

Trevor Andrew Brown,
39603 Neston Street,
Novi, Michigan, 48377
Email: Trevorb.mkxoilco@gmail.com
Ph: 810-614-1194

Date: June 9, 2022

[U.S.Post](#), Certified Mail#: pending

RE: COMPLAINT FOR VIOLATION OF CIVIL RIGHTS;
COMPLAINT FOR OBSTRUCTION;
COMPLAINT FOR BREACH OF TRUST and FIDUCIARY DUTIES.
EXECUTION on 18 USC 4. REPORTING CRIMES.
NOTICE OF PENDING DISTRESS ON FIDELITY BONDS.

REF: CRIMINAL ACTION Case no. 21-mj-498-(GMH)
or
CRIMINAL DOCKET FOR CASE #: 1:22-cr-00170-CKK All Defendants
United States District Court, District of Columbia.

To: Attorney General of the United States,
Merrick B. Garland.
Director Civil Rights Division,
Kirsten Clarke.
Director Office of Professional Responsibility,
Stacy Ludwig.
Inspector General,
Micheal G. Horowitz.
U.S Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue NW
Washington DC 20530-0001

To Attorney General, Merrick B. Garland, and those officers identified above.

**Trevor Andrew Brown approaches the
United States Department of Justice from
the recognized standing and capacity of**

Sovereign verified and ratified to the U.S District Court by the duly served Supreme Court Order found at Yick Wo v. Hopkins, 118 U.S. 356 (1886) duly served to the court under duly filed Motion to Dismiss, docket no. ...???... . The court and U.S. DOJ will either recognize and act under the law or not. This Supreme Court Order to you all in particular.

I demand that a file number for this complaint be provided immediately as required by operational procedures governing the U.S.D.OJ. I may need to supplement this file.

Please NOTE I have accepted your Fiduciary Duties and tied that acceptance to your individual FIDELITY BONDS.

The U.S District Court has failed to timely and properly docket my Motion to Dismiss. That is in fact and deed illegal and unlawful

because I am being denied access to the law, denied protection of the law, denied the right to see and understand the claims and laws being applied to me. Further, the courts action is obstructing government process, which is a felony.

You all, each identified above, will either take all necessary actions to remedy this egregious breach by the court, or you will create the federal public record of your conspiracy to deny me the Civil Rights owed to me by each of you and the court and the criminally negligent U.S. Attorney for the District.

Annexed hereto as fully incorporated are the files as presented to the U.S. District Court via U.S. Post. Simple review of the documents will establish as fact that the District Court in DC is completely naked of jurisdiction. Yet, the judge and clerk apparently act as if they can prove they have

jurisdiction and can do anything they like, tamper with my records and obstruct justice by failing to properly construct public record of all matters happening in the court.

Tampering with federal records, particularly court records is also a serious felony and you all know it.

Simply put, my presentations to the court are dispositive of the fact that the court lacks jurisdiction. If you all after reading my documents do not recognize the facts and law as presented, and your duties to assist me in obtaining justice, then you are either incompetent or crooked. Your acts in this matter will be public record testimony qualifying as judgement on the facts you create by your actions.

In order to protect myself I present Acceptance of Fidelity Bond for each of you so that recourse by surety may be

implemented if necessary as fully incorporated herein.

Holding the standing qualified and recognized by the Supreme Court and being unlawfully restrained of full unimpaired liberty as a misidentified defendant certifies my right to demand In this instant matter the Civil Rights laws be enforced by U.S, DOJ.

Essentially I am reporting crimes by federal officers to the proper place and officers so that in the case of a mistake by the court and its clerk that matter may be corrected. If not the conspiracy to knowingly violate civil rights and other criminal statutes will be proved by federal record.

When you contact the U.S.Attorney for the District of Columbia, please advise him that NOTICE OF PENDING DISTRESS ON the FIDELITY BOND issued will be entered in the proper federal registries. The U.S.

Attorney knows or should have known the process he filed against me was fatally defective because as a highly trained and knowledgeable legal professional serving the United States Government, he has access to every federal record, with few exceptions. What this means in real simple terms that criminal negligence is admitted by the whole of the U.S. Attorneys office operating in the District. They knew or should have known the limits of their powers. The bogus case they filed against me through misidentification is proof of fact of criminal negligence in public service. One phrase settles this fact. Ignorance of the law is no excuse. Conversely, ignorance of the lack of law is no excuse for not knowing.

I have not yet engaged in Notice of Distress on Fidelity Bond for the judge because the U.S. Attorney lied to the court which means the court should receive process due to correct mistakes it may have made to this

point based on the U.S attorneys criminal negligence and false filings.

I have engaged process against the court appointed attorney because he has lied, threatened, mislead me, failed to advise me of beneficial to me relevant material facts, laws, and procedures which have put me at risk. I am dealing with matter in my state jurisdictions. I would appreciate U.S.D.O.J provide me a copy of his contract as the courts attorney, appointed without my fully informed consent and his invoices so I may complete both the damage ledger and provide the BAR with proof of fact that the breach of oath, breach of contract with the United States to provide proper representation to a defendant.

The simple fact is the U.S. Attorney is being denied by the court relevant material facts and law presented in my documents. This is because I refuse to serve him as required by

the rules. I refuse to be enticed to cooperate with a fatally defective process. The use or being held to the rules by a court with no jurisdiction will most certainly be construed as a waiver of some sort causing me further harm and injury and compound the damages for the TORTS. No one may force me to cooperate with a known fraud. Any one attempting to force me to recognize or cooperate with fraud is practicing SLAVERY.

The trick bag the court finds itself in is that the judge made the statement on the record at the hearing June 3, that the U.S. Attorney would respond to my Motion to Dismiss. Being that the judge admitted not being aware and not having reviewed my Motion to Dismiss the judge unknowingly acted without jurisdiction. So, without the Motion to Dismiss and other documents being docketed the judge would be required to provide the documents to the U.S. attorney, which is a trespass on the case and acting

for the U.S, Attorney by providing documents known to be exposing the U.S. Attorneys fraud on the court.

In the event any public servant is concerned about me acting for myself, I present a few Orders from the Supreme Court that should let you know your duties.

The right to defend myself by representation.

Faretta v. State of California, 422 US 806.

Taylor V. US Probation Office, 409 F3d. (DC Circuit)

Vogue V. MacDougall, 454 US 364,

Haines V. Kerner, 404 US 519.

Pro se litigant pleadings are to be construed liberally and held to less stringent standards than formal pleadings drafted by lawyers; if court can reasonably read pleadings to state valid claim on which litigant could prevail, it should do so despite failure to cite proper legal authority, confusion of legal theories, poor syntax and sentence construction, or

litigant unfamiliarity with pleading requirements.

In the event that the totally bogus so called case law allegedly overruling the Archivist of Congress, the Supreme Court, Clerk of the House of Representatives and US DOJ Counsel to the Federal Bureau of Prisons are not recognized as full faith and credit government acts I present the following.

SPECIAL NOTE: Drawn from the same USC applied to charge me, Trevor Andrew Brown, misidentified as TREVOR BROWN.

PART ONE. No federal court in any state holds any judicial power contemplated by the National Constitution. (No matter how many judges say different. Judges and their courts are constructed by the Legislatures.)

Verification of this statement takes less than 30 minutes reading time. More to the point identifying the federal courts with actual judicial power contemplated by the constitution takes 10 minutes reading. After completing this reading perhaps the impression of fraud of a massive proportion will expose its self.

28 United States Code §§ 1 through 144, Supreme, Appeals and District courts, does not identify nor assign either Article III nor inferior Article I judicial power to any of the code courts identified.

Article I inferior judicial power is found in the creation of the United States Court of Federal Claims, § 171, in the same Title 28 USC, and the Court of International Trade § 251, Article III powers.

Creation and Composition of Federal Courts.

§ 171, (a) The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the

Senate, sixteen judges who shall constitute a court of record known as the United States Court of Federal Claims. The court is declared to be a court established under article I of the Constitution of the United States.”

§ 251, (a) The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, nine judges who shall constitute a court of record to be known as the United States Court of International Trade. Not more than five of such judges shall be from the same political party. The court is a court established under article III of the Constitution of the United States.

(b) The offices of the Court of International Trade shall be located in New York, New York.

Compare, § 171 and § 251 with § 132, (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.

(b) Each district court shall consist of the district judge or judges for the district in regular active service. Justices or judges designated or assigned shall be competent to sit as judges of the court.

(c) Except as otherwise provided by law, or rule or order of court, the judicial power of a district court with respect to any action, suit or proceeding may be exercised by a single judge, who may preside alone and hold a regular or special session of court at the same time other sessions are held by other judges.

§ 1, The Supreme Court of the United States shall consist of a Chief Justice of the United States and eight associate justices, any six of whom shall constitute a quorum.

§ 41, The thirteen judicial circuits of the United States are constituted as follows: citing federal districts in the states.

For perfect clarity on federal courts holding real judicial powers contemplated by the Constitution, District of Columbia Code settles the unfounded conjecture passed out by judges and attorneys in their bogus pontifications concerning judicial power and jurisdiction.

Code of the District of Columbia

§ 11–101. Judicial power.

The judicial power in the District of Columbia is vested in the following courts:

(1) The following Federal Courts established pursuant to article III of the Constitution:

(A) The Supreme Court of the United States.

(B) The United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.

(C) The United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

(2) The following District of Columbia courts established pursuant to article I of the Constitution:

(A) The District of Columbia Court of Appeals.

(B) The Superior Court of the District of Columbia.

PART TWO. 1 USC §§ 112, 113 and § 204 defines and clarify what the actual law is and what the code is. Code is mere prima facia, looks like the Baby Ruth, but is actually a turd.

§ 112 USC:

The Archivist of the United States shall cause to be compiled, edited, indexed, and published, the United States Statutes at Large, which shall contain all the laws and concurrent resolutions enacted during each regular session of Congress; all proclamations by the President in the numbered series issued since the date of the adjournment of the regular session of Congress next preceding; and also any amendments to the Constitution of the United States proposed or ratified pursuant to article V thereof since that date, together with the certificate of the Archivist of the United States issued in compliance with the provision contained in section 106b of this title. In the event of an extra session of Congress, the Archivist of the United States shall cause all the laws and concurrent resolutions enacted during said extra session to be consolidated with, and published as part of, the contents of the volume for the next regular session. The United States Statutes at Large shall be legal evidence of laws, concurrent resolutions, treaties, international agreements other than treaties, proclamations by the President, and proposed or ratified amendments to the Constitution of the United States therein contained, in all the courts of the United States, the several States, and the Territories and insular possessions of the United States.

§ 113 USC:

The edition of the laws and treaties of the United States, published by Little and Brown, and the publications in slip or pamphlet form of the laws of the United States issued under the authority of the Archivist of the United States, and the Treaties and Other International Acts Series issued under the authority of the Secretary of State shall be competent evidence of the several public and private Acts of Congress, and of the treaties, international agreements other than treaties, and proclamations by the President of such treaties and international agreements other than treaties, as the case may be, therein contained, in all the courts of law and equity and of maritime jurisdiction, and in all the tribunals and public offices of the United States, and of the several States, without any further proof or authentication thereof.

§ 204 USC: (PRIMA FACIE) In all courts, tribunals, and public offices of the United States, at home or abroad, of the District of Columbia, and of each State, Territory, or insular possession of the United States—

(a)United States Code.—The matter set forth in the edition of the Code of Laws of the United States current at any time shall, together with the then current supplement, if any, establish prima facie the laws of the United States, general and permanent in their nature, in force on the day preceding the commencement of the session following the last session the legislation of which is included:

Mr. Garland et al, I now report the crime of Slavery committed by alleged judicial officers of the United States as drawn from the standard reference services counseling attorneys, particularly U.S Attorneys.

When federal judicial officers refuse to recognize the records and record keepers from which all authority for creation and operations of the legislative constructed courts comes from THERE IS NO LAW IN THOSE COURTS, MERELY RULE BY MEN OPERATING BY DECEPTION.

SLAVERY in fact and deed now presented for your cogitation and action in this instant matter of OBSTRUCTION OF GOVERNMENT PROCESS AND JUSTICE.

“ Mr. Cunningham argues that the text of H.R. 3190, or PL-80-772 enacting Title 18 was only passed by the Senate and not by the House of Representatives, and no quorum was in session. As noted by the Government, every court to address this argument has rejected it:

Although the Fourth Circuit does not appear to have addressed the specific issue of the circumstances surrounding the passage of Public Law 80-772, several other federal courts have done so and have determined that Public Law 80-772 was properly enacted. See, e.g., *United States v. Abdullah*, 289 Fed. Appx. 541, 543 (3d Cir. 2008); *United States v. Campbell*, 221 Fed. Appx. 459, 461 (7th Cir. 2007); *United States v. Risquet*, 426 F.Supp.2d 310 ([E.D.Pa.](#) 2006); *United*

States v. Williams, Crim. No. 03-20147-01-KHV, 2007 WL 38080 (D.Kan. Jan. 4, 2007); Lister v. United States, Nos. 3:06-cv-1355-N, 3:03-cr-374-N, 2006 WL 3751324 (N.D.Tex. Dec. 20, 2006); Cullum v. Fox, No. 1:06cv309, 2006 WL 3691170(E.D.Tex. Dec. 11, 2006); Martinez v. Gonzales, No. 8:02-cr-19-T-27EAJ, 2006 WL 2982856 (M.D.Fla. Oct. 18, 2006); United States v. Lawrence, No. 02 CR 200 (N.D.Ill. Jan. 27, 2006); Derleth v. United States, Crim. No. L-03-1745-6, Civ. No. L-05-205, 2006 WL 1804618 (S.D.Tex. June 27, 2006). Given the clear weight of authority, this Court concludes that P.L. 80-772 was constitutionally enacted.

Webb v. Driver, 2009 WL 529827, 3 ([N.D.W.Va.](#) 2009). See also, United States v. Hawkins, 2009 WL 585477 (M.D. Pa. 2009) (discussing additional authorities rejecting similar constitutional claims.)”

I would be amenable to dismissal and complete ledgering of the accrued TORT damages to date of release from bogus federal process attaching me. Full release of liabilities seems in the best interest of the government. That is unless you all want to prove conclusively how broken and thoroughly corrupted the federal criminal process truly is.

I would appreciate the U.S. DOJ advise all government actors related to this bogus process that settlement with honor is much preferable to class action liabilities and horrendous costs.

I, Trevor Andrew Brown, declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct.

Done this 9th day of June, 2022, duly sworn within the venue jurisdiction of the United States of America recognized as separate from jurisdiction of the United States found by reference Title 28 U.S. Code 2671 (1).

Trevor Andrew Brown, State Citizen of Michigan, All Rights Reserved.