

MOTION FOR DELCARATORY ORDERS AND AN INTERDICT

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF

MISSOURI

Case No:

Notice of Related cases: Office of the Circuit executive Complaint 11-12-90202 and

Judicial Complaint No: DC12-90041

United States Supreme Court : 11- 5659

United States Supreme Court: 11- 10350

NOTICE OF PERTINENT LAWS: THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, THE CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE MENTIONED HEREIN, THE SUPREMACY CLAUSE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, THE BILL OF RIGHTS AND ALL OTHER PERTINENT LAWS ARE INVOKED HEREIN

In the matter between

Annamarie ? Last name uncertain

(referred to as First Petitioner or "Petitioner")

Telephone number: 337-254-1451 and address, 1207 43rd St W, Bradenton, Florida, 34209.

619 Others (List appended in US11-10350 Marked "A" and 41-2009-DR-10430 6/25/09 filing)

(Petitioners Two to Six Hundred and Twenty – the list are case numbers, all related to Mental Health cases decided in the 12th Judicial Circuit Court, in and for Manatee County, Florida. These are cases in which the evidence of a psychiatrist was relied on at a time that the psychiatrist practiced with a Florida medical license issued by the Florida Department of Health which made the fraudulent allegation that she was certified by the American Board of Psychiatry and Neurology which she was not, a statutory and criminal offense and showing she lacked the credibility to be relied on when judicial officers made life changing decisions about the 619 Mental Health cases quoted, thus violating their fundamental rights protected by the Supremacy Clause of the Constitution of the United States of America. By the psychiatrists own written admission she was further during this time disabled by-mental illness in the form of anxiety)

30 Others (List appended in US11-10350, Marked "B")

(Petitioners Six hundred and Twenty One to Six Hundred and Fifty One – This is a list is of 30 referenced numbers obtained from the Florida Department of Health public records under payment to accounting vendors and indicates accounting vendors paid by the Florida Department of Health. The accountant vendor paid in respect of mental health patients as indicated in this list, is payment to the same **psychiatrist as the one who saw the patients in list A above, namely Plaintiffs Two to Six Hundred and Twenty and again at a time her Florida Department of Health license was fraudulent.** In the current list, Plaintiffs Six Hundred and Twenty One to Six hundred and Fifty, are people in respect of whom the psychiatrist was in her capacity as an **accountant** vendor illegally appointed by who knows who in the Florida Department of Health as an **accountant** vendor, as she was not a Florida licensed accountant, a requirement by the Florida Department of Health to be a accountant vendor. Yet, this psychiatrist, at a time the Florida Department of Health had been notified her psychiatric license was fraudulent and they did not deal with it, was paid by the people of Florida for **accounting** services rendered in respect of medical patients. Once a special prosecutor is appointed - as the First

Plaintiff has been asking should be case since June 2010 - it can be established if such 30 people were examined by the psychiatrist herself as mental health patients, then decided on by her in her capacity as accountant, which would be a clear conflict of interest, particularly in the light of the fact that the psychiatrist was reported by one witness to deliberately target particularly the elderly to declare them incapable to deal with their own affairs in her capacity as psychiatrist and then have their assets be held in an **accounting** firm in which she alleged has or had an interest. According to another witness, the psychiatrist is often suicidal, ie suffers from mental illness herself, corroborated by court filings by herself in which she claims to be disabled for years through anxiety – mental illness)

Vs

Electors for the State of

Missouri

NOTICE OF PERTINENT LAWS: SUPREMACY CLAUSE INVOKED

EMERGENCY INTERDICT

Comes now the First Petitioner on behalf of all the Petitioners and Motions this court as follows:

1. To issue a declaratory order that the 2012 Presidential Candidate nominee by the Democrat party, Barak Hussein Obama, is ineligible to be a candidate, and;
2. To interdict the Electors of the State mentioned at the heading hereof to refrain from allowing as candidate on the ballot in the State for President, the Democrat Party nominee, Barak Hussein Obama (in his capacity as a candidate, not President), for violating Amendment 14, Section 3 of the Constitution of the United States of America and other constitutional provisions in his capacity as President and specifically in respect of the Petitioners made himself guilty of a Federal crime against the United States of America in terms of 18USC241 which is simultaneously a violation of his oath to the Constitution of the United States of America the circumstances of which are explained in the attached affidavit. Obama through his conduct prior to and during his presidency renders himself ineligible as candidate for re-election in terms of the Constitution of the United States of America. This court is bound by the Constitution of the United States of America to order the said State Electors to refrain from placing Obama on the ballot, and in addition to or alternatively;
3. If through this court's subpoenaing power it is proven Obama is not a natural born citizen eligible to be President of the United States of America in terms of the Constitution, to interdict the State Electors mentioned at the heading hereof from allowing as candidate on the ballot for the State Barak Hussein Obama, in such instance for violating Amendment 14, Section 3 of the Constitution of the United States of America through various unconstitutional acts (inconclusive list provided at the end of the affidavit attached in support of this Interdict) and thus violated the public trust through injuries

done to the American Society itself and Obama again through his own conduct rendering himself through his conduct and utterances ineligible as candidate for President of the United States of America;

4. To order the Federal Crimes Unit of the Federal offenses against the United States reported to the court in this matter and to order such unit to take action against the perpetrators of the crimes, including Obama, and to protect the victim Petitioners by appointing counsel to protect their rights and halt the 18USC241 and other crimes;
5. Declare this matter complex and in need appoint counsel to assist the Petitioners;
6. Declare this matter urgent and provide urgent relief, the reasons for emergency procedures are provided in the attached affidavit and auxiliary relief to prevent a recurrence of the violations against the Constitution of the United States of America;
7. Further and or alternative relief.

NOTE : OBAMA IS NOT BEING SUED IN HIS CAPACITY AS PRESIDENT OR AT ALL. SIMPLY HIS ELIGIBILITY AS CANDIDATE NEEDS TO BE DETERMINED BY THIS COURT WHICH IS ON A SIMPLE FACTUAL BASIS, THE FACTS OF WHICH THE COURT HAS ACCESS TO THROUGH THIS FILING OR WHICH DETAILS ARE AVAILABLE TO THE COURT THROUGH ITS ACCESS TO RECORDS. THEREFORE OBAMA DOES NOT NEED TO BE A PARTY TO THE PROCEEDINGS: THE DECISIONS FOR THE COURT IS TO ESTABLISH IF THE CANDIDATE OBAMA VIOLATED HIS OATH TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BEFORE OR DURING HIS PRESIDENCY AND WHEN ANSERWERED IN THE AFFIRMATIVE, THAT HE IS IN TERMS OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA IS INELIGIBLE TO BE A CANDIDATE AND THIS FEDERAL COURT MUST INTERDICT THE STATE ELECTORS MENTIONED AT THE HEADING HEREOF FROM PLACING OBAMA ON THE BALLOT FOR THE NOVEMBER 2012 ELECTION ROLL AND THE STATE MUST NOTIFY ITS ELECTORS ACCORDINGLY. Wherefore this court is to order that the Court immediately interdicts the said State Electors as requested in 1 to 5 above, the Affidavit of Annamarie ? (last name uncertain) to be used in support of this interdict. This done and signed at Bradenton, Florida, United States of America on September 11, 2012.

 ANNAMARIE ? Last name uncertain
 1207 43rd St W, Bradenton, Florida, 34209

And in the event that something happens to her, or she is unable to attend hereto:
 THE SOUTH AFRICAN EMBASSY, For the attention of : Mr Ndlovu,
 4301 Conneticut Av, NW, 220, Washington DC, 20008

ANNAMARIE (?) 

Certificate of Service :

I hereby certify that on September 17, 2012, a true and correct copy of the above has been furnished by U.S. Mail/By Hand delivered to THE OFFICIAL ADDRESS OF

The Governor, the Attorney General and the Supreme Court of the State mentioned at the heading hereof.

AFFIDAVIT TO MOTION FOR DELCARATORY ORDERS AND AN INTERDICT

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF

Missouri

Case No:

Notice of Related cases: Office of the Circuit executive Complaint 11-12-90202 and

Judicial Complaint No: DC12-90041

United States Supreme Court : 11- 5659

United States Supreme Court: 11- 10350

In the matter between

Annamarie ? Last name uncertain

(Referred to as First Petitioner or "Petitioner")

Telephone number: 337-254-1451 and address, 1207 43rd St W, Bradenton, Florida, 34209.

619 Others (List appended in US11-10350 Marked "A" and 41-2009-DR-10430 6/25/09 filing)

30 Others (List appended in US11-10350, Marked "B")

(Petitioners Six hundred and Twenty One to Six Hundred and Fifty

One – This is a list is of 30 referenced numbers obtained from the Florida Department of Health public records under payment to accounting vendors and indicates accounting vendors paid by the Florida Department of Health).

Vs

Electors for the State of

MISSOURI

AFFIDAVIT OF ANNAMARIE (? LAST NAME UNCERTAIN) IN SUPPORT OF AN EMERGENCY INTERDICT TO PREVENT THE STATE MENTIONED AT THE HEADING HEREOF FROM ALLOWING BARAK HUSSEIN OBAMA AS CANDIDATE IN THE NOVEMBER 2012 ELECTION IN THE SAID STATE AND TO TAKE ACTION AGAINST CRIME

1. The Jurisdiction of this court is invoked pursuant to this court being required to hear federal questions (28 U.S.C. section 1331), as well as in respect of violations of civil rights pursuant to 42 U.S.C. section 1983. The Court has subject-matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 because some of these actions arise under the Constitution and laws of the United States. Venue is proper in this district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(e)(3) because some of the defendants are agencies of the United States or officers thereof acting in their official capacity.

2. 

3. My name is Annamarie. I no longer have certainty as to my last name as a direct result of the Obama regime. I provide the reasons for no longer having certainty as to my last name in the paragraphs below. My address is 1207 43rd St W, Bradenton Florida and my fundamental rights protected by the Supremacy Clause of the United States of America have been violated on an ongoing basis despite the Supremacy Clause having been invoked. I also invoke the Supremacy Clause of the United States into this matter in the latter part of this affidavit which I file in support of the Motion to which it is attached.
4. As the First Petitioner herein, I have suffered extreme violations of individual, human rights and women's rights abuses at the hands of the Obama regime over a prolonged period of time. This resulted in complex litigation which is ongoing. Had the laws of the State of Florida and of the United States of America been implemented from the outset into the criminal harm suffered by me and my family, the litigation would not have been necessary.
5. The litigation became necessary for me to protect my and my family's fundamental rights, and as I learnt of more victims of crime who are unable to protect their own rights, it has also been my obligation in terms of my oath to the Constitution of the United States of America to protect their rights.
6. I would not have known about the state of extreme danger "we the people" of the United States are in because government officials tasked and paid by "we the people" to implement and protect "we the people" and the Constitution of the United States of America, have turned against "we the people", the hand that feed them, and become traitors to the Constitution of the United States of America.
7. Such government officials guilty of treason are getting away with their treason because those who know about their treason are part of the broken judicial system in need of repairing itself to the Constitution which gives it life. However, those who are fully aware of its shortcomings of the system and the extreme lack of integrity by officials in the system, put their own agendas ahead of their duty to "we the people" of the United States of America.
8. The court to which this Interdict is addressed shall no doubt have such traitors in its midst who refuse to honor their oaths to the Constitution of the United States of America. As such, they are enemies of the Constitution and I have sworn an oath to protect the United States from enemies within and without. Despite firsthand knowledge of the brokenness of the system, it is the only correct system to use for this Emergency Motion and Interdict, and in the interest of the 300 million "we the people" as well as the rest of the world to work inside until it is repaired to the Constitution of the United States of America, exactly as George Washington meant when he said of the Constitution: "Let us set a standard to which the wise and honest can repair".
9. The repair to the Constitution of the United States of America that is asked for in this specific Emergency Motion for Declaratory orders and an interdict is simple: The United States of America belongs to "we the people". "We the people" have a Constitution which organizes our country. All those whom we employ to work for us, and serve us, and our country, must do so inside a set of strict rules we have laid down. This court is the rule keeper for this State. One of the requirements is that we refuse to employ as our managers anyone who did not adhere to our rules, to which we made him or her make a promise they will keep. If they don't keep their promise, we disqualify them. In 2012 we are employing a new senior manager. We do not think the candidate Obama is suitable, because he did not stick to the rules even though he promised to do so. This court, the Rule keepers, must with honesty and integrity compare his conduct against the rules and tell us if Obama broke the rules and made himself ineligible as a candidate for "we

the people's" top job. The first set of circumstances this court is asked to deal with, is to compare Obama's conduct against the Rules as relate to the specific circumstances of the over 600 Petitioners herein. The second set of circumstances this court is asked to compare Obama's conduct against is whether or not he is eligible in terms of his citizenship, namely qualifying as a natural born citizen, a Constitutional requirement, or not, in order for Obama to be a candidate at all. Whether Obama was previously a President (ie, if an error was made before, such error does not correct the wrong and we do not need to be suckers twice) is irrelevant. Obviously if Obama was never eligible in terms of the Constitution of the United States to be President, for instance, if he is not natural born, then he is automatically disqualified in terms of the Constitution of the United States of America. If he is eligible, then the court must ask itself, if over and above having disqualified himself through his conduct in respect of the Petitioners, if Obama also disqualified himself through other unconstitutional conduct after he swore to adhere to the Constitution of the United States of America and to protect it from enemies foreign and domestic? The Rule keepers, this court, is also asked, that if any illegal or criminal conduct is revealed in the process of this court considering the matter, that this court act inside its rules, which means in respect of crime, that this court notify, the owners, "we the people" thereof, and in terms of our Rules, take care of the criminal conduct and all who acted criminally, that means exercising the criminal jurisdiction of the United States and start the federal prosecution process, subpoena witnesses, do what needs to be done to stop the criminal conduct and to bring the situation back under the supreme law of the United States, the Supremacy Clause of our Constitution.

10. In the event that there are any justices in this court who do honor their oath to the Constitution of the United States of America (the First Petitioner is not being nasty, she simply has truly not come across any), I wish to remind the justices at the outset of this: ANY government official in the United States of America, including the President and Federal court justices, derive their power from the contract with "we the people", namely, that in exchange for such government official making a solemn and sacred oath to stay completely inside the parameters of the Constitution, not venturing out in any respect whatsoever, "we the people" give such government official the power to fulfill certain duties. If they break the rules, they abuse us.
11. Further, if any such government official, became appointed into a government position and paid in good faith by "we the people" due to the fraudulent allegations of such official which "we the people" did not know about at the time of the appointment, then such fraud by the government official invalidates the appointment of such fraudulent government official *ab initio*, namely from the outset, and whatever functions the fraudulent official performed during their time in office, is void and of no legal effect. That would mean that if Obama was never eligible to be a President of the United States of America in terms of the Constitution of the United States of America, then he and all who worked with him to cover the fraud are traitors to "we the people" of the United States of America and must be dealt with in terms of the Rule of Law. The Rule of Law demands the fraudulent appointment of a government official invalidates the "official" conduct by such government official. Therefore, if whilst this court is examining whether Obama as candidate is eligible to be on the ballot for the 2012 election, it come to its attention Obama was not eligible as a person due to not having been natural born as the Constitution of the United States of America demands, then he must be removed immediately as his Presidency was invalid *ab initio*, from the outset. Having fraudulently become United States President will also invalidate his nominations of justices to this court. There is therefore over and above the general conflict of interest demanding any judge Obama appointed him or herself disqualifying themselves to adhere to Judicial Cannon, the additional danger, that judges appointed by Obama may wish to cover up any unconstitutional conduct to not lose their appointment as a judge to this court: no judge appointed by Barak Obama may therefore consider this matter.

12. The First Petitioner wants to make it very clear, there is much about Obama she likes, so this is not a vendetta against him. However, the all the Petitioners are victims of the State of Florida and the United States failing to exercise its criminal jurisdiction and those who joined the criminal conduct are government officials. Obama is the ultimate keeper of the law. When Obama was fully aware of the extreme losses of fundamental rights by the Petitioners, he failed to intervene. Obama could have prevented the extreme women's rights abuses which deprived the First Petitioner of certainty to her last name and much more. Obama's conduct and failure to act, caused the Petitioner to start asking why he says one thing and does another and led to this matter which is solely brought about by Obama's conduct, not by malice of the First Petitioner. Yes, she has a right to be disgruntled under the circumstance, but much bigger than that, is her sacred oath to protect the United States of America against enemies foreign and domestic, and that is her only motivation for this exercise.
13. Although for this specific case, the only relevance of the abovementioned statements is to remind the justices of this court that it is their duty to apply the Constitution of the United States to conduct brought to their attention through this motion, I also mention this, because I believe if this court applies itself to this matter and the issues raised herein, that it may well uncover serious fraud against "we the people" of the United States of America. In terms of their oaths to the Constitution of the United States of America such discovery shall place a burden on the justices to protect the rights of "we the people" and their Constitution, even if it has to make the United States of America the laughing stock of the world to have been defrauded by senior government officials.
14. I have seen such total disregard for the law and the Constitution of the United States in the very federal system which has as it's first and foremost duty the implementation of the Constitution of the United States of America that I do not expect to find anyone of integrity. I therefore know that by filing this matter to this court I shall encounter enemies to the Constitution of the United States as well as to me for daring to say so, but most of all for having the audacity to dare raise the Constitution! Being foreign born and trained in law, makes it easy to see the deviation from the "plumb line"/Constitution. The Constitution is the rock and foundation of the United States and of its legal system. The political hogwash which created the impression that to demand repair to the Constitution of the United States of America is far right is nonsense. There is only one solid footing for the United States, and that is the foundations of its Constitution. That is therefore the center of this country and always where any of this veering off to too little or too much need to repair to. All federal courts and all federal justices have a single mandate: adhere to the Constitution of the United States of America. If that happens, the United States and its Constitution shall be fine to play a meaningful role into the world for a long time to come. Below are set out Obama's allegiance to the Saul Alinsky model, wanting to replace the Constitution of the United States with an anything goes type of third world socialist communist bastardized regime. One understands Obama's strange background and upbringing probably brought him lots of hardships from the system. Instead of working to repair the system, it appears, following the Alinsky model, he decided to break it, planning to build a better one, which is not likely. Countries which have fallen for Hitlers and Mugabe,s etc, also got carried away by people who made as if they are mesiah's and all that happened is the people were destroyed. This court has only one allegiance: the Constitution of the United States of America and "we the people". Officials are of no importance. If Obama's feelings are hurt and the press is angry, it is of no importance whatsoever: stick to the rock of the Constitution that is how this country shall survive and be truly great again.
15. I have spent a great deal of time praying for the United States of America and have prayed that despite my doubt that there are any government officials who respect the Rule of Law or the

Constitution of the United States, that if there are such men and women of true integrity who have this matter come before them, that they will have the patience to come to understand the complex issues involved and the courage to prevail and with honesty and integrity consider this matter seriously and against the Constitution of the United States of America alone and nothing else. If it was not that I had the extreme abuses of fundamental rights at the hand of those tasked to have protected my fundamental rights, I would not have taken so much time and effort to explain in such simple language the situation. For those with a quick understanding and of integrity: again, sorry, but I had no choice under the circumstance, but to be overcautious that people understand the relevance and seriousness of this matter.

16. Below is set out the sequence of events which involves Barak Hussein Obama, the current President of the United States of America and hereinafter referred to as "Obama". Obama violated his oath to the Constitution of the United States of America in respect of the Petitioners, rendering himself ineligible in his capacity as a candidate for the 2012 or any other election.
17. Obama's ineligibility is his own doing for having violated his oath to the Constitution of the United States of America whilst in office, and for illegal conduct prior to becoming President as well as during his presidency, the proof of which is available to this court through this filing and through its subpoenaing powers.
18. The Petitioners believe that the conduct complained of demands that this court declare the candidate Obama ineligible to be a candidate in the 2012 election and when the Constitution of the United States of America demand that this court interdicts the Electors of the abovementioned State from allowing Obama as a candidate on the list of candidates which the Electors are entitled to elect from.
19. The powers invoked herein are set directly by the Constitution of the United States of America and cannot be altered by the United States Congress, the States, of which the abovementioned who has to inform its Electors is one, or this court. The only function this court has is to implement the Constitution of the United States into the circumstance.
20. This is not a case against any State or against the United States of America or against any federal officer. Obama as President is the present Executive of the United States of America and a federal officer, however, at the time he is a candidate at the November 2012 election as nominated to be a candidate for President of the United States of America by the Democrat Party, he is not a candidate in his capacity as President or as Federal officer, but is merely 'Obama' a private individual, a candidate in his capacity as an individual, and it is in this capacity as an individual who wants to be a candidate that this court has to measure Obama the candidate, the individual's conduct as against Obama the President's conduct in respect of his duties and oath under the Constitution of the United States of America as well as if there was any criminal intent, ie, to have known he is ineligible in terms of the Constitution of the United States of America to be a candidate in the 2008 election by not being natural born, and yet having made himself available for election then.
21. Because in January 2009 Obama swore an oath to the Constitution of the United States of America and violated such oath whilst in office, Amendment 14, Section 3 of the Constitution of the United States of America applies to him. Only former officials may be candidates for future elections who did not violate their oaths to the Constitution of the United States of America during their time in office.
22. The first and foremost question before this court is for this court to determine if the Petitioners are correct that Obama disqualified himself as candidate by having violated his oath to the Constitution of the United States of America.
23. Although the Petitioners believe that over and above having violated his oath to the Constitution of the United States of America in respect of them, that in addition thereto in further instances

brought to the attention of this court herein, Obama during his presidency also acted *ultra vires* and beyond his authority in other respects. As a secondary duty this court must hold Obama accountable for such additional conduct brought to the attention of the court herein. The primary objective of this Emergency Interdict is to show this Court Obama acted constitutionally and is due to his own conduct disqualified as candidate for the 2012 Election.

24. It is the duty of this court to exercise the criminal jurisdiction of the United States of America in respect of constitutional and other crimes learn about through this filing.
25. Impeachment proceedings against a President or certain other government officials can only take place after a majority vote by congress and a copy hereof is served on the United States Congress. The United States Congress is reminded through the serving hereof on it, that it has implied power to investigate any of the allegations made herein, and that its duty lies with the 300 million American's whose future is affected by the conduct described herein, and by the individual oaths to the Constitution of the United States each Congressman or women took (ie to the Constitution of the United States of America) and not with any other power, such as the President. If Congress should impeach President Obama, but fails to do so, it fails the people of the United States of America who trusted Congress to protect them from fraudulent or illegal conduct by anyone, including the President of the United States of America.
26. In his capacity as President, Obama has the privilege to keep certain communications secret. However, in criminal proceedings presidential communications are allowed to be available to the prosecution where there is a need for such information to be demonstrated.
27. Therefore, in respect of Obama's participation in the 18USC241 constitutional crime against the United States of America which the Petitioners are accusing Obama of herein: in the event that this court decides to prosecute Obama for such or any other crime, (Possible examples such as Obama putting himself up for election as President when he knew from the outset he is not a natural born United States citizen as the Constitution of the United States prescribes a President has to be, information such as whether Obama is responsible for the illegal conduct of Moody by influencing Moody to take the matter from Whittemore, can be obtained as evidence.) this court, as a part of the Federal system, has direct access to information as to Obama's place of birth, whether he was an Indonesian citizen who came to the United States of America on a study visa, is alleged to never have restored his citizenship, and in the Federal court for the District of Columbia is alleged of using the Social Security numbers in tax fillings and other official documents belongs to someone else, ie is fraudulent, and other allegations "we the people" have the right to have certainty about, then it is the legal duty of this court to act and file criminal charges if there is, or has been, any illegal conduct in respect of any of such issues "we the people", Obama's bosses, must know about.
28. As part of the decision of this court as to whether or not Obama qualifies as a presidential candidate for the 2012 election, the Petitioners demand this court examines, obtain evidence and make its order in terms of the Constitution of the United States of America and that alone.
29. This court is reminded, that it is not bound by errors of the past. What the Petitioners mean is that even if it comes to the attention of this court that Obama was not born in the United States or when he came back as an Indonesian citizen and never applied through the naturalization process to be a United States citizen once he reached the age of majority (if he was born outside the United States of America to an America mother in Keyna as that country's records are purported to indicate, he would be entitled to citizenship, but would only receive such citizenship after the naturalization process which it appears there is no evidence of), and for that reason, or for the reason that he was not a natural born United States citizen in that both parents were not citizens, and despite him having therefore been Constitutionally barred from the office of President and he none the less became president for the period 2009 to date, that it does not remove the obligation from this court in deciding as to whether or not Obama is eligible to be a candidate for the 2012 election or not. To overlook his past lack of compliance with the Constitution of the United States of America. In short: if Obama violated the Constitution of the United States of America to be

president when he was ineligible and none the less became president, it is the right of the Petitioners and the right of the People of the United States to know the exact details.

30. This court is further reminded that the Constitution of the United States of America prevails over any conflict between it, Federal Statutes, Treaties and Executive Agreements and orders and State laws. The court is further reminded that no Treaty may be inconsistent with the Constitution of the United States of America. No treaty or executive agreement can confer on Congress authority to act in a manner inconsistent with any specific provision of the Constitution. Specific provisions of the Constitution are herein asked to be implemented, ie, considering his prior conduct before and whilst in office, as against his oath to the Constitution of the United States of America, and also Obama's eligibility as a natural born American or not, also a Constitutional question only.

Specifically this court must note: the Supremacy Clause of the Constitution of the United States is raised herein. Therefore, what Lamberth, who decided Obama's social security issue said was wrong, namely: "The judge, Royce Lamberth, credited Taitz for her dedication to her cause but said that "today is not her lucky day."

He concluded that there's no real interest in determining whether the Obama Social Security Number is genuine or fraudulent, arguing that the need for privacy for the president trumps all else." The Constitution of the United States of America trumps all else, this specific court is not bound by Lamerth trying to defend Obama, this court is bound by the Constitution of the United States of America, which demands the President of the United States be a natural born citizen and that means that he legally acquired his social security number and it is of every relevance. The people have the right to know. The people have the right to raise the Constitution which indeed trumps all else. If Obama used a fraudulent social security number, then it goes to the root of his presidency and his oath to the Constitution of the United States of America. This court must give definitive answers: is Obama natural born, does he comply and qualify in terms of the Constitution of the United States of America and the judges who sign this matter, if he is not and does not bring it to light, will be traitors with him. A nation under God believes what God says, namely that all things will be revealed. If Obama is not natural born and does not qualify in terms of the Constitution of the United States of America, then he must be ordered disqualified. This court has the subpoenaing power to establish that and it needs to do so. Every American has the right to certainty that the President complies with the Constitution of the United States of America.

31. This matter falls outside the Eleventh Amendment Limits on Federal Courts. The exception which applies is that if State Electors who are sought to be interdicted herein, are not interdicted and they vote for a candidate prohibited by the Constitution of the United States to be a candidate, (whether due to not being natural born or, as alleged herein, who violated the oaths of office as prohibited by Amendment 14, Section 3 of the Constitution, or for any other reason this court may deem meet), such State Electors will violate the Constitution of the United States of America and Federal laws relating thereto through their vote for the Constitutionally ineligible candidate: in this instance, Obama. Obama's eligibility or not in terms of the Constitution is always a matter of fact. If Obama is Constitutionally ineligible, whether it is recognized now or not: the Constitutional bar, if applicable in respect of him, is a bar, prior, during or after any time he may have served. Therefore, enjoining the State Electors herein is to interdict them and prevent future conduct by such State Electors which, but for the granting of this interdict, will by the contention

- of the Petitioners, be conduct causing the Electors to violate the Constitution themselves. This matter is therefore not prohibited by the Eleventh Amendment.
32. This matter does not deal with political questions, but with constitutional questions within the jurisdiction of this court.
 33. This is a case of controversy. For the Petitioners the first controversy arose when they were victims of crime and the State of Florida and the United States of America failed to exercise its criminal jurisdiction, leaving them deprived of fundamental rights. Those complained to about their loss of fundamental rights created the next controversy when they decided to go along with the perpetrators of crime and deliberately harm the victims setting of a continuing 18USC241 crime, of which Obama became a part. Obama knows he violated his oath to the Constitution of the United States of America whilst in office in respect of the Petitioners, which renders him ineligible as a candidate in the 2012 and any other election.
 34. This court must determine without a shadow of doubt (an absolute right “we the people have” if Obama is a natural born United States citizen as the Constitution of the United States of America demands that a President must be or not. If not, then the Democrat party no doubt knows that. In such case, despite having through his own conduct or birth being Constitutionally barred, the Democrat party will none the less nominated him as a candidate for the 2008 and now 2012 election: possible widespread fraud on the people.
 35. The Petitioners are first hand victims and it is in their personal knowledge that Obama violated his oath of office in respect of them. The Petitioners have standing in terms of the Constitution of the United States in being citizens compelled by Amendment 14 to the Constitution of the United States to provide evidence affecting the Constitution of the United States, which if they fail to bring the information to the attention of the court, will harm the sovereignty of the Constitution of the United States of America and the First Petitioner will violate her oath to the Constitution of the United States of America. Various Federal Statutes, such as the Civil Rights Act of 1870 created interests sufficient for standing to the Petitioners.
 36. The First Petitioner further has the right to assert the constitutional right of the other Petitioners and she has an obligation in respect of them, knowing they are victims of state and constitutional crimes. The First Petitioner’s obligation in respect of the other Petitioners arose as follows: On 25 June 2010 under State of Florida case number 41-2009-DR-10430 the First Petitioner brought to the attention of the 12th Judicial Circuit Court in and for Manatee County, Bradenton, Florida, Clerk of the Court, Chip Shore, that Bradenton psychiatrist, Fabisiak, according to the court record as reflected against Fabisiak’s name at the time, was the expert in over 600 mental health cases in that court. The court record showed Fabisiak was an expert in these over 600 cases over a ten year period. Fabisiak the psychiatrist therefore had close working and other relationships developed over a long period of time into the court. These relationships would prohibit officials who know her well and over a long period of time to preside in matters concerning her mental health patient, William Riethmiller, the First Petitioner’s husband, where the psychiatrist had committed a Florida Statute 491.0111 and 491.0112 felony and other criminal conduct in respect of him. Although the First Petitioner did not know at that time, for all relevant times the psychiatrist was practicing with a fraudulent Florida license. Further during that time, by the psychiatrists own admission in a case against Sunterra in that court filed December 27, 2010, the psychiatrist admitted that during all relevant times, she, the psychiatrist, was disabled by mental illness (anxiety). Because of criminal conduct by Ezell and Gilner, two officials of that court and self acknowledged friends of the psychiatrist, as at July 2010, the First Petitioner subpoenaed Chip Shore, the Clerk of the Court, on 10 July 2010 for Shore to provide details of the judicial officers who decided the over 600 cases. Chip Shore responded in writing that he did not keep the records of such cases, a constitutional violation by him as constitutional officer. When in 2011 conclusive evidence by the American Board of Psychiatry and Neurology was obtained that the psychiatrist license was fraudulent, Chip Shore and various others were notified that the over 600 mental health patients had the evidence of a psychiatrist relied on when her license was

fraudulent and she lacked the integrity to be relied on. By then the psychiatrists self admitted mental illness was known to Shore, and was also provided to all relevant authorities, including the Second District Court of Appeal for the State of Florida, the Florida Supreme Court, the Governor for the State of Florida, the Attorney General for the State of Florida, the Inspector General for the State of Florida, the Inspector General for the Department of Health of the State of Florida (who participated in the psychiatrists fraud in the Florida Department of Health Inspector General supporting the psychiatrists fraud in writing, aiding and abetting the psychiatrists fraud in the letter by the Florida Inspector General for the Florida Department of Health dated September 30, 2010, wherein the Florida Inspector General for the Florida Department of Health alleged the psychiatrist is American Board of Psychiatry and Neurology certified, when the Inspector General for the State of Florida had direct access to that board and knew it was a fraudulent allegation by the psychiatrist). The Federal court was notified in US Florida Middle District Court matter 8:12-cv-1796-T-30AEP, now SC11-10350. The Federal court was in particular notified that the Petitioner through a witness whose full details was provided to the court, that the psychiatrist deliberately (according to the witness) declared an old lady incompetent, when she was not competent, to put the lady's assets in an **accounting** firm in which the **psychiatrist** had an interest as **accountant**, and that when the ordeal for the old lady was over, most of her assets were gone, ie, serious fraud and abuse of the elderly. Therefore, the balance of the Petitioners, due to them being mental health cases, represent people who are likely ill, including mentally ill, maybe old or suffering from addictions and other problems: all likely vulnerable people. The fate of these vulnerable and innocent American citizens was decided by judicial officers, such as Gilner and Ezell (Ezell hi-jacked a court July 14, 2010 and August 9, 2010) who relied on the "expert" evidence of their psychiatrist friend with a fraudulent license, rendering her testimony and the decision of the court, null and void. Combining this with the witness testimony about the old lady, namely that some government official in that court most likely knowingly ordered the old lady's assets to an accounting firm they must have known their fraudulent psychiatrist expert had an interest in, means quite likely there is foul play in more than just the old lady's case. The First Petitioner has demanded repeatedly that the State of Florida to investigate if any of the over 600 people (such as the elderly lady) came to harm as a result of the criminal conduct, obviously a huge task, but until the State of Florida accepts its responsibility these over 600 people are disenfranchises and deprived of their fundamental rights (see US SC11-10350). Obama has had full details of the plight of these over 600 vulnerable US citizens since service on him of US Florida Middle District Case 8:10CV1763-T-27TGW, now SC11-5659. The relationship between the First Petitioner and the other Petitioners is that they are all victims of crime where the State of Florida and the United States of America failed to exercise its criminal jurisdiction in terms of the Petitioners under the Obama regime when Obama himself had firsthand knowledge of the matter, leaving all Petitioners as victims deprived of fundamental rights protected by the Supremacy Clause of the United States of America and entitled to international protection, which they have sought from the International Criminal court in OTP-CR-50/12. However, the United States unsigned from the Rome Statute (on the grounds of being concerned for individual rights abuses!!!!). Hillary Clinton in her capacity as Secretary of State for the United States of America on the request of South Africa appears to have refused any concern for the over 600 helpless victims of crime and fundamental rights abuses and remained silent in giving consent that the United States will submit itself to the jurisdiction of the International Criminal court. Accordingly, the First Respondent in August 2012 addressed a request to France, which headed the Security Council for the United Nations during that month, to ask the Security Council of the United Nations to petition the International Criminal court to bring the United States officials Ezell, Gilner, Moreland, Smith and others to Justice for their abuse of the victims of crime of which the Petitioners herein are some such victims. The special relationship between the First Petitioner and the rest of the Petitioners are then that they are therefore all people deprived of their fundamental rights protected through the Supremacy Clause

of the United States of America for which Obama and his regime has shown no respect whatsoever. All the Petitioners have accordingly been personally affected by Obama violating his oath to the Constitution of the United States of America and it is in their interest that the Constitution of the United States of America be adhered to. The Constitution of the United States of America demands that no candidate who violated his or her oath whilst in office can be a candidate in a future elections. (Amendment 14, Section 3).

37. The Petitioners all suffer harm, as well as a threat of future harm, and the harm is specific: the Supremacy Clause of the United States subjects all laws and all people under its Superior Rule. No one and no law in the United States of America is above it, not even the President of the United States of America. Obama has harmed the Petitioners by violating his oath to the Constitution of the United States of America. Obama not being stopped as a candidate pose a real and immediate danger to the interests of the Petitioners and “we the people” who only gave a mandate to Obama as long as he acts inside the parameters of the Constitution he gave his solemn promise to keep. When Obama failed to keep his promise to conduct himself inside the framework of the Constitution of the United States of America he became a threat to all the people of the United States of America, hence the Constitution of the United States of America not wanting the people to ever again be subject to such potential harm and placing an absolute ban on such person being a candidate, unless congress votes with a two third majority that he can proceed despite his violation of the Constitution of the United States of America: Once this court has debarred Obama from being a candidate he can ask Congress to condone his violations of the Constitution of the United States of America. Only congress can therefore decide if it shall go against the provisions of the Constitution in that respect: this court does not have that right.
38. The Petitioners all have a concrete stake in the outcome of this case. But for Obama and the illegal conduct of Moody (appointed by Obama’s friend, Bill Clinton) who seized 8:10CV1763-T-27TGW, now SC11-5659 at a time Whittemore had already sent out pre-trial notices for a jury trial to hold Ezell and Gilner (amongst others) accountable for violating the Constitution of the United States of America, and Moody, ignoring the laws and rules of appointment of judges to Federal cases, summarily dismissed the matter. This dismissal was an unconstitutional act as the de facto result is against the law: condoning county disobedience to the laws and Constitutions of the State of Florida and the United States of America. Officials like Ezell, quoted Obama as their leader they follow (Ezell quoted following Obama whilst hi-jacking the court in 41-2009-DR-10430 on July 14, 2010). The influence of the President over lesser officials is accordingly extremely important. If the President shows no respect for the laws and the Constitution this matter shows how such unconstitutional conduct by one reckless government official is followed through by lesser officials, making this matter of extreme urgency and importance to stop the abuse of the Rule of Law and the Constitution in the United States of America and interrupt the pattern of abuse put in place by the Obama regime. Obama as President violating the Constitution influenced the illegal conduct of Ezell showing the unconstitutional conduct of higher officials influenced county officials, and the State of Florida officials such as Pariente, and Federal officials such as Moody (and Whittemore who was too much of a coward to stop Moody’s abuse when he had a constitutional duty to do so), and Hillary Clinton. The State Electors must not be allowed to vote for a candidate who does not adhere to his or her oath to the Constitution of the United States of America, because if they do, the harm to people such as the Petitioners, the result is a complete loss of fundamental rights, the cornerstone of the Constitution of the United States of America and a violation of the Supremacy Clause of the United States of America.
39. The Petitioners have all been directly and personally injured by the unlawful government action of which Obama’s violation of his oath to the Constitution of the United States of America forms part which affects the fundamental rights of the Petitioners under the Constitution of the United States of America as they have a right to be protected by the provisions of the Constitution and the Supremacy Clause thereof and other pertinent laws, all of which were invoked in the matters

referred to herein, as matters where Obama violated his oath to the Constitution of the United States of America.

40. Obama had it in his power and it was his Constitutional duty to intervene when he was provided full details on numerous occasions. His failure to give effect to his oath of the Constitution of the United States of America caused the harm the Petitioners continue to suffer.
41. This court granting this order will eliminate the grievance, in that a President who adheres to the Constitution of the United States of America may be elected who will hold accountable illegal conduct by government officials such as Ezell, Smith, Moody and others and prevent harm and deprivation of fundamental rights by people such as the Petitioners.
42. The provisions relating to the federal judicial power in Article III of the Constitution of the United States of America state:

“ The judicial power of the United States, shall be vested in one Supreme Court, and in such inferior courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish” (The Federal Court in which this matter is filed, is such court) “. . . 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. . . . In all cases affecting ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, and those in which a state shall be party, the Supreme Court shall have original jurisdiction. In all the other cases before mentioned, the Supreme Court shall have appellate jurisdiction, both as to law and fact, with such exceptions, and under such regulations as the Congress shall make. ”

The Supremacy Clause of Article VI states:

“ 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, any Thing in the Constitution or Laws of any State to the Contrary notwithstanding. . . . **[A]ll executive and judicial Officers, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by Oath or Affirmation, to support this Constitution.** ”

The power of judicial review has been implied from these provisions based on the following reasoning. It is the inherent duty of the courts to determine the applicable law in any given case. The Supremacy Clause says "[t]his Constitution" is the "supreme law of the land." The Constitution therefore is the fundamental law of the United States. Federal statutes are the law of the land only when they are "made in pursuance" of the Constitution. State constitutions and statutes are valid only if they are consistent with the Constitution. Any law or conduct contrary to the Constitution is void. The federal judicial power extends to all cases "arising under this Constitution." As part of their inherent duty to determine the law, the federal courts have the duty to interpret and apply the Constitution. All judges are bound to follow the Constitution. If there is a conflict, the federal courts have a duty to follow the Constitution Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S. at 175–78.

43. My last name is uncertain after a Florida State judicial official, Smith, who swore an oath to the Constitution of the United States of America, violated that oath by hi-jacking a State of Florida court on May 24, 2012, when his court, the 12th Judicial circuit, Manatee county, Florida had no jurisdiction in 41-2009-DR-10430 as the Florida Supreme Court had jurisdiction over the matter at the time.
44. Smith, who was notified he had no jurisdiction and if he proceeded it shall be hi-jacking of the court, on May 24, 2012 none the less hi-jacked the court and whilst hi-jacking the court intentionally committed fraud on an order he issued in which he alleged deliberately fraudulently in writing that the matter 41-2009-DR-10430 was a simple divorce when Smith knew full well it

was a contested divorce. The First Petitioner's husband filed for the divorce after he became criminally abused by his psychiatrist. The psychiatrist made use of the transference phenomenon and Stockholms syndrome, the First Petitioner believes her husband suffers from due to his completely out of character conduct supported in various court filings by affidavits of unrelated parties. The First Petitioner's husband, William Riethmiller, fell victim to the psychiatric crime at a time he was most vulnerable. All academic literature the First Petitioner has read on the subject, as well as a consultant psychiatrist she approached in Tampa, confirmed her husband is in danger and may well suffer serious and long term negative effects as a result of being a victim of psychiatric crime. The First Petitioner's husband filed for divorce in October 2009 shortly after the First Petitioner learnt that his psychiatrist at a time he was on mind altering medication the psychiatrist prescribed, had moved him into her (the psychiatrist's) home. In February 2010 the First Petitioner filed a counter-petition and counter-claim and that and all subsequent evidence clearly shows the matter is a contested divorce. In particular several Motions immediately before Smith hi-jacking the court, reminded Smith that one of the reasons a final divorce cannot proceed is because no discovery of marital asset, Fresh Start Law Group LLC had taken place, despite the First Petitioner having filed a written request for a date to compel discovery, after her husband had filed a fraudulent affidavit in May 2010. As stated, from numerous filings, and especially since February 2012 when Smith, with no assignment or appointment from anyone suddenly appeared on the "scene", he was notified by the First Petitioner in writing that it was a matter where one of the parties, the First Petitioner's husband, had a very long history (over twenty years) of serious mental illness and addictions, had become a victim of a Florida felony at the hands of his psychiatrist, and the First Petitioner had already suffered serious fundamental rights abuses (even till then!!!) through illegal unconstitutional (18USC241 crimes) by Smith's colleagues, Gilner, Ezell, Moreland and others). Smith made no error on May 24, 2012, he knew full well the matter was a contested and not a simple divorce. Smith alleging in writing it was a simple divorce, is therefore a deliberate fraud and crime, over and above his hi-jacking the court.

45. Smith accordingly committed a 18USC241 constitutional crime through his order. Smith's order was no in isolation, but forms part of a string of constitutional crimes the President of the United States, Barak Obama had full knowledge and details of long before Smith committed the crime. The Constitution of the United States of America lays down that in the President of the United States of America "vests the power to execute the instructions of Congress, which has the exclusive power to make laws as set out in the United States Constitution: "To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof."
46. Smith is such officer. Smith's deliberate fraudulent allegation that it was a simple divorce when he knew it was not, makes him with his own written proof in the form of the fraudulent order of May 24, 2012 guilty of an 18USC241 crime, where he joins others, including Obama, for reasons set out below.
47. The United States Constitution also provides: "Each State shall appoint, in such Manner as the Legislature thereof may direct, a Number of Electors," Because Obama violated his oath to the Constitution of the United States of America and had duties in terms of the Constitution he deliberately failed to perform or even negatively participated in, he is ineligible as a candidate in terms of Amendment 14, Section 3 of the Constitution of the United States of America, and other provisions, to be a candidate in the 2012 election, and this State must be interdicted from having Obama on the ballot as a candidate for the State and through this State the Electors must be notified that the State Electors may not have as a candidate from which to choose a President the candidate, Barak Hussein Obama.
48. 18USC241 reads in part: " If two or more persons conspire to injure, oppress, threaten, or intimidate any person in any State, Territory, Commonwealth, Possession, or District in the free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege secured to him by the Constitution or laws of the

United States, or because of his having so exercised the same; They shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both; and if death results from the acts committed in violation of this section or if such acts include kidnapping or an attempt to kidnap, aggravated sexual abuse or an attempt to commit aggravated sexual abuse, or an attempt to kill, they shall be fined under this title or imprisoned for any term of years or for life, or both, or may be sentenced to death.”

Smith, the judge from the 12th Judicial Circuit for Manatee county, Florida whose conduct is described above and below, under case number 41-2009-DR-10430 knew full well this was a contested divorce he was not allowed by law to issue a simple divorce order on, and he knew that by issuing the order he was depriving me of the free exercise and enjoyment of my rights and privileges secured by the Constitution and laws of the United States. Part of his order illegally deprived me of my last name, Riethmiller, without my input or consent, a serious violation of my fundamental individual and women’s rights protected by the Supremacy Clause of the Constitution of the United States of America which was already invoked in the matter, 41-DR-2009-10430, at the time. Smith’s conduct was not only illegal but also unconstitutional and forms part of a wider 18USC241 constitutional crime Barak Obama was fully aware of is ongoing and was warned Smith was about to participate in, and either Obama aided and abetted Smith’s crime, or failed to intervene, when he had a legal duty in terms of the Constitution of the United States of America to have done so. Obama has officially been a party to the matter and related matters, since September 2010 when 8:10CV1763-T-27TGW, a case in the US Middle District at Tampa was served on him.

49. Obama’s immediate response was to misuse his power and authority to get a government officer, Moody, appointed by Obama’s friend, Bill Clinton, to harm the Petitioner and other victims of crime in order to protect a person, a psychiatrist the First Petitioner in good faith asked her husband to see, now rumored to be a long term friend of the Obama’s since his early years in Chicago when the psychiatrist was then a nursing sister there.
50. The Six Hundred and Fifty other Petitioners and the First Petitioner are all victims of crimes started by the psychiatrist and followed up by people she worked with closely for ten years in government protecting her, causing constitutional crimes against the United States of America in terms of 18USC241 and other provisions and in violation of the Constitutional rights of victims of which I, the First Petitioner am one, which fundamental rights are protected by the Supremacy Clause of the Constitution of the United States of America.
51. The constitutional violations were set off through the protection by government officials of the psychiatrist who turned out to at all relevant times to have had a fraudulent Florida license and by her own admission on court records mentally ill at the time that she committed a Florida Statute 491.0111 and 491.0112 felony in respect her mental health patient, my husband, and whilst practicing with a fraudulent license, influenced the outcome and their capacity to conduct their own affairs and/or stand trial of over 600 mental health cases in the 12th Judicial circuit court for Manatee county, Florida.
52. Obama played an active role in depriving us deliberately of our fundamental rights since he first became aware of our plight when US Middle District Case 8:10CV1763-T-27TGW, currently still SC11-5659, was served on him in 2010, which had the immediate reaction that within 24 hours of serving on Obama, that Moody, a judge of the US Middle district court appointed by Bill Clinton, with no notice or following the law or rules in respect of changing judges in a matter where a judge had already been allocated, “took” the matter away from Judge Whittemore who had already sent out pre-trial notices for a jury trial, Moody abruptly dismissing the matter and causing additional 18USC241 crimes beyond Ezell and Gilner hi-jacking a court, to also result in Moreland, Smith and others doing the same or committing similarly serious crimes, and culminating in Smith brazenly and criminally hi-jacking the court May 24, 2012 and committing a deliberate written fraud completely destroying the Petitioner’s most fundamental rights protected by the Supremacy Clause of the United States of America. The allegations made herein are all provable on the record of the cases and are neither fictitious or slanderous. The hi-jacking of

the court by Ezell and Smith, amongst others can be verified from the record and is factual. Smith committing fraud on his written order of May 24, 2012 is factual: the case shows clearly it was contested with a counter-claim, not a simple divorce. Smith merely committed the fraud because he was so convinced he shall never be held accountable, that the Constitution and the law no longer matters, exactly what Ezell did and Ezell stated clearly, his actions are based on following his leader: Obama.

53. In case 8:12-cv-1796-T-30-AEP. Moody is a defendant for his part in the 18USC241 constitutional crime and for having violated his oath to the Constitution of the United States of America and the Judicial Cannon for United States Judges deliberately depriving the First Petitioner of her fundamental rights to have due process, equality and a jury trial in 8:10-CV-1763-T-27TGW.
54. 8:11CV2194T30MAP in the US Middle District for Florida court, is a case against the State of Florida which has a Federal duty to remain through its conduct inside the parameters of the Supremacy Clause of the United States of America. Florida ventured outside the parameters of the Supremacy Clause of the United States. The case was filed when it was clear the over 600 other petitioners herein, also petitioners in that matter, had their fundamental rights affected when the same psychiatrist was the expert psychiatric witness in their mental health cases at the 12th Judicial circuit court for the State of Florida (a state court) when the psychiatrist expert witness was relied on by the court at a time the psychiatrists Florida license was fraudulent and she lacked the integrity to be relied on. The court was also provided with the psychiatrist's on the record written confirmation in a case she filed against Sunterra, that she was disabled by mental illness (anxiety) during the period she was relied on as expert in the over 600 mental health cases. The full details of a witness, Thomson, were also provided to the court. Such witness told me personally that he had first hand details of how the psychiatrist had deliberately falsely caused an elderly lady to be certified incompetent to deal with her own affairs, only to have the lady's assets moved to the ACCOUNTING firm, in which according to the witness, the psychiatrist had an interest as ACCOUNTANT. {This is how the First Petitioner found out that the psychiatrist who committed a Florida Statute 491.0111 and 491.0112 felony in respect of her husband whilst practicing with a fraudulent Florida medical license, was also a (fraudulent) accountant, despite not being a licensed Florida accountant. The Middle District Court for Florida at Tampa was also given proof that the psychiatrist is an **accountant** vendor to the Florida Department of Health. Petitioners Six Hundred and Twenty One to Petitioners Six Hundred and Fifty One herein are people whom the then fraudulently licensed Florida psychiatrist got paid for in her capacity as a fraudulently appointed accountant vendor}. It was no surprise that Moody was also the judge who summarily dismissed that matter, 8:11CV2194T30MAP, now SC11-10350, instead of allowing it to go to court where the witness could be called to give evidence and which would have led to the safety of the over 600 victims who may still be suffering extreme harm due to the psychiatrist whose evidence should never have been relied on's influence.
55. 8:11CV2194T30MAP was brought as an emergency case to the court because I had learnt that my husband was displaying out of character conduct in line with what is warned in respect of the transference phenomenon and Stockholms syndrome when mental health patients are victims of psychiatric crimes and I feared then, as I still fear now, that he is in danger. I place on the record that when the 18USC241 Constitutional crime is finally dealt with in the case of Moody, that the additional penalties of the section, 18USC241 must be applied to him as he knew from the evidence before him that the Petitioners husband was abducted by his psychiatrist and moved into her home at a time he was most vulnerable from a long history of mental illness and addictions and at a time he was on mind altering medication the psychiatrist prescribed. My husband acting out of character due to the transference phenomenon and showing clear effects of being harmed and clear evidence of the psychiatrists crime and her collaboration with State officials to escape prosecution was provided to Moody. It was only much later that the Petitioner heard the rumor that the psychiatrist and Obama are long term friends. What the Petitioners are therefore likely

suffering from are abuses of power that permeates from county level, through State level, and into the Federal system, because the criminally minded psychiatrist is friends with the President? Not knowing about the possible link between Obama and the psychiatrist, Moody's illegal conduct (even without Obama interference), was reported in good faith to Obama through various filings, which considering Obama's supposed support of individual rights and freedoms, made his ignoring the matter nonsensical and the only explanation, that he most likely is using his power to influence justices like Moody in the Federal court system to protect a long term friend and harm those who want to hold her accountable. In a banana republic one could expect what the Petitioners suffered. However, this is the United States of America with its Constitution which specifically takes care of such violations and this court must address the effects hereof, before more people suffer at the hands of a President not willing to act inside the parameters of his oath to the Constitution of the United States of America. This needs to happen whether or not Obama misused his power, because even if he is not a friend of the psychiatrist and even if he did not cause Moody's illegal conduct, Obama is fully appraised with the situation and know the psychiatrists criminal conduct left many victims, her link into government officials caused criminal conduct by Ezell, Smith and others like Moody, which together are crimes against the United States in terms of 18USC241 and other sections and because of his oath to the Constitution of the United States of America in such instance where other branches of government failed and where a State, the State of Florida stepped outside the Supremacy Clause of the United States of America, Obama had a duty to intervene.

56. It is not necessary for the purpose of this Emergency Petition for this court to verify if Obama was indeed a friend of the psychiatrist or not. All that is relevant, is whether Obama violated his oath to the Constitution of the United States of America whilst in office. In cases US District Court of Columbia 1:12-mc-00372-UNA (now US Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia case 12-5233) and 12CV1287, Obama is a Defendant and therefore this court knows that he has full knowledge of the details set out in 5 below, which placed an obligation on him as the ultimate keeper of the law in the United States to act immediately and halt the fundamental rights abuses protected by the Supremacy Clause of the United States perpetrated by the state of Florida even after the Supremacy Clause of the United States was invoked in all the matters which all displayed clear and exact evidence of the violations by government officials, Ezell, Smith and others. Obama had a duty for the "execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof." So when Obama knew officers of the government Ezell, Smith and others violated fundamental rights protected by the Supremacy Clause, and even acted criminally, it was his duty to intervene and ensure the Supremacy Clause is implemented into the State of Florida and into the situation and victims are brought to safety. Obama's failure failure has given free reign to the abusers and abuse which continues, especially after the separation of State and Federal government became blurred through the orders of Moody, when Federal government had a duty to intervene and the Executive became the next separate power to rely on for the failure of the judiciary to be corrected and brought back into line with the Supremacy Clause.
57. Obama is further a Defendant in 8:12-cv-1796-T-30AEP. In the first District of Columbia case Lamberth (the same judge who dismissed the social security case, saying the people of the United States does not have the right to know and that Obama's right to privacy trumps all else – obviously Lamberth saying that violated his oath to the Constitution of the United States of America as the Constitution is what trumps all, and when an individual places themselves in the position to be President, as Obama did, they must comply with the Constitution which demand being natural born. Obama himself failed to give conclusive proof of being natural born and therefore the sequence of events in respect of his social security number is essential proof in respect of his citizenship and natural born. The social security number of his father and mother as having been United States citizens must be provided, that he was born in the United States and that his social security number was issued and remained from birth till now, if that is not the case,

then this court have a fundamental constitutional duty to reveal it to “we the people” who have the right to know the Constitution is complied with by a person to be President. Lamberth in the Petitioner’ matter in May 2012 was the judge who refused to implement the Supremacy Clause of the United States, using as an excuse the fact that the Petitioner who was ill at the time gave her address and advised the court that if she is unable to attend to the matter herself, or would die as a direct result of having her rights under the Supremacy Clause of the United States of America violated, that the South African Embassy must be notified to appoint counsel to assist her or protect other victims after her demise. The Petitioner had therefore complied with the rule by giving her address and the additional information about the South African Embassy should did not nullify her having given her address. Lamberth’s failure to apply the Supremacy Clause of the United States to the then urgent circumstances of the First Petitioner, caused her irreparable harm, because three weeks later, on May 24, 2012, Smith hi-jacked the court, committed fraud, further deprived the First Petitioner of fundamental rights and women’s rights and even her last name: Lamberth was not only a traitor to the Constitution of the United States in the Social Security matter of Obama, but Lamberth being a traitor to his oath to the Constitution of the United States of America made him not implement the Supremacy Clause in respect of the Petitioner and enhanced instead of protected her loss of fundamental rights: Lamberth has through these orders proven himself an enemy to the Constitution of the United States of America, who valued his friendship with what may turn out to be a fraudulent President more, than his oath to the Constitution of the United States of America. If this court establishes that Obama is not natural born and that his social security number was at any point illegal, such judge has the legal duty to not only hold Obama criminally liable, but also Lamberth.

58. Lamberth purposefully falsely alleged the Petitioner did not provide her address, using falsely a much lesser rule than the Supremacy Clause of the United States of America he was asked to implement into extreme abuses of the Supremacy Clause of the United States of America, to avoid implementing the most sacred law in the country, the Supremacy Clause to the Constitution of the United States of America.
59. It was no surprise to find out that Lamberth was the same judge who denied the evidence in the matter before that court where Obama’s social security details which he used in filing IRS tax returns was shown to not belong to him, but to a person who was born in the 1890’s, ie, a fraudulent Social Security number.
60. After the Petitioner put a line through the details of the South African Embassy she returned the matter to the US District for the Columbia Circuit Court. With no notification of a changed judicial officer as the rules demand, Judge “Amy” (presumed Jackson as it is the only judge in that circuit with the name “Amy” – only the signature was given, no typed name!) dismissed the matter summarily, quoting irrelevant reasons inferior to the Supremacy Clause of the United States of America: worse, Amy Jackson was appointed by Obama himself, and as he is a defendant in the matter, it placed an obligation on her in terms of the Judicial Cannon for US Justices, to have recused herself. She accordingly did not only act willfully and intentionally to deprive the Petitioner of recourse in having he Supremacy Clause of the United States implemented into the situation (the only request in that matter), but violated her oath the the Constitution further by compromising her own integrity to have made an order to protect Obama who appointed her.
61. And of course, as stated above, this trend of judicial officers partial to Obama deciding to protect Obama inside the Federal Court system continued in the 8:12-cv-1796-T-30-AEP.Moody case in the Middle District for Florida matter.
62. Moody was again the Judge to dismiss the matter: despite the fact that he is the Eighteenth Defendant!!!
63. Moody again violated his oath to the Constitution of the United States of America and the Judicial Cannon for United States Judges by his order.

64. What conduct then motivates justices who had sworn an oath to the Constitution of the United States of America and who know they are the safeguard of the rights of “we the people” violate their oaths and allow conduct which the Petitioners can capitulate against as violating their fundamental rights protected by the Supremacy Clause?
65. The answer is simple: a series of 18USC241 Constitutional crimes, all intended to protect the criminal conduct of the psychiatrist and victimize the First Petitioner as whistleblower wife of one of the psychiatrist’s victims.
66. This court must keep in mind as it reads the sequence of crimes briefly described below, that for all relevant times the psychiatrist was practicing with a fraudulent State of Florida medical license and thus a fraudulent Federal PIN number, indicating wide criminal intent, and by her own admission, on court records, she was and remains disabled through mental illness (anxiety):
 - 66.1 Psychiatrist commits Florida Statute 491.0111 and 491.0112 felonies in respect of the First Petitioner’s husband who was most vulnerable at the time, early 2009, from long term mental illness and drug and alcohol abuse and who was on mind altering medication the psychiatrist prescribed when after he was her mental health patient and the First Petitioners medical insurance, Aetna paid the psychiatrist accounts, the psychiatrist moved her mental health patient, the First Petitioner’s husband, into the psychiatrists home. For a list of statutes violated by the psychiatrist see Motion to a single judge filed in SC11-10350.
 - 66.2 October 16, 2009 in 41-MH-2009-3013 the State of Florida hands the Petitioners husband back to the abuser, violating **United States Code: Chapter 109a, Title 18 Section 2242** without him having been assessed by a panel of independent psychiatrist, it appearing later the official who briefly examined him and did not test him for alcohol and methadone, also had a fraudulent medical license alleging he was a neurologist (not a psychiatrist), when he was not a neurologist.
 - 66.3 Gilner, the self acknowledged friend of the psychiatrist who abused the First Petitioner’s husband, presided and simultaneously heard cases 41-DR-2009-10742 and 41-DR-2009-10429, despite the cases having had completely different causes of action. Although Gilner was disqualified shortly thereafter for his friendship with the psychiatrist who acknowledged under oath November 3, 2011 that Gilner issued the order of October 21, 2009, for her, the psychiatrist, who was a non party. Gilner therefore committed a State and Federal crime and violated the First Petitioners fundamental rights protected by the Supremacy Clause of the United States of America.
 - 66.4 Unbeknown to the First Petitioner and only confirmed by an order of August 10, 2010, Gilner also became the judge in 41-DR-2009-10430, but deliberately did not want the First Petitioner to know he was actually the judge in that matter, so she could not disqualify him. To hide his presence in the case Gilner caused the criminal conduct of various other officers from the 12th Judicial circuit to help him hide his presence. The most blatant criminal conduct came from Ezell, a magistrate who openly hi-jacked the court with no authority, no assignment to the case and hearing specifically cases specifically prohibited to be heard by a magistrate. Later it became clear Ezell worked under Gilner, who allowed Ezell to openly hi-jacked the court July 14, 2010 and August 9, 2010 with the intent to deprive the First Petitioner of fundamental rights. Ezell knew his conduct was criminal and also a violation of the First Petitioners fundamental rights, but he said he did not care, she can go the Hague and the United Nations, ie, once he and Gilner acted in collaboration with the psychiatrist and they acted openly and deliberately to deprive the First Petitioner of her fundamental rights protected by the Constitution of the United States of America, the 18USC241 constitutional crime against the First Petitioner and the United States was underway. This court must note that the conduct of Gilner and Ezell was immediately reported to the FBI and to the Middle District Federal court in Tampa and the below is quoted from the Tampa case: Judges have given themselves judicial immunity for their judicial functions. Judges have no judicial immunity for criminal acts, aiding, assisting, or conniving with others who perform a

criminal act, or for their administrative/ministerial duties. When a judge has a duty to act, he does not have discretion - he is then not performing a judicial act, he is performing a ministerial act.

Judicial immunity does not exist for judges who engage in criminal activity, for judges who connive with, aid and abet the criminal activity of another judge, or to a judge for damages sustained by a person who has been harmed by the judge's connivance with, aiding and abetting, another judge's criminal activity. The Court in *Yates v. Village of Hoffman Estates, Illinois*, 209 F.Supp. 757 (N.D. Ill. 1962) held that "not every action by a judge is in exercise of his judicial function. ... it is not a judicial function for a judge to commit an intentional tort even though the tort occurs in the courthouse." When a judge acts as a trespasser of the law, when a judge does not follow the law, the judge loses subject-matter jurisdiction and the judge's orders are void, of no legal force or effect. Whenever a judge acts where he/she does not have jurisdiction to act, the judge is engaged in an act or acts of treason. *U.S. v. Will*, 449 U.S. 200, 216, 101 S.Ct. 471, 66 L.Ed.2d 392, 406 (1980); *Cohens v. Virginia*, 19 U.S. (6 Wheat) 264, 404, 5 L.Ed 257 (1821). Any judge or attorney who does not report judges for treason as required by law may themselves be guilty of misprision of treason, 18 U.S.C. Section 2382.

- 66.5 The First Petitioner shall not bore this court with the many additional officials who joined in the 18USC241 constitutional crime. The only relevant one's for the purpose of this matter are Obama whom Ezell quoted as "his leader" whose lead Ezell followed for his illegal and unconstitutional hi-jacking of the court July 14, 2010 and 9 August 2010, and Ezell's reason for a judicial order declaring the United States of America not a Christian country, quoting himself following Obama's lead of by Executive order declaring the United States of America not a Christian country.
- 66.6 Ezell and Gilner's criminal conduct was reported in 8:10CV1763-T-27TGW, the case Moody snatched from Whittemore and summarily dismissed, as soon as it was served on Obama.
- 66.7 Moody, by dismissing a valid case that warranted a jury trial that would have corrected the criminal conduct of Ezell and Gilner, by dismissing the case, gave State officials such as Ezell, Gilner, and later Moreland and Smith, the certainty that they will not be held accountable for additional criminal conduct. The result is that various other state government officials joined into the 18USC241 crimes: some were from the Florida Department of Health Inspector General's office, such as Turner, who tried to hide the psychiatrists fraudulent license by going along with her fraud in a letter dated 30 September 2010; the most important for the purpose of this matter is Smith, who hi-jacked the court when he had no jurisdiction, in writing made the State of Florida guilty of fraud by alleging a contested divorce is a simple divorce, just so that the could "get rid" of the First Petitioner sounding the alarm that a mental health patient is being abused by his psychiatrist who happens to have worked closely with 12th Judicial Circuit officers like Smith for years. Smith's order of May 24, 2012 violated the First Petitioners fundamental rights protected by the Constitution of the United States of America, robbed the First Petitioner of her legitimate interest in marital asset Fresh Start Law group and robbed the First Petitioner of her last name, and all just because the 12th Judicial circuit officers cannot risk that the First Petitioner has access to an undetached unbiased bench which will apply the law. The First Petitioner has been asking the same things since her first such request in writing February 2010 before Dubensky in 41-2009-DR-10430. At the time she did not know that Dubensky was fraudulently acting as circuit judge, and that Gilner was actually the judge. In good faith the First Petitioner presumed she was before an undetached unbiased constitutional forum, and asked verbally, then in March 2010 she handed up to Dubensky her own handwritten request for case management, namely: that the first serious issue is to ensure that her husband is not harmed, as the conduct by his psychiatrist to have violated him and moved him into her home is

warned by all academic literature to be greatly harmful to him due to the transference phenomenon and Stockholm's syndrome and that therefore the first requirement is to establish her husband's capacity by having him assessed and examined by an independent panel of psychiatrists. The next step then, in the event that he was fine and unharmed, (which the First Petitioner doubted because of her husband's long history of mental illness and addictions), would be that if he was fine and without acting under the influence himself wanted a divorce, that discovery of marital asset Fresh Start Law Group LLC needed to take place, that the return of the First Petitioners pets, Buddy and Princess, which she and her children raised from when they were puppies and the psychiatrist got rid of needed to be arranged. In February 2010 the First Petitioner herein had filed a counter petition and therefore it was officially and legally a contested divorce, something of which Smith was fully aware. The psychiatrist had worked in the 12th judicial circuit court in over 600 mental health cases, herein Petitioners Two to Six Hundred and Twenty, providing written and or oral expert advice at a time her Florida license to practice medicine was fraudulent. She had known and worked closely with Ezell who heard many of the cases for ten years, and with Gilner since he was appointed, the reason the First Petitioner had asked since June 2010 when she filed a list of the mental health cases in court, that the venue be changed. The relevance of bringing all this to the attention of this court, is to point out, that no matter who does a due diligence of the matters in the 12th Judicial Circuit, it can and will be established without a shadow of doubt that the First Petitioner had every right to complain and seek redress for having been exposed to State officials such as Ezel, Gilner and later Moreland and Smith, who blatantly disregarded their oaths to the Constitution of the United States of America with the intent to harm, compelling ground for Obama to have intervened.

66.8 And none of it was necessary. As soon as the First Petitioner came upon the over 600 mental health cases case numbers in which the psychiatrist was expert and the court relied on at a time her license was fraudulent and she was disabled by her (the psychiatrists) mental illness, the First Petitioner asked that the venue be changed which would have avoided this entire trauma. The reason the judicial officers of the 12th Judicial circuit did not want the venue to be changed was that they knew the First Petitioners husband, although an attorney, is a vulnerable mental health sufferer with long term serious addiction problems and would never be found to be okay by an independent panel of psychiatrists. Further since being abused by his psychiatrist, he has developed serious kidney and heart problems most likely associated with drugs she prescribed or still provides him with. The likelihood was therefore very good that an independent court applying the law would order the psychiatrist be held criminally liable for her felony with exacerbating circumstances.

66.9 The Second reason the judicial officers of the 12th Judicial circuit did not want the matter going to another circuit is that witness Thomson described how the psychiatrist worked in conjunction with local judicial officers to deliberately falsely certify an elderly lady as incompetent and how her money was then sent to an accounting firm where the psychiatrist has/had an interest and how most of the money was gone when the lady was, (according to Thomson, after years of struggle for him and a Bradenton Florida attorney to help her), declared no longer incompetent. Therefore, if there were manipulations of the elderly and perhaps vulnerable mentally ill people or people suffering addictions, then the 12th Judicial circuit court for Manatee county did not want an investigation which the First Petitioner was asking for then and is still asking for now.

66.10 It is in that light that it was particularly suspicious that the Clerk of the Court, Chip Shore, the constitutional officer to the 12th Judicial Circuit Court for Manatee county, with a legal duty to keep records, wrote July 2010 in response to a subpoena issued on him to provide details of the judicial officers who presided in the over 600 mental health cases (Petitioners herein), that he did not keep records of the cases.

- 66.11 At all times the First Petitioner was most concerned for her husband's safety having been abducted by his psychiatrist when he was on mind altering medication the psychiatrist prescribed. A mutual friend, Billy Cox, volunteered to the First Petitioner late 2009, early 2010, information that the psychiatrist was often suicidal and would come to him for help. Cox made it clear that the psychiatrist suffers from serious mental illness over a prolonged period of time. This was later confirmed by the psychiatrist herself in court filings of December 27, 2010, namely that she was disabled by mental illness during all relevant times.
- 66.12 Cox had further told the First Petitioner that the psychiatrist had lied in her book, "The Thorn Hearts" that she and her late boyfriend, Dr Whitt, about whom the book is written, had a happy last day together, and that instead the psychiatrist had told him, Cox, that she and Whitt had a huge fight the day Whitt was found dead of unnatural causes in the Manatee River when the psychiatrist appeared to have been the last person to have seen him alive. The last time the First Petitioner checked, Whitt's death certificate, despite many years having elapsed, had still not been filed in the public record as it was supposed to have been filed. Therefore, with her husband already being a vulnerable person himself, if the First Petitioner's husband is simply left in the situation where he is abused by his psychiatrist where in terms of Florida law her conduct is a felony, the First Petitioner's husband as a highly addicted person with serious long standing mental health problems, would be a vulnerable adult victim deliberately left in the hands of his unscrupulous and criminally minded psychiatrist. By virtue of the First Petitioner's marriage she does not only have a right, but a duty to ensure her husband is fine and her concerns under the circumstances are reasonable that he could come to serious harm if a divorce is granted and no-one is looking over the shoulder of his psychiatrist abusing him to ensure that he is fine. This would be the case even if the psychiatrist is the Obama's long term friend as rumor has it. Being a friend of the Obama's does not mean one is not a criminal and accountable in terms of the law. Even if the psychiatrist is Obama's best friend, her conduct in respect of the First Petitioner's husband remain a crime and remain the duty of the First Petitioner to investigate until she knows without any doubt that her husband is fine.
- 66.13 In respect of marital asset, Fresh Start Law Group LLC, the First Petitioner put up her money in part to help her husband start the business. Her husband's mental illness and other problems were instrumental in the First Petitioner selling her estate in South Africa, all properties for which her husband had signed as the public record in South Africa clearly shows, (because of his mental illness it appears the First Petitioner's husband forgot he had firsthand knowledge the properties were sold). In an unbiased venue the First Petitioner can prove beyond any doubt that she helped her husband set up a successful debt relief agency and marital asset, Fresh Start Law Group LLC (which the psychiatrist used extensively to protect her against creditors, as did Gilner for financial difficulties suffered by overextending himself with a Rolls Royce motor vehicle). Therefore, when Smith handed down his illegal fraudulent order of May 24, 2012 in the 12th Judicial circuit for Manatee county, Florida he deliberately deprived the First Petitioner of equitable distribution of marital asset Fresh Start Law Group LLC, under the circumstance where he deliberately committed fraud on the order, theft.
- 66.14 Gilner, whilst hi-jacking the court 21 October 2009 deprived the First Petitioner of any income, as did Ezell when he hi-jacked the court 14 July 2010 (resulting in criminal charges in the International Criminal Court under OTP-CR-50/12 which the First Petitioner filed early 2012 when it was suspected she suffers from life threatening disease which could have been prevented if she had medical care she was accustomed to until Gilner and Ezell illegally deprived her of any income, ie, their conduct outside the law and outside their constitutional oaths rendered them and those who helped them, internationally criminally liable as they were government officials abusing their power when they harmed the First Petitioner. However, more important at the time, was the concern by the First Petitioner, that if she

died, no-one would be aware to help her husband or the over 600 other victims, so if the United States just covered all up, there could be persons suffering serious harm and no one protected their fundamental rights – she was accordingly asking for a due diligence of the over 600 cases, and as always that her husband be examined by a panel of independent psychiatrists).

- 66.15 In July 2010 the First Petitioner responded to a deliberately fraudulent income affidavit by her husband wherein he failed to list assets in his banking accounts and in William Christopher Riethmiller, Attorney at Law or Fresh Start Law Group LLC accounts at Bank of America and other institutions, as well as his ownership of Fresh Start Law Group LLC and William Christopher Attorney at Law. The First Petitioner sent out a notice to compel and in writing asking for a date to compel details of marital asset Fresh Start Law Group LLC she is fully entitled to equitable distribution of in terms of Florida law. The notice which the First Petitioner filed asking for a date was August 2010, but to date, September 2012, no such date was ever set by the court.
- 66.16 The matter, 41-DR-2009-10430 has had the following judicial officers Gilner (never letting the First Petitioner know this – October 2009 to August 10, 2010: during that time officials who his his presence were Dubensky, Maulucci, Ezell and Dunnigan). The order of August 10, 2010 officially “appointed” Dubensky, who was disqualified for hiding Gilner, and Dunnigan for the same reason, although she refused to go, using Moreland in between. Finally, still not having had a hearing to compel details of marital asset Fresh Start Law Group LLC, with no notices in terms of court rules in respect of his appointment, Smith threatened to hi-jack the court May 24, 2012. The First Petitioner filed an urgent request for intervention to the Florida Supreme court which knew it had the jurisdiction for the matter at the time and Smith had no jurisdiction, cases 1f:12-mc-00372-UNA and 12-cv-1287. The First Petitioner also filed an affidavit with the Federal Bureau of Investigations in West Palm Beach. (Since Gilner and Ezell first hi-jacked the court and their collaboration was proven August 10, 2010, he First Petitioner filed proof of these crimes with the FBI as hi-jacking a court is a federal offense. When the psychiatrists license was proven to be false through a letter by the American Board of Psychiatry and Neurology and it was clear there are over 600 victims, the FBI in Tampa suggested the First Petitioner gets an investigative journalist. At the time this did not make sense to the First Petitioner, and only later when it was rumoured the psychiatrist is Obama’s long term friend, did it start making sense, ie, that even the FBI was being intimidated. The First Petitioner was not keen to get journalists involved and had early on not responded to Judge Janine, a Fox News person, because her husband is the brother of Stephanie Rietmiller who about forty years ago was raped by a man her mother paid to stop her showing lesbian tendencies, a case which was at the time widely reported in the press and which deeply traumatized the First Petitioners husband).
- 66.17 Smith, because of Moody letting Ezell and Gilner get away with their criminal conduct proceeded with his fraud on May 24, 2012 because he was acting with certainty that he shall not be held accountable by his employer, the State of Florida. The Second District Court of Appeal is the review court. Because Ezell and Gilner’s criminal conduct is completely clear and proven in writing and violates the Judicial Code of Conduct , the Florida Judicial Qualifications Commission was the correct structure put in place by “we the people” to hold them accountable. This Commissions duty was to report their conduct to the Florida congress which should have let the Florida Senate charge them. However, August 2010 the Florida Judicial Qualifications Commission wrote that the Review courts must deal with the matter. As the First Petitioner is not a US attorney, she did not know the laws and had to through extreme trauma and no money find her way through this legal mess. As soon as she learnt about the Supremacy Clause of the Constitution of the United States of America, she knew that was the clause which demanded the State of Florida bring itself in line with the Supremacy of the United States Constitution, and therefore even though the State of Florida

has devised plans to avoid due process, equality and application of the law and constitution by the Second District Court of appeal dismissing matters with no reason, causing the Florida Supreme Court to then allege it has no jurisdiction, quoting cases the State “manufactured” as a means to deprive citizens of Constitutional rights, the Supremacy Clause demands alignment to the Constitution by a devious State such as Florida to protect victims of State abuse of power, such as has been suffered by the First Petitioner , her husband and the over 600 other Petitioners herein. The abuse of power by government officials demanded that the Supremacy Clause be implemented into the situation, the reasons the First Petitioner invoked the Supremacy Clause and other pertinent laws. Anyone caring to look at the law and Ezell’s conduct where he so blatantly and openly hi-jacked the court on July 14, 2010, was proven to those who had a duty to implement the Supremacy Clause. Anyone who is honest and willing would have to acknowledge Ezell and Gilner and Moreland and Smith’s conduct violates fundamental rights protected through the Supremacy Clause, which in terms of the Clause demanded immediate attention to the matter and immediate relief to victims. In the wider sense the same clause protects in conjunction with 18USC241 against the constitutional crimes the Petitioners are suffering, as since Ezell, the plight of the over 600 others have been brought to the attention of the court as well as victims. Further, for the latter crime, the collaboration between Ezell, Gilner and the psychiatrist was easily proven, and the motive is clear: to keep the psychiatrist from being held accountable for her felony in respect of the First Petitioners husband.

66.18 Once the Judicial Qualifications Commission did not act in terms of their duties, and had passed the matter to the Second District Court of Appeal and the First Petitioner had invoked the Supremacy Clause of the United States of America and other pertinent legislation, the Second District court of Appeal for Florida instead of performing its duty to implement the Supremacy Clause of the United States, dismissed the matter early 2011, therefore purposefully not applying the most supreme law of the United States of America, showing a rebellion against the most sacred of United States laws, thus treason. The Florida Supreme Court advised it had no jurisdiction if no reasons were given by the Second District Court of Appeal, therefore, when the Supremacy Clause was already invoked, conducting itself specifically outside the Supremacy Clause and violating fundamental rights protected by the Supremacy Clause. In this way the First Petitioner learnt how the State of Florida had developed methods of depriving citizens of their fundamental rights, the Florida Supreme Court raising case law as an excuse for not implementing the Supremacy Clause of the United States of America, the highest law of the lands taking a backseat to shaky unconstitutional utterances never intended for the kind of situation the First Petitioner found herself in.

66.19 It was further increasingly becoming clear that there were serious structural problems in the judicial system in that not sufficient adaptations were made to deal with increased population and that even though the Constitutions of both the State of Florida and the United States guarantees citizens certain rights, that the reality of the judicial system demand that clerks not judges decide who and what will be considered, in the First Petitioner’s first hand experience as system leading to extreme abuse of power by officials who have no respect whatsoever for their oaths to the Constitutions of the State of Florida and the United States of America. A discussion on such findings is irrelevant for the purpose of this filing, other than to mention that the Petitioner has a masters in law and in environmental studies and have studied countries and societies extensively to establish why certain countries function successfully and some not, even if they have similar constitutions. The First Petitioner further has firsthand experience, in that the United States greatly influenced the transition from the apartheid system in South Africa, where she is from. Now through this nightmare personal experience through the Florida and United States judicial system, she can see clearly how the United States seem to not even have cognizance of the weaknesses in its

system and she can now see how the United States had influenced some of its flaws into the South African Judicial system. Unless something is done soon the judicial structural problems in the United States of America will most likely get worse over time. What is of extreme importance about this in this matter, is that for anyone who applies themselves and have some knowledge of the law, it is clear that the United States legal system has progressively eroded individual rights and made the judiciary corrupt and overly powerful, till they produced people with the likes of Ezell, Gilner, Moreland, and obviously Smith. The First Petitioner has no doubt that Obama has full knowledge of the weaknesses of the system. However, unlike the First Petitioner who believes it is imperative for the United States of America to repair its broken system and restore to its Constitution, safeguarding individual rights, the cornerstone of the United States Constitution, Obama has exactly the opposite ideas (see below). Therefore, if Obama had given effect to his oath to the Constitution of the United States of America, instead of deliberately violating it, he could have used the First Petitioners pleas for help to have helped correct and enhance the system, instead of rubberstamping its corruption and brokenness.

66.20 Smith made his order of May 24, 2012 before it was mentioned to the First Petitioner that Obama and the psychiatrist had a link and that this relationship between Obama and the psychiatrist account for Moody's strange conduct to violate his oath to the Constitution of the United States of America and the reluctance of the Federal police to deal with the crimes reported to them as conclusive proof of 18USC241 crime against the Constitution of the United States of America was provided to them. The First Petitioner has no idea if this is true or not. What she does know is that she had in good faith asked the Federal government to protect her from irreparable harm as it became clear on undisputable evidence through the conduct of Ezell and others that a 18USC241 constitutional crime against the United States of America was underway, but of course, the Federal government suffers from the same defects, in particular that it can produce people who swear an oath to the Constitution of the United States, like Moody, who have no qualms in violating it and who will rather see victims of constitutional crime harmed rather than hold their friends accountable: typical imperialistic conduct which must be stopped before it destroys the United States of America and its Constitution.

66.21 Smith's order is evidence in the 18USC241 crime he is part of. He knew a counter petition with a claim was filed and that it was s contested divorce, so when he put pen on paper, alleging deliberately falsely that it was a simple divorce, he knew he was committing fraud with the intent to harm the First Petitioners fundamental rights protected by the Supremacy Clause of the United States of America.

66.22 Smith also knew from the evidence on the file that there was a marital asset, Fresh Start Law Group LLC, to which the First Petitioner had a valid claim for equitable distribution, so Smith knew he was illegally and unconstitutionally depriving the First Petitioner of due process, equality and property.

66.23 Smith did not find such extreme abuses of power enough and further unconstitutionally and illegally took the First Respondent's last name Riethmiller from her, when she had not consented to it, or been known in the matter. On the contrary, her counter petition and counter claim clearly showed she did not agree to it. Smith therefore committed an extreme violation of the First Petitioners fundamental women's rights also protected through the Supremacy Clause of the United States of America. Smith through his fraudulent order whilst hi-jacking the court dumped the United States into the middle ages where women under the Obama regime are mere chattels with no rights.

67. Therefore, after Obama was a party and after filings on him warned of threatening further constitutional harm, he did nothing and it may as well have been Obama himself who issued Smith's order.

68. The abuse merely became worse. It was Moody who deliberately dismissed the case in which Ezell and Gilner were to answer for the unconstitutional conduct. Now in the summons issued 8 August 2012 in the US Middle District of Florida Tampa division matter in which Moody is a defendant for having contravened the Constitution of the United States of America purposefully, Moody, a Defendant in the matter himself, dismissed 8:12-cv-1796-30AEP!!! This conduct shows another extreme failure in the United States Judicial system. The Federal government is supposed to deal with Federal offenses, cases where the Federal Constitution and laws are violated. Eventhough Ezell, Gilner, Moreland and Smith's crimes were committed in the State of Florida, the laws they violated, such as 18USC241 and numerous others protected by the Supremacy Clause of the United States into the Florida system, placed a duty on the Federal court to protect victims. Moody's conduct shows this separation between State and Federal government has become so blurred that "we the people" are unprotected and vulnerable to extreme abuse of power: such as in the case of the First Petitioner, leading to a complete loss of individual rights.
69. Both Obama, Biden and Hillary Clinton have over the last four years held other countries, in particular China accountable for human and fundamental rights abuses. When Hillary Clinton with great fan fare brought a Chinese dissident to the United States in 2012, the dissident being unhappy about China trying to contain its 1,3 billion people's numbers, Hillary Clinton was very vocal in defending his individual rights. Therefore, at a time, about April 2012, when the Obama administration, had already been contacted and provided proof by South Africa of Ezell and Gilner's crimes, Clinton cared considerably more for a Chinese dissident that for an American stripped of individual rights. Therefore, when Moody issued his order in the cases he did, the last one even being Defendant in the case, he acted in terms of Obama and Clinton's wishes to deprive the First Petitioner and the other Petitioners of fundamental rights protected through the Supremacy Clause of the United States of America. Both Obama and Clinton had firsthand knowledge of the matter and it was in their power and it was their duty to intervene. Their failure to act at a time they fake concern for individual rights of an outsider, is conclusive proof that they violated their oaths to the Constitution of the United States of America in respect of the Petitioners.
70. In 12cv1287 in the US District Court for Columbia, the First Petitioner pointed out to the court the danger of Obama's illegal divisive conduct, when he knows by far the majority of the people in the United States of America are Judeo Christians, yet saying the country is not Christian and influencing people like Ezell who confirmed on the record he acted illegally as he did because he was following Obama's lead, even taking pride in his criminal conduct challenging the First Petitioner to go to the United Nations and the Hague (the Christian faith stands for truth, respecting and loving God and neighbor inside clearly defined rules and laws, the origin of the United States Constitution stems from these faiths which make it superior law that people such as the Petitioners have inalienable rights which no government or government officials are allowed to deprive them of: exactly what the Petitioners have been deprived of by the Obama administration and the reason she has every right to bring this matter to stop Obama from being a candidate for the 2012 election, as he has violated his oath to the Constitution of the United States of America whilst in office, precluding himself from being a candidate again in terms of Amendment 14, Section 3 of the Constitution of the United States of America.
71. It would be bad enough if Obama simply did not like the First Petitioner for being a white South African (although she was against apartheid and have done all she can to build bridges between the people in that country, specifically training young black attorneys as commercial attorneys to give effect to calls by then President Nelson Mandela to correct the system), and if his conduct was based on discrimination. In such instance there would at least be a measure of understanding for discrimination of origin the First Petitioner suffered. However, Obama also showed no regard for the over 600 other Petitioners, most likely all American born, and at least some African American. That Obama has no concern for vulnerable mental health sufferers is not acceptable

and shows an extreme disregard for individual rights and a complete violation of his oath to the Constitution of the United States of America.

72. The principle of separation of powers is there specifically to protect “we the people”. Therefore, when the State and Federal governments failed the Petitioners, and when the judiciary so shamelessly acted in concert with the criminal conduct of the psychiatrist to even use their government offices as centers for retribution against the First Petitioner for daring to hold the psychiatrist and her government friends accountable in terms of the law (the exact purpose of the judiciary), then the executive had a duty to intervene either through his office or through the office of the Secretary of State, Hillary Clinton. However, keep in mind the judge who prevented the first Federal summons and demand for trial before a jury to proceed, was Moody, appointed by Hillary Clinton’s husband Bill, the person who nominated Obama as candidate for the 2012 elections. If over and above this it is true that the psychiatrist and the Obama’s are long term friends, then Obama’s disregard for the plight of over 600 people will not only be violating his oath of office, but will show a personal agenda where friendship with people of criminal conduct (the psychiatrist) is more important to Obama than his Presidential duties in terms of his oath.
73. The question would then be, why would Obama, who trades wherever he can on a human rights ticket, professing he cares for human rights, when the truth is from the First Petitioner’s personal experience that Obama abuse instead of protect fundamental individual rights?
74. The answer is somber and can be found in his past. The First Petitioner read that Communist career politicians are called community organizers all over the world, the title Obama gave himself.
75. In the case of Obama both his parents are reported in the press as known communists and when apparently when he returned to live with his grandparents his confidante was a communist friend of his parents who lived close by.
76. Obama and Hillary Clinton has a role model in common in Saul Alinsky. David Horowitz in his book *Barak Obama’s Rules for Revolution The Alinsky Model*, tells how Clinton (then Rodham) wrote of Alinsky’s most important contribution to the radical cause, namely his embrace of political nihilism of which Horowitz reports Alinsky to say “ ‘the issue is never the issue. The issue is always the revolution.’ In other words the cause – whether inner city blacks or women – is never the real cause, but only an occasion to advance the real cause which is the accumulation of power to make the revolution”.
77. On 24 March 2007 the Washington Post reported how the group that Obama joined in his youth was part of the Gamaliel Foundation, a religious group that operated on Alinsky principles. Horowitz writes “Three of Obama’s mentors in Chicago were trained at the Alinsky Industrial Areas Foundation and for several years Obama himself taught workshops on the Alinsky method.Alinsky is the Sun-Tzu for today’s radicals, his book a manual for their political war. As early as its dedicatory page Alinsky provides revealing insight into the radical mind by praising Lucifer as the first rebel: ‘Lest we forget, an over-the-shoulder- acknowledgement to the very first radical: from all our legends, mythology, and history... the first radical known to man who rebelled against the establishment and did it so effectively that he at least won his own kingdom – Lucifer.’ Thus Alinsky begins his text by telling readers exactly what a radical is. He is not a reformer of the system, but it’s would be destroyer. In his own mind the radical is building his own kingdom... the radical’s only real word efforts are those which are aimed at subverting the society he lives in. He is a nihilist.... This is the radical hubris: We can create a new world. Through our political power we can make a new race of men and women who will live in harmony and peace and according to the principles of social justice. We can be as gods... and let us not forget tjaat kingdom the first radical “won” as Alinsky so thoughtlessly puts it, was hell.....Conservatives think of war as a metaphor when applied to politics. For radicals the war is real....It is also why they often pretend to be what they are not and rarely say what they mean. Deception to them is a military tactic in a war that is designed to eliminate the enemy....The most basic principle of Alinsky’s advice to radicals is to lie to their opponents and disarm them by

pretending to be moderates and liberals.... Deception is the radicals most important weapon.” Horowitz goes on to quote Alinsky from his book *Rules for Radicals* as follows: “As an organizer I start from the world as it is.... not as I would like it to be.... it is necessary to begin where the world is if we are going to change it to what we think it should be. That means working in the system.... advance your radical goals by camouflaging them: change your style to appear to be working in the system.” Horowitz goes on to say : “There is nothing new about radicals camouflaging their agendas as moderate in order to disarm their opposition... exactly what the 1930’s popular front was designed to accomplish... devised by communists who pretended to be democrats ... which would help them to acquire the power to shut the democracy down.... One man one vote one time... this is the political credo of all totalitarians including Hitler.... Rules for radicals is written for the Have Nots on how to take it away..... when you are overthrowing the existing order, you must break the rules to do it.... Tom Hayden once described the drug culture to me... Once you get a middle class person to break the law, ... they are on their way to becoming revolutionaries.... Alinsky’s radical is not going to worry about the legality or morality of his actions, only their practical effects... Dostoevsky ... wrote ‘If God does not exist then everything is permitted’ .. what he means is if humans do not have a conception of the good.... They will act with nothing to restrain them.... What radicals like Saul Alinsky create is not salvation, but chaos.....In his (Alinsky’s) view, criminality was not a character problem but a result of the social environment, in particular the system of private property and individual rights, which radicals like him were determined to change.”

78. The question is then who is Obama really? Is he faking loyalty to the Constitution of the United States of America just to get enough power to destroy it? Is he lying with the specific purpose to mislead the masses, so that he, like Hitler, can get popular support to misuse gullible people for his own ends of abuse of power?
79. All the First Petitioner can do, is to make the court aware, there is a motive for Obama having violated his oath to the Constitution of the United States of America in respect of the Petitioners. The next is, having that background of Obama in mind, his conduct must be measured against his duty in terms of his constitutional oath and the deviation measured to establish if his conduct prohibits him from being a candidate in the 2012 election.
80. What I have suffered, the United States and the State of Florida not exercising their criminal jurisdiction over the psychiatrist, Ezell, Gilner, Smith and other’s blatant criminal conduct using their government positions as abusive and destructive basis to harm the very people they are paid to protect, reflects a United States on the verge of destruction. In the matter before this court and of relevance is simply this: did Obama through his actions or lack of action violate his oath to the Constitution of the United States of America during his presidency, because if he did, then he is in terms of Amendment 14, Section 3 barred from being a candidate again.
81. The oath to the United States Constitution which both Obama and I took has relevance for both of us. Whatever his prior political agendas are, whether or not he fully or only partially subscribe to Saul Alinsky’s views, is irrelevant, because all that is relevant is whether or not he adhered to his oath that he shall conduct himself solely inside the parameters of the Rule of Law, of which the first and foremost is the Constitution of the United States of America.
82. If Obama did not violate his oath, when I reported the sheriff and Florida Department of Health’s failure to deal with the psychiatrist in terms of the law, the matter would have been resolved through the application of the law: I would have had an unbiased platform on which to give evidence of my husband’s mental illness and his vulnerability when his psychiatrist violated the law and committed a felony in respect of him.
83. If a panel of psychiatrists found my husband was not harmed by the psychiatrists felony and he still wanted a divorce, an unbiased platform would have taken cognizance of our circumstances, how I gave up my life to be with my husband and how I sold with his written consent my assets which he benefitted from allowing and enabling him to start marital asset Fresh Start Law Group LLC. Interim assistance and a contribution to legal costs would have meant when my husband

violated his oath and lied that he did not have assets, that subpoenas would have caused transparency and equitable distribution of assets.

84. Instead of those two simple steps, holding the psychiatrist in front of a fair tribunal responsible for her conduct, and if my husband was fine and wanting a divorce, holding him accountable and responsible in front of a fair unbiased tribunal, I have had three years of hell, a peep as to what Obama's future America looks like: an America with no laws, where the friends of friends can commit crimes and violate the law and individual rights of others with no fear of retribution or accountability. It is an America where over 600 people most likely unable to fend for themselves, the Petitioners, are subjected to a fraudulent mentally disabled psychiatrist and have "friends" like Ezell, Gilner, Moreland and Smith whom I know have no scruples to break the law, decide their fate and ability to conduct their own business based on the testimony of a fraudulent psychiatrist. Is she a personal friend of Obama from New York, Boston and Chicago? It is irrelevant, because part of Obama's oath to the Constitution, was that he would have as his first and foremost guiding principle the Constitution, so when he learnt about Ezell hi-jacking the court and ending with Smith's hi-jacking of the court committing deliberate fraud on his order and even stealing my last name, Obama had a duty to intervene and order the enquiry and due diligence of the cases, which I repeatedly asked for.
85. Obama is therefore as guilty for the deprivation of my and the other Petitioner's fundamental rights as the psychiatrist, Ezell, Gilner, Moreland, Smith and the others like Moody who helped them get away with their 18USC241 constitutional crime.
86. I therefore repeat paragraphs 1 to 18 above **and ask this court to order** the State mentioned at the heading hereof to prevent it or its electoral college to have Obama on the ballot for the State as his prior conduct in respect of the Petitioners violated his oath to the Constitution of the United States of America and therefore in terms of Amendment 14, Section 3 of the Constitution of the United States of America he is not allowed to be a candidate again. I further ask this court to exercise its Federal criminal jurisdiction and order the United States of America opens a formal case against Obama and the other constitutional criminals who violated 18USC241 in respect of the Petitioners and in he event that I am not there at the time of the trial and sentencing, I ask for the most severe of sentences.
87. **Explanatory notes in respect of order asked for in previous paragraph:** It is not out of malice or unkindness that I am asking for the most severe punishment in terms of the 18USC241 crimes committed: I am, and will always be, a Christian with a forgiving heart, the reason the psychiatrist, and even Ezell and the others were repeatedly offered ways to exit this confrontation by simply providing a changed venue which could provide blind justice. I am asking for it, because it is only the grace of the One and Only Living God who has gotten me this far, and I believe Obama destroying this One Nation under God, caused God to allow all this to happen, so that those in the courts to whom this Motion is sent, will wake up to the disaster they are busy creating by sitting passively by while the Constitution of the United States of America is destroyed. I have spent decades looking at what makes societies work and what not, what breaks down and what builds up. I spent years in the very kind of societies the Alinsky model appears to want to emulate, a neo communism where the rhetoric is human rights, but the only humans with rights are those with the iron fist beating their wishes into those they dictate to. My research and studies have shown the only truly functional societies and people are those with optimal individual rights: somehow something happens when people are valued and treasured and given the opportunity to be their best. The problems Obama probably noticed and which motivated and endorsed his Communist upbringing, were failings by the right model because of people moving away from the proper Constitutional principles of the United States. Had Obama researched more, or educated himself more in a wider perspective, he would have realized that in 1925 the people of the United States were robbed of the absolute guarantee of judicial equality and fairness, that the system built into itself a flaw which is creating injustice and inequality and that **the system needs correction, not replacement** as Obama's conduct indicates he intends. The

ganging up of those who quote Obama for their illegal conduct, like Ezell, means that it is bullies and gangsters at heart who have penetrated the system (just as the Alinsky model recommended), but on the otherside they are not going to get utopia, they are simply going to join the other 6 billion have nots busy abusing and killing one another. The only hope for the world is the American Model, but then in terms of its constitution implemented through its structures and acting as One UNDER God, the God of love and truth. It struck me, how so much money could be talked about at opulent functions to discuss helping the poor. But, in the dirt and hardship of the poor, none of those billions of trust funds were visible. What is visible and reported in my research are American Christians who learn about the plights of people outside their borders, who collect money between themselves and who put in the boreholes or the libraries or the clinics. If the world does not have a functional United States of America, it will be a much worse off place. Obama simply does not know the world well enough. Of course everyone is aware of the models put forward by especially China which is increasingly wanting to order the world into non resistant labor blocks (Zimbabwe had individual rights and a constitution, the people were deliberately so that it would divide and someone else rules: now, at the end of the country being destroyed, the Chinese puppet, Mugabe sits in a palais the Chinese built him and they have cheap or free access to the country's rich mineral wealth they need for their manufacturing industry. On paper the people still have rights, but it is in name only, they were overrun by a power with a scorched earth policy where the people are of no importance) where they can obtain cheap or free mineral and other resources for their manufacturing industry. If individual rights are curtailed, and all look similar instead of the contrast between those that have (the United States and Europe) and those who do not have (the rest of the world), that all will be happier. That is simply practically a lie, as anyone who has seen such models know firsthand. Again: the only hope for the world is to give people individual rights and the right to be their best on an equal just and fair platform where government is an instrument for the people to fulfill functions which benefit the people, not the other way around. This court is urged to not allow someone in the form of Obama who has shown clearly that he cannot even keep his sacred oath to the Constitution of the United States of America to steal the Constitution of the United States away from its people and away from the world by gaining even more power through another term in office.

88. As Obama also violated his oath to the Constitution of the United States of America in other respects which this court has a legal Constitutional duty to investigate and deal with, I provide an inconclusive list after first helping the court understand in the next paragraph from a broader perspective the important crossroad this matter stand at.
89. The First Petitioners research over many years have shown the world is in the broadest terms divided between those who have individual rights and those who do not. That line in general terms also reflect the have's and the have not's. From earlier comments, it appears the Obama philosophy he is not honest about, is that he believes the United States, a country with individual rights, and one of the few "have's" must become a "have not" country so that the rest of the world does not need to feel so bad about itself, and presumably Obama thinks he will have done the world a favor and he himself will feel less "guilty". The First Petitioners research has shown there is a fundamental error in that kind of thinking and earlier quoted the example of West Germany, the same gene pool as East Germany, which thrived despite the same devastation of the Second World War, because on the West German side through the Marshall plan individual rights were respected and a platform of equality was created which gave rise to of the worlds greatest modern inventions and entrepreneurship. East Germany was just the opposite. The people were oppressed by a communist regime and became government focused and the economy lagged behind: they were like two different worlds. In "Engaging the Powers" Walter Wink describes the differences between world orders based on power and violence as opposed to the order chosen by the United States of America, namely to go forward in love under God, to live and let live, which gave birth to the Constitution of the United States of America which honors individual rights which in turn gave birth to the United Nations Charter and many other Constitutions, and obviously

international treaties having made considerable differences in the world with much, much more implementation needed. When Hitler started out, he sounded like a savior with great understanding for the plight of the people but he manipulated their weaknesses to obtain raging power. The two million non Jewish Germans who died in his concentration camps are testimony to the many who were brave enough to stand up against him, but paid with their lives and history shows in the end, when unbridled power is given to leaders they will abuse it and overrun those who try to stop them. To think that the United States is immune to dictatorship or an overthrow of its constitution from within is shortsighted. In the same way for Obama to think that if he removes individual rights and govern the United States with an iron socialist communist fist, that he will make either the United States or the world better, is a simple proven error of thinking by him and his mentor, Saul Alinsky. Obama and Saul Alinsky have in common that both made friends with the underworld and what is wrong. For Obama to have used cocaine on a regular basis he broke the law and did what Alinsky said, the drug culture turns middleclass citizens into rebels. If the people of the United States were lied to to the extent that they have put a person with ulterior motives into the most powerful position in the country and in the world, then extreme error can occur which can affect the United States for decades to come. A loss of individual rights as the First Petitioner has suffered will lead to economic stagnation, whatever suppression of individual rights do to people, the world is one hundred percent proof that it destroys economies. The justices of the courts overseeing the Federal implementation of the Constitution of the United States of America into the fifty American States are reminded of the following again:

[REDACTED]

Federal judges promised to with their lives DEFEND the Constitution of the United States of America. I took the same oath. Below are spelt out signs on the potentially unconstitutional conduct and unconstitutional conduct by Obama which these judges who read and deal with this matter, must take cognizance of.

It is not only the plight and lives of three hundred million Americans they have responsibility for in their decision, but for the entire world population. The differences in world systems and their functionality to be sustainable or not with the increased world population of less than two billion when I was born in 1958 to over seven billion now, in 2012, has as the clearest dividing line between the have's and have nots, individual rights as set out above. The system which birthed individual rights is the United States and its greatest gift to the world is its post war effort to assist other nations through the United Nations, to put principles ahead of power.

Obama, through the conduct described below displays that he believes that if he has all the power, he will make the world a better place. Examples are provided to support this contention.

The examples are also instances where Obama crossed the line from the principles laid down as NEVER to be crossed by an executive (or anyone in the United States of America) so that the country remain principle (constitutionally) driven and not violence and fear driven with weakened or in my case a complete illumination of individual rights. This explanation is given, because many people in the United States seem to be ignorant and believe if someone says the Pledge of Allegiance, that it makes that person a patriot. The only thing which makes a person a true patriot is their conduct inside the parameters of the Constitution of the United States of America.

Again the reminder: The judges of this Federal court and the Supreme Court are the fence keepers.

Thus far in the experience of the Petitioners, these fence keepers are traitors. Will any of the fifty states to which this Interdict is sent produce patriots who consider the situation with the seriousness it deserves?

Below are instances where the current President of the United States of America, Barak Obama violated through his conduct, in addition to the conduct of which I am a victim, the Constitution of the United States of America and it is not a conclusive list, but due to the importance of the matter, it is the duty of the court to look wider at this application and by people who are Constitutional experts in the United States of America who may find considerably more ways in which the Constitution was violated by Obama, than I did.

Although I feel great compassion for the hardships Obama suffered in his youth, and no doubt a great deal of discrimination, this is not about him. This matter is about safeguarding the only world order which makes that the seven billion on the planet has a hope of going to bed fed and without fear. The example of human and individual rights set by the United States must carry on.

Below it shows how in a subtle and determined manner, Obama is taking power from the people and from the structures they created, Congress, the Judiciary, and the power grab by Obama is not in line with the Constitution of the United States of America. The people did not give Obama any power, until he made a solemn and sacred oath to abide by and Defend the Constitution of the United States of America. It was through this oath that he received the power to be the Executive. When he stepped outside his oath, he himself made himself ineligible to be a candidate again.

90. Is Obama a natural born citizen of the United States of America, or is he not and therefore is his presidency illegal and a scam? If his presidency is legal, ie, if he is a natural born United States citizen: Did Obama through his conduct violate the public trust through injuries done to the American Society itself? Also, did Obama in such instance render himself through his own conduct and utterances ineligible as candidate for President of the United States of America in 2012 for having violated his oath to the Constitution of the United States of America through such conduct? In the section below this court has to answer these questions posed by the Petitioners conclusively.
91. Because of the extreme violations of fundamental rights which the Petitioners have suffered at the hands of even federal justices, it is uncertain if the justices of the present court know the law or have understanding of Federal government. The Petitioner is therefore not trying the insult the current justices dealing with this matter by stating the obvious below, but the decision of this court is of extreme importance and the Petitioner ask of this court to have understanding that she is merely acting in terms of her experiences, not believing that simply because a person is a federal justice, that they necessarily have a clear grasp of the Federal system they are presiding over, or the integrity to cling first and foremost in principle and belief to the principles of the Constitution of the United States of America. In particular, it appears the Federal justices do not understand that eventhough they are appointed by a President and their appointment is confirmed by the Senate of the United States of America, that the Constitution of the United States which they have sworn an allegiance to in order to in exchange receive from "we the people" their power as a justice, demand that they have allegiance to none more than the Constitution of the United States of America and the laws flowing from it.
92. Moreso, the Constitution of the United States was specifically developed around the concept of individual rights, that the "owners" of the United States is "we the people", and that even the person they choose from time to time to be the chief executive, the President, must NEVER have so much power that he can abuse "we the people" or their fundamental rights. The "goal keepers" are the judges in the Federal Judicial system, of which the justices considering this matter, is part. The "we the people" created a system of One Nation under God as a reminder that integrity

and subservience to the Highest order of Good and Respect, Decency, Integrity and Honor, is the goal of the American people and none are to be moreso, than characteristics of the justices of the federal court. The “we the people” anticipated that from time to time the politically expedient, maybe even in the form of a President, may want to depose the Constitution as “king” and harm the “we the people”. Hence the Constitution set specifics for this court how it must safeguard “we the people. These safeguards were built into the system, to ensure, that if there is a threat, that the brave men and women of the federal court, the justices, will stand on the Constitution of the United States and please none other, in making decisions. For the system to function in this fashion it means the President who appoints the justices, must be a person beyond reproach, that he or she would choose people as federal court justices, who have no greater goal or love than to adhere to the Constitution of the United States of America. It means it is a system with the potential for great flaws. If the President is unscrupulous and make friends with similar people who have no respect for the Constitution, the Constitution can get destroyed from inside the Federal system and “we the people” can become disenfranchised without even knowing what is going on, because in the world of Federal laws, it is a complicated terrain even relatively well trained attorneys can find themselves lost in. As *de facto* the Petitioners herein have become completely disenfranchised of their fundamental rights, and in the complex litigation, only those who are trained, able and interested will realize the extreme abuses of fundamental rights. Ginsberg of the US Supreme Court in a recent television program said repeatedly how surprised she is at in what high regard the American people hold the judicial system in the United States. Considering that that court hears less than a hundred matters of the ten thousands or more a year filed in that court and the decision is made by clerks as to who and who does not have the privilege of the Constitution applied to them, no wonder she is surprised. The horror is how can people like her who took an oath to the Constitution of the United States sit by complacently whilst they know firsthand of the thousands and thousands of people who never have access to the promise of the Bill of Rights of the Constitution.

93. The First Petitioner has therefore in her experience found a people in the United States who are greatly impressed by themselves and fancy buildings, rather than by their richest treasure, the Constitution itself. Below then, is first the reminder of who the President of the United States is supposed to be in practical terms and in integrity:

The US Presidency in practical terms: The executive arm is the part of government that has sole authority and responsibility for the daily administration of the state. The executive branch executes the law. The division of power into separate branches of government is central to the idea of the separation of powers.

In many countries, the term "government" connotes only the executive branch. However, this usage fails to differentiate between despotic and democratic forms of government. In authoritarian systems, such as a dictatorship or absolute monarchy, where the different powers of government are assumed by one person or small oligarchy, the executive branch ceases to exist since there is no other branch with which to share separate but equal governmental powers.

The separation of powers system is designed to distribute authority away from the executive branch—an attempt to preserve individual liberty in response to tyrannical leadership throughout history (The Federalist Papers, #51) The executive officer is not supposed to make laws (the role of the legislature) or interpret them (the role of the judiciary). The role of the executive is to enforce the law as written by the legislature and interpreted by the judicial system. Obama therefore has as President no right or power outside the Constitution of the United States of America and the Rule of Law.

In the situation which the Petitioners are bringing to the attention of this court, it shows the Obama regime has completely destroyed the separation of powers. Below are examples of how Obama is taking over the legislative role to make laws, or change them or fundamentally affect them.

The matters highlighted above in which the Petitioners are parties, show clearly how the judiciary is no longer playing its role in the separation of powers, but has abandoned the law entirely and appears to like puppets to do whatever they are told (the court is reminded of Ezell's comments whilst hi-jacking the court, that he is following Obama's lead, and then Smith hi-jacking the court blatantly to deprive the First Petitioner of fundamental rights eventhough the Supremacy Clause was invoked, therefore showing complete rebellion against the Constitution and the Rule of Law by government officials claiming they follow Obama's lead.

The President of the United States of America is the head of state and head of government of the United States. The president leads the executive branch of the federal government and is the commander-in-chief of the United States Armed Forces. Many consider the President of the United States as the most powerful person in the world. The truth is, the most powerful is "we the people", even he works for them and they have the Constitution which demands a recall if he exceeds his powers.

Article II of the U.S. Constitution vests the executive power of the United States in the president and **charges him with the execution of federal law**, alongside the responsibility of appointing federal executive, diplomatic, regulatory, and **judicial officers**, and concluding treaties with foreign powers, with the advice and consent of the Senate. The president is further empowered to grant federal pardons and reprieves, and to convene and adjourn either or both houses of Congress under extraordinary circumstances. ("Article II, Section 3, U.S. Constitution". *law.cornell.edu*. Legal Information Institute. 2012).

Integrity an essential requirement for the US President: The court knows the above. The only reason the Petitioners remind the court thereof, is to remind the court, that the executive of the United States of America is to be a fit and proper person, a person of integrity beyond reproach, who can be trusted completely by "we the people" of the United States of America. After all, he holds at the tip of his fingers an arsenal which can destroy the planet, so he holds more than the lives of the 300 million Americans in his hands: he HAS to be a person of complete sound mind and complete honor and integrity.

If Obama was indeed born in Kenya, had his US citizenship renounced by his mother when he became an Indonesian citizen, and returned to the United States on a student visa and was deported after which he was illegal. If any of these or similar allegations affecting Obama being a constitutionally sound natural born United States of America citizen is true, the people of the United States of America have the right to know such facts.

This court has the duty to know beyond any doubt such facts and to notify through its order herein the people of the truth exactly of Obama: his place of birth, how, when and how he became naturalized, etc. If Obama's birth certificate he produced a few months ago is fraudulent, the people need to know that too. By Obama standing as candidate for the 2012 Elections, Obama alleges he complies with the natural born clause of the United States of America Constitution.

The justices of this court are reminded they are servants to the people, not to Obama and they have a duty to answer these questions: to use their subpoenaing power to obtain exact details until without a shadow of doubt the question can be answered if Obama qualifies Constitutionally as natural born US Citizen, and this court then has a duty to let the "we the people" know with certainty through their order herein, if Obama is a natural born citizen.

If Obama is not a natural born citizen and therefore acted from the outset with the intent to defraud "we the people", this court has no need to wait for Congress, because then Obama was never the President of the United States of America at all, but merely a criminal and a fraud who hi-jacked a country, and this court has the right and duty to hold Obama accountable in terms of the Constitution

of the United States of America to declare him a fraud for posing as a President when he knew full well his ineligibility, not being a natural born citizen of the United States of America, cannot be corrected as it is a Constitutional requirement (note in this regard: Obama as a candidate for 2012 not being eligible because he violated his oath of office whilst President makes him in terms of Amendment 14 Section 3 ineligible, but a two thirds vote by congress could cure that defect. Not so with him not being a natural born citizen of the United States of America).

94. The Petitioners ask that the court declare the matter complex. The first prayer to this court, namely to assess the circumstances of the Petitioners and assess if Obama exercised his fiduciary duties executing federal law, is relatively simple. The second prayer to this court, asking to on a factual basis determine if Obama is a natural born Constitutionally eligible citizen to qualify for the position of President, is also relatively simple as Obama's full details exactly are available to this court(except of course if it has been falsified deliberately, in this regard the court's attention is drawn to a posting on the internet which reads as follows: While the American media provide cover for the constitutionally ineligible Barack Hussein Obama, Vladimir Putin and the nation of Russia are reaping a treasure trove of defense secrets and missile technology by threatening to reveal the true history of the Manchurian Candidate. Obama has spent millions to prevent his personal story from being revealed to the American public. Records have been destroyed, information has been hidden, false claims have been advanced, potential whistle-blowers have been threatened and official documents have been forged. Enabled by a complicit media and the craven cowardice of political opponents, the most egregious felonies in the nation's history have served to make the American people easy prey for the schemes of a dedicated Communist and committed enemy of our Constitutional Republic. And those schemes have included the betrayal both of the United States and her allies.). The last prayer in respect of Obama, namely for this court to assess from Obama's conduct and decisions during his time in office generally in order to measure if Obama violated his oath of office is more complex and the Petitioners hereby invoke that which allows a matter to qualify as complex needing what special and specialist attention may be necessary for this court to make its determination in this regard.

Part of the complexity is because the Obama situation is the first for the United States, other nations, such as Germany with Hitler, or Zimbabwe with Mugabe, has more experience with charismatic leaders who says whatever will get them elected, but who harbor a sinister personal agenda with bad intentions for the people.

The below shows how Obama uses rhetoric to say things different from what things really are: which means it appears one common thread runs through the Obama regime - deliberate deceit to use the office of President to impress upon the people his will rather than "we the people's" will.

The First Petitioner grew up in apartheid South Africa, so she knows how deceitful leaders can be, how they can tell the people one thing whilst they do another. An example is a President, PW Botha, who in 1984 swore with his hand on the Bible that South Africa was not participating in the war in Angola.

Similarly Mugabe of Zimbabwe, a supposed great proponent of individual rights gave in to the big money powers to rape Zimbabwe of its mineral wealth whilst the people were deliberately divided to fight one another and let big money with a strong Chinese influence, walk off with the minerals (divide and rule).

When people become lied to by their leaders who have different agendas than the good of the people it becomes very dangerous for all concerned, because the leaders have enormous power and often those who speak against their conduct at a time something could have been stopped their march to destruction of individual rights, are silenced through disappearance or even death.

Had it not been that the First Petitioner faced death earlier this year, caused directly by Gilner, Ezell and later Smith depriving her of income she is legitimately entitled to, she would probably not have had the courage to take on the powers she is forcing before this court through this Motion.

The First Petitioner however has complete certainty that she has a duty to bring this matter to this court and that God is with her, no matter what.

The First Petitioner is not a United States Attorney and due to her circumstances does not even have access to a law library or West Law. She believes legally and especially constitutionally trained American Attorneys could do a vastly better job than her of this Motion and could cite specifics which would make for a much stronger case. However, despite her inability and no financial resources, the First Petitioner has the moral and legal duty to defend the Constitution of the United States of America and this court must kindly excuse her inabilities and rather focus on the sincerity of the case: that the First Petitioner know firsthand Barak Hussein Obama is not who he says he is: he has no respect for individual rights, or she would not have been deprived of even her last name, all fundamental rights and women's rights. The First Petitioner believes sincerely that whoever looks at her case, looks at what is in store for Americans in the future if Obama is not stopped from implementing surreptitiously the Alinsky model of chaotic and abusive government into the United States of America. Remember, Alinsky was friends with the mob. Obama is rumored to be the same. Everyone knows that lawlessness and ruthless government is what their forefathers fled to the United States for: all the good for securing individual rights brought about the past can be destroyed in a very short while, because if the Federal court justices have no respect for the Rule of Law or for the Constitution of the United States of America, then the fence keepers are allowing the rights of 'we the people', the Constitution to be destroyed. Over and above that, Obama is in control of an arsenal which can destroy the world several times over.

Below is described conduct which the First Petitioner believes is unconstitutional and examples of where Obama violated his oath to the Constitution of the United States of America whilst in office.

95. In a recent magazine article a Harvard professor to both John Roberts, the chief justice of the Supreme Court and Obama wrote how he taught both that congress can regulate the people Constitutionally by imposing taxes and further that it is the duty of the Supreme Court to not change the will of the people through a decision by congress, unless it absolutely has to. All know about Obama's health care law: the extreme measures he and those on his side went to to make submission after submission to congress (most of whom are not legally trained people) telling them the health care law is not a tax. Roberts in deciding to allow the health care law to proceed shows he is a man of integrity, namely that even though he is on the opposite side of the political spectrum, that the principle is that congress has the right to use a tax to regulate the people. Unfortunately Roberts also showed he is a coward: Roberts knew full well that Obama deliberately over and over misled congress that it was not a tax. Obama is considered by many just stupid and hence does not know he is busy doing wrong. That is obviously not the case: Obama knew full well the health care law is using the taxing system to regulate the people through congress imposing a tax. However, he specifically and deliberately misled congress. Roberts who knew this had a duty to hold Obama accountable to blatantly and deliberately lie to the people, through their representatives in congress, when he knew it is a tax and specifically intended it as a tax, but did not want the people to know this: the question to this court is not to decide on the health care law, it is to examine Obama's allegations to congress that it is not a tax, examine keeping confirmation by his law professor who even cites a specific discussion between him and Obama that Obama was fully aware congress can use taxes to regulate the people.

96. The President, according to the Constitution, must "take care that the laws be faithfully executed", and "preserve, protect and defend the Constitution". President Obama has violated these duties of his office. The Executive is one of the branches of government under the Doctrine of the Separation of Powers and has no right to put itself above the Constitution creating amongst lesser officials such as Ezell, a sense of lawlessness, that Ezell even said he does not care about the human rights of the Plaintiff which he is violating "you can go the United Nations, you can go to the Hague, I do not care" and also that he is agreeing with what "his President" is saying, this is not a Christian country, apparently the reason for his illegal hi-jacking of the court he was abusing the Plaintiff *erga omnes* rights from. Obama encouraged directly the illegal conduct of Ezell, causing directly and causally untold harm to the Petitioners as follows: (Extract page 28 volume I in record of case 41-2009-DR-10430, proceedings of July 14, 2010 before Ezell) At line 10, Ezell speaking: "...our President (Obama) has made it very clear that we are not a Christian country... he stated that in public addresses.... Therefore he is the leader of my country.....and he is my leader.....and I follow his lead.", thus Ezell according to himself, followed Obama's unchristian lead that rules like the rules of Ezell's appointment or what Ezell was allowed to hear in terms of the Rules of Court need not be followed by Ezell and Ezell can violate the First Petitioner's most basic human rights, thus giving rise to Ezell's deliberate illegal conduct. Ezell, presiding illegally further said: "Your Motion to join the State of Florida is denied. You have the State of Florida" (meaning himself, illegal Ezell). Ezell through the latter displayed the imperialist agenda of the Obama regime, that not only are individual rights not honored or recognized, but any effort to seek help from legitimate structures provided in the Constitution will be suppressed, leaving "we the people", in that case the First Petitioner, utterly disenfranchised and suffering loss of fundamental rights under imperialist tyranny. And Ezell was right, the State of Florida Supreme Court and the federal courts follow Obama's lead rather than the Rule of Law or the Constitution of the United States of America. The second most important from the above, is that this court must apply its mind to the fact that Obama denounces publicly Christianity. Only a fool at this stage thinks that Obama is a fool. He is working meticulously in terms of a pre-calculated plan to destroy the United States of America and the Constitution of the United States of America. The Constitution of the United States of America is based on the Judeo Christian faith which believes inalienable rights are provided by God directly, that all people are equal and deserving of justice and freedom. That means the Constitution of the United States was the first and remains the foremost to go forward in the main characteristics of the Judeo Christian One and Only God, namely truth and love. It believes that if just equal and fair platforms with minimal government intervention can be created that people can enjoy freedom. It places individual rights as sovereign and untouchable, that no one, not even the most powerful person in government, the President can take that away from anyone. Ezell showed that under the Obama regime that is no longer the case. Ezell showed that under the Obama regime Christianity is mocked and ridiculed as well as the laws and Constitution the United States stand for. It is most important to understand why Obama says that the United States is not a Christian country. Obviously the statement is a lie: over eighty percent of the people in the United States confirmed recently they are Jews or Christians, ie part of the Judeo Christian faith. Obviously Obama's first reason is that he is exploiting his leadership position, if he ridicules the Christian faith through that statement, those who are way laid more easily by charismatic leaders than by principle, may just think being a Christian is a bad thing and denounce their faith (note re Obama himself: his father practiced the Islamic faith, Obama grew up under that faith even with his step father in Indonesia, although his mother whose parents were non practicing Christians, embraced the Hindu faith. When returning to the US mainland as a student Obama was a practicing Muslim. Only after he met his wife, did he become a Christian, but when there was political pressure for the revolutionary talks of his pastor, Wright, he immediately for the sake of political expedience stopped going to church. Eventhough his website says he is Christian, it appears he only goes to church just before elections to give off a Christian aura, but his actions contradict that he has ever met Jesus Christ.

Note further: before the 2008 election a dinner is held at the Whitehouse for both presidential candidates: in his speech Obama said some say he is the Christ, some say he is the anti-Christ, he made that as a joke, but not the kind of joke a true Christian would make. When one considers that joke and his strong allegiance to the Alinsky model which believes in revolution and the overthrow of the government and therefore Christianity in favor of a communist socialist government controlled model where people are puppets run by officials like him, then this court need to thoroughly analyze Obama's true religious intent). Another and the more sinister reason why Obama is likely to want to use his utterance that the United States of America is not a Christian country, is to divide and rule. Because Obama knows over 80 percent of Americans are Judeo Christians, he knows he is polarizing the people of the United States and whilst they are busy fighting one another and feel increasingly insecure about who they are, he can get away with plundering the country. In the wider picture Obama's allegation that the United States of America is not a Christian country probably has the widest application in terms of his plans. It is common knowledge in some parts of the world that the North Africa and Middle Eastern Muslim uprising was started deliberately by Hillary Clinton and her second in command a Muslim woman appointed by Obama and they did so by using modern media to stoke the fire the individual rights hungry people of that region stepped right into. The indication is that Obama intends to be the leader of a united communist world in which there is no room for any faith. The very strange conduct and rumors already that protestors were paid, indicate that the anti-Muslim film by a "no one" miraculously supposedly spread like wildfire, killing US Ambassadors and others now in September 2012 in riots. Considering Obama's communist past and his close relationship with Putin, both are likely to want to pit the Muslim and Christian worlds against one another. In Zimbabwe those who now own the mines, got the people to fight one another while the unscrupulous walked off with the spoils. The First Petitioner may not be expressing herself clearly, but she believes Obama stating the United States of America is unconstitutional, that under his oath he did not have the right to say that and that under his oath the consequences of such utterance must be seen as a violation of his oath. Whether Obama is merely trying to divide just the American people, or if he is trying to divide religious groups like Muslims and Christians in the hope they will fight one another that he can establish a communist socialist world order in which he is some kind of king, is uncertain. What is certain, is this court has the duty to identify the mischief and reign in his unconstitutional conduct by declaring his utterances unconstitutional and a breach of his oath to the Constitution of the United States of America, rendering him in terms of Article 14, Section 3, disqualified to be a candidate in 2012.

97. Mr Obama through his utterances on British Broadcasting Channel on March 26, 2012, violated his duty to the Constitution of the United States by attacking openly the Separation of Powers doctrine, an essential part for the checks and balances of the Constitution, the fundamental Constitutional safeguard for 'we the people', Mr Obama violated not only his oaths of office but all of 'we the people', Republican and Democrats and Independents, and those too young to vote, all over 300 million Americans. Obama's legal duty and oath prohibit him from an attack on fundamental Constitutional principles such as the separation of powers.
98. The attack referred to in the above paragraph was also against the Judicial Branch. The Legislative Branch and the Executive branches all represent great power and money. The United States remains the largest economy in the world and is by far the most powerful country in its military strength. That makes individuals like the Plaintiff very weak and without power in such system. The only strength individuals and the small, weak and lame have, such as all the Petitioners herein, is through the judiciary. That is why the judicial branch must ALWAYS and FOR ALL, including the Plaintiff, offer blind equal due process justice and prevail by applying the Constitution as is asked for herein.

That is why Ezell, Gilner, Moreland, ect, must be held accountable by the Federal and Higher courts. Imperialism always shines at the top, but it is in the day to day trenches of life, that a judicial system must be free of the likes of Ezell, Gilner and Moreland, or individuals and

individual rights such as those of the Petitioners will be destroyed. That is why the system must function in terms of the Constitution which binds this court and demands this court correctly in terms of the Constitution decides this matter. It makes it imperative that this court gathers the facts by ordering the due diligence and in need an investigation and then simply apply the Constitution of the United States of America.

Obama, by breaking down the judicial branch is destroying the only chance the little people, "we the 300 million individuals", strong together but incredibly weak by ourselves, are protected by in our individual capacities, where we are most vulnerable, the most important safeguard of the Constitution of the United States.

It is this fundamental right destroyed by Ezell in the example of President Obama which the Plaintiff has a right and duty to protect. This suit is therefore not an attack on Obama or even Ezell, but is merely her duty under the Universal Declaration of Human rights, part of what the Petitioner swore an oath to when she swore an oath to the Constitution of the United States, to hold these government officials accountable for their unconstitutional conduct and to defend in the example of her leader, Mr Nelson Mandela, a person worthy to look up to and who taught her the duty of each individual to protect the rights and freedoms in the Bill of Rights or they will be stolen away.

When the Plaintiff swore her oath to the Constitution of the United States of America she swore before God to defend the Constitution of the United States, in need with her life. At the time she never thought it would be necessary, but did take her oath seriously enough to realize that if she has to be destroyed to stop the further illegal destruction of the Constitution of the United States, even by its own President, that she must do so for herself, for the 300 million we the people and for her family to ensure individuals do not suffer the extreme deprivation of rights she has suffered at the hands of Ezell/Obama having so deliberately deprived her of her most basic human and civil rights.

"Resistance to tyranny becomes the Christian and social duty of each individual. ... Continue steadfast and, with a proper sense of your dependence on God, nobly defend those rights which heaven gave, and no man ought to take from us."

John Hancock

History of the United States of America, Vol. II, p. 229

99. A recent presidential decree brought into effect a situation where Martial Law can instantaneously be ordered by Obama, and that the citizens of the United States be treated as enemies who can be detained without trial indefinitely. The First Petitioner challenges this order as unconstitutional. What she refers to is described on the internet as follows: "The President will promptly sign NDAA Section 1031 into law, codifying who is eligible for "Detention under the law of war without trial." Without a trial, there is no chance to tell a judge that the government has no evidence. The worst thing about this law is that it originally exempted U.S. citizens, but now it dangerously does not specify either way... The bottom line is that the NDAA bill contains language that will codify, or make into law, the much debated act of defining U.S. citizens as enemy combatants. It will leave that discretionary power to the executive branch.

While many readers have contended that nothing in this bill applies to U.S. citizens, Senator Carl Levin, the bill's sponsor, explicitly disagrees. Even more alarming, it was Senator Levin who announced in Senate chambers that it was Barack Obama himself who demanded the verbiage that includes U.S. citizens as fair game by our own military on U.S. soil. This followed Senator Lindsey Graham's gleeful announcement that through the passage of this draconian legislation, the whole of America is now a battlefield and a venue in which the U.S. military may operate against its own. " The law referred to violates the Supremacy Clause of the United States of America and deprive individual citizens of their fundamental rights. This Federal Court has the jurisdiction and the duty to declare Obama's conduct in respect thereof unconstitutional and a

breach to his oath of the Constitution of the United States of America. This has further to be considered in conjunction with Obama's proud announcement that he keeps a "hit list" a common term for mafia type leaders who systematically kill off who they perceive as opponents to their druglord and other operations. When Obama swore an oath to the Constitution of the United States of America he swore an oath to the Rule of Law. The Rule of Law demands that all people have the right to a blind justice legal platform. Say Obama puts the First Petitioner on his hit list and gets the FBI to fake a car crash, Obama would be a murderer and so will the FBI agent be, because the First Petitioner is a simple person just trying to have her family protected from an extreme abuse of human and fundamental rights. To make it worse, what if in such scenario the FBI agent makes a mistake and kills the First Petitioner's neighbor who happened to use her car instead? No president of the United States must EVER have "hit list" it is uncivilized and it is unconstitutional and this court must say so.

100. No system or country can function outside the Rule of Law. Wikipedia on the internet sets it out as follows: "The Rule of Law, in its most basic form, is the principle that no one is above the law. The rule follows logically from the idea that truth, and therefore law, is based upon fundamental principles which can be discovered, but which cannot be created through an act of will.

The most important application of the rule of law is the principle that governmental authority is legitimately exercised only in accordance with written, publicly disclosed laws adopted and enforced in accordance with established procedural steps that are referred to as due process. The principle is intended to be a safeguard against arbitrary governance, whether by a totalitarian leader or by mob rule. Thus, the rule of law is hostile both to dictatorship and to anarchy. "So widespread is the abuse of the Rule of Law in what is highlighted to this court, that this court must realize there are two important elements at work. The one is that those tasked with implementing the law are deliberately not doing so, ie a general state of anarchy has developed which permeates the legal environment to the extent that severe and gross violations of human rights protected in the Supremacy Clause are matter of factly brushed aside and by Ezell's admission, this instruction comes from Obama. The other is the specifics, namely individuals tasked specifically with the higher standard of care failing. The United States of America through its Constitution and through its Supremacy Clause agreed to the entire world to be an honorable nation dictated to by principle along. Obama killing Bin Laden is used by Obama as a great political achievement, but he sacrificed principle and the Rule of Law, making the people who died in the attack on the Twin Towers to have died in vain, because if they died so that the United States will become a nation who violates international laws and who deviates from the very Rule of Law which have effectively made the world a safer place, then they died in vain. It shall not be popular, but the truth is that in terms of the United States Constitution and the Supremacy Clause of the United States of America, Obama violated his oath to the Constitution of the United States of America when he ordered American troops into a foreign sovereign country the United States of America is not at war with.

101. The Constitution of the United States kept in place through the Rule of Law is what created the United States and the modern world and is the only hope for a broken world. All that is asked from this court is to implement the Constitution of the United States of America into Obama's conduct and determine if he violated his oath to the Constitution.

102. Anarchy is when vigilantes take over and do what they want. In the matters highlighted to this court the over 600 Petitioners are victims and are not equal, nor free, nor protected under the Obama regime.

103. **U.S.C.A. Const. Amend. XIV** which at Section 1 demands that no State shall deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law.

104. The court is reminded that the United States subscribes to article 18 of the **Universal Declaration of Human Rights** which states that no country should arbitrarily compromise the religious rights of an individual. The **U.S.C.A. Const. Amend. I** safeguards the free exercise of

religion and are reminded the Gilner Ezell Obama Smith combination deprived her of that right and even her last name.

105. **Dalmau v. Vicaoareario-Grandenese, SA, 337 F. Supp. 2d 1299** states discrimination is evidenced through a discriminatory and retaliatory attitude correlating to the discrimination of retaliation. The cases giving rise to this filing will show this court through a simple due diligence, that the Petitioners have been extremely discriminated against by Obama.

The First Petitioner stood against her own people in apartheid because it was a system which discriminated and destroyed individual rights, she stood against the remnants of the apartheid regime in the legal system in South Africa, she shall prevail against a United States stealing her individual rights from her, and she quotes her mentor, Nelson Mandela: *"I have fought against white domination, I have fought against black domination. I have challenged the idea of a democratic and free society. It is an ideal I hope to live for, but.. if need be, it is an ideal for which I am prepared to die."*

106. No domestic issues are relevant hereto and case 41-2009-DR-10430 and other cases merely highlight Obama's violation of his oath to the Constitution of the United States of America. The issues brought to the attention of this court are of a federal nature, dealing with Federal questions based on the Constitution of the United States of America which through government officials such as Gilner, Ezell, Moreland and Smith caused extreme discrimination and intentionally deprivation of fundamental rights of the First Petitioner which is protected through the Supremacy Clause of the Constitution of the United States of America. The First Petitioner, with many others from Africa, was delighted when Obama spoke at the Democratic convention. In Africa it was told he is a Muslim half African, showing the lack of discrimination by the American society. Therefore as the First Petitioner did not have a political home as at 2008, Obama appeared to be her natural choice. However, the more she read about his strong communist inclinations, the more concerned she became. When she read about how he is not helping his half brother in Kenya, who has to survive off less than a dollar a day, she became most disenchanted. At the same time she heard an old man tell he was a co-prisoner with McCain and when McCain would come back from torture sessions whilst a prisoner of war, bleeding and unable to walk without help, McCain, knowing the other prisoners were peeping through the keyholes of their cells, would behind the back of the guard pulling him back to his room show his fellow American's a thumbs up sign: in McCain's hour of extreme hardship, when he had no idea if he would get to the experience with his life, his concern was not for himself, but that those around him would be encouraged. That made the Petitioner want to support the campaign of such man. In South Africa the First Petitioner, a white South Africa, refused to vote until all the people in the country could vote. The only President she therefore ever voted for was Nelson Mandela. The First Petitioner suffered extreme human rights abuses in South Africa after Mbeki replaced Mandela and she had innocently continued the direction set by Mandela, not knowing Mbeki had a big business apartheid style intention with Xhosas (his tribe), being pushed ahead of others. As the reality became ever clearer despite the party (ANC) pacifying rethoric of Mbeki, the First Petitioner became targeted for speaking out which caused her to realize a big problem in the protection of the new South African constitution, namely that the Constitutional court was made so exclusive that in post apartheid South Africa which needed the new Constitution applied vigorously, that less than a hundred matters a year was being considered by the Constitutional court and that the only ones actual reasons were given for, were high profile mainly commercial matters. It was clear the court was built as a tourist attraction when what the country needed was active implementation of the South African 1996 Constitution. Prior to the end of apartheid the United States played a significant role in South Africa and anyone in the know knew many people from the United States helped South Africa transition into a democracy and people from the United States helped draft its Constitution. Mbeki was involved from the background all along,

but his true colors and intent only showed when he was president. Through her experiences the First Petitioner came to understand that Mbeki had strong links into the previous apartheid regime and in particular through the big money which controlled banks and mines. Before apartheid ended the whites had tried to make a coalition with the Zulu tribe, and on the face of it it appeared the African National Congress was a truly independent representative of all the tribes once it infiltrated the Zulu tribe, mainly by the assistance of who is not President Zuma. For reasons too long and boring to repeat here, it came to the attention of the First Petitioner that the actual behind the scenes deal between big money (the apartheid regime) was with the Xhosa tribe, which means much of post apartheid South Africa was shaped by tribalism, not its new Constitution. Many there are ignorant of that fact ;especially the still disenfranchised just do not understand why the Constitution did not bring the change they needed. It was the deliberate non implementation of the Constitution and the behind the scenes maneuvering with big business between the Xhosa tribe, led by Mbeki, which caused the continuing apartheid style problems in the country. The First Petitioner believes the people became aware of Mbeki's double role and hence the only non Xhosa at the time in a position to replace him was current President Zuma. Anyone who knows Africa politics know that Mbeki played a major role in the devastation in Zimbabwe through behind the scenes dealings which now have the country destroyed and the mines belonging to big money with the people completely disenfranchised. It was started through dividing the people to fight one another. Exactly the same scenario happened in the Democratic Republic of the Congo: the countries resources are raped by large countries and corporations whilst the people are totally destroyed. Some of those who are destabilized in Northern Africa were competition to Mbeki;s aspirations in the African Union. The reason the First Petitioner mentions this, is that it does not mean that because a person wears a nice suit and smiles and make friends with foreign nations that such person as a President has the best interests of the people of a nation in mind. In the case of South Africa, it appears the same big money mines and banks are trying a Zimbabwe divide and rule on South Africa now as at September 2012, Mbeki ever in the background. The First Petitioner has asked herself repeatedly if she would have been able to help prevent the extreme hardships South Africans will face if they are targeted to have Zimbabwe style civil war so that mine magnates can have the country's resources for cheap? There may never be an answer to that question, but it has made the First Petitioner realize those who can prevent harm to people must be notified so that they can hopefully stop the harm. In her current situation she in any event became desperate when she fell ill and she had to seek help from South Africa. The First Petitioner is further still actively trying to let the true principles for which Mr Mandela stand, justice, freedom and true equality become a reality through ongoing sustainability projects she is involved with. This paragraph intended to show the justices dealing with this matter, their wider responsibility. The United States is a world leader. As the above shows, by the United States judiciary not having responded correctly to increased populations, and therefore since 1925 having made that the guarantee to citizens of equality, justice and freedom (application of the Constitution) will only apply to a few lucky ones (the United States Supreme Court hears less than 100 matters a year despite receiving about 10 000 a year – the building is like the South African Constitutional court also mainly used for tourists), rather than to all, the true jist of the Constitution, but even influenced a country like South Africa to make the same error. If the United States of America now start violating at the highest level its own Constitution just to please Obama, what chance does lesser nations have to keep in check their dictators? This court must honestly and truthfully deal with the situation and apply the Constitution.

107. The South African High Court, Kwa Zulu Natal Division, on March 9, 2012 in case 2012/2626 advised the First Petitioner that the correct court to formally obtain protection by the Republic of South Africa against the abuse the Petitioner suffer from the Obama regime, is via its Embassy in Washington DC. The Washington DC court was approached and referred to a letter addressed to Mr Couvreur, Registrar of the International Court of Justice, which set out in greater

detail violations of international law by the United States, in particular against the *erga omnes* rights of the over 600 Petitioners hereof. Because of the nature of the violations against the Petitioners being *erga omnes*, any other state becoming aware of the circumstance could and should also approach the International Court of Justice on behalf of the victims, or join South Africa in its efforts to resolve the illegal situation affecting the victims. The urgent reason First Petitioner involved South Africa for is that early in 2012 it was feared that she suffers life threatening illness as a direct result of Gilner, Ezell, Smith under the Obama regime having deprived her of any income. If this court orders a due diligence of 41-2009-DR-10430 from the 12th Judicial Circuit for Manatee county, Florida it will see the Petitioner suffered deliberate violations of her fundamental rights, will know she had no alternative but to invoke the Supremacy Clause of the United States, and when she got ill, had no alternative but to seek assistance through South Africa. The First Petitioner mentions this, because she has come to realize that the American people are deeply divided by having fallen victim to bad leadership and advice. The truth is that 39 people, all Rotarians, like the First Petitioner, after the Second World War wanted to stop the horrors of such war and assist the world to be a more peaceful place. The Rotary organization started by Paul Harris at the beginning of the last century, is a friendship organization, trading on goodwill and care to make friends beyond borders. The United Nations was not started to harm the United States as many conservative Americans are erroneously led to believe, it was started to use the United States model of individual rights to propel friendship and help into cultures and countries, enhancing the idea that all people are equal and deserving or respect, friendship and care. Amongst conservative Americans, the United Nations is like a swearword. What the people do not realize is that that organization holds in check many abuses disenfranchised people would otherwise suffer. Those who are of deep principle should participate and take the United Nations forward in a responsible manner, not ridicule it. When individuals like the First Petitioner get stripped of individual rights, the United Nations is supposed to be an independent organization protecting against such abuse. If Obama's march against individual rights as experienced by the First Petitioner succeeds, the very people who now ridicule the United Nations may still need it for protection. The First Petitioner did not approach the United Nations for help to ridicule the United States, but because the Obama regime acted outside the Constitution of the United States of America, its Supremacy Clause, violated the Petitioners internationally protected fundamental rights and threatened the First Petitioners life and she had every right in her desperate moment to seek help and protection from United Nations structures specifically there for that purpose. The First Petitioner mentions this, because the justices, who have to decide this, may well become annoyed for her daring to have sought help. The First Petitioner believes that if anyone was as deprived of fundamental rights as she was and feared terminal illness which would have made it impossible to deal with the situation, they would have done the same. It was therefore not an act of disloyalty to the United States to seek UN help, but desperation. The Obama regime through what the Petitioners have suffered has proven itself disloyal to the Constitution of the United States of America and the Petitioners are victims of such disloyalty and deserved to have their plight attended to. That plight still remains, eventhough this specific matter is for this specific court first and foremost a matter where it has to decide if Obama violated the Constitution of the United States of America rendering him ineligible as candidate, there is additional burden on this court, namely, its justices, as soon as they know about the deprivation of fundamental rights of the Petitioners and the Constitutional 18USC241 and other crimes, stand under a legal obligation to halt the abuse of fundamental rights and to ensure the safety of victims of fundamental rights abuses and crimes, the Petitioners.

108. INVOKING SUPREMACY CLAUSE:

The Petitioners therefore hereby invoke the Supremacy Clause of the Constitution of the United States herein. The Supremacy Clause demands that Constitutional and International law violations and harm be dealt with first and that abused victims of unconstitutional conduct be restored to the situation ante, before

lesser issues are dealt with. The essence of this matter is to enable the United States to correct itself in terms of its own laws and Constitutional principles and to implement its laws and treaty obligations in terms of Obama and the Petitioners and other victims brought to the attention of the court, so that an international tribunal is not necessary to hold it accountable.

The International Court of Justice recognized the importance of the *erga omnes* principle in the Barcelona Traction case (Belgium v Spain) (Second Phase) ICJ Rep 1970 3 at paragraph 33), which reads:

"... an essential distinction should be drawn between the obligations of a State towards the international community as a whole, and those arising vis-à-vis another State in the field of diplomatic protection. By their very nature, the former are the concern of all States. In view of the importance of the rights involved, all States can be held to have a legal interest in their protection; they are obligations erga omnes. [at 34] Such obligations derive, for example, in contemporary international law, from the outlawing of acts of aggression, and of genocide, as also from the principles and rules concerning the basic rights of the human person, including protection from slavery and racial discrimination. Some of the corresponding rights of protection have entered into the body of general international law . . . others are conferred by international instruments of a universal or quasi-universal character."

If Obama is not a natural born citizen and he therefore knows that he hi-jacked the country of the United States illegally against its sacred Constitution, then he hates the Constitution of the United States of America and "we the people" have the right to know that Obama has no good intent for the Constitution or for anyone in the United States of America and that his campaign propaganda is rhetoric intended to mislead the American people. If he was sincere he would have been honest with "we the people" from the outset, and the uncertainty which has resulted from his secrecy is harmful to the greater good of "we the people". This court must not stop till it knows conclusively and truly what the Obama situation is and then it has a legal Constitutional duty to share it with "we the people", whatever the outcome.

Hereby then is invoked the Constitution for the United States of America, as lawfully amended ("U.S. Constitution"); by treaties enacted pursuant to the Supremacy Clause in the U.S. Constitution, including specifically the Universal Declaration of Human Rights ("Declaration"), and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the latter with specific Reservations by the U.S. Congress ("Covenant"); and by the Bill of Rights in the Constitution of the State of Florida ("Florida state Constitution").

The Florida Supreme Court has jurisdiction over 41-2009-DR-10430 and must restore the Rule of Law and the Constitution in that matter, but this court has jurisdiction over the 18USC241 and other constitutional crimes flowing from it, as well as over the fundamental rights abuses protected by the above legislation:

That Court has original jurisdiction over this case by virtue of the Florida state Constitution, and also the specific Reservations which Congress attached to the Covenant in the Document of Ratification of the International Covenant ("Ratification Document"). Article II, Section 5, of the Ratification Document reads as follows:

(5) That the United States understands that this Covenant shall be implemented by the Federal Government to the extent that it exercises legislative and judicial jurisdiction over the matters covered therein, and otherwise by the state and local governments; to the extent that state and local governments exercise jurisdiction over such matters, the Federal Government shall take measures appropriate to the federal system to the end that the competent authorities of the state or local governments may take appropriate measures for the fulfillment of the Covenant.

When the State of Florida failed to adhere to the above and subject itself in respect of the first part of the matter before this court, namely if Obama failed his duty in respect of the Petitioners, the Federal

government became responsible to implement the fundamental laws and in particular the Supremacy Clause to hold Florida accountable for its fundamental rights abuses. This court as a Federal court have the right and jurisdiction to determine if the violations of fundamental rights needed to be stopped by Obama when details were formally served on him since 2010. Whether Obama is a friend of the psychiatrist which gave rise to this unacceptable deprivation of fundamental rights must be examined by this court. Any shortcomings of this filing must be overlooked: Section 466 demands that pro se pleadings in a civil rights action must be viewed without regard for technicalities, and such pleading should be according to a liberal construction. In *Eldridge v Block*, 832 F.2d 1132,9 Fed. R. Serv 3d 616 (9th Cir. 1987) it was held the court should provide a pro se “plaintiff” with at least some notice of the deficiencies in the complaint to insure that he plaintiff uses the opportunity to amend effectively. The Appellant’s lack of legal skills and her inability to defend her own rights and the rights of others must be rectified by the court urgently appointing counsel, if necessary. The court has that discretion. (U.S – Marashll v. Columbia Lea Regional Hosp., 345 F. 3d 1157 (10th Cir. 2003); *Davis v. Scott*, 94 F. 3d 444 (8th Cir. 1996).

The Civil Rights Act 1870, Section 1981 provides for equal rights under the law. There is a direct connection between the conduct of officials at the 12th Judicial circuit, their obvious unlawful conduct, such as Gilner and Ezell (even “appointing” himself and hearing matters he knew the Statue specifically forbids a Magistrate to hear.) and the conduct of Obama complained herein as violating the Constitution of the United States of America.

The integrity of the judiciary must be above reproach. Its decisions are trusted.

42 U.S.C.A provides remedies when conspiracies, deprive a person from equal protection of the laws (U.S – *Soto v. Schembri*, 960 F. Supp. 751 (S.D. N.Y. 1997)), a fundamental human and civil right violated . If a person like Judge Lamberth of the Columbia circuit knows due to having seen full details of Obama’s social security details that Obama is not natural born and is Constitutionally ineligible, then Lamberth becomes a co-conspirator with Obama and 18USC241 crimes are committed by them against all “we the people”, and they must be held accountable as traitors to the Constitution of the United States of America.

The Supreme Court of Florida had a duty to remedy Constitutional cases and redress the condition offending the Constitution.(*Inmates of Occoquan v. Barry*, 844 F.2d 828(DC. Cir. 1988). That court had no right to decline to exercise its discretion and had a legal duty to resort to vindicate the deprivation of constitutional rights (U.S. – *Watson v. City of Memphis*, 35, 526, 83 S. Ct. 1314, 10L Ed. 2d 529 (1963), but deliberately failed to do so, now leaving it up to the Federal judiciary to remedy. One glance at 41-2009-DR-10430 of the 12th Judicial Circuit for Manatee County Florida, and it is clear no court would ever have acted as Gilner, Dubensky, Maulucci, Ezell, Dunnigan, Brownell, and Moreland and now Smith did, but that the Appellant is from Africa originally and thus the discrimination on race and country of origin is clear, and this court has a duty to take conginsance of such discrimination and to take conginsance of the fact that Obama had since 2010 to put a stop to it, and he did not. It is not only correct to eliminate the effects of past discrimination but bar future discrimination. U.S. N.A.A.C.P. v *City of Evergreen* 693 F.2d 1367, 35 Fed. R. SErv. 2d 1098 (11 1982); *Taylor v. Jones*, 653 F 2d 1193 (8 1981) and this court has the duty to the American people to hold Obama responsible for his failure as the utmost protector of the Law, to have failed in his duty.

Florida Statute Section 768.28 (9)(a) where a state official would have immunity in “any act, event, or omission of action in the scope of her or his employment or function, unless such officer, employee, or agent acted in bad faith or with malicious purpose or in a manner exhibiting wanton and willful disregard of human rights, safety, or property.” The conduct of the judicial officers brought to the attention of this court herein such as by Gilner, Ezell, Moreland and Smith fall in such category, especially in respect of their 18USC241 Constitutional and other crimes and this court has the duty to stop the criminal conduct and ensure the safety of the victim Petitioners.

109. And this court’s duty is pointed out to it as follows:

“The court cannot decline to exercise its discretion and must resort to vindicate the deprivation of constitutional rights (U.S. – Watson v. City of Memphis, 35, 526, 83 S. Ct. 1314, 10L Ed. 2d 529 (1963).”

“NOTICE OF PERTINENT LAWS

This matter deals with International Treaties, and the Constitutions of the United States of America, the State of Florida and resultant legislation. The Supremacy clause is invoked below.

The First Petitioner’s status is by Law, an "individual" as that term is defined in the federal Privacy Act. See definition at 5 U.S.C. 552a, section 552a(a)(2). First Petitioner thus claims standing under that Act.

The First Petitioner now invokes the Human Rights Treaties enumerated *supra*, in order to claim, to assert, and to enforce her fundamental Rights, as guaranteed by the Supremacy Clause of the Constitution of the United States of America, to equal protection of the Law. Declaration Article 12, and Covenant Article 17, for "privacy"; Declaration Article 7, and Covenant Article 26, for "equal protection".

The Rights which were violated and referred to herein, correspond to remedies which arise from fundamental Laws and the Constitution of the United States of America. The remedies are greater than those Obama rely on for his nomination as the Democratic candidate for the position as President of the United States of America to be elected in November 2012 as the rights relied on are directly from the Constitution of the United States of America, the Supreme Law of the United States of America and greater than any lesser laws.

The First Petitioner qualifies for the protection by the Constitutions of the United States of America and the State of Florida, in terms of the definition of "individual" in the Act, *i.e.*, citizens of the United States [*sic*] and aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence [*sic*]. The exact language of the definition now follows:

Section 552a. Records maintained on individuals

- (a) Definitions. For purposes of this section --
 - (2) the term "individual" means a citizen of the United States or an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence;

I, Annamarie no longer certain of my last name as a direct result of the violation of my fundamental rights by the Obama regime. The Obama regime, with the knowledge and consent (specific or implied) of Obama himself, illegally through Florida government official, Smith when he hi-jacked the 12th Judicial Circuit Court at Manatee county, Bradenton, Florida, and acted deliberately fraudulently in his order of May 24, 2012, conduct part of a 18USC241 crime because I am the whistleblower in crimes the State of Florida and the United States refuse to exercise their criminal jurisdiction in, deprived me of my fundamental rights protected by the Supremacy Clause of the United States of America and of my last name. I am, pro se, a Citizen of ONE OF the United States of America and hereby verify, under penalty of perjury, under the laws of the United States of America, that the above statement of laws and facts is true and correct, according to the best of my current information, knowledge, and belief, so help Me God, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 1746(1). See Supremacy Clause.

The First Petitioner swore an oath to the Constitution of the United States of America and has a right to protect the Constitution of the United States of America by pointing out to this court the unconstitutional conduct of candidate Obama, rendering his candidacy for the 2012 election invalid and of no force and effect. I further have a right to approach this court on behalf of victims, the 619 and the 30 as well as my fellow 300 million Americans as the Constitution of the United States of America warrants that we can demand certainty as to whether or not a candidate of election in terms of Article 14, Section 3 violated his oath whilst in office, if a candidate is natural born and complying with the Constitution of the United States or not. We have the right in terms of the Constitution of the United States of America for the court to examine not only the letter, but the intent of the Constitution of the United States of America, if the Constitution allows for a President who swore an oath to the Constitution to say untruths, such as “the United States is not a Christian country, as Obama has done, when it is factual that about 80 percent of

people in the United States of America are Christian and Obama knew such statement would be divisive and goes against the heart of the Constitution to develop a nation that is entitled to have citizens with religious freedom, who can proudly be Christian, and who by his statement are deliberately made as if they should be ashamed to be Christian and divides instead of unites the nation, therefore making the questions before this court highly complex, deserving the matter to be declared as such and also urgent as the 2012 election is only weeks away

Further affiant sayeth not

JENNIFER F. ROMANO
Notary Public, State of Florida
My Comm. Expires Aug. 8, 2015
No. EE 102325

Sworn to and subscribed to before me this 18 day of September 2012

Although the federal courts have exclusive jurisdiction of federal criminal prosecutions, the same act by those violating laws and rights, may constitute a federal crime and a state crime. In such a situation the offender may be prosecuted by both sovereigns. *Bartkus v. Illinois*, 1959, 79 S.Ct. 676, 359 U.S. 121, 3 L.Ed.2d 684; *Abbate v. US.*, 1959, 79 S.Ct. 666, 359 U.S. 187, 3 L.Ed.2d 729; *U.S. v. Logan*, C.A. 5th, 1991, 949 F.2d 1370, 1380 n. 16. The Assimilative Crimes Act, first adopted in 1825, provides that in areas within a state subject to federal jurisdiction, if an act is committed that would be a crime by state law, it is also a crime by federal law – 18 U.S.C.A Section 13 and *US v. Sharpnack*, 1958, 78 S.Ct, 291, 355 U.S. 286, 2 L.Ed.2d 282, upholding the 1948 revision of the statute by a continuing conformity to state law, rather than the assimilation of state law as of the date of enactment of the federal statute is provided. Obama's conduct is therefore violations of state and federal law. The failure of the United States of exercise its criminal jurisdiction in respect of Obama and those assisting him to escape his crimes shall be guilty of treason. The justices who decide this matter owe all 300 million Americans a clear nondiscretionary duty in terms of it being bound to comply with Article 38(1) of the Statute of the international Court of Justice sources of law and must protect them from possible harm by an unscrupulous leader. This court must also be forthright and honest about Obama being natural born and the 300 million Americans through THEIR Constitution place an obligation on this court THEIR judge, who in THEIR court have a duty to apply the Constitution, to tell them the exact details of Obama's birth and if he qualifies as a natural born Constitutional president.

Mr Obama is not above the law, he must be held accountable, and this court has a legal and Constitutional duty to do so, regardless of his power, because the next most important quality over and above being "blind" justice, is that the court MUST implement the law FEARLESSLY, exactly why Mr Obama's comment as to "who are they?", about the justices of the Supreme Court, must be his reminder "they" are the "one" tasked by the Constitution of the United States to uphold the Constitution through holding the great powers of the legislature and the executive in check, lest either abuse even one little individual of "we the people", of which the Petitioners are some.

The court is reminded **"A nation...cannot survive treason from within...the traitor ...wears the face of his victims,...and he appeals to the baseness that lies deep in the hearts of all men. He rots the soul of a nation—he works secretly...he infects the body politic so that it can no longer resist. A murderer is less to be feared....." Cicero, 42 B.C.E**

109 EMERGENCY

Injunctive relief cannot be granted unless the movant demonstrates: "(1) a substantial likelihood of success on the merits; (2) that irreparable injury will be suffered if the relief is not granted; (3) that the threatened injury outweighs the harm the relief would inflict on the non-movant; and (4) that entry of the relief would serve the public interest." *Schiavo ex rel. Schindler v. Schiavo*, 403 F.3d 1223, 1225-26 (11th Cir. 2005).

- a. Success on the merits: the conduct of Obama and the Constitution dictate the outcome. The First Petitioner is a personal victims of Obama having violated his oath to the Constitution of the United States of America and does not even have certainty as to her last name as a direct result of Obama's human and women's rights abuses through the deliberate conduct of Smith on May 24, 2012, conduct Obama was fully aware of and did not stop when he had a legal duty to have done so. If the Constitution, Article 14, Section 3 is applied in respect of what the Petitioners have suffered, it will be clear that as President in respect of them Obama deliberately violated his oath to the Constitution of the United States of America and there will be success on the merits to determine candidate Obama is ineligible.
- b. Irreparable injury will be suffered by the people if the Obama violated the Constitution of the United States of America and is not who he said who he is, ie, a person who lacks integrity and should not be trusted with the soul of the country. This court has a duty to "we the people" to give exact details of Obama whether he is natural born and eligible in terms of the Constitution of the United States of America to be a president, or not. The Constitution of the United States is founded on inalienable individual rights: If Obama was not natural born and therefore Constitutionally ineligible and knows that, Obama abused deliberately the trust of "we the people" and their inalienable right of justice and full transparency, and his conduct is not fitting of a president of the United States, but is most of all against the Constitution itself. If someone, Obama, is illegal and not a natural born citizen, and blatantly abused his oath as Obama has done has by the first hand knowledge of the Petitioners who are victims of his abuse, proceeds, the harm can be tremendous all over the world, not only in the United States of America and far beyond the victim Petitioners who are deliberately stripped of their individual rights and the First Petitioner also of her women's rights by the Obama regime.
- c. If Obama is eligible and natural born, but did not keep his oath to the Constitution of the United States whilst in office, perhaps because he is indeed deliberately having a separate agenda not in line with the Constitution, for instance to be a Saul Alinsky determined "rebel" with the intent to overthrow the Constitution of the United States from within, which conduct brought to the attention of the court indicates may be the case, then the Constitution of the United States is in jeopardy and anyone who swore an oath to protect it from foreign and domestic enemies, as the justices of this court has done, must by fully examining the circumstance and applying the Constitution do so. That would mean this court must declare the matter complex and a team of unbiased experts must immediately take Obama's utterances, actions and decisions and compare them against the CONSTITUTION of the United States of America to determine if he violated the Constitutional oath which will render him as CANDIDATE ineligible. The court is reminded it is not asked to take over the impeachment process of congress, but it is asked to implement Article 14 section 3 of the Constitution and because Obama, by his own choice, in conduct and word, veered so widely and so often from the Constitution of the United States of America, that it is necessary for this court to do this exercise and report to "we the people" honesty and truthfully, if the **candidate**, Obama, violated Article 14, Section 3, whilst in office. Obama the candidate, can if he is found ineligible because he violated his oath to the Constitution of the United States of America, go to congress and a two thirds majority can still allow him to proceed, despite his breaking his oath to the Constitution of the United States of America.
- d. Relief shall serve the public interest: the President of the United States must be of the highest integrity and beyond reproach: if he is not safe with holding the principles of the Constitution of the United States, he is not safe with holding the codes to the nuclear arsenal either.
Further affiant sayeth not

110. The Petitioners repeat the contents of paragraphs 1 to 109 above and asks this court for an orders in terms of the Motion to which this affidavit is attached, namely to :

- Declare and Interdict: In terms of Amendment 14, section 3 of the Constitution of the United States of America, (No person shall be a Senator or Representative in Congress, or elector of President and Vice-President, or hold any office, civil or military, under the United States, or under any State, who, having previously taken an oath, as a member of Congress, or as an officer of the United States, or as a member of any State legislature, or as an executive or judicial officer of any State, to support the Constitution of the United States, shall have engaged in insurrection or rebellion against the same, or given aid or comfort to the enemies thereof. But Congress may by a vote of two-thirds of each House, remove such disability), the candidate Obama for violating his oath to the Constitution of the United States of America in respect of the Petitioners (Article II, Sec. 3, is to "take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed.") is ineligible as candidate in any future election, and interdict the Electors of this State from voting for or having on the ballot to vote for Barak, Hussein, Obama at the 2012 Presidential or any other election, and/or;
- Declare (in need the court having used its subpoenaing powers to obtain certainty as to the factual situation) and if necessary interdict: In terms of the Constitution of the United States of America Obama is/is not (delete whichever is appropriate) a natural born citizen of the United States of America and is/is not (delete whichever is appropriate) eligible to be a candidate for president in terms of being natural born, and if not interdict the Electors of the State from voting for or having on the ballot to vote for Barak Hussein Obama at the 2912 Presidential or any other election, and/or;
- Declare (in need after having declared the matter complex and appointing an unbiased team of experts to assist in making the determination) and in need interdict: In terms of his conduct whilst President, whether such Presidency was legal or not, that the candidate Obama violated his oath to the Constitution of the United States of America and in terms of Amendment 14, section 3, rendered himself ineligible as candidate in any future election, interdict the Electors of the State from voting for or having on the ballot to vote for Barak Hussein Obama at the 2912 Presidential or any other election, and/or and or;
- Order federal criminal and other offences, including fundamental rights violations protected by the Supremacy Clause of the United States of America and a conspiracy and a constitutional crime to have violated in breach of 18USC241 and other Constitutional provisions (Article II, Sec. 4 states that the President "shall be removed from Office on Impeachment for... Treason, Bribery, or other High Crimes and Misdemeanors."), to be dealt with by the appropriate bodies and the safety of victims ensured and protected, and or;
- Declare the matter complex to investigate allegations made herein and by others such as Rick Santorum, who stated:

Sadly, it seems that President Obama believes that we live in a country where you can change the law simply by giving a speech.

Over the past few weeks, we have seen President Obama's absolute disregard for the Constitution on a variety of issues, from healthcare to immigration to marriage.

The role of President, by design, is quite limited. You actually do need Congress to change laws, at least according to the Constitution.

This past Friday, the President gutted the landmark welfare reform law that I coauthored in 1996. He instructed Health and Human Services (HHS) to remove the work requirement for welfare recipients.

This legislation had been passed by the House and Senate and signed by a President, which is the requirement to change laws, yet he changed this major piece of legislation and ignored the intent of Congress all by simply giving a speech.

Here are some additional abuses by President Obama:


- Earlier this year, he made three recess appointments to the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) when the Senate was still in session.
- He had his Justice Department file a lawsuit against the state of Arizona for enforcing immigration laws. Arizona was just enforcing the laws that Obama refused to enforce.
- By giving a speech, he announced that he would now follow the DREAM Act, a law Congress has not passed. He instructed his Department of Homeland Security to no longer deport young illegal immigrants who meet certain criteria he set.
- He instructed his Justice Department to stop enforcing DOMA, the Defense of Marriage Act, a law duly passed by Congress, simply because he did not like the law.
- He instructed HHS Secretary Kathleen Sebelius to grant waivers, and establish new budgets and guidelines for implementing Obamacare, without any Congressional oversight.
- He had his Department of Interior illegally place a moratorium on offshore drilling. This was illegal because a federal judge in Louisiana held them in contempt of court for "dismissive conduct" for doing that earlier.
- His Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has implemented one job-killing policy after another, without Congressional approval.

- Declare the matter urgent;
- Appoint counsel to assist the Petitioners to protected their fundamental rights which have been violated over a prolonged period of time, despite the Supremacy Clause having been invoked which demand urgent relief to victims under such circumstances;
- Further and or alternative relief.



Sworn to and subscribed to before me this 18 day of September 2012.

19



JENNIFER F. ROMANO
Notary Public, State of Florida
My Comm. Expires Aug. 8, 2015
No. EE 102325

ADDITIONAL MANNERS IN WHICH OBAMA VIOLATED THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

“ Launching an illegal war in Libya. Article I, Section 8 gives Congress the power to declare war. Under the congressionally enacted War Powers Act, Mr. Obama had 60 days to get congressional approval after U.S. bombs started dropping in Tripoli, but he didn't bother.

Appointing agency “czars” without Senate approval. Article II, Section 2, gives the president the power to appoint ambassadors, judges and top agency officials, but only with the “advice and consent of the Senate.” Mr. Obama has appointed, without Senate approval, more than two dozen czars in federal agencies.

Making illegal recess appointments. Article II, Section 2 allows the president to “fill up all Vacancies that may happen during the Recess of the Senate.” While the Senate was in session, Mr. Obama made recess appointments of Richard Cordray to head the new Consumer Financial Protection Bureau and three members of the National Labor Relations Board.

During policy debates in 2009, the White House denied that the Affordable Care Act's individual mandate was a “tax.”

Refusing to enforce laws that he doesn't like. Article II, Section 3 states that the president “shall take care that the Laws be faithfully executed.” Mr. Obama directed Attorney General Eric H. Holder Jr. to ignore the Defense of Marriage Act and even work against it in the federal courts. Mr. Holder also suspended newly enacted photo ID voter laws in Texas and South Carolina.

Stonewalling on Fast and Furious. The Justice Department's Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives “walked” more than 2,000 firearms to drug gangs across the border to Mexico. U.S. Border Patrol Agent Brian Terry was killed, along with at least 100 Mexicans. The administration has shown contempt for Congress, and Mr. Holder denied knowing about the debacle despite evidence indicating otherwise. This is not “faithfully” executing the law or defending America's sovereign borders.

Allowing the FCC to grab the Internet. The Telecommunications Act gives the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) authority over wire and broadcasting, but not broadband. Congress and a federal appeals court rejected the FCC's claims of authority, yet the FCC released “net neutrality” rules in December 2010. This violates the First Amendment's protection of free speech. The FCC has no more authority over the Internet than it does over the musings of Vice President Joseph R. Biden

Read more: KNIGHT: Trashing the Constitution - Washington Times <http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2012/sep/14/trashing-the-constitution/#ixzz26wn75ZEI>
Follow us: @washtimes on Twitter