record or “justice courts” created by the legislature and proceed according to statutes or statutory law.
92. The Colorado BAR members are not licensed to practice law or due process in Colorado. “The practice of law can not be licensed by any state/State. Schware v. Board of Examiners, United States Reports 353 U.S. Any one can practice law, “The practice of Law is an occupation of common right.” Sims v. Aherns, 271 S.W. 720 (1925).
93. The Colorado BAR Association does practice the law of the Corporation or statutes, statutory or color of law for persons or corporations and government employees unlawfully enforced on the people in “justice courts”. “The effect of the statute is to eliminate altogether the question of intent and this is a denial of due process of law. Calder v. Bull, 3 Dall 386; Coffey v. Harlan County, 04 U.S. 659.
94. The BAR Association controlled statutory courts are called “Justice Courts” they are non constitutional courts that use statutes not due process or the law of the land. Orders from these courts come from biased members of the Colorado BAR Association an unjust monopoly with members on both sides of the bench and are void. “A prejudiced, biased judge who tries a case deprives a party adversely affected of due process.” See Nelson v. Cox, 66 N.M. 397.
95. The right to a tribunal free from bias and prejudice is based on the Due Process Clause. Should a judge issue any order after he has been disqualified by law, and if the party has been denied of any of his/her

property, then the judge has engaged in the crime of interference with interstate commerce; the judge has acted in his/her personal capacity and not in the judge's judicial capacity. See U.S. v. Scinto, 521 F.2d 842 at page 845, 7th circuit, 1996. Party can attack subject matter jurisdiction at anytime in the proceeding, even raising jurisdiction for the first time on appeal, State v. Begay, 734 P.2d 278. The judges involved in the attack against claimants in the inferior courts are not qualified to sit as judges as they have been proven to be in violation of Colorado statutes and the Colorado constitution in regards to oath and bond.

96. The swearing in "fundamental and integral" So these persons understood they are to protect the peoples rights instead of violate them in non constitutional "justice courts" violating the people's due process in an inferior court. These Colorado BAR Association members swore they have knowledge of law and know or should have known that judicial proceedings should commence under the common law in a court of record independent of a magistrate, unlike unconstitutional statutory courts the Colorado BAR Association monopolize. "A 'court of record' is a judicial tribunal having attributes and exercising functions independently of the person or the magistrate designated generally to hold it, and proceeding according to the course of common law, its acts and proceedings being enrolled for a perpetual memorial." Jones v. Jones, 188 Mo.App. 220, 175 S.W. 227, 229; Ex parte Gladhill, 8 Metc. Mass., 171, per Shaw, C.J. See, also, Ledwith v. Rosalsky, 244 N.Y. 406, 155 N.E. 688, 689.

97. The criminal impersonators are without excuse for bringing fraud upon the court and their scheme or artifice to defraud the people enforcing statutes or statutory law when they swore an Oath to the Law of the land and due process to protect the peoples rights and protect the oppressed not violate the people's rights as the oppressor. The persons have perjured their oath and their Colorado Rules of

Professional Conduct, committing multiple felonies against the people including frauds and swindles, racketeering activity, false claims and sedition and violation of the Smith Act of 1940 prohibits the knowing advocacy of the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence., conspiracy against rights, deprivation of rights under color of law, corruption, and others listed below.

98. The BAR members throughout these united states have conspired with the enemy to overthrow the Constitutional republican form of government for the purpose of administering the bankruptcy of the United States corporation. The debt owed by the US is not the debt of the USA, which has not entered into the agreements with the privately held Federal Reserve Bank, a bank that had 14 original , and mostly foreign, shareholders that included J.P. Morgan and John D. Rockefeller.

99. It is through this unlawful bank monopoly, that the unconstitutional Federal Reserve Note was forced on the people, contrary to Article 1, Section 10, Clause 1 of the Constitution for the United States of America which disallows any state to allow any thing to be tendered in exchange for debt “other than gold and silver coin.”

100. The fraud perpetrated by the BAR extends up to the office of the president of the USA. President Trump did not take a Constitutionally agreeable oath of office. The oath that President Trump took was to defend and uphold the “Constitution of the United States of America” There is no such document as the constitution that formed these united states is titled “The Constitution for the United States of America.” So either Donald John Trump took an oath to uphold a document that does not exist, or he took it as though he were taking the oath from without the United States of America as the way he stated his oath would have been the Constitution of (or from) the United States.

101. The so call indictment purports to be “The People of the State of Colorado” verses claimants herein named.

102. All of the people of Colorado were not injured by claimants. This is a false claim by the fake grand jury.

103. Colorado has certified there is no entity known as “The People of the State of Colorado”. See exhibit I.

104. The foreign agents who signed the so called indictment for “The People of the State of Colorado” falsified this document to further their fraud against the real people of Colorado.

105. The foreign agent BAR esquires further the fraud by commonly arguing in motions for dismissal, when a people files a suit against a client of said BAR member, that “Plaintiff has failed to state a claim upon which relief can be granted.” This is a ploy used by the closed union shop to interfere with due process of law and provide a remedy for the injured people. The ploy used in the motion of dismissal is usually granted by the other BAR member sitting behind the bench purporting to be a judge. As was previously presented in this action, the judges are not on a valid oath of office for the two reasons previously stated.

106. One additional ploy used by the BAR member foreign agents is to claim that a filing is “unintelligible”, “incomprehensible” or “giberish”. These two are simply ploys to avoid responding to a lawful argument that the foreign agent BAR members cannot overcome as it would reveal the fraud in which the BAR members are participating. While these arguments make the foreign agents BAR members appear to be ignorant, claimants contend this is an intentional ploy used to interfere with due process of law. The ploy is the foreign agent BAR member are operating in commerce as “persons”

while the opposition people is communicating from a human being perspective and the foreign agent BAR members are not acknowledging they comprehend what is being said by the people human beings. The closed union shop violates the Taft-Hartley Act, The Clayton Trust Act, the Sherman Antitrust Act, and the Smith Act.

**REQUEST FOR RELIEF**

107. For that cause of action therefore claimants bring this action at law.

108. WHEREFORE, claimants requests relief and judgment against defendants as follows:

109. WHEREFORE, claimants pray judgment against defendants, and each of them, as follows:

110. For First Cause of Action of Trespass which included jury tampering, \$1,500,000.00 (dollars).

111. For Second Cause of Action of Trespass which included evidence tampering \$500,000.00 (dollars).

112. For Third Cause of Action, \$50,000.00 (dollars) paid to each claimant for each day of actual imprisonment rounded up to the next full day until the issues before this court are settled. For constructive imprisonment, \$5,000.00 (dollars) per day rounded up to the next full day until the issues before this court are settled.

113. For Fourth Cause of Action \$30,000.00 (dollars) to be paid to each claimant.

114. For Fifth Cause of Action \$350,000,000,000.00 (dollars) to be paid by Defendant United States, Inc. to the united States of America, the de jure original jurisdiction united states as united under The Constitution for the United States of America.

115. That the court enter a declaratory judgment ordering the State of Colorado and the United States and all its subdivisions, municipalities, counties townships, villages, towns or any other subdivision falling

under the jurisdiction of Colorado and/or the United States, Inc. to update its records removing claimants from their respective jurisdictions;

116. That the court enter a declaratory judgment that defendants have acted contrary to constitutional right, power or privilege;

117. That the court enter a declaratory judgment that defendants actions were in excess of statutory jurisdiction, authority and short of statutory right;

118. That the court permanently enjoin defendants from interfering with claimants' lawful right of free travel;

119. That the court enter a judgment dismissing the causes for which all claimants were arrested and vacate the fake grand jury "indictment" pending in the inferior court;

120. That the court issue a declaratory judgment dissolving corporations that have replaced the de jure government and replace the government agencies with those limited by the Constitution for the United States of America and the Colorado State.

121. That the court order President Donald John Trump to take the seat of the original jurisdiction de jure government until such time as the election for the president can be held according to the Constitution for The United States of America for the next term.

122. The the court order the President Donald J. Trump to take his Constitutional Oath of office.

123. That the court release defendant Trump from this action other than the requirements above ordered upon providing evidence that the orders of the superior court of record have been obeyed and has returned his duty to the people and abide by the common law and release from imprisonment claimants named herein.



124. That the court issue a declaratory judgment that the C.u.S.A. Marshals a.k.a Continental Marshals, are the highest law enforcement agency serving the people of the united States of America having jurisdiction in every state of the union over and above the law enforcement agencies employed by contract for the United States corporation including but not limited to the U.S. Marshal Service, the U.S. Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco Firearms and Explosives, The Federal Bureau of Investigations and any other agency, entity, bureau or administration as said agencies, entities, bureaus and administrations are employed by a corporation having no jurisdiction within the several states members of the union and only have jurisdiction within the territorial boundaries of Washington D.C. and other outpost, and territories belonging to the corporation.

125. That the court issue a declaratory judgment that the United States of America (U.S.A) cease all ties with any foreign central bank, including but not limited to any bank under the control of the Rothschild family and take responsibility for coining money per The Constitution for the United States of America at Article I, Section 8, Clause 5.

126. That the United States of America remove from all public offices all people who have been granted a title of nobility from any foreign entity as required by the original 13<sup>th</sup> amendment to The Constitution for the United States of America and revoke the citizenship of said people as also required by said 13<sup>th</sup> amendment.

127. That the court grant claimants such other and further relief as the court deems proper;

128. For interest as allowed by law;

129. For cost of suit;

I declare under penalty of perjury in the United States of America that the foregoing facts are true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

April 25<sup>th</sup>, 2017.

<u>Kim Shields</u> by: Kim Shields 2862 W. Centennial Dr unit H Littleton, CO 80123	<u>S/ Bruce Doucette</u> 2862 W Centennial Dr by: Bruce Doucette unit H Littleton, CO 80123
<u>S/ Steven Byfield</u> by: Steven Byfield 2862 W Centennial Dr unit H Littleton, CO 80123	<u>S/ Stephen Nalty</u> 2862 W Centennial Dr by: Stephen Nalty unit H Littleton, CO 80123 <u>S/ Harlan Smith</u> 2862 W Centennial Dr by: Harlan Smith unit H Littleton, CO 80123

Please serve defendants.

<b>United States</b> 1600 Pennsylvania Ave, Washington, D.C. 20500	<b>Donald John Trump</b> 1600 Pennsylvania Ave. Washington, D.C. 20500	Federal Bureau of Investigation 8000 East 36th Avenue Denver, Colorado 80238
State of Colorado 1300 Broadway, 10th Floor Denver, Colorado 80203	Cynthia Coffman 1300 Broadway, 10th Floor Denver, Colorado 80203	Colorado BAR Association 1900 Grant Street # 900 Denver, Colorado 80203
Michael A. Martinez <b>Ralph L. Carr Judicial Center</b> 1300 Broadway, Suite 220 Denver, Colorado 80203	Patricia M. Jarzowski 1900 Grant Street # 900 Denver, Colorado 80203	Martin F. Egelhoff <b>Ralph L. Carr Judicial Center</b> 1300 Broadway, Suite 220 Denver, Colorado 80203
Robert S. Shapiro 1300 Broadway, 10th Floor Denver, Colorado 80203	Chris Byrne	Kim Doe (FBI) 8000 East 36th Avenue Denver, Colorado 80238
FBI Agent Doe 1-50 8000 East 36th Avenue Denver, Colorado 80238	Stanley L. Garnett Justice Center 1777 Sixth Street Boulder, CO 80302	Internal Revenue Service 1500 Pennsylvania Avenue Northwest, Washington, DC 20229