

**GARLAND COUNTY DISTRICT/
CIRCUIT COURTS**

Claimant
STATE OF ARKANSAS

Vs.

Defendant
RES: SHERREL JEAN COURVELLE

)
) PETITION FOR A WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS
) MOTION TO VACATE/ DISMISS ALL CHARGES
) MOTION TO DISCHARGE FOR FALSE
) IMPRISONMENT
) CLAIM ATTACHMENT #1 COURT OF RECORD
) CLAIM ATTACHMENT #2 GENERAL VERDICT
) AND FINAL JUDGMENT
) CLAIM ATTACHMENT #3 LIBRARY OF
) CONGRESS EXPLANATION AND EXHIBITS
)

)

) Case Numbers:
) HTC-18-5727
) 26CR-19-84
) HTC-21-523
) 26CR-21-123
) HTS-21-3296
) 26CR-21-531
) HTS-21-1411
) HTS-23-4237
) HTC-23-3289
) 26CR-23-712
)

)

**Arkansas State Court-
Common Law**

Claimant
**Sherrel-Jean: House of Courvelle,
a woman,**

Vs.

Accused
**Joe Graham
Meredith Switzer
Danny Thraikill
Darryl Mahoney
Kara Ann Petro
Michelle Coe Lawrence**

)

) **Case Number: Ar-026-2023-001**
)
) **TRESPASS**
) **TRESPASS ON THE CASE**
) **MALFEASANCE/DERELICTION OF DUTY**
) **THEFT AND UNLAWFUL CONVERSION**
) **CRIME OF PERSONAGE**
) **TORT OF MALICIOUS PROSECUTION**
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)

WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS
MOTION TO VACATE
WRIT OF PROHIBITION
MOTION TO CORRECT JUDGEMENT
TO THE SUPREME COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

I, Sherrel Jean Courvelle, the living woman am being unlawfully imprisoned by the GARLAND COUNTY DISTRICT / CIRCUIT COURT in Arkansas and am being held as cargo. My Constitutional guarantees have been violated. I have been

Impersonated, Misaddressed, Misrepresented, stripped of my property and my liberty by inland pirates, who have kidnapped me are holding me hostage and are trafficking me for profit, which violates the 3 Federal Constitutions of the United

States of America, the Arkansas Constitution of 1836, the Declaration of Independence, the Northwest Ordinance, the Bill of Rights and President Donald Trump's Executive Order #13848. It is the wish of the people at large, domiciled

on Arkansas, as Arkansans to have all charges against Sherrel Jean Courvelle dismissed or vacated. It is the people; the Arkansans wish that Sherrel be immediately released from captivity and be completely restored and made whole.

It is also the people, the Arkansans wish that the General Verdict and Final Judgment that was declared by the competent Lawful Tribunal of the Arkansas State Court be remanded down to the INFERIOR COURTS for enforcement.

Sherrel Jean Courvelle

Sherrel-Jean: House of Courvelle©

\\Prisoner Number #39455

Birth Date 06/19/1968

GARLAND COUNTY DETENTION CENTER

3564 Albert Pike Road

Hot Springs, Arkansas 71913

Kimberly Baker

Kimberly Baker
Counsel at Law

The Arkansas State Court- Common Law

P.O. Box 179

Jessieville, Arkansas [71949]

arjuralassembly@gmail.com

WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

The writ of Habeas Corpus is issued to inquire into the grounds upon which any person is restrained of his liberty; upon which any person is restrained of his liberty; and when it is found that the restraint is illegal, to deliver him from that restraint. A person imprisoned or restrained in his liberty, within the State, for any cause, or upon any pretense, is entitled, ... to a writ of Habeas Corpus, as prescribed in this article, for the purpose of inquiring into the cause of the imprisonment or restraint, and, in a case prescribed by law, of delivering him there from... The right to relief from unlawful imprisonment by Habeas Corpus is not the creation of the statute but exists by common law... The writ of Habeas Corpus is a writ demandable as of right, on a proper foundation being made out of proof.

A prisoner may be brought up on this writ to determine that the judgment imposed on prisoner was in violation of the United States Constitution.

A prisoner may also be brought up on this writ to determine that the committing court was without jurisdiction to impose any judgments or arrests and that committing court is subject to collateral attack.

It will be proven that Sherrel Jean Courvelle the living woman is innocent and is being trafficked into a foreign jurisdiction that uses a foreign law, and these foreign courts do not have jurisdiction over Sherrel Jean Courvelle, the living woman, who is owed the Constitutional guarantees of the Common Law. These officials and courts are acting in color of law and acting in excess of their jurisdiction and all of their actions are not just voidable but void.

Commencement

I, Sherrel Jean Courvelle©, the living woman, an American State National, one of the people standing on the Land and Soil Jurisdiction, domiciled on Arkansas. I am NOT a resident. I am Not an infant descendent. I am NOT a CORPORATION, I am NOT a British Territorial Citizen, I am NOT a Municipal Citizen of the United States. I am NOT operating in Interstate Commerce. I AM NOT part of these CORPORATIONS. I DO NOT have a CONTRCT with these CORPORATIONS obligating me to their SEA /MARITIME Jurisdiction. As one of the

people of Arkansas I am OWED the Common Law, The Law of the Land and all the guarantees in all 3 Federal Constitutions and the Arkansas Constitution of 1836. If you have a British Territorial Citizen in your possession, I DEMAND you produce that Individual NOW! If you have a Municipal Citizen in your possession, I DEMAND you produce that individual NOW! It is time you produced the body! Produce your citizens! I DEMAND you bring them front and center proving their existence and their correct citizenship.

It is time you Produce the Injured Party. There can be NO CRIME without an injured party. The STATE OF ARKANSAS CANNOT be an injured party because "STATE OF ARKANSAS" is a CORPORATION with a Dunn and Bradstreet number, a FICTICIOUS ENTITY, not a living soul that can be injured or not a living soul that can own property. It is also not a lawful government since it is a CORPORATION. I DEMAND you Produce the Injured Party NOW! Who have I, Sherrel Jean Courvelle©, the living woman, harmed? Who have I injured? Whose property have I stolen or damaged? I DEMAND you produce those living individuals NOW!

I refuse to continue to be misaddressed and misrepresented by these Officials acting in color of law any longer.

Through deceit and fraud upon the court, I have been misaddressed, impersonated, and trafficked into a foreign jurisdiction. I have also been falsely arrested multiple times. These foreign courts, and foreign officials have taken a specific action against me known as a Bill of Attainder. They have applied it against me, the living woman, and they are using that to impound me as cargo on a foreign vessel. I DEMAND THE RELEASE OF THE CARGO NOW!

The GARLAND COUNTY DISTRICT / CIRCUIT COURTS and their officials, the SUPREME COURT OF ARKANSAS and their officials have misaddressed me as a CORPORATE FICTION, a CORPORATION. Their Plaintiff is SHERREL JEAN COURVELLE, a fictitious dead entity created in my name without my knowledge or consent when I was a baby, through fraud. This fictitious entity is actually a trust set up in my name and I have the sole survivorship interest in that British Territorial Estate Trust.

Those Courts and their Officials refused to do their lawful duty and have refused to act with due diligence concerning me, one of the people of Arkansas, who is OWED the constitutional guarantees set forth in all 3 Federal Constitutions, the Declaration of Independence, as well as the Arkansas Constitution of 1836, I have presented them with a NOTICE OF LIABILITY, holding them liable for violating my Constitutional Guarantees and for my false imprisonment.

VENUE

All events described herein and all matters relating thereto occurred on unincorporated land on the county named or known as Garland in the State of the Union named or known as Arkansas State, and therefore all actions herein shall proceed, by necessity, according to the course of the common law in a court of record in said county. Since this occurred on the Land and Soil then this is a Land Jurisdiction issue and requires Common Law. See THE LAW OF THE SUIT, section: THE COURT, and THE RULES OF THIS COURT ARE AS FOLLOWS, which are included by reference as if fully stated herein.

JURISDICTION

The Arkansas State Court- Common Law has subject matter and in person am jurisdiction as a court of record and holds Superior Concurrent General Jurisdiction and is the proper venue and the only lawful court to deal with Land title and living people. This is the Land Jurisdiction court. The Law of the Land Jurisdiction is the Common Law. The Jurisdiction of this court is invoked upon the common law.

CASE HISTORY

This Timeline and Exhibits is taken from the Court of Record filed with the Arkansas State Court. A full copy of that document is filed as CLAIM ATTACHMENT 1- COURT OF RECORD. To see the full case with Exhibits go to thearkansasassembly.net website and Click on Arkansas State Courts Common Law.

On January 5, 2018, OCTOBER REIGNS EQUINE RESCUE (herein after "RESCUE") opened for business. Ronnie Courvelle and Donald Snider and Amanda Garibay were the owners of the business. They came to Sherrel Jean Courvelle, Claimant (hereinafter "Claimant") to lease

pastureland to board the rescue horses on. A lease Agreement between Claimant and Ronnie Courvelle (Owner of RESCUE) was signed on January 1, 2018, leasing said pastureland for boarding horses (Exhibit G pgs. 29-37) (PACKET 1) The RESCUE elected a Board of Directors on February 2018. By August 2018, RESCUE had 4 horses that were boarded on Claimants property at 249 Nathan Terrace, Jessieville, Arkansas. Claimant at that time had 4 personal horses and 3 personal donkeys that were family living at 249 Nathan Terrace Jessieville, Arkansas.

On August 10, 2018, Claimant was on her way to work at the Arlington Hotel, as manager of the Salon, when Claimant received a phone call from Andre Burns from HOT SPRINGS ANIMAL CONTROL (hereinafter named "ANIMAL CONTROL") demanding that Claimant immediately go home to meet him. Claimant explained that she could not turn around because she had to be at work to open the Salon and there was no one else to open the Salon so she would have to meet him later. He demanded again that if she was not at 249 Nathan Terrace by the time he arrived, then he would come straight to the Arlington Hotel and arrest Claimant there. Claimant went to work and checked in and told them she had to leave immediately. Claimant went to meet Andre Burns at her house. Ronnie Courvelle was on the property from the RESCUE. Andre Burns walked up and gives Claimant a prewritten Citation for 9 counts of Cruelty to Animals (Exhibit I (p 38) PACKET 1). Claimant read the ticket and questioned him, "Why are you writing me a ticket when there is nothing wrong with my personal horses?" Then Claimant explained that the RESCUE had just picked up 3 starved horses from north Arkansas on July 24, 2018, and they haven't even been on the property for 3 weeks and there was no way a horse can put on weight in 3 weeks; it would cause them to colic and die. Claimant tried explaining to him that it takes a year to put healthy weight on a horse without killing them. He commented, "Can't you just give them a handful of feed." Claimant tried showing him the RESCUE'S feed bills but he refused to look at them. Claimant asked, "why are you not writing the RESCUE a ticket?" He said, "because you own the place." He then stated, "We have been getting calls since May about this place." Claimant replied, "It takes you almost 3 months of sitting on your butt to get out and check on an animal. You should have been out here asking, "Hey what's going on? Can we help you guys out? But No! You just write me a ticket." Claimant argued with Andre for hours. Finally, GARLAND

COUNTY SHERIFFS OFFICE (hereinafter "SHERIFF") falsely arrested Claimant taking her to jail the same day around 1:40pm (Exhibit I-2-3, (p 49-50) PACKET 1); (Exhibit 168 (p213-239) PACKET 8).

This was the claimant's **FIRST ARREST** on these charges of animal cruelty. The GARLAND COUNTY DISTRICT COURT case number is **HTC-18-5727** (See **TIMELINE OF EVENTS** for further reference).

Claimants unalienable right for protection of property was violated according to the Arkansas Constitution of 1836 Article II Section 10, "That no free man shall be taken or imprisoned or diseased of his free-hold liberties or privileges, or outlawed or exiled, or in any manner destroyed or deprived of his life liberty or property, but by the judgment of his peers or the law of the land...'

18. After being released, Claimant checked the game cameras and realized HOT SPRINGS POLICE had been showing up and trespassing on Claimant's private property about an hour after Claimant would leave the house each time.

(Exhibit J-1 to J-8 (pgs. 51-58) PACKET 1); (Exhibit 171 (p 310-323) PACKET 8).

19. On August 23rd, 2018, around 10:41 am, ANIMAL CONTROL and a dog veterinarian showed up on Claimants private property to draw blood on one of the horses named Hanna. They possessed no warrant to seize any fluids out of said horse or any paperwork stating their cause for being there (Exhibit L -1, (p 60-61) PACKET 1).

(See also LAW OF THE SUIT, pg. 47-48; 52; 54).

20. On September 6th, 2018, special judge Tapp ordered temporary custody of all horses to be given to the care of Richard Hesse, a racehorse facility owner (Exhibit N, (p 63-64) PACKET 1). The order stated that Claimant had 15 days to file for their return which was September 24th, 2018. The horses were taken on September 7, 2018, by SHERIFF and seized 11 animals: 2 mustangs, 1 burro, 2 donkeys, 5 horses, and 1 colt. The court order stated they could take the horses with no mention of any donkeys. The horses and donkeys were taken to 132 Running Deer Trail, Royal, Arkansas, 25 miles away to Richard Hesse's racehorse facility, a good friend of Sheriff Deputy Hawthorn. (Exhibit O, (p 65-75) PACKET 1); (Exhibit 172 (p 324-343) PACKET 8) (Exhibit - HORSES VIDEO)

21. After horses and unlisted donkeys were seized, Claimant called Bureau of Land

Management (hereinafter called "BLM") and spoke with Scarlett Frost who told them about SHERIFF taking the animals. The director, Scarlett Frost showed up at SHERIFF with a U.S. Marshall the next day on September 8th, 2018, and threatened to arrest the sheriff's deputy for seizing the 2 mustangs and the 1 burro. Claimant was given the two mustangs and 1 Burro back the very next day. This proves that through the BLM, the Federal Government knew Claimant wasn't mistreating her animals, since Scarlet Frost and the U.S. Marshall went to the SHERIFF's who stole Claimants equine and seized 1 Mustang and Two Burros back from him and brought them back to Claimant. The SHERIFF's still had 4 of Claimants personal horses and donkeys in their possession after that. (Exhibit P, (p 80) PACKET 1).

22. On September 10th, 2018, Defendant Meredith Switzer granted the order to seize the horses, but those horses had already been seized before the order was granted. Claimant submitted a petition to the Garland County courthouse BEFORE the September 24th deadline (Exhibit Q, (p 81-82) PACKET 1). A hearing was scheduled but the September 24, 2018 court hearing was canceled and never rescheduled. Defendant Meredith Switzer on September 24th, 2018 cancelled the hearing and the clerk would not reschedule Claimants court case (Exhibit S- T, (p85-87) PACKET 1). Claimants' attorney filed a continuance at court without her knowledge on September 20th, 2018 (Exhibit R, (p 83-84) PACKET 1). Judge Ohm denied the return of Claimants Horses on October 17th, 2018 (Exhibit U, (p88) PACKET 1). The court order stated they could take horses only. Yet they took all the horses and all the donkeys. I lost my job at the Arlington Salon for getting arrested and my job at the Oaklawn racetrack because of the animal cruelty charges.

23. On December 12, 2018, Jack, one of the donkeys, died in the SHERIFF and Richard Hesse's custody. No vet was called. In September, Jack the Donkey was in perfect health (Exhibit O (p 65) PACKET 1).

24. On December 31, 2018, Claimant received a bill from Richard Hesse for the boarding of the horses for a total of \$7,382.00 (Exhibit W (p 90) PACKET 1).

25. On February 2nd, 2019, the INFERIOR COURTS decided to transfer this case (Case number HTC-18-5727 transferred to case number to 26CR-19-84) to circuit court (Exhibit X-1, X-2, pgs. 92-93). The GARLAND COUNTY CIRCUIT COURT opened case 26CR-19-

84 launching felony charges. This case was then unexplainably, and now presently, turned into a felony against Claimant. Now the charges stated, "9 counts of aggravated animal cruelty." Claimant asks, why is Claimant charged with 9 counts when 11 animals were seized, two instantly go AWOL in SHERIFF's care, one dies in SHERIFF's custody, while BLM returns 2 horses and 1 burro to Claimant? How is it that only 5 animals remain in SHERIFF's custody, and I am charged with "9 counts of aggravated cruelty?" Who will be held responsible for Jack's death? The two missing horses lost or died in their care?

26. On February 4th, 2019, judge Hearnberger issued a warrant with a bond amount of \$5000.00 for the arrest of Claimant for the "9 counts of aggravated cruelty"

(Exhibit NN, (p246-249) PACKET 1.

27. On March 4th, 2019, Claimant was falsely imprisoned on a warrant issued and posted a \$5000.00 bond with H&H Bail Bonds. This is the **SECOND ARREST** over the same charges even when said Claimants animals were not even in Claimants possession at the time.

28. On June 16th, 2020, Claimant verbally agreed while in court to relinquish the 4 RESCUE horses to the court. However, Claimant never agreed to relinquish any of her personal animals that belonged to said Claimants children (Exhibit PP, (p258) PACKET 1).

29. On June 21st, 2020, the front page of the newspaper had a huge picture of Claimants children's horses and the donkeys offering them free to a good home (Exhibit QQ (p 259-260) PACKET 1). On June 29th, 2020, an order was issued to take the horses in perpetuity and that Claimant should not "own horses or donkeys for the remaining duration of her life." Neither of these orders were signed by a judge and the Claimant's signature is a forgery; Claimant would never authorize or sign such an order.

(Exhibit RR-SS (p 261-262) PACKET 1).

30. On June 22nd, 2021, Claimant was falsely arrested for the **THIRD TIME** before court trial (Exhibit XX (p273-280) PACKET 1). The Arkansas State Constitution of 1836 states in Article II Section 12, "That no person shall for the same offense be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb."

31. On July 26th, 2021, the defendant Michelle Coe Lawrence, increased the penalty of the charges against Claimant by claiming her as a habitual offender (Exhibit YY (p 281-295)

PACKET 1). Said Defendant has attempted to use charges against Claimant that have been discharged or remanded in the appellate court. It is evident and clear; the officials of the INFERIOR COURTS are maliciously prosecuting Claimant.

(Exhibit ZZ (p 296-311) PACKET 1); (Exhibit AAA (p 224) PACKET 2).

32. On October 29th, 2021, Defendant Michelle Coe Lawrence filed a second amended habitual offender packet to amplify Claimant's punishment further by adding it as a class D felony up to 15 years in prison and/or a fine up to \$10,000.00 or both.

(Exhibit BBB (p 312-327) PACKET 1).

On July 27th, 2023, Claimant filed a motion for recusal for Defendant Kara Ann Petro to recuse herself from this case and put another judge on the bench. Defendant Kara Ann Petro, now judge, worked along with the prosecuting attorney's office prior on this case and as such, necessitated a conflict of interest (Exhibit EEE (p 336-337) PACKET 1). In the end, Kara Ann Petro did not recuse herself from the case.

41. From September 7th, 2018, until all horses were sold, Richard Hesse had been keeping a boarding bill for Claimant to pay. Claimant's bill was \$30,000.00 from Richard Hesse for the boarding of her horses at the racetrack facility.

42. During the month of December 2020, Claimant decided to sell her mobile home to come up with the \$30,000.00 to pay the boarding fee and get the horses back. Claimant listed her mobile home on Facebook marketplace. Claimant showed it to a young girl, Taylor Bellinger, in Jessieville. She said her parents, Eric and Mattie Bellinger, were going to buy her and her children a place. Her mom and stepdad wanted to see it on Christmas morning. They were running late, and the daughter contacted Claimant and asked for Claimant's legal name because her parents were stopping and having a contract typed up. Claimant said OK. They arrived and were supposed to pay half of the sale price as down payment. They brought \$2000.00 Claimant refused the earnest money and told them that another buyer was coming Monday with the full amount in cash. They promised that they would be back that Monday with the full amount and begged me to sell it to them. Claimant took their word that they would be back on Monday. Claimant told them she would have to mail off for the title at the time buyers agreed to wait for the title. (Exhibit WWW (p 40-46) PACKET 2); (Exhibit WWW-8 (p 83) PACKET 2).

43. On December 29th, 2020, Claimant didn't hear from the Bellingers. Taylor, the daughter, told Claimant that her stepfather was working, and he wouldn't be back for a few days). Claimant lost out on the sale of mobile home to another buyer waiting on Eric Bellinger to finally contact her. Claimant had her daughter, Harley, go on Facebook and mark the house as pending. It posted sold until she figured out how to list it as pending. Claimant lost out on \$20,000 waiting on Taylor's stepdad to finally contact Claimant.

(Exhibit WWW-4 (p 71-75); WWW-1-2 (p 40-47) PACKET 2)

44. On January 7th, 2021, Claimant received a voice mail from Eric Bellinger which stated: "Hey Sherrel, it's Rick...just calling to see if you got your title yet on the trailer or not if you do fine let me know I'll bring the rest the money if not let me know when I need to come get my \$2000.00 cash back because it is 14 days now and we do need to buy your place or go find something else so give me a holler back please..."

(Exhibit WWW-2, (p 47) PACKET 2).

45. On January 8th, 2021, the following day, Claimant reimbursed Eric Bellinger's earnest money of \$2000.00 This should have ended and concluded this contract.

(Exhibit WWW-2a (p 159) PACKET 5).

46. After two weeks, Claimant listed the mobile home again and Taylor Bellinger went nuts posting Claimants animal cruelty charges all over Facebook. Claimant contacted the SHERIFF over the harassment and the SHERIFF told Claimant it was a civil matter. On January 20th, 2021, Mattie Bellinger called her friend, JD Crow, that she went to school with that worked at the SHERIFF, and filed a false police report, stating Claimant didn't own the mobile home. Stating that Claimant gave them a false name and that Claimant typed up the contract. Claimant contacted an attorney, and he said it was a civil matter.

(Exhibit WWW-5 (p 76-78) PACKET 2).

47. On January 25th, 2021, CID Det. Andrew Goodman contacted Claimant and wanted Claimant to come to the SHERIFF to give him a statement. Claimant explained she didn't have a vehicle and her aunt was letting her borrow her van. He made an appointment, and Claimants aunt needed her van to haul something. Claimant called and left a voicemail stating that she needed to reschedule. Claimant also emailed him a

statement and included all the text messages from the daughter, Taylor, stating that it is all about who you know in Jessieville and that she heard the police wouldn't even take a harassment report from Claimant regarding Taylor Bellinger slandering Claimant and sending the police to Claimants home to do a welfare check. Claimant included all the messages and her last payment she made on the home along with a copy of where Claimant mailed off for the title It was during covid, and it took nearly 4 months to get the title in the mail. (Exhibit WWW-3 (p 48-70) (p 79-83) PACKET 2).

48. On January 27th, 2021, INFERIOR COURTS posted an affidavit for warrant of arrest for Claimant and filed the court case as GARLAND COUNTY DISTRICT COURT case HTS-21-523. (Exhibit XXX-1 (p 84-94) PACKET 2).
49. On January 29th, 2021, Claimant was **FIRST ARRESTED** by SHERIFF CID Det. Goodman and JD Crow with no warrant signed and was given a choice for my kids to go over to the DRUG HOUSE to wait on adult or police would call DHS- Department of Human Services. (Exhibit YYY 1-2 (p 95-101) PACKET 2).
50. Claimant bonded out for \$2500.00 through H&H Bail Bonds and took evidence to court proving that the \$2000.00 earnest money had been refunded to Eric Bellinger on January 8th, 2018, and they refused to listen to Claimant.
(Exhibit WWW-2a (p 159) PACKET 5), (Exhibit YYY-3 (p 102) PACKET 2).
51. On February 8th, 2021, Defendant Meredith Switzer would not allow Claimant to testify to the misunderstanding and Claimants innocence, Claimant was only allowed to plea (Exhibit ZZZ (p 103-104) PACKET 2).
52. On March 16th, 2021, Defendant Meredith Switzer convened a review hearing and decided to transfer the District Court case number HTC-21-523 to Circuit Court case number 26CR-21-123 determining felony charges on Claimant (Exhibit AAAA (p 105-107) PACKET 2). A pattern is devised with respect to malicious prosecution and excessive bonds and fees with no evidence that Claimant has harmed anyone or stolen or damaged anyone's property. Claimant is the injured party, yet again.
53. The case was filed in Circuit Court as a felony.
54. On January 29th, 2021, Claimant was **FIRST FALSELY ARRESTED** on this charge with case number HTS-21-523.

55. On March 5th, 2021, Claimant was arrested again on the same charge. Same case, **SECOND FALSE ARREST**. Claimant posted bond for \$2500.00. Claimant told attorney that Mattie Bellinger filed a false police report, and attorney told me he could get it dropped easily. Almost 3 years later, among many continuances, Claimant is still fighting the charges (Exhibit KKKK, pgs. 1-5) (Exhibit OOOO 1-3 (p 21-59) PACKET 2). Claimant's constitutional guarantees and unalienable rights are being tread upon; the Arkansas State Constitution of 1836 states:
- “That no free man shall be taken or imprisoned or diseased of his free-hold liberties or privileges, or outlawed or exiled, or in any manner destroyed or deprived of his life liberty or property, but by the judgment of his peers or the law of the land,” section ten. “That no person shall for the same offence be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb,” section twelve (See THE LAW OF THE SUIT, pgs. 52-54).
56. On March 16th, 2021, the notice of hearing and a docket report showing Claimant was forced to plea not guilty even though she is innocent. (Exhibit PPPP (p 60-64) PACKET 2).
57. On July 26th, 2021, Defendant Michelle Coe Lawrence amended Claimants criminal information to elevate felony charges stating that Claimant had four prior felonies on her record. Those felonies listed pertained to the felony charges that were either remanded or expunged (Exhibit RRRR (p 71-73) PACKET 2).
58. On October 29th, 2021, Defendant Michelle Lawrence amended a second Criminal information packet on Claimant. This time, outright stating that Claimant is a habitual offender in order to increase Claimant's sentencing up to 15 years and/or up to a \$10,000.00 fine (Exhibit SSSS, pgs. 74-76). Again, Defendant is trying to utilize or build upon old charges that have been cleared (Exhibit SSSS-1 (p 77-78) PACKET 2).
59. On March 29th, 2022, Defendant Kara Petro handled this case and refused to recuse herself (Exhibit TTTT (p 79) PACKET 2).
62. Claimant Called the DMV in Little Rock about her mobile home title. The representative said they were shorthanded because of COVID and she had to mail my paperwork back to me because I filled out the paperwork with my married name and the title was in my maiden name. I asked her if it would take much longer to get it because I needed to sell

it. She told me no it would not and to let whoever was purchasing it know that the title would be coming in as soon as I corrected my last name back to my maiden name and mailed the paperwork back into her. She would get it back out to me as soon as she was able. Claimant asked attorney about selling it. He told me it belongs to you. You can sell it if you want to. Claimant contacted another potential buyer, Latricia Fitzwater, that wanted to buy the mobile home. She had looked at it in January. She gave Claimant check that her dad wrote, and the check would not clear the bank. I tried contacting her several times and she told Claimant she had horrible reception on her phone. Latricia told Claimant her dad would wire the money to Claimants bank OZK account because he also banked at OZK. Latricia gave Claimant a date and the money still was not in her account. She finally got it in there. She was looking for a mobile home moving company to move it around 100 miles away.

63. On May 18th, 2021, somehow CID Det. GOODMAN made contact with Latricia and convinced her that Claimant didn't own the mobile home and he wanted her to come up and file a report because he said the Claimant had previously scammed someone else and could not get the title. Latricia drove to Hot Springs, and filed the report (Exhibit 4-a (p 5-12; PACKET 4).
64. On May 19th, 2021, Defendant Meredith Switzer issued an arrest warrant for Claimant (Exhibit 5 (p 13) PACKET 4).
65. On June 22nd, 2021, Claimant was falsely arrested for the 5th time. The prosecutor filed to revoke my bond on that day. Claimant arrived at court and the bailiff cuffed her immediately and made her sit over with the inmates for the entire court hearing. Claimants case was called last. Claimant had documented proof on the CID DET. GOODMAN lying and falsifying documents. It was presented in court and the Judge asked what was going on here. Claimants bond was not revoked, and the prosecutor Michelle Lawrence was so angry, she threw Claimants court files on her desk. The CID DET. GOODMAN still filed an affidavit, and Claimant was arrested, again. (Exhibit 6 - a-b (p 14-20) PACKET 4).
66. On June 25th, 2021, Claimant deposited \$8000.00 into Cody Fitzwater's account to reimburse the earnest money for the mobile home (Exhibit 21 (p 163-164) PACKET 4).

67. On July 12th, 2021, Defendant Joe Graham issued a no contact order for Latricia Fitzwater (Exhibit 7 (p 21) PACKET 4).

On August 1, 2023, the Claimant challenged Jurisdiction in both GARLAND COUNTY DISTRICT COURT and GARLAND COUNTY CIRCUIT COURT (hereinafter "INFERIOR COURTS"). Claimant proved on the record of the INFERIOR COURTS to be a living woman, permanently domiciled on Arkansas, one of the People owed all her God-given, natural, unalienable rights and guarantees as a living woman. Claimant demanded to have cases all transferred to the Arkansas State Court - Common Law and a Trial by jury of Claimant's peers be convened. The INFERIOR COURTS did not respond to the challenge of jurisdiction, even after an opportunity to cure with an added 10 (ten) days to respond. The INFERIOR COURTS are in Default in Dishonor and the matter of Jurisdiction was ignored by the INFERIOR COURTS. Every action taken against Claimant since August 1, 2023, has been in excess of their jurisdiction and in excess of their power.

On November 5, 2023, Sherrel Courvelle's case came before the Arkansas State Grand Jury. After hearing the case, the Grand Jury sent a Cease-and-Desist order with indictments against the INFERIOR COURTS Officials to David Clay Fowlkes, the U.S. District Attorney, for implementation. David Clay Fowlkes acted with negligence and in dereliction of his duty to carry out the will of the Arkansas State Grand Jury. The Grand Jury then had said indictments process served to the INFERIOR COURTS. A Notice was also sent to Sarah Sanders, Arkansas Governor; Tim Griffin, Attorney General; David Clay Fowlkes, U.S. District Attorney; and John Dan Kemp, Chief Justice of the Arkansas Supreme Court. The Notices of indictments and Trial by Jury (all above State officials received invitations to attend the trial) were received by all officials except for John Dan Kemp, Chief Justice of the Arkansas Supreme Court which was marked "Return to Sender."

On January 21, 2024, A Common Law Trial by Jury was held, hearing all of Claimants INFERIOR COURT cases.

On January 23rd, 2024, a Writ of Mandamus, Writ of Coram Nobis, and writ of De Amoveus Manus was hand delivered by Arkansas State Justice Will Harrison to the INFERIOR

COURTS. The Circuit Clerk, Kristie Womble-Hughes, assured Will Harrison that the Writs would be hand delivered to Judge Kara Ann Petro. At 12:08 p.m. on January 23rd, 2024, the GARLAND COUNTY DISTRICT COURT Chief Administrator, Chris Burrows, acted in dereliction of his duty, refusing to accept or deliver the Writs to Judge Meredith Switzer or Judge Joe Graham. Chris Burrows even outright refused to place the Writs in the judges' office mailboxes from another SUPERIOR court justice's hands. Chris Burrows is in contempt of court.

On February 22, 2024, the Jury declared their General Verdict and Final Judgment of innocence to Claimant Sherrel Jean Courvelle. Five judges and one prosecuting attorney were found guilty.

On February 29, 2024, Claimants house was raided by a large SWAT team with drawn Assault weapons who unlawfully batter-rammed through Claimant's door and falsely, and unlawfully imprisoned Claimant.

On March 1, 2024, the General Verdict and Final Judgment of the Common Law Jury was recorded on the INFERIOR COURTS docket. When Claimant went before Judge Joe Graham on March 1, 2024, Claimant advised the court she is/was falsely imprisoned and that a Common Law Trial by Jury already decided said cases and that a copy of the General Verdict and Final Judgment was on the court docket. Judge Joe Graham responded that the common law court was bogus and fictitious and that it was not recognized by his court and that said Claimant would be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law in his court even though jurisdiction was never established. Claimant was then sent back to prison and is still unlawfully bound and unfree today. These Officials are falsely imprisoning Claimant at least until July, when they have scheduled a jury trial in the MARITIME/SEA Jurisdiction to have Claimant tried on all these fake charges which have already been tried on in the Arkansas State Court the Superior Court. This is double jeopardy. A crime and a violation of my unalienable rights and Constitutional guarantees.

On March 20, 2024, a case was filed in the SUPREME COURT OF ARKANSAS to release Sherrel Courvelle from Unlawful Imprisonment and a writ of Prohibition to compel the Common Law Jury Verdict down to the INFERIOR COURTS.

On April 14, 2024, the SUPREME COURT OF ARKANSAS denied the writ of Prohibition

and the motion to release from false imprisonment.

On April 30, 2024, A Request for Reconsideration was filed with the SUPREME COURT OF ARKANSAS and then that Request was rejected and mailed to the Arkansas State Court. It was received on the last day of our time to submit paperwork, giving no time to correct or resubmit.

The GARLAND COUNTY DISTRICT/ CIRCUIT COURTS and the SUPREME COURT OF ARKANSAS and all their Officials are guilty of violating Claimants constitutional guarantees, guilty of Personage, Barratry, Inland Piracy, Trafficking. These officials have trafficked me into a foreign jurisdiction with a foreign law and have held me hostage and are trafficking me in the prison system to make money off me as cargo. This violates the 3 Federal Constitutions, the Declaration of Independence, the Northwest Ordinance, the Arkansas Constitution of 1836, The Judiciary Act of 1789, the Saving to Suitors Clause, and President Donald Trump's Executive Order 13848 and these officials should be held accountable for their actions of harm and injury to me the living woman.

7. When any officer of the law or governmental official exceeds his or her jurisdiction decreed by the state and federal constitutions they are stripped of their immunity and are subject to suit for their crimes against the people. (See LAW OF THIS SUIT: section WARRANTS pg.47-48, DUE PROCESS pg.45-46, JURISDICTION pg.41-45, PUBLIC OFFICERS pg.33, SOVEREIGNTY: RIGHTS pg. 5-9).

Within the "Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act of 1976," Pub. L. 94-583, it states that "...Under international law, states are not immune from the jurisdiction of foreign courts insofar as their commercial activities are concerned, and their commercial property may be levied upon for the satisfaction of judgments rendered against them in connection with their commercial activities..."

8. The INFERIOR COURTS are a commercial business with a Dunn and Bradstreet Number of 031870319 and engage in commercial activities and are therefore not immune to suit nor are its officers, regarding said activity.

9. The STATE OF ARKANSAS is a corporate Entity, a fiction of law and cannot be harmed nor damaged. The STATE OF ARKANSAS cannot be an injured party or plaintiff because it is a corporate fiction. The Claimant asks who is the injured party? Who has Claimant

harmed, brought injury to, or stolen from? Corpus Delecti · Claimant is the only injured party in all the above stated cases.

10. For a complete CASE HISTORY read the Claim Attachment 1· Court of Record and Claim Attachment 2 Common Law Jury Final Judgment. Claim Attachment 3 ·Library of Congress Exhibits

GROUNDS FOR RELIEF-

WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

MOTION TO VACATE/ DISMISS MARITIME/ADMIRALTY CASES

GROUNDS FOR RELIEF THIS HAS TO BE STYLED POINT BY POINT

EACH GROUND FOR RELIEF AND EACH VIOLATION OF RIGHT IS MENTIONED AND IS INCLUDED BY SPECIFIC SUPPORTING FACTS AND LEGAL ARGUMENT· IF YOU HAVE CLAIM ATTACHMENTS MENTION AND ATTACH.

Here are a list of reasons why Claimant, Sherrel Jean Courvelle should be released immediately from prison and why all cases in the GARLAND COUNTY DISTRICT /COUNTY COURT should be dismissed and/or vacated and the Correct Common Law Final Judgment from The Arkansas State Court should be compelled to the INFERIOR COURTS.

Here is a list of those Constitutional violations that have brought harm, injury and damage to Claimant and her property;

1. **The Northwest Ordinance 1787, “The ordinance passed by congress 13th July 1787, for the government of the territory of the United States, northwest of the river Ohio is our earliest of our written laws. Possessing the Northwest Territory in absolute sovereignty... it was ordained and declared that the inhabitants of the said territory shall always be entitled to the benefits of the writ of habeas corpus, and of the trial by jury;”... “and of judicial proceedings according to the course of the common law”...and thus the common law became here, as it had become in the earliest colonies, the foundation of our whole system of jurisprudence....” “It is also the law of liberty...” pg. 83, State v. Lafferty, Harrison County, March 1817.**

Even at the earliest part of our forming the Common Law was fully established as the Law of the Land. These INFERIOR FOREIGN COURTS are violating Claimants Constitutional guarantees to have any access to the Common Law, the Law of this great Land.

2. The Constitution of the United States of America Article I Section 9 states *"No Title of Nobility shall be granted by the United States: And no Person holding any Office of Profit or Trust under them, shall, without the Consent of the Congress, accept of any present, Emolument, Office, or Title, of any kind whatever, from any King, Prince, or foreign State.* The B.A.R. British Accredited Registry is an operation that is foreign to America, and foreign to American Law. There are to be No Person holding any office that has a Title of Nobility. The B.A.R. Association is directly controlled by the Crown, and they are the Crowns Foreign Agents. They have no place in our lawful government ·the Republic · and they operate in the SEA/MARITIME/ADIRALTY Jurisdiction. Our Republican form of government operates in Land and Soil Jurisdiction dealing with all matters that come before the Common Law Court which is run by the People of the State and the People of the county. Our Arkansas State Courts and our county courts that operate the Land and Soil Jurisdiction are the Article 3 Courts discussed in the constitution.

3. The Arkansas State Constitution 1836 under heading Militia SEC. 3. *"The Circuit Court shall have original jurisdiction over all criminal cases which shall not be otherwise provided for by law; and exclusive original jurisdiction of all crimes amounting to felony at the common law."*

This Arkansas State Constitution was written before the "Civil War" which was really a mercenary conflict because no proper war was ever declared by Congress and the Southern States had already walked out of Congress without setting a date to reconvene. The carpetbagger judges from the north came into the south after the mercenary conflict and took over the Common Law courts and turned them into British Territorial SEA MARITIME/ ADMIRALTY courts. This is proof right in this section of the Arkansas Constitution that the Circuit Courts operate at Common Law. The COUNTY COURTS

that are in place today across these states of the Union are not the Article 3 Courts guaranteed in the Constitutions. They are frauds, foreign courts, with foreign law.

4. The Constitution of the United States Article IV Section 4 states, "*The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a Republican Form of Government and shall protect each of them against Invasion; and on Application of the Legislature, or of the Executive (when the Legislature cannot be convened) against domestic Violence.*"

The STATE OF ARKANSAS is not a Republican form of Government, but it is a for profit CORPORATION a democracy with foreign courts operating in the ADMIRALTY/ MARITIME/ SEA JURISDICTION which is a foreign law and a limited jurisdiction that can only operate on the inland waterways and has no jurisdiction on the Land and Soil of our Union states. The Constitution says that the United States shall guarantee a Republican form of government in each State. Arkansas has been in reconstruction for the past 10 years. Arkansas has reinstated our General Assembly and has also re-established our Common Law Land Jurisdictions Court. Our courts are open and in session and are perfectly capable and competent to deal with all matters relating to the people of our state and their property.

5. The United States Constitution, Amendment IV- *The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no Warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by Oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.*

****This is an excerpt from the of Arkansas State Court- Common Law, General Verdict and Final Judgment, Case Number Ar-026-2023-001, FACTS AND SPECIFICS: MALICIOUS PROSECUTION, pages 4-5. The full Verdict is attached as Claim Attachment #3**

"15. On August 10, 2018, Andra Burns with HOT SPRINGS ANIMAL CONTROL (hereinafter "ANIMAL CONTROL"), and a deputy from GARLAND COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT (hereinafter SHERIFF), without good cause, upended Claimant's life, by forcefully and falsely carrying her away and imprisoning her for nine Counts of Animal Cruelty. (Exhibit I, p 38, PACKET 1).

16. Evidence shows that Claimant's horses and donkeys were in good health and not malnourished nor unhealthy as the three RESCUE horses that had arrived three weeks prior. (Exhibit O, p 65-74, PACKET 1). (Exhibit 168(p 213- 240) PACKET 8); (VIDEO: HORSES VIDEO PACKET 1)

17. Claimant had a lease agreement with the RESCUE and the RESCUE was responsible for their own horses. Andra Burns and the SHERIFF's deputy, due to and based on, an improper investigation, wrongfully cited and falsely imprisoned Claimant with nine counts of animal cruelty. Claimant owned seven of those animals. The RESCUE owned and were responsible for the other four. The RESCUE owned the only three horses that were malnourished and starved, plus a colt. Claimant cannot be held legally and lawfully responsible for the RESCUE horses.

18. On August 10, 2018, Defendant, Joe Graham, opened case number HTC-18-5727 and Claimant came before Joe Graham after being falsely apprehended.

From August 15, 2018, to September 7, 2018, on 11 different occasions, different Law Enforcement Agencies: ANIMAL CONTROL, SHERIFF, HOT SPRINGS POLICE, trespassed on Claimant's Private Property multiple times without warrants, even snooping around Claimant's property in the middle of the night. During one instance of trespass, a small animal veterinarian came and drew blood from Hannah, one of the RESCUE horses, without warrant or order to seize bodily fluids.

(Exhibit J p 51-58, PACKET 1) (Exhibit L p 60-61, PACKET 1) (Exhibit 171 (p 310-323) PACKET 8)

19. On September 6, 2018, Special Judge Tapp ordered all horses to be seized from 249 Nathan Terrace Jessieville, Arkansas and taken into Richard Hesse's Custody (hereinafter "HORSE JAIL") at 132 Running Deer Trail Royal, Arkansas.

20. The SHERIFF's Deputy Hawthorn seized not only all horses but Claimant's personal donkeys as well on September 7, 2018. The order stated to seize all horses. The SHERIFF unlawfully seized Claimant's four horses and three donkeys even though the donkeys were not listed on the Custody Order.

On September 7, 2018, SHERIFF stole Claimant's horses and donkeys which were in good health, the following exhibits prove that fact with pictures of that day. (Exhibit N, p 63-64, PACKET 1) (Exhibit FFF-1, p 338, PACKET 1). (Exhibit 172 (p 324-343) PACKET 8); (VIDEO: HORSES VIDEO)

21. No clear distinction was determined by Special Judge Tapp on the Temporary Custody Order between the Claimant's personal horses and donkeys owned and the RESCUE horses. Judge Tapp had no good cause, acting in dereliction of duty to unlawfully seize Claimant's personally owned horses and donkeys on said custody order. Because of a wrongful and unlawful written order, began a chain of abuses to Claimant and of theft of Claimant's property. Claimant is, and was, and continues to be, the injured party in this case.

22. Claimant's unalienable, indefeasible, right for protection of property was violated,..."

We are finding that many of these “Officials” do not have Oaths on file. There was no probable cause to search Claimants house and seize Claimants horses based on a hearsay phone call.

6. The Arkansas Constitution Article II Section 9 “*That the people shall be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and possessions, from unreasonable searches and seizures; and that general warrants whereby an officer may be commanded to search suspected places without evidence of the fact committed, or to seize any person or persons not named, whose offenses are not particularly described, and supported by evidence, are dangerous to liberty and shall not be granted,*”

****This is an excerpt from the of Arkansas State Court- Common Law, General Verdict and Final Judgment, Case Number Ar-026-2023-001, FACTS AND SPECIFICS: MALICIOUS PROSECUTION, pg. 5.**

The full Verdict is attached as Claim Attachment #3

“25. Special Judge Tapp failed to realize his error, and on the following day, after Andra Burns and SHERIFF Deputy Hawthorn unlawfully seized Claimant’s horses and donkeys, Scarlett Frost, Director of the Bureau of Land Management, accompanied by a U.S. Marshall, stormed to the HORSE JAIL where Claimant’s animals were being held hostage, and demanded to take custody of Claimant’s federally owned equine. Scarlett Frost threatened to arrest the SHERIFF’s who hindered her from taking custody of the horses. Scarlet Frost exclaimed with the SHERRIFS, “they (Equine) were federal property and could not be seized from the owner (Claimant)”. Scarlett Frost and the U.S. Marshall took custody of, and returned, two mustangs and one Burro to the Claimant’s possession the same day. The action from BLM director Scarlett Frost and the U.S. Marshall is valid proof Claimant was not mistreating her animals and is a victim of theft of property. **(Exhibit P (p 80) Exhibit M, (p 243) PACKET 1).** 26. The order issued by Special Judge Tapp states that Claimant shall have 15 days to Petition for return of horses and a hearing be held on September 24, 2018, to resolve the issue. The hearing was moved to October 17th, 2018, by Judge Ohm. He denied the petition from Claimant to return animals. **(Exhibit N (p 63-64) PACKET 1); (Exhibit T and U, p 87-88, PACKET 1).**”

These Constitutional guarantees were trampled on by these Officials. There was no evidence of any crime being committed by the Claimant. Based on the Common Law – the Law of the Land- a horse cannot be taken without the consent of the owner.

Claimant never consented for any of these foreign officials to take her horses and donkeys.

7. Magna Carta 1215 – *(30) No Sheriff, Royal Official or other person shall take horses or carts for transport from any free man, without his consent.*

8. The United States Constitution, Amendment V *No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a Grand Jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the Militia, when in actual service in time of War or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offence to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.*

****This is an excerpt from the of Arkansas State Court- Common Law, General Verdict and Final Judgment, Case Number Ar-026-2023-001, FACTS AND SPECIFICS: MALICIOUS PROSECUTION, pages**

5. The full Verdict is attached as Claim Attachment #3

“27. On December 12, 2018, Claimant’s personal Donkey, Jack, died while in the SHERIFF and HORSE JAIL’s care, no vet was called, no one held responsible. **(Exhibit W (p 90) Exhibit M (p 243) PACKET 1).**

28. On January 2nd, 2019, with Judge Graham presiding, the entry on the docket declares “state anticipates filing as felonies in Circuit.” Thus, beginning a trail of malicious prosecution against Claimant who was unlawfully imprisoned and wrongfully charged, and along with her animals wrongfully seized. **(Exhibit I (p 39-49) PACKET 1)**

29. Defendant, Michelle Lawrence and Judge Hearnberger took further malicious actions against Claimant by forging Claimant’s signature on an agreement to relinquish ownership of horses and a forged document stating Claimant would never own Horses or Donkeys again for life. **(Exhibit RR & SS (p 261-262) PACKET 1).**

30. On February 1, 2019, Defendant, Michelle Lawrence acted with malicious prosecution when she filed fictitious Felony Class D charges against Claimant enhancing judgment to 6 years in prison and \$10,000 in fines per count. Nine counts computes to 54 years in prison and/or up to \$90,000.00 in fines. **(Exhibit MM (p 237-244) PACKET 1).**

31. On February 1, 2019, Judge Hearnberger issued a warrant for Claimants arrest over the same occurrence Claimant was wrongfully imprisoned for, initially. SHERIFF’s forcibly carried Claimant

away again and imprisoned her for the **second time** over the same occurrence. Claimant bonded out of jail for \$5,000.00. (Exhibit NN (p 246-252) PACKET 1). “

Claimants’ constitutional guarantees were violated by these officials because they are trying Claimant for capital crimes with over 200 years in prison sentences and Claimant has never been given an indictment or presentment by a Grand Jury.

Claimant has been put in jeopardy of life and limb 3 times in one case and twice in the other two Criminal Cases.

These officials are still violating these Constitutional Guarantees by falsely imprisoning Claimant in order to try Claimant a second time on all these charges when the Final Judgment has been given by a competent Lawful Tribunal according to the Common Law. Claimant has not been given Due Process of Law, but instead was railroaded and trafficked into this foreign British Territorial MARITIME jurisdiction.

On August 1, 2023, Claimant challenged jurisdiction and proved that the Land Jurisdiction Common Law court was the correct jurisdiction for these cases, but the officials were derelict in their duties and chose not to respond or answer those challenges brought forward by Claimant – they are continuing to act in excess of their jurisdiction and all of their action are void.

9. The Arkansas Constitution 1836 Article II Section Fourteen- *“That no man shall be put to answer any criminal charge but by presentment, indictment or impeachment,”*

In Article two Section fourteen Claimants unalienable rights and Constitutional guarantees were violated by the STATE OF ARKANSAS and its OFFICIALS multiple times. Anyone with any elementary knowledge of law understands that a presentment or indictment CAN ONLY come from a Grand Jury. I have NEVER been given a presentment or indictment from a Grand Jury for any criminal charges and therefore should NOT be put to answer any of these false criminal charges drummed up by STATE OF STATE OFFICIALS operating in color of law and in foreign jurisdictions.

Claimants cases were brought before the Arkansas State Grand Jury on November 5, 2023 and said Grand Jury did not give indictments for Claimant but instead gave

indictments to the Judges and Prosecuting Attorney who are harming and stealing Claimants property.

The Garland County Officials continued to stomp on Claimant Constitutional guarantees because they took criminal action against her without obtaining an indictment from a Grand Jury. These court officials worked with the police and with others to file false police reports and making false arrests for theft of property with no evidence of theft. All of the criminal charges Claimant has against her total up to more than 200 years in prison but never once has there been an indictment by a grand jury. These officials just made up charges and inflated them to suit their planned destruction of Claimant.

10. The Arkansas Constitution 1836 Article II Section Twelve -“*That no person shall for the same offence be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb.*”

Article II section Twelve says that no person shall for the same offence be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb. Claimants’ unalienable rights are being violated by the STATE OF ARKANSAS and its OFFICIALS. On February 22, 2024, the verdict from the Common Law trial by jury was rendered and on February 29, 2024, Claimants home was raided by over 30 STATE OF ARKANSAS OFFICIALS, and she was kidnapped and falsely arrested on charges that have already been rendered by a trial by jury of her peers at the Common Law. Claimant has been falsely arrested and is still presently falsely imprisoned. The GARLAND COUNTY COURT OFFICIALS are violating Claimants unalienable rights by falsely arresting her and attempting to hold a jury trial in a foreign jurisdiction where they have no jurisdiction over the Claimant. They are attempting to put Claimant on trial for the same offence Claimant was just tried for, which is double jeopardy.

The Claimant, Sherrel Jean Courvelle, was arrested twice on each of her false charges and required to pay more bail on the same charges. This is another violation of Claimants constitutional guarantees where these officials are operating by color of law and are harming and injuring Claimant.

11. The United States Constitution, Amendment VI *-In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the Assistance of Counsel for his defence.*

Claimant has been denied the Constitutional guarantee to a speedy public trial. It has been 6 years and Claimant never got a speedy trial to get her horses back. Claimant has also been denied the Constitutional guarantee of having the assistance of counsel. These foreign officials continue to try and force their foreign agents (BAR ATTORNEYS) onto the Claimant. BAR ATTORNEYS ARE FOREIGN AGENTS and even now Claimant is in prison and Claimant has a Counsel at Law, Kimberly Baker, and the Detention Center and all the other officials refuse to recognize her as Counsel and will not allow Claimants Counsel access to Claimant in prison.

12. The United States Constitution, Amendment VII *In Suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed twenty dollars, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved, and no fact tried by a jury, shall be otherwise re-examined in any Court of the United States, then according to the rules of the common law."*

Claimant is owed the right to a Common Law court for any suit over the amount of twenty dollars and that a Trial by Jury Verdict cannot be re-examined. The INFERIOR COURTS are violating Claimants rights and guarantees to the Common Law courts and breaking the law by not adhering to the General Verdict and Final Judgment of the competent lawful Tribunal.

13. The Arkansas Constitution Article II Section Six *"That the right of trial by jury shall remain inviolate."*

****This is an excerpt from the of Arkansas State Court- Common Law, General Verdict and Final Judgment, Case Number Ar-026-2023-001, FACTS AND SPECIFICS: MALICIOUS PROSECUTION, pg. 6. The full Verdict is attached as Claim Attachment #3**

“37. On August 1, 2023, Claimant Challenged jurisdiction, invoked Ex-Parte Milligan, and demanded a Common Law Trial by Jury. Defendants refused to respond to multiple notices and are in Default in Dishonor and have tacitly agreed that all of Claimant’s Challenges are true and correct.

(Exhibit 107-d (p 34-40) PACKET 5); (Exhibit 108 (p 88-127) PACKET 4); (Exhibit 109 (p 1-6) PACKET 8)”

Article II section six of Claimants unalienable rights have been violated multiple times. This clearly states that Claimant, Sherrel Jean Courvelle, has the right to a trial by jury. It is crystal clear that a trial by jury is a jury under the Common Law, Land and Soil Jurisdiction courts!!! The MARITIME/ ADMIRALTY Courts have jury trials and can ONLY deal with Commerce or CORPORATIONS. The STATE OF ARKANSAS and its OFFICIALS have violated Claimants constitutional guarantees by refusing her access to the Common Law trial by jury court. And even after, Claimant exercised her right to a trial by jury Common Law court, that verdict has been unlawfully rejected by the INFERIOR MARITIME/SEA courts and then unlawfully rejected by the SUPREME MARITIME/SEA court in Arkansas. These actions by these OFFICIALS are a direct violation of Claimants unalienable and inalienable rights and Constitutional guarantees. This Constitutional Guarantee was violated and is still being violated. Claimant has a right to the Common Law Trial by Jury. Claimant exercised that right and has a General Verdict and Final Judgment of INNOCENT, yet these criminals are holding her hostage in prison for profit, trafficking her for profit.

14. The United States Constitution, Amendment VIII - *Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted.*

****This is an excerpt from the of Arkansas State Court- Common Law, General Verdict and Final Judgment, Case Number Ar-026-2023-001, FACTS AND SPECIFICS: MALICIOUS PROSECUTION, pg. 6 The full Verdict is attached as Claim Attachment #3**

“33. On February 4, 2019, Defendant, Michelle Lawrence and Judge Hearnberger continued their malicious prosecution against Claimant by unexplainably transforming Case number HTC-

18-5727 to case number **26CR-19-84** to circuit court. The GARLAND COUNTY CIRCUIT COURT opened case **26CR-19-84** instigating felony charges against Claimant. This case was then without evidence turned into a felony charge against Claimant. Now adding to the charges of “nine counts of **aggravated** animal cruelty” with no evidence. The judgment on this charge is 15 years in prison and a \$10,000 fine per count. With nine counts, that becomes 135 years in prison and up to a \$90,000 fine. **(Exhibit X-1-2 (p 92-93) (p 346-258) PACKET 1).**

34. On July 26, 2021, Defendant, Michelle Lawrence amended Claimant’s charges again to Habitual Offender with no evidence, to elevate felony Class D charges, stating Claimant had prior felonies. Claimant had those charges overturned or amended in the appellate court. Claimant had other charges in Texas Dismissed for Cause. **(Exhibit YY (p 281-295) PACKET 1); (Exhibit ZZ (p 296-311) PACKET 1); (Exhibit AAA (p 224) PACKET 2)**

35. On October 29, 2021, Defendant, Michelle Lawrence amended the Claimant’s charges again with no evidence to keep increasing the false charges. **(Exhibit BBB (p 312-327) PACKET 1).** These actions by the Defendants and their agents are unlawful from the beginning. The malicious prosecution initiated and that continued to mount in these cases, is unprecedented. Claimant who was innocent from the beginning and has had her unalienable rights trampled by Defendants and their agents is now facing 135 years in prison and/or \$90,000 in fines in these two cases. Claimant was forcibly carried away and imprisoned, kidnapped repeatedly over the same false charges. Charges were inflated to felony charges for no good cause. Then enhanced again by adding Habitual Offender to the Charges, without good cause. This shows a patten of repeated malicious prosecution from Defendants and their agents conspiring against Claimant who was innocent ab initio (from the beginning).”

Claimants’ Constitutional guarantees have been trampled on with excessive bail and even having to pay even more bail fines over the same offenses. Claimant has been the victim of cruel and unusual punishment by being subjected to false police reports, false arrests, false imprisonment, inflated charges, as is now falsely imprisoned in order for these foreign agents to railroad Claimant through a foreign court in a foreign jurisdiction to commit double jeopardy against Claimant. This is Human trafficking.

15. The Arkansas Constitution Article II Section Seventeen *“That excessive bail shall in no case be required nor excessive fines imposed.”*

In Article II section seventeen Claimants unalienable rights and constitutional guarantees were violated by the STATE OF ARKANSAS and its OFFICIALS. Claimant

has had excessive fines and excessive bail, and even though Claimant is on bail, the kangaroo courts are keeping her in prison even though she is on bond, and it has not been revoked. Claimant was forced to pay bail in all these charges twice for each charge. That is excessive. Claimants bond was never revoked yet Claimant is sitting in prison unable to get out. Claimant has had excessive fines and bonds. Another clear violation of Claimants Constitutional guarantees.

16. The Arkansas Constitution of 1836 Article II Section One- *"That all free men when they form a social compact are equal and have certain inherent and indefeasible rights amongst which are those of enjoying and defending life and liberty; of acquiring possessing and protecting property and reputation and of pursuing their own happiness."*

These rights are given to the people by the Creator and cannot be taken from the people, they cannot be given away. The STATE OF ARKANSAS and their OFFICERS have violated these rights stated in Article II section one. It has been proven that these Officials acting in color of law and in excess of their jurisdiction and have stolen Claimants property instead of protecting her property, they have trampled on, and ruined Claimants reputation and have hindered her from pursuing happiness because they have preyed upon her life, liberty, and property for the past 6 years.

17. The Arkansas Constitution of 1836 Article II Section Two." -*"That all power is inherent in the people; and all free governments are founded on their authority and instituted for their peace, safety, and happiness. For the advancement of these ends, they have at all times an unqualified right to alter, reform or abolish their government in such manner as they may think proper*

Article II section two makes it clear that ALL POWER remains with the people. The government is founded on the people's authority and the only reason the government is instituted is for the people's peace, safety, and happiness. If that government is not maintaining peace for the people, or if that government is not protecting the people or not protecting their property, not keeping the people safe, and if that government is

usurping the happiness of the people by acting tyrannically then the people have every right to alter, reform or abolish that government as they think proper.

The British Territorial Government operating under the 1789 Constitution of the United States of America, Incorporated, and the Municipal Government operating under the 1790 Constitution of the United States, Incorporated have both violated Claimants unalienable right to have peace, safety, and happiness.

****This is an excerpt from the of Arkansas State Court- Common Law, General Verdict and Final Judgment, Case Number Ar-026-2023-001, STATE ACCOUNTABILITY, pg. 18 The full Verdict is attached as Claim Attachment #3**

"150. Whenever there is a Malicious Prosecution charge the State is held accountable. We, the jury, hold the STATE OF ARKANSAS INCORPORATED accountable as follows:

151. The STATE OF ARKANSAS INCORPORATED is required to establish an individual or a team who is responsible for working with The Arkansas Assembly and the Arkansas State Court-Common Law operating on the Land and Soil Jurisdiction. The Arkansas Assembly Team will be Will Harrison, Kimberly Baker, David Williams, Keely Treadway, and Lori Maldonado.

This individual or team established by the STATE OF ARKANSAS INCORPORATED will work with The Arkansas Assembly Team to plan, execute, and map continued progress of education to all the STATE OF STATE OFFICIALS, LAW ENFORCEMENT, ATTORNEY's, JUDGES etc.

152. The education must consist of Common Law, Federal and State Constitutions, Declaration of Independence; The difference between U.S. Citizens and State Citizens, Political Status and jurisdictions. Everyone must be educated about different jurisdictions and which courts apply to those jurisdictions.

153. All Law Enforcement must be educated and trained on the THICK RED LINE Program. They must know that it is not required to have a Driver's License, Registration, Insurance to travel on the roads for an American State Citizen or American State Nationals. American State Nationals and American State Citizens are owed all the guarantees of the Constitutions and are not residents of the CORPORATE STATE but are permanent inhabitants domiciled on the land and soil jurisdiction of the organic union Arkansas state as living men and women.

154. Enforce Marbury vs. Madison "You cannot take a liberty and turn it into a License" the acknowledgement of Declaration of Jurisprudence and Provenance (independent, peaceful, non-combatant civilians as stated in Declaration of Jurisdiction and Provenance)

155. The SOIA request system in Arkansas must allow transparency and information to be gathered by American State Nationals and American State Citizens as well as U.S Citizens. We must not be denied access to these requests."

18. The Arkansas Constitution 1836 Article II Section Ten *"That no free man shall be taken or imprisoned or diseased of his free-hold liberties or privileges, or outlawed or*

exiled, or in any manner destroyed or deprived of his life liberty or property, but by the judgment of his peers or the law of the land,”

Article two Section ten of the Arkansas Constitution clearly states that Claimant cannot be taken or imprisoned, or deprived of her life, liberty, or property EXCEPT by the judgment of her peers or the Law of the Land. There is no confusion here. The STATE OF ARKANSAS and its OFFICIALS are ONLY allowed to take Claimant, and imprison her, or take her property AFTER a judgment has been made by her peers. The peers or peerage can only be made up of the living people - and the Law of the Land IS THE COMMON LAW ONLY! The STATE OF ARKANSAS and their OFFICIALS have repeatedly stolen Claimants property and repeatedly imprisoned her WITHOUT A TRIAL BY JURY VERDICT FROM THE PEERAGE AT THE COMMON LAW!! The Common Law trial by jury is a constitutional guarantee that Claimant is owed, and for this Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, not to enforce the Common Law verdict that you have in your possession is a direct violation of Claimants constitutional guarantees. Claimants' property, horses and donkeys were stolen by the Garland County Sheriff Department, Animal Control, and by the Prosecuting Attorney and the Judges. Claimant was also imprisoned all WITHOUT the judgment of her peers and WITHOUT giving Claimant access to the Common Law which is the Law of the Land.

19. The Arkansas Constitution 1836 Article II section Thirteen -*“That all penalties shall be reasonable and proportional to the nature of the offence.”*

****This is an excerpt from the of Arkansas State Court- Common Law, General Verdict and Final Judgment, Case Number Ar-026-2023-001, FACTS AND SPECIFICS: EXCEEDING JURISDICTION AND TRESPASS, CASE, pg. 12-13 The full Verdict is attached as Claim Attachment #3**

“90. On September 6, 2023, per phone call from Prosecuting Attorney’s office, LAW ENFORCEMENT came out to Claimant’s house to check on animals and according to Joshua Crom, from ANIMAL CONTROL, the animals “didn’t appear to be in distress. ANIMAL CONTROL had no warrant to search Claimant’s private property.

(Exhibit (p 1-2) PACKET 7); (Exhibit 61-a (p 126-135) PACKET 8)

91. On September 23, 2023, at 7:31 pm, SHERIFFs were trespassing on Claimant’s Jessieville Property. Claimant’s property is properly posted, and SHERIFFs were trespassing. SHERIFFs walked all over property and talked to the guys at the DRUG HOUSE.

92. On October 13, 2023, at 7:49 pm, SHERIFFs were out at Claimant's Jessieville Property searching the property. Property is properly posted, and SHERIFFs were trespassing. On October 15th, 2023, in response to a 911 call from DRUG HOUSE, during the 911 call, Aaron from the DRUG HOUSE told the 911 operator that he "was told to call when he sees Sherrel Courvelle...she has felony warrants out of county." This begins SHERIFFs conspiracy with the DRUG HOUSE to go after Claimant's kids. SHERIFF deputy Presley stops to talk to the people at the DRUG HOUSE, and then proceeds to Claimant's House. Deputy Presley threatened to take Claimant's minor children to jail if they did not tell of their mother's whereabouts. Deputy Presley Assaulted Claimant's stepdaughter, Brooke Light, by grabbing hold of her arm. Claimants' grandson, Bently Light, was traumatized, age 6, and has been in and out of hospitals ever since this encounter. Deputy SHERIFFs raided Claimants' home without a proper warrant with weapons drawn. Sheriff Deputy says, "Sheriff's office if you're in here you will be shot, if you don't come out."

(SEE PRESLEY BODY CAM VIDEO)

93. On October 16, 2023, at 6:39 pm SHERIFFs were trespassing on Claimant's Jessieville Property. Claimant's property is properly posted, and SHERIFFs were trespassing.

94. On October 23, 2023, when Brooke Light and Harley Light went to Walmart, Deputy Presley was in her SHERIFF's car and watched Brooke until the girls left Walmart.

95. On November 5, 2023, while Claimant was giving her testimony before the Arkansas State Grand Jury concerning all these cases, Claimant's house in Hot Springs Village was raided by SHERIFF's, HOT SPRINGS VILLAGE POLICE (hereinafter "POLICE"), and other unmarked law enforcement vehicles while three of Claimant's Children and one grandchild were there.

96. On November 6, 2023, SHERIFF's, POLICE, raided Claimant's house in the village two days in a row.

97. On December 6, 2023, MOUNTAIN PINE POLICE pulled Brooke Light over at the Railroad tracks in Mountain Pine saying she was following a white truck too close but there was no white truck. They asked for her information about Sherrel Courvelle and then let her go.

98. On December 7, 2023, POLICE pulled Brooke Light over in the Barcelona Baptist Church parking lot to ask Brooke where Sherrel Courvelle was located.

99. On December 8, 2023, at 9:00 pm, Brooke Light was pulled over by POLICE because the POLICE said Claimant and Brooke looked similar and that Claimant was a fugitive.

100. On December 12, 2023, POLICE were parked at the neighbor's house for hours stalking Claimant's children from next door.

101. On December 15, 2023, at 1:03 pm, POLICE staked out 8 Cevico Lane and watched Claimant's house then trespassed on Claimant's private property without a warrant and blocked the driveway. POLICE asked Brooke if she knew if Sherrel had been there.

102. On December 30, 2023, at 9:02 am an officer from POLICE was staking out Claimant's home in POLICE car #203. Brooke, Claimant's daughter, went outside and took a photo of his vehicle. The POLICE left.

103. On January 1, 2024, at 7:45 pm Brooke Light was pulled over on Barcelona Road and asked if she knew where Sherrel Courvelle was located.

(Exhibit 171-a (p 344-351) PACKET 8); (Exhibit 169 (p 255-265) PACKET 8); (Exhibit 170 (p 266-268) PACKET 8); (Exhibit 188 (p 26-36) PACKET 9).

104. Based on the evidence, Defendants and their agents have by color of law and abuse of power unlawfully detained, stalked, harassed, threatened, assaulted, intimidated, traumatized, Claimant, Claimant's minor children, Claimant's grandson, and Claimant's young adult child. Sheriff Deputy even stated that he would shoot Claimant in front of all the children. This type of aggressive behavior is dangerous to liberty. **(SEE Body Cam video)"**

20. The Arkansas Constitution 1836 Article II Section 24: *“This enumeration of rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people; and to guard against any encroachments on the rights herein retained or any transgression of any of the higher powers herein delegated, we declare. That everything in this article is excepted out of the general powers of the government and shall forever remain inviolate; and that all laws contrary thereto or to the other provisions herein contained, shall be void,”*

I don't know what laws the STATE OF ARKANSAS and its OFFICIALS are using to enforce their powers. Article II section twenty-four states that if these OFFICIALS act and operate laws contrary to the ones previously listed, then those laws are VOID! The STATE OF ARKANSAS and their OFFICIALS are in violation of the Arkansas Constitution of 1836 and in violation of the 1787, the 1789 and 1790 Federal Constitutions and should be prosecuted as criminals. Again, another Constitutional violation against the Claimant. Their color of law court proceedings that are foreign to our American Courts based on this statement declare that their laws that are contrary to the American Common Law is VOID!

****This is an excerpt from the of Arkansas State Court- Common Law, General Verdict and Final Judgment, Case Number Ar-026-2023-001, FACTS AND SPECIFICS: EXCEEDING JURISDICTION AND TRESPASS, CASE. pg. 11-12 The full Verdict is attached as Claim Attachment #3**

“74. On August 1, 2023, Claimant Challenged jurisdiction on all her court cases. Claimant proved she was a woman found to be living, standing on the land and soil jurisdiction, one of the people of Arkansas state. Claimant noticed Defendants on how Ex-Parte Milligan had been invoked in Arkansas and demanded a Common Law Trial by Jury. Defendants were given due process with an added Opportunity to Cure, giving Defendants ten extra days to respond to jurisdictional challenge. Defendants refused to respond to multiple notices and are in Default in Dishonor and have tacitly agreed that all of Claimant's challenges are true and correct (**Exhibit AA-BB (p 96-194) PACKET 1**).

75. “Once jurisdiction is challenged, jurisdiction cannot be ‘assumed’, it must be proven to exist. Defendants must prove they have jurisdiction before they may proceed with their court.”

“However late this objection has been made, or may be made in any cause, in an inferior or appellate court of the United States, it must be considered and decided, before any court can

move one further step in the cause; as any movement is necessarily the exercise of jurisdiction. Jurisdiction is the power to hear and determine the subject matter in controversy between parties to a suit, to adjudicate or exercise any judicial power over them; the question is, whether on the case before a court, their action is judicial or extra-judicial; with or without the authority of law, to render a judgment or decree upon the rights of the litigant parties. If the law confers the power to render a judgment or decree, then the court has jurisdiction; what shall be adjudged or decreed between the parties, and with which is the right of the case, is judicial action, by hearing and determining it." (6 Peters, 709; 4 Russell, 415; 3 Peters, 203-7" Cited by STATE OF RHODE ISLAND v. COM. OF MASSACHUSETTS, 37 U.S. 657, 718 (1838))

76. If the Defendants proceed without proving their jurisdiction to the counterclaiming court, then the proceedings from that point onward are void.

77. "Where a court has jurisdiction, it has a right to decide any question which occurs in the cause, and whether its decision be correct or otherwise, its judgments, until reversed, are regarded as binding in every other court. But if it acts without authority, its judgments and orders are regarded as nullities. They are not voidable, but simply void, and form no bar to a remedy sought in opposition to them, even prior to a reversal. They constitute no justification, and all persons concerned in executing such judgments or sentences are considered in law as trespassers." Elliott v Peirsol, 1 Pet. 328, 340, 26 U.S. 328, 340, 7L.Ed. 164 (1828)

78. Defendants have continued to proceed with aggressive action against Claimant while remaining silent in regards to jurisdiction making them trespassers. From the challenging of jurisdiction from Claimant on August 1, 2023, and every date forward, every action Defendants take against Claimant is in excess of Defendants jurisdiction and each instance is either a trespass or trespass on the case. Below are the actions taken by the INFERIOR COURTS and the Defendants and their agents in excess of their jurisdiction and are either a trespass or trespass on the case.

79. -August 3, 2023 –Defendant, Danny Thrailkill - issues FTA Warrant **HTC-23-3289**, and FTA Warrant **HTC HTS-23-4237**; Bond of one thousand dollars (\$1000).

80. -August 22, 2023, Defendants held a hearing and instead of deciding jurisdiction in writing, they ordered a bench warrant against Claimant.

81. -August 23, 2023, Bond forfeiture hearing held.

82. -August 24, 2023, Hearing held, and FTA warrant issued against Claimant. Order Bond Forfeiture, Bond forfeiture summons.

83. - September 6, 2023 Defendant, Joe Graham issued "FTA warrant on **HTS-23-1411** \$1000c-s"

84. -October 6, 2023, Defendant, Michelle Lawrence files last fake felony case on Claimant-whipped up out of thin air **26CR-23-712**.

85. -November 14, 2023, FTA warrant sent out against Claimant and Bond Forfeiture hearing held and reset for January 16, 2024

86. -November 15, 2023, Bond Forfeiture hearing scheduled

87. -November 16, 2023, Motion to Strike

88. -January 23, 2024, Bond hearing held - Bond not revoked- because Bond company asked court to give Claimant more time. Bond hearing scheduled for April 16, 2024, at 1:30 p.m.

(Exhibit YYYY (p 132-140) PACKET 3); (Exhibit CCCCC (p 179) PACKET 3); (Exhibit KKKKK (p 193) PACKET 3). (Exhibit 56-a (p 19-28) PACKET 5); (Exhibit 62 (p 86) PACKET 5); (Exhibit 92-93 (p 68-69) (p 97-100) PACKET 6)

89. All these actions taken by the INFERIOR COURTS and the Defendants are actions in excess of their jurisdiction and are either a trespass or trespass on the case.”

****This is an excerpt from the of Arkansas State Court- Common Law, General Verdict and Final Judgment, Case Number Ar-026-2023-001, CONSPIRACY, RACKETEERING EVIDENCE. pg. 13-16 The full Verdict is attached as Claim Attachment #3**

“105. The DRUG HOUSE resident, Gale Black, trespassed on Claimant’s property and dumped his horse named Hanna, in Claimant’s pasture. **(Exhibit A-F, (p 2-24) PACKET 1)**

106. On August 10, 2018, ANIMAL CONTROL officer Andra Burns went to Claimant’s Private Property and falsely imprisoned Claimant for nine Counts of animal cruelty. Officer Burns came to Claimant’s property with a pre-written citation based on a complaint. **(Exhibit I (p 38) PACKET 1).**

107. On August 21st, 2018, Sgt. Chris Lackey from HOT SPRINGS POLICE DEPARTMENT and Andra Burns from ANIMAL CONTROL went to 249 Nathan Terrace in reference to a complaint of animal cruelty or abuse.

It is the jury’s belief that the DRUG HOUSE was the source of the original complaint. Based on the multiple reports, there was always ample amount of hay and water for the horses to eat and drink. **(Exhibit I-3, (p 50-58) PACKET 1)**

108. On August 23, 2018, SHERIFF and ANIMAL CONTROL trespassed on Claimant’s property bringing a small animal veterinarian with them. They took a blood sample from only one horse, Hanna, that was dumped off by the resident, Gale Black, from the DRUG HOUSE. **(Exhibit L, (p 60-61) PACKET 1)**

109. On September 6, 2018, Special Judge Tyler Tapp signs a temporary custody order to remove all horses from Claimant’s property. The horses were taken from Claimant, the following day, on September 7, 2018. Three days later, Judge Meredith Switzer granted the temporary custody order of Special Judge Tapp and then amended the order. **(Exhibit K-n, (p 62-64) PACKET 1)**

110. On October 17, 2018, Judge Ohm denies the return of animals. **(Exhibit X, (p 91) PACKET 1)**

111. On December 25, 2020, Claimant signed a contract to sell her mobile home to Eric Bellinger. Eric Bellinger deposited two thousand dollars (\$2,000) with Claimant as earnest money. Claimant had to mail off for the title and it still had not been received two weeks later, on January 7th 2021 when Eric Bellinger left a voicemail message with Claimant.

112. On January 8, 2021, the following day, Claimant reimbursed Eric Bellinger’s earnest money of two thousand dollars (\$2000.00). The said contract was satisfied and settled between both parties. However, twelve days later, on January 20, 2021, Mattie Bellinger filed a false police report against Claimant with JD Crow at the SHERIFF stating that Claimant did not own her home and claimed Claimant stole the two thousand dollars (\$2000.00) earnest money, even though Claimant had settled that contract twelve days earlier. **(Exhibit WWW (p 47) PACKET 2); (Exhibit WWW-2-2a (p 158-159) Packet 5);**

(Exhibit WWW-5 (p 76-83) PACKET 2).

113. Why would Mattie Bellinger lie and file a false report? Is Mattie Bellinger connected to the DRUG HOUSE? Is Mattie Bellinger connected to the SHERIFF Detective JD CROW?

114. Mattie Bellinger is good friends with SHERIFF Detective JD CROW. They have been buddies for years. Mattie files a false police report with JD Crow stating that Claimant was "in court proceedings with the legal property owner for failure to vacate her property and that she had not done so at the time of the report." This is a false statement, and she conveniently files a false report on what the DRUG HOUSE wants Claimant to do which is vacate the property. Detective JD Crow then falsely imprisons Claimant on false charges. **(Exhibit WWW (p 78) PACKET 2);** Taylor Robertson in a text message to Claimant states that JD Crow and Mattie Bellinger are good friends. Taylor even says that Claimant cannot get SHERIFFs to file a complaint on her family, saying they are untouchable. **(Exhibit (p 13-16) PACKET 3).**

115. Mattie Bellinger is also connected to the DRUG HOUSE because her husband caters for their fundraiser fish fry events. Mattie Bellinger trespassed on Claimant's property on October 23, 2021, during a fish fry at the DRUG HOUSE after Mattie Bellinger filed false charges on Claimant. **(Exhibit 181 (p 3-5) PACKET 9).**

116. Claimant enters another Contract to sell her mobile home with Latrica Fitzwater. Detective JD Crow and Detective Goodman find out about the contract and contacts Latrica Fitzwater and talks her into going to the police station to file charges. He told her about Mattie Bellinger's case and then he talked her into filing charges too. Latrica lied stating she had paid sixteen thousand dollars (\$16,000) for the mobile home, but she had only paid eight thousand dollars (\$8,000) down and still owed Claimant eight thousand dollars (\$8,000). Claimant found out what had happened and immediately refunded the eight thousand dollars (\$8,000) earnest money. **(Exhibit 1-4 (p 1-7) PACKET 4)**

How is Latrica Fitzwater connected to DRUG HOUSE?

117. Prosecuting Attorney took these cases and began multiplying charges against Claimant. And the judges would not allow Claimant to show proof that she owned her property and mobile home.

118. Tiffany Attaway is employed by DRUG HOUSE. Claimant's dog was stolen off her property by said woman. Tiffany bragged, using the same story as the horses, "the dog isn't being taken care of." Tiffany boasts that she would not get arrested nor fired from her job for stealing the dog. She was right. She did not get arrested or cited with a ticket after Claimant filed charges against her for theft of property. The police filed the police report but refused to file any charges. **(Exhibit 76 (p 4-6) PACKET 6); (Exhibit 76 (p 7-40) PACKET 8).**

118. On March 2, 2023, Andra Burns from ANIMAL CONTROL wrote nine counts of animal cruelty charges on a prewritten citation based off a complaint. Now for a second time, Andra Burns comes to Claimant with a prewritten citation for four counts of dogs running at large and four no proof of rabies vaccinations. This was all contrived from a phone call from Kahla Lovan, wife of the director of the DRUG HOUSE, as she made a false claim that she was bitten and that she wanted the dog arrested. The story on the bite kept changing and there is no proof of a bite on the paperwork from ANIMAL CONTROL.

(Exhibit 91 (p 241-254), PACKET 8); (Exhibit 55 (p 14-18) PACKET 5).

119. Claimant made many police reports against the DRUG HOUSE for stealing mail, for tying mailbox shut, for trespassing, for loud parties, dogs killing chickens, and intercourse in the woods. The cops never filed charges on anything the Claimant filed reports on. Claimant had to force police to give her a written report. They reluctantly did so. **(Exhibit 79 (p 23-41), PACKET 6); (Exhibit 90 (p 64-66), PACKET 6).**

120. On September 26, 2023, Prosecuting Attorney, Michelle Coe Lawrence, dispatched SHERIFFS to Claimant's house because she was "concerned about the welfare of the animals." Michelle Lawrence called SHERIFFS just after she had left court with Kahla Loven, wife of the director of DRUG HOUSE.

(Exhibit 61-a (p 126-135), PACKET 8) (Exhibit (p 1-2), PACKET 7).

121. Brad Lovan, Director of DRUG HOUSE, said he was told to shoot Claimant's birds by ANIMAL CONTROL. **(Exhibit (p 136) PACKET 8)**

122. On October 15, 2023, Aaron from the DRUG HOUSE calls 911 about Claimant's kids being on their own property. He says that Claimant was home, but she was not at the time. Police come conspire against kids. The body cam video shows that the police are working with the DRUG HOUSE. And for three months the cops harass Claimant's kids **(Exhibit 89 (p 56-63) PACKET 6); See Also BODY CAM VIDEO.**

123. Testimony from Melissa, Claimant's other neighbor on the other side of DRUG HOUSE, stated that the DRUG HOUSE was buying up property and that they (DRUG HOUSE) killed Claimant's birds.

(Exhibits 167 (p 194-199), PACKET 8).

124. Brad Lovan sends revealing text message that says, "It is such a shame that you can't come home because of all your felony warrants...It has taken us years to get rid of you and all of your animals!! You can bi**ch and raise hell all over social media about us!! The bottom line is you are nothing more than white trash with warrants!! My wife took care of something we could not accomplish. She single-handedly got rid of you and all your nuisance animals!! I guess you f**ked around and found out that you have absolutely zero pull with law enforcement here! Stop by and visit the next time you are out of hiding. You don't have to worry about penning up your geese anymore! (Emoji laughing with tears streaming)."

125. Brad Lovan, director of Drug House admits that he has been trying for years to get rid of Claimant from her property and to get rid of her animals. They got rid of the horses, started on the dogs, then killed all the geese, chickens and ducks. Brad even admitted that the law enforcement officers were involved. **(Exhibit 18 (p 1-2) PACKET 9).**

JURY FINAL JUDGMENT

126. It is this Tribunal's recommendation that the Arkansas State Grand Jury investigate these conspiracy and racketeering findings instigated by the DRUG HOUSE against Claimant and the collusion of law enforcement, and all the other people listed in the Conspiracy and Racketeering Evidence section. The Grand Jury can decide if further action needs to be taken with these individuals.

127. We the jury in the Garland County District Court Case Number **HTC-18-5727** find Sherrel Courvelle Innocent of all charges and demand dismissal of all pending charges.

128. We the jury in the Garland County Circuit Court Case Number **26CR-19-84** find Sherrel Courvelle Innocent of all charges and demand dismissal of all pending charges.

129. We the jury in the Garland County District Court Case Number **HTC-21-523** find Sherrel Courvelle Innocent of all charges and demand dismissal of all pending charges.

130. We the jury in the Garland County Circuit Court Case Number **26CR-21-123** find Sherrel Courvelle Innocent of all charges and demand dismissal of all pending charges.

131. We the jury in the Garland County District Court Case Number **HTS-21-3296** find Sherrel Courvelle Innocent of all charges and demand dismissal of all pending charges.

132. We the jury in the Garland County Circuit Court Case Number **26CR-21-531** find Sherrel Courvelle Innocent of all charges and demand dismissal of all pending charges.

133. We the jury in the Garland County District Court Case Number **HTS-21-1411** find Sherrel Courvelle Innocent of all charges and demand dismissal of all pending charges

134. We the jury in the Garland County District Court Case Number **HTS-23-4237** find Sherrel Courvelle Innocent of all charges and demand dismissal of all pending charges

135. We the jury in the Garland County District Court Case Number **HTS-23-3289** find Sherrel Courvelle Innocent of all charges and demand dismissal of all pending charges

136. We the jury in the Garland County Circuit Court Case Number **26CR-23-712** find Sherrel Courvelle Innocent of all charges and demand dismissal of all pending charges”

Declaration of Independence 1776

“We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness. That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to affect their Safety and Happiness. Prudence, indeed, will dictate that Governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes; and accordingly, all experience hath shewn, that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed. But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same Object evinces a design to reduce them under absolute Despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such Government, and to provide new Guards for their future security...”

21. EX-PARTE MILLIGAN, 71 U.S. 2, 1866.

“It has been found to be unconstitutional to try civilians by military tribunals unless there is not a civilian court available. “A citizen not connected with the military service and a resident in a State where the courts are open and in the proper exercise of their jurisdiction cannot, even when the privilege of the writ of habeas corpus is suspended, be tried, convicted, or sentenced otherwise than by the ordinary courts of law.” Ex Parte Milligan (1866)

Military commissions organized during the late civil war, in a State not invaded and not engaged in rebellion, in which the Federal courts were open, and in the proper and unobstructed exercise of their judicial functions, had no jurisdiction to try, convict, or sentence for any criminal offence, a citizen who was neither a resident of a rebellious State nor a prisoner of war, nor a person in the military or naval service, and Congress could not invest them with any such power.

The guaranty of trial by jury contained in the Constitution was intended for a state of war, as well as a state of peace, and is equally binding upon rulers and people at all times and under all circumstances.

The Federal authority having been unopposed in the State of Indiana, and the Federal courts open for the trial of offences and the redress of grievances, the usages of war could not, under the Constitution, afford any sanction for the trial there of a citizen in civil life not connected with the military or naval service, by a military tribunal, for any offence whatever. Cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the militia in time of war or public danger, are excepted from the necessity of presentment or indictment by a grand jury, and the right of trial by jury in such cases is subject to the same exception.

Neither the President nor Congress nor the Judiciary can disturb any one of the safeguards of civil liberty incorporated into the Constitution except so far as the right is given to suspend in certain cases the privilege of the writ of habeas corpus. A citizen not connected with the military service and a resident in a State where the courts are open and in the proper exercise of their jurisdiction cannot, even when the privilege of the writ of habeas corpus is suspended, be tried, convicted, or sentenced otherwise than by the ordinary courts of law. The prayer of the petition was that...the petitioner might be brought before the court and either turned over to the proper civil tribunal to be proceeded with according to the law of the land or discharged from custody altogether.

The court adjourned on the 27th day of January, having, prior thereto, discharged from further service the grand jury, who did not find any bill of indictment or make any presentment against Milligan for any offence whatever, and, in fact, since his imprisonment, no bill of indictment has been found or presentment made against him by any grand jury of the United States. In any legal sense, action, suit, and cause, are convertible terms. Milligan supposed he had a right to test the validity of his trial and sentence, and the proceeding which he set in operation for that purpose was his "cause" or "suit." It was the only one by which he could recover his liberty. He was powerless to do more; he could neither instruct the judges nor control their action, and should not suffer, because, without fault of his, they were unable to render a judgment. But the true meaning to the term "suit" has been given by this court. "If a party is unlawfully imprisoned, the writ of habeas corpus is his appropriate legal remedy. It is his suit in court to recover his liberty."

22. WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS AND WRIT OF PROHIBITION BOTH COVERED AND EX-PARTE MILLIGAN INVOKED

A Writ of Prohibition is used to prevent a lower court from re-litigating issues that have already been decided by a higher court, in this case the Arkansas Court- Common Law. As

stated above, the lawful Tribunal of the Arkansas State Court delivered their General Verdict and Final Judgment on all the cases concerning said Claimant in the INFERIOR COURTS on February 22, 2024. The INFERIOR COURTS unlawfully imprisoned Claimant continuing to act in excess of their jurisdiction. In addition, Judge Joe Graham, Judge Kara Petro, Prosecuting Attorney Michelle Lawrence, Arkansas Attorney General, Tim Griffin, and Arkansas Chief Supreme Court Justice John Dan Kemp have all acted in excess of their power and in excess of their jurisdiction bringing harm, loss, injury, and damage to the Claimant by openly rejecting the Lawful Tribunal competent General Verdict and Final Judgment of the Arkansas State Court-Superior Court. Claimant exhausted every lawful action she had for remedy. Claimant comes now before the United States Justice of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia to Petition for a Writ of Prohibition to be granted since the Claimant has no other adequate means of relief.

The exemplary case of *Ex Parte Milligan*, in which Lambda Milligan had no other remedy but to pursue *“the only remedy which the law afforded him”* (*Ex Parte Milligan*, 71 U.S.113), ended up being the only one by which he could recover his liberty. It was noted in *Ex Parte Milligan* that cause was *“a suit or action in court; any legal process which a party institutes to obtain his demand, or by which he seeks his right, or supposed right”* and *“One of the questions in Weston v. City Council of Charleston, [Footnote 8] was whether a writ of prohibition was a suit, and Chief Justice Marshall says: ‘The term is certainly a comprehensive one, and is understood to apply to any proceeding in a court of justice by which an individual pursues that remedy which the law affords him.’”*

The INFERIOR COURTS refuse to take notice of the General Verdict and Final Judgment in the case of Sherrel Jean Courvelle, continuing Claimant’s false imprisonment. In Mr. Milligan’s case, several of the remedies according to *Ex Parte Milligan* 71 U.S. 110, was *“by writ of error or appeal, if the court renders a final judgment refusing to discharge him; but if he should be so unfortunate as to be placed in the predicament of having the court divided on the question whether he should live or die, he is hopeless, and without remedy.”* The Claimant, Sherrel Jean Courvelle, is *“hopeless, and without remedy”* without the right to be heard by a jury of her peers in a common law court of justice. How is it that the INFERIOR COURTS jurisdiction was challenged and yet never responded to or addressed

in any capacity? Who has jurisdiction? Under the Supreme Law of the Land, under Land and Soil Jurisdiction, that jury was convened, and a verdict was rendered by our Arkansas State Court-Common Law jury on February 22nd, 2024. However, the INFERIOR COURTS have failed to acknowledge that decision as both the GARLAND COUNT DISTRICT and CIRCUIT COURTS were noticed on multiple occasions as to the Superior Court's rendering of a cease-and-desist order initially rendered by a Grand Jury. The INFERIOR COURTS are in contempt of the Grand Jury and in contempt of the Arkansas State Court. Therefore, it is the Claimant's will and the will of the people at large domiciled on Arkansas that the General Verdict of the Arkansas State Court which holds Superior General Concurrent Jurisdiction be compelled onto the INFERIOR COURTS.

In reference to **Ex Parte Milligan** 71 U.S. 3 and 4, "*Military commissions organized during the late civil war, in a State not invaded and not engaged in rebellion, in which the Federal courts were open, and in the proper and unobstructed exercise of their judicial functions, had no jurisdiction to try, convict, or sentence for any criminal offence, a citizen who was neither a resident of a rebellious State nor a prisoner of war, nor a person in the military or naval service. And Congress could not invest them with any such power. The guaranty of trial by jury contained in the Constitution was intended for a state of war, as well as a state of peace, and is equally binding upon rulers and people at all times and under all circumstances. The Federal authority having been unopposed in the State of Indiana, and the Federal courts open for the trial of offences and the redress of grievances, the usages of war could not, under the Constitution, afford any sanction for the trial there of a citizen in civil life not connected with the military or naval service, by a military tribunal, for any offence whatever. Cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the militia in time of war or public danger, are excepted from the necessity of presentment or indictment by a grand jury, and the right of trial by jury in such cases is subject to the same exception. Neither the President nor Congress nor the Judiciary can disturb any one of the safeguards of civil liberty incorporated into the Constitution except so far as the right is given to suspend in certain cases the privilege of the writ of habeas corpus.*

A citizen not connected with the military service and a resident in a State where the courts are open and in the proper exercise of their jurisdiction cannot, even when the privilege of

the writ of habeas corpus is suspended, be tried, convicted, or sentenced otherwise than by the ordinary courts of law. A person who is a resident of a loyal State, where he was arrested, who was never resident in any State engaged in rebellion, nor connected with the military or naval service, cannot be regarded as a prisoner of war. No graver question was ever considered by this court, nor one which more nearly concerns the rights of the whole people, for it is the birthright of every American citizen when charged with crime to be tried and punished according to law. The power of punishment is alone through the means which the laws have provided for that purpose, and, if they are ineffectual, there is an immunity from punishment, no matter how great an offender the individual may be or how much his crimes may have shocked the sense of justice of the country or endangered its safety. By the protection of the law, human rights are secured; withdraw that protection and they are at the mercy of wicked rulers or the clamor of an excited people. If there was law to justify this military trial, it is not our province to interfere; if there was not, it is our duty to declare the nullity of the whole proceedings. The decision of this question does not depend on argument or judicial precedents, numerous and highly illustrative as they are. These precedents inform us of the extent of the struggle to preserve liberty and to relieve those in civil life from military trials. The founders of our government were familiar with the history of that struggle and secured in a written constitution every right which the people had wrested from power during a contest of ages. By that Constitution and the laws authorized by it, this question must be determined. The provisions of that instrument on the administration of criminal justice are too plain and direct to leave room for misconstruction or doubt of their true meaning. Those applicable to this case are found in that clause of the original Constitution which says, "That the trial of all crimes, except in case of impeachment, shall be by jury," and in the fourth, fifth, and sixth articles of the amendments. The fourth proclaims the right to be secure in person and effects against unreasonable search and seizure and directs that a judicial warrant shall not issue "without proof of probable cause supported by oath or affirmation." The fifth declares "that no person shall be held to answer for a capital or otherwise infamous crime unless on presentment by a grand jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the militia, when in actual service in time of war or public danger, nor be

deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law." And the sixth guarantees the right of trial by jury, in such manner and with such regulations that, with upright judges, impartial juries, and an able bar, the innocent will be saved and the guilty punished."

Claimant continues to be charged with criminal charges having never received a presentment or an indictment by a Grand Jury. Claimant is NOT in the Military and MUST be tried according to the Common Law. The President, The Congress, and the Judiciary CANNOT disturb any one of the safeguards of civil liberty incorporated into the Constitution. Claimant is OWED the Common Law and the Common Law Trial by Jury. No military tribunal is allowed, No MARITIME/ADMIRALTY/SEA JURISDICTION tribunal is allowed, Claimant is Owed the Common Law and has exercised that right and the Final Judgment by the Common Law Trial by Jury is FINAL and cannot be re-examined by any court in the United States.

23. The Arkansas State Court – Common Law Establishment

1. The Arkansas Assembly is in session and has accepted the Arkansas State Trust.

Arkansas is a State of the Union and a member of The Federation of States operating as The United States of America, Unincorporated. Our State Courts hold Superior, Concurrent General Jurisdiction and are the superior authorities regarding all American State Citizens and State Citizen assets, just as the District Courts maintain their authority over U.S. Citizens and matters pertaining to them and their assets. After 1860, all land interests entered Territorial Statehood according to the Northwest Ordinance. As of October 1, 2020, all those Territorial States were enrolled officially as States of the Union by those State Assemblies established prior to 1860 entering their unanimous Roll Call Votes upon the Public Record. All 50 states are now indeed actual States of the Union, owning all land within their borders and free of any Territorial custodial interest. (Exhibit 178 (p 383-401) PACKET 8)

2. On August 27, 2023, the Arkansas Assembly conducted a public election, and the Court Officers were elected. The Arkansas State Grand Jury of 26 members were empaneled and a jury pool was established. The Arkansas State Jural Assembly is at capacity and

standing competent to adjudicate the affairs of living men and women on the Land and Soil Jurisdiction, who are known as American State Nationals or American State Citizens. The Arkansas State Court Common Law is standing on the Land Jurisdiction and our county courts are the soil jurisdiction. These are the Superior Court and they are the Article 3 courts mentioned in the 3 Federal Constitutions, operating the supreme Law of the Land, Common Law. Our courts hold Superior Concurrent General Jurisdiction regarding all Americans and American assets, including our land, soil, water, and air resources. The Arkansas State Court invoked the Supreme Court Ruling known as Ex-Parte Milligan. All ARKANSAS STATE OF STATE Officials were noticed along with most all UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, INC. Officials that are courts are open and in session and fully capable and competent to adjudicate all matters that come before our court concerning the living people of Arkansas and their property. (Exhibit 177 (p 372- 382) PACKET 8).

**WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS
MOTION OF DISCHARGE FROM FALSE IMPRISONMENT**

Therefore, it is Sherrel Jean Courvelle, Claimant's, wish and the wish of the people at large domiciled on Arkansas that the General Verdict of the Arkansas State Court which holds Superior General Concurrent jurisdiction be compelled onto the INFERIOR COURTS. It is the Grand Jury and Trial by Jury's wish, as well as the Claimants will, to be discharged immediately and cessation from all false imprisonment and all action by the INFERIOR COURTS stopped.

The Grand Jury, the Trial by Jury, and Claimant request that the United States Justice of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia immediately discharge Claimant from being falsely imprisoned at the GARLAND COUNTY DETENTION CENTER located at 3564 Albert Pike Road in Hot Springs, Arkansas 71913, under SHERREL JEAN COURVELLE Prisoner Number #39455, Birth Date 06/19/1968.

LAWFUL BASIS FOR THE CLAIMS OF HABEAS CORPUS

MOTION TO CORRECT JUDGMENT/ COMPEL THE FINAL JUDGMENT

The Arkansas State Courts hold Superior, Concurrent, General, Jurisdiction, and it is the duty and obligation for ALL FOREIGN COURTS to honor our courts and to honor the 3 Federal Constitutions and the Common Law. The Common Law is the LAW OF THE LAND! The Sea Jurisdiction Courts may not have Common Law, but we do, and Common Law is a Constitutional Guarantee OWED to the people. Obviously, it is time for a more thorough education. Only someone ignorant of the law and the political status of the people would call the people of Arkansas "Sovereign Citizens". A Sovereign Citizen is an oxymoron because you cannot be king and slave at the same time. There is no excuse for these STATE OF STATE officials to be ignorant of the law. Tim Griffin, the Attorney General holds the highest Attorney position in the STATE OF ARKANSAS and Chief Justice John Dan Kemp holds the highest judiciary office in the STATE OF ARKANSAS it is their duty to know the 3 Federal Constitutions and the Arkansas Constitution. They are also responsible for knowing the different jurisdictions of law and their limits.

So how is it possible for Attorneys and judges to say that "the common law does not exist" or "I don't understand what you mean by common law." Or, "We did away with the common law." Or "The common law is just a theory and its frivolous."

How is that even a possibility if you are learned in the law to even entertain these statements? Only someone ignorant of the law would say something so absurd.

1. Quote from James Madison one of the founding fathers, "*We have staked the whole future of American civilization not upon the power of government, far from it. We have staked the future of all our political institutions upon the capacity of mankind for self-government, upon the capacity of each and all of us to govern ourselves, to control ourselves, to sustain ourselves according to the ten commandments of God.*"

"For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of my son after those days says the Lord, I will put my laws into their minds and write them on their hearts I will be to them a God and they will be to me a people." Hebrews 8:10

All laws come from either religion or an ethical system.

This is a very clear statement from a leading founding father of the intent and purpose of the creation of the Declaration of Independence, The Constitutions, the Bill of Rights, and the Articles of Confederation. It explains how and what we as a nation should be living by, but are not living by those standards, customs, or laws. We are living under jurisdiction foreign to them as defined by the Declaration of Independence. A foreign law has been imposed upon us and we ourselves have been impersonated as foreigners.

In 2024, the people are no longer equal under the law, as the ancient caste system has been re-established over the people in America without their knowledge or consent. This is the British-Romano caste system that was set up on our shores without our knowledge or without our permission, since the mercenary conflict labeled as the "Civil War". And it has been imposed upon us illegally, unlawfully, and immorally.

2. **American Admiralty Its Jurisdiction And Its Practice** by Erastus Benedict, published in 1850, states, *"The worst civil code would be one in which would be intended for all nations indiscriminately. The worst Maritime code, one which should be directed by the special interest and particular influence of the custom of only one people. In this case the tribe of Dan. What if that special interest and particular influence was not the custom of only one people, what if it was the custom of only one corporation or of one union?"*

"As I will explain by whom and how the above statement was accomplished and perpetuated on the American people both the worst civil code and the worst Maritime code directed under the influence and custom of only one group of people. Those civil and Maritime codes were foisted upon the people without knowledge or consent. America is clueless as to what has actually taken place in full frontal view completely out of sheer ignorance as stated in the Bible. *"My people are destroyed by lack of knowledge;"* Hosea 4:6. The basis of American Common Law is the ten commandments according to our founding fathers.

Long ago in England while that remote land at large was under the rule of the Anglo-Saxon kings of the earth, small groups of godly men and their families gathered together

within their Shires, later the king's county, to deal with that which they knew is upon the Lord's shoulder, the government. Within the Shires, groups of families called tithings, ten families each, that is. Further united into ten tithings under the Lordship of the Christ, what we know today as the hundred. So, each tithing was ten families, then ten times ten, a hundred. A hundred families were known as a hundred. In this, they were aware of our Father's proverb, "Many wait on the favor of rulers but justice comes to a man from the Lord." Proverbs 29:26. Therefore the members of each hundred took responsibility for the crimes and defaults of each and every one of its members. And were therefore diligent as to who remained within their hundred and who did not belong. With each and every member involved, they formed their own hundred in Shire Courts, chose their own Constable of the hundred and reeve of the Shire, later the King's Constable and Sheriff. All independent of the so-called king's prerogative and they dispensed justice as the word directed." So here you have the earliest fundamental basis of Common law in England, which as you see is community based on family units and a hundred family units would create a hundred. Each hundred would discipline, and care for, and judge each person in the hundred. They had their own courts which were based on what were called the Constable and the Reeve, which was the Shire name for Sheriff. We, you and I, the people at large and also, We the People, meaning the State Citizen, the elected officials, have failed ourselves and our society by allowing our political institutions to be taken over by a parasitic group that has led America away from our system of self-government and our moral code to sustain ourselves according to the ten commandments of God." "They Be Pirates, Matey!" by Graywolf, Published 2021.

3. The book, The American Admiralty Its Jurisdiction and Practice by Erastus C.

Benedict, sub section "The authority on the American Admiralty of the Federal Courts".

Their primary jurisdiction states, "*Most especially is this true in our country, where from the peculiar form of our institutions there are two governments with separate and independent judicial establishments extending over the same territory and the same individuals. That territory acquired from other nations and originally subject to their*

laws. And in Section two, "their agents and instruments have rights, privileges, and liabilities which do not belong to those of the land."

This proves that there are two separate governments and two separate judicial systems here in America. One is Maritime and Admiralty, which is sea jurisdiction – British-Romano law foreign to America. And the other is Land Jurisdiction which based on American Common Law, and the American Common Law is the Law of the Land. This is where our Land and soil Jurisdiction Courts have Superior, Concurrent, General, Jurisdiction.

The Maritime and Admiralty jurisdiction have rights, privileges, and liabilities which do not apply to those of us on the Land jurisdiction.

4. Because of this situation, Benedict goes on to say, *"The statute, meaning the Judiciary Act, was passed to protect the common law jurisdiction in the bodies of the counties that is on the land."* That statement helps establish the small "s" supreme court in article three, section one of the Constitution.

This gives us the key to understanding what that really means and why it's a lowercase "s". They are talking about the union state made up of all the counties. They are not talking about the international State with a capital "S." They are talking about the soil jurisdiction, the national jurisdiction. Whenever you see the lowercase "s" on state or whether it is a lowercase "s" on supreme and/or supreme court, as in Article 3, section one of the Constitution, it refers to the county which lies in the soil jurisdiction and operates at common law. The county soil jurisdiction courts are superior to Courts (Capitol "C") ordained and established by the Congress or by the State meaning the International State of the Land jurisdiction. And they operate within the counties, within the States. This is the bird's eye view of the structure of the government as it relates to the courts.

Where are the Article three courts of section one of the Constitution?

They are superior to the Courts ordained and established by the Congress, and they operate within the counties within the states.

5. This is a protection of the common law jurisdiction in bodies of the counties so that the basic authority and the general jurisdiction of the common law cannot be supplanted by, or replaced by, or overcome by, the foreign Maritime and Admiralty jurisdiction.

The Constitution, Article three section one states, "*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.*"

6. The Constitution, Article three Section two states, "*The judicial power shall extend to all cases in law and equity to all cases of Admiralty and Maritime jurisdiction.*"

Following the maxims of law and tradition "first in time is first in line," which makes law, the common law. The first jurisdiction in Article three section two is the common law superior jurisdiction of those jurisdictions named in the Constitution. Therefore, the jurisdiction of law is to be exercised within the supreme Courts within the counties situated within the Dejure states in union, in the republic. This establishes the courts of common law, the courts of common pleas, then and now, operating within the counties as the supreme Courts in America pursuant to Article three section one.

Where are the Article three Section one Courts? The article three section one courts are our county courts in the union state in the soil jurisdiction. This makes complete sense once you realize that our American system is exactly 180 degrees different than the British Maritime and Admiralty system. And why is that?

Because in our American Common Law system, the power flows from the bottom up and in their British Maritime and Admiralty system the power flows from the top down. So where are the most powerful courts in America?

THE COUNTIES! And why is that? Because the counties control the soil jurisdiction, which is really where the pedal hits the metal. The most powerful common law courts in the county, the courts that are protected under Article three section one are the county courts and if you think of this in the terms of protection, you cannot get any more protected than that, because of the structure of the entire government, which is to

separate the county off in its own little world and to protect it so that the county has the say over what happens and the people have the say over the county.

“Therefore, the jurisdiction of Law is to be exercised within the supreme Courts within the counties situated within these states of the union which establishes the courts of common law and courts of common pleas. However, the courts of common pleas have not honored their duty to operate in law with independent Grand and Petit juries since the beginning of the Civil War and the law of the Land and its practice was attempted to be totally abolished around 1938 and was abolished for the purposes of Federal courts (they openly admitted that they had no common law). This is only partially true because they do have common law in the form of universal common law and there are other forms of common law. Nor is the common law recognized or in use today except for where it pleases the judge or justice.” “They Be Pirates, Matey!” by Graywolf Published 2021.

Basically, what this is saying is the reason we don't have justice is that our courts are not operating. We have not provided ourselves with our own courts. In order to invoke a common law court, you have to have someone go along with the concept and agree to it. We do and have, on an ongoing basis, seen these British BAR Attorney judges who were born in America decide that they are going to operate in common law because if this is such a big deal that if I don't operate at common law the county will be sunk. They have independently as volunteers, operated as common law judges on an ongoing basis here and there throughout history ever since the Civil War. But when they do lose their jobs, they often lose their homes and often suffer greatly for doing it. This is again reprised in the famous case that Sheriff Mack brought to the U.S. Supreme Court (Printz V. USA) where the decision was that the Sheriff had it within his discretion, also the judges have it within their discretion, to choose whether to operate in common law or not. This is something that goes against their careers and goes against their ability to function within that other system, but individual people like Judge Mahoney in the Credit River Decision and others, have done so since the Civil War.

Arkansas has lawfully and successfully set up our State Assembly in 2019. Our Arkansas Assembly began working hard to re-establish and reconstruct our common law

Land Jurisdiction State Courts which went into session on August 27, 2023. We are now working on reconstructing our Article three section one county supreme Courts which are the supreme Courts of the Land. Our Common Law State Courts and common law county courts hold Superior, Concurrent, General, Jurisdiction and are superior to the INFERIOR COURTS of the SEA Jurisdiction which are the British Maritime and Admiralty Courts. (The COUNTY and STATE COURTS operating in BRITISH MARITIME and ADMIRALTY SEA Jurisdiction have NO authority to operate on the Land and soil jurisdiction because they are confined to operating within the inland water ways. Arkansas does not have inland water ways. So, these SEA jurisdiction COURTS have no authority to deal with issues that occur on the land of the state.

7. The law, common law, was also laid out in the ordinance for the territory Northwest of the river Ohio, otherwise known as the Northwest Ordinance, adopted July 13, 1787, referred to as The Northwest Ordinance. As it laid out that the whole of the territory Northwest of the river Ohio was under the common law in perpetuity. The Northwest Ordinance is one of four organic laws that underlie everything. In the last sentence of the fourth paragraph states, *“There shall also be appointed a court to consist of three judges any two of whom to form a court, who shall have a common law jurisdiction. The Law intended by the Constitution is the common law that had come down from our forefathers as it existed and was understood and administered when that instrument was framed and adopted.”* That is a quote from a case called State v. Doherty 60 ME 504 509 (1872).

After the Civil War, from 1865 for two decades afterward, this was a very crucial and common argument about which form of law are we acting under. And this is a clear statement of the intention that the common law would be the Law of the Land and would be the practice of our courts in this country. NOT MARITIME CONTRACT Law, Not ADMIRALTY Law. This establishes that the law of the king, Admiralty, Maritime contracts, and the law of the king, that the king refused to assent to, was the common law in the Land of America.

8. Now this is a reference back to **the Declaration of Independence**, Today, in the year 2024, even though the law is required to be recognized and assented to, the common law, that is; it is not recognized and assented to by current modern day esquire BAR members, controlled Judges, and Attorneys in the courts of America. Still today, in 2024, we are subject to the same foreign jurisdiction alluded to in **paragraph 15 of the unanimous Declaration of Independence**, “...*a jurisdiction foreign to our Constitution and unacknowledged by our laws...*” The English ADMIRALTY/MARITIME laws controlled all the courts in America at the county, state, and federal levels, through the esquire officers, the court of the crown, complained of in the same unanimous Declaration of 1776. So, you see the Brits snuck in the back door and very quietly shuffled things around so that they took control of our courts and our country without firing a shot. That is why all of the COUNTY COURTS and STATE COURTS we have today are operating in a foreign law on our Land and soil. They are operating here illegally, and by color of law. These SEA Jurisdiction Courts have NO jurisdiction over any issue that occurs on the Land and soil. Only the Land and soil Jurisdiction Courts that operate in common law are legitimate and superior.

9. The unanimous Declaration of Independence paragraph 10, “*he has obstructed the administration of justice by refusing his ascent to laws for establishing judiciary powers...*” This is a complaint against the king that was issued in the Declaration of Independence. So, the crown, the king, the queen of England, their courts of Admiralty/Maritime jurisdiction operated and controlled by their Esquire attorneys, expanded and exercised the law of the sea onto the land of England and America. And to quote Thomas Jefferson, “Sent hither swarms of officers” the BAR members. Now you have to understand, that the king opposed the American Common law courts because both common law and American Admiralty Courts had been set up by the American colonists to provide remedy for their disputes that arose either in law or in Admiralty issues without resort to the kings bench, a separate court, a foreign court, and the kings esquires, or the kings Admiralty /Maritime jurisdiction. You see, America has its own Admiralty. America has its our own Maritime. America is not dependent on the British

king. We are not Brits. We are not Tories. We are not British Territorials. We are Americans. Our founders had established courts of American Admiralty/Maritime jurisdiction, which is granted exclusively as a Federal Jurisdiction, as defined by the Judicial Act of 1789, except for states that have navigable waterways, inland to the sea.

What states would have navigable inland waterways?

All the states along the Mississippi River, those states on the Great lakes. It's only the high seas and the navigable inland waterways. The only place the Brits have a trusteeship agreement is on the high seas outside of our continental water and in the navigable inland waterways. So, for example in Alaska, the Yukon River is a navigable inland waterway. The Columbia River is also a navigable inland waterway. Navigable refers to larger ships, commercial ships, and military ships and that waterway must empty into the sea.

For example, on both sides of the Mississippi you have states on each side of the Mississippi, as far north as its navigable to larger ships, then they have an ability to conduct Maritime contracting along the shores of those states. This is a concurrent Maritime jurisdiction owing to the existence of navigable inland waterways.

The states themselves provided in the counties, were established courts of common law jurisdiction, which the Judicial Act of 1789 defined and secured those jurisdictions and restricted the expansion or extension of the Admiralty/Maritime jurisdiction onto the land in the states, as stated in *Martin v. Hunter of the Admiralty/Maritime*, onto the land.

10. "The government then of the United States can claim no powers which are not granted to it by the Constitution and the powers actually granted must be such as are expressly given or given by necessary implication. On the other hand, this instrument, like every other grant, is to have a reasonable construction according to the import of its terms. And where a power is expressly given in general terms, it not to be restrained to particular cases unless that construction grow out of the context expressly or by necessary implication." In other words, "the words are to be taken in their natural and

obvious sense and not in a sense unreasonably restricted or enlarged.” Martin v. Hunter lessee 14 US 1Wheat 304 1860.

This is basically telling you that these powers of the Admiralty in these states that are open to having Concurrent Admiralty and Maritime jurisdiction existing in them. They are to play it straight. They are not to be unduly restrictive of it or unduly enlarging upon it. And it is the enlarging upon it, that has left us in the situation we are in now. They have unreasonably enlarged upon the grant of jurisdiction that was allowed to them. Is it reasonable to think that the Admiralty/Maritime Jurisdiction could then be enlarged by a group of unelected members of committees, of unelected Esquire agents of the crown who advocate and circumvent the established authorities granted within the Constitution and confirmed in the Judicial Act of 1789.

I think it is obvious that they have usurped upon and against all three of the Federal Constitutions.

11. *“Now the judicial power in cases of Admiralty and Maritime jurisdictions ‘has never been supposed to extend to contracts made on land and to be executed on land. But if the power of regulating commerce can be made the foundation of jurisdiction in its Courts and a new and extended Admiralty jurisdiction beyond its heretofore known and admitted limits, may be created on water under that authority. The same reason would justify the same exercise of the power on land.”* This is a decision known as Propeller Genesse Chief et al. v. Fitzhugh et al. 12 how U.S. 443 1851.

The key to this is regulating commerce, because of the interstate commerce clause. This is where the British Admiralty/Maritime courts make all of their money. This is one of the few regulatory powers that the Federal Government was granted. And the regulatory power over interstate commerce applied on land or sea. But what this is also telling you is that as of 1851, it has never been supposed to extend to contracts made on the land and to be executed on land.

So, what we have today is a bunch of courts that assume everything is in Maritime contract whether its executed at land, on the land, or whether it’s meant to be completed

on the land or the sea. The vast majority of cases, everything that we do is on the land. When was the last time that you had a sea going contract with anything?

They have usurped upon the jurisdiction of the Land, and they have created, per their registration processes and other frauds, a legal presumption that you are conducting your interstate business in interstate Maritime commerce; when in fact you are operating under Land Jurisdiction commerce and under Law Merchant.

The above stated decision defines exactly what transpired under the revolutionary and evolutionary law, as judges like to call it, the Admiralty/Maritime law which evolved into exercising its power on the land. At that time in history, from 1776 to 1851, all major cities were built around the deep-water ports of America and the king's Admiralty jurisdiction was being operated beyond its defined boundaries then, and still is today. The issue is that we must call all of you out on this. It is our responsibility to object. As stated in the above Propellor Genesse Chief decision, making the regulation of commerce as a foundation of jurisdiction, would allow the expansion of Admiralty on land and it, Admiralty/Maritime, was being used to oppress the people on the land then, as it is today in 2024 under the commerce of the Constitution.

It is the Interstate Commerce Clause which has allowed the law of the Sea to usurp upon the jurisdiction of the Law of the Land and supplant the Common Law and to deny justice and remedy to Americans. That is one fundamental piece of the Great Fraud we have suffered. The other piece is the registration that subjects us individually to that system. They have usurped their Admiralty/Maritime Courts onto the land in violation of the limitations of the Constitution, but then the second step is registering all of us as their citizens so that they can address us under this foreign law and pretend that when we are engaged in commerce, we are engaging in Maritime or Admiralty commerce even when all of our contracts are on the land and are executed on the land.

We the people at large have been hoodwinked into thinking that the British Admiralty/Maritime courts which have been illegally and unlawfully operating on our land in a foreign jurisdiction, with a foreign law in our states and counties. Arkansas has

properly established our Land Jurisdiction Courts and have Superior, Concurrent, General, Jurisdiction. And it is clear, that Common Law is the Law of this great Land.

12. It is also clear that the GARLAND COUNTY DISTRICT AND CIRCUIT COURTS are simply defunct corporations that are not a government and have no authority over the actual people of this state. These "COURTS" that operate in Admiralty and Maritime are only allowed to operate on the Navigable inland waterways. There are NO navigable inland waterways in the mountains of Garland County or NO inland waterways in Arkansas except for the shores along the Mississippi River. These Admiralty and Maritime courts are ONLY allowed to operate on the shores of the Mississippi river in Arkansas and No where else in this State.

"The extent of the Admiralty jurisdiction ends at the highwater line, high tide at the first bridge inland from the highwater mark of the sea on navigable waterways. From there landward, the common law jurisdiction is to reign supreme."

13. The Authority on American Admiralty which is the book, American Admiralty Its Jurisdiction and Practice by Erastus C. Benedict, published in 1850, volume 1, states in Chapter two, Jurisdiction at section 19, page 12 and 13, *"The constitution of the United States grants to the Federal government, judicial power over all cases of Admiralty and Maritime jurisdiction. This is the whole of the grant of power to that branch of power, and brief and simple as it is on its true construction, depends on the entirety of the whole of American Admiralty jurisdiction."*

The constitution mentioned here is the original constitution for the united States of America of 1787, which then created the Federal Republic which was known as the United States also. It was the Federal Republic, NOT the British Territorial Government, that was granted the entire judicial power over all cases of Admiralty and Maritime Jurisdiction. And that has been missing in action since the 1860's. So, the British Territorial Government has usurped against it and has been running the Admiralty and Maritime Courts based on the idea that the British Monarch is our Trustee on the high seas and Navigable inland waterways, but in fact, there is no

granted power to the British Territorial government to come ashore and mess with us on land. You just read the extent of the jurisdiction regarding the inland waterways which is the high-water mark, the high tide of the first bridge inland from the high-water mark of the sea. From there inland, the common law jurisdiction is to reign supreme.

This is the historical basis that we have for making the claims that we do. It is central to understanding the difference between the British Territorial Government and the American Government that were put into place and the limits set on the British Territorial foreign law of Admiralty/Maritime in our country. There are British Admiralty and Maritime Courts operating in places that are inland and where they have no granted powers, like Arkansas, which is nowhere near the high seas. There is no basis to have these Courts operating in Arkansas. And we, the Arkansas State Courts Land Jurisdiction and our Arkansas county courts soil jurisdiction have Superior, Concurrent, General, Jurisdiction in the common law throughout the entire state of Arkansas.

“This constitutional grant embraces only those few cases in which the English high court of Admiralty was permitted to take cognizance of at the time of the American Revolution. And two, that it embraces all cases that English Admiralty anciently had jurisdiction before the common law courts had by prohibition prevented the exercise of most of its powers. Third, that it embraces only the cases which were within the acknowledged competency of the British colonial courts of vice admiralty, as they existed at the time of the American Revolution. And five, that the words Admiralty and Maritime relate simply to subject matter and were used in that general sense which embraces all those cases relating to ships and shipping that arise under the Municipal Maritime regulations of each nation and those which arise under the general Maritime law. Municipal Maritime regulations of each nation (This talks about Commercial Shipping) and those that arise under the general Maritime law (This talks about Law Merchant). Admiralty Maritime only embraces cases relating to ships and shipping, which includes cargo, which includes salvage operations, which includes prize money at sea, and booty on land.” **They Be Pirates, Matey!** by Graywolf Published 2021

There was a huge scandal called the Bottomry bonds scandal in Britian. Their powers were taken away by the common law courts and limited to only four subjects. As a result of that, there was a giant outcry to clean up the Admiralty court. The Admiralty Court was severely pruned back and an awful lot of work that would have been in Admiralty court originally, got transferred into the Land Jurisdiction Courts, forming this new basis of law that they called Equity law. This all happened in the years before the American Revolution.

14. The American Admiralty Its jurisdiction and Practice by Erastus C. Benedict, of 1850, volume 6, states in chapter two Sources of Jurisdiction, Section 9, Page 12, "*In recent years, the Supreme Court has expounded a broad doctrine of uniformity and harmony in the Maritime Law in accordance with which the common law courts are beginning to consider that they must apply at least some of the characteristic Admiralty doctrines to the decision of such a Maritime causes as come before them under the Saving clause of the Judiciary Act of 1789; The Saving to Suitors Clause. This is telling us that Admiralty Maritime can be heard in the Common Law Courts, which means that the adulteration that took place in Britian was hauled over to America and that Equity law began to be established in America even though there's no provision for it.*"

15. The American Admiralty Its Jurisdiction and Practice by Erastus C. Benedict, of 1850, volume 6, Page 8-33, Subsection 122, Exclusive and Concurrent Jurisdiction. "*The Judiciary Act of 1789 established the United States Courts meaning the Federal Republic Courts and defined their Jurisdiction as a contemporaneous construction and implementation of the constitution (The constitution for the united States of America, 1787, Federal Republic). Cotemporaneous in 1789, when that Judiciary Act hit, they also established the Courts of the United States related to the British Territorial United States. The Judiciary Act of 1789 established the United States Courts and defined their jurisdiction as a contemporaneous construction and implementation of the Constitution, creating the two systems of the Land Jurisdiction and the Admiralty and Maritime. It confirmed the jurisdiction of the Common Law Courts by providing that the United States District Courts shall have Exclusive Original Cognizance of all civil causes of Admiralty and Maritime Jurisdiction saving to suitors in all cases the right of a common law remedy where the common law is competent to give it.*"

So, in 1787 the Federal constitution was written, and everything was laid out and all of the powers were granted and established for the Federal Republic. Two years later, along comes the British Territorial Constitution in 1789. The British Territorial Courts were also set up as coterminous construction and implementation of the Constitution (The Constitution of the United States of America, 1789.). There are two different constitutions, two different Subcontractors. We know for certain from the first foregoing that it was the Federal constitution of 1787 that received the Exclusive jurisdiction. The Federal constitution was granted the powers over Admiralty and Maritime Jurisdiction. The Federal Republic had the entire grant of Admiralty and Maritime Jurisdiction. In 1789, a Concurrent Jurisdiction was established.

In establishing these Concurrent jurisdictions of Admiralty/Maritime and Common Law, they retained the superiority of the Common Law regarding all issues that were not specific to the Admiralty courts. And as stated earlier, there are only four things that the Admiralty courts still had jurisdiction over.

16. The American Admiralty Its jurisdiction and Practice by Erastus C. Benedict, of 1850, volume 6, chapter 4, Page 33, Subsection 20 Concurrent Jurisdiction Under the Constitution states, "The common law courts always have jurisdiction of a cause of action against a ship owner in contract or in tort when he could be reached personally, and money damages only were demanded. That right was not excluded by the Admiralty grant in the Constitution and the Concurrent right also to hear such cases as well as other cases of Admiralty jurisdiction was immediately given to newly constituted Federal Judiciary. The jurisdiction of the Admiralty and of the common law courts is therefore to a certain extent Concurrent."

This is saying that in certain matters we always had a Concurrent Jurisdiction. The common law court does hear cases that are in Admiralty/Maritime. But the common law court does not hear cases that were reserved for Admiralty Maritime in the four subject matters that remained with the Admiralty courts after the Bottomry Bond Scandal.

So how is it possible for Attorneys and judges to say that "the common law does not exist" or "I don't understand what you mean by common law." Or, "We did away with the common law."

Or "The common law is just a theory and its frivolous." How is that a possibility if you are learned in the law?

17. The American Admiralty Its jurisdiction and Practice by Erastus C. Benedict, of 1850, Page, Subsection 28, states, "*The constitutional grants of judicial power, they are not to this or that court of the United States. The constitution does nothing but draw the line between the cases which belong to the United States Government and those which belong to the State Government. The Common Law Courts and the independent grand and petit juries under the Law of the Land are the final buffer between the people at large and the state and federal agents.*"

This is saying it does nothing whatsoever but make a demarcation between what's Federal and what is State. And as we have seen from our prior quote "The constitution of the United States (meaning the Federal Republic, the American Subcontractor) grants judicial power over all cases of Admiralty and Maritime jurisdiction." So, this is where the power lies. That is where the delegation of power was made. What are they talking about when they say common law doesn't exist? Or when they threaten you in contempt of court, when you bring up a constitutional issue? In Federal court or the U.S. District Court? The constitution was a kind of buffer between the feds and the states to protect the people from arbitrary prosecutions in Maritime or Admiralty law by the federals. The United States of America, unincorporated run by the Federation of States is the only American Federal government that is left. It is in operation, as well as all 50 States. We the People, the State Citizens happen to be the delegator of all the delegated powers that the British Territorial government is exercising and including the delegation of powers of the Municipal government.

We the People, are not government agents. We the People are the State Citizens of the State Assembly and in that sense, We are government agents because We are working for the government. But we are all volunteers and are not supported by paid positions. The State Citizens are, We the People who established the constitutions for operation at a federation state level. They are members of the federation states, international jurisdiction because the constitutions are international agreements, so it had to be the international business

committee of the state assemblies that voted in the constitutions. But the American State Nationals are the general public or known as the people at large.

The counties are the soil jurisdiction, and those counties make up the union state which is National jurisdiction. They are called American State Nationals. The general public populate these counties and are known as the people at large.

The State is the Land Jurisdiction and is defined by its borders. The People that make up the State are State Citizens. They volunteer to help the State government without pay. This is the International Jurisdiction and is where our 1787 constitution is derived from.

Part of the protection that was built into our forefather's system they created, gave the judicial powers of the Admiralty and Maritime to the Federal Republic government to protect the Land and soil jurisdiction from the Admiralty and Maritime mischief. This is literally a foreign law that has infested our shores and has moved inland by the Brits; we have been showing you the proof.

18. The American Admiralty Its jurisdiction and Practice by Erastus C. Benedict, of 1850, Volume 6, states in Chapter 4, Exclusive and concurrent jurisdiction, Subsection 23, Pages 38-39, *"The right to proceed in REM is the distinctive remedy of the Admiralty and hence administered exclusively by the United States courts in admiralty. No state can confer jurisdiction upon its courts to proceed in REM. In REM, is an action in admiralty maritime. No state can confer in REM actions to the State Courts but they do. Every bank foreclosure or IRS foreclosure carried out in this country, even in the counties, or in the courts of common pleas, are foreclosures in REM with auxiliary attachment against the RES, EN LEGIS NAME, capital name in all caps, on the instruments. The property deed of trust, the promissory note, and the mortgage agreement are the RES. These are actions against the deed, the note, and the mortgage agreement, actions in REM. In the RES NAME, the EN LEGIS of the man/woman, to hide the real party of interest which is the fund. In our case the International Monetary Fund, an agency of the U.N. CORPORATION and the FEDERAL RESERVE BANK, INC. which is a private corporation posing as if it were part of the federal government."*

In all those cases, it's not a state bank and it's not a state issue; it is an admiralty issue where they have latched upon our assets, put them in a state trust and are using foreign law to administer the state trust.

No state can confer jurisdiction upon its courts to proceed in REM because admiralty and maritime are uniquely federal jurisdictions (that would be the American Republican government).

RES is the actual physical asset; the property at stake. The REM part of it is the title system; the deed, the note, the mortgage agreement. So, they are taking an administrative action which is called in REM action in maritime admiralty against a municipal corporation that is a dummy corporation. The deed, the note, and the mortgage agreement in an action in REM meaning in admiralty maritime. All of this is illegal and in contravention of the constitution and all of this is completely rigged. They have been getting away with all this by claiming that the federal government was absent. Additionally, they claimed that we were in a state of perpetual war. There was no peace process ending the civil war. There was no peace process because the war was never declared properly by the Congress and therefore it was just a mercenary conflict and there was no war.

19. The American Admiralty Its jurisdiction and Practice by Erastus C. Benedict, of 1850, Volume 6, Chapter 4, Exclusive and concurrent jurisdiction, Subsection 23, page 39 states in part, *"The Saving Clause (The Saving to Suitor's clause) of the Judiciary Act and of the Judicial code does not contemplate admiralty remedies in a common law court. Its meaning is that in cases of concurrent jurisdiction in admiralty and at common law, the jurisdiction in the latter is not taken away. The remedy which state courts may administer, though it may be subject to regulation and modification by state statute, must be according to the general course of the common law."*

Section 23 also tells us that the code does not contemplate admiralty remedies in a common law court. In cases of concurrent jurisdiction in admiralty and at common law, the jurisdiction of the common law is not taken away. The saving of a common law remedy which we read in the Saving to Suitors Clause in Section 9 of the Judiciary Act of 1789, known as the Saving to

Suitors in all cases, the right of a common law remedy where the common law is competent to give it, meant that the jurisdiction of the common law courts was not taken away it was a saving for the benefit of both the plaintiff and the defendant and not of the defendant alone. What was saved was the common law remedy not merely a remedy in the common law courts in a proceeding in REM as used in the admiralty courts and it is not such a remedy nor was a statutory proceeding to wind up a corporation. But an action of trespass for damages caused negligence of defendant's servant in cutting loose from the war of burning scowl and allowing it to drift against the plaintiff's vessel and was held within the Saving clause and a bill in equity to foreclose a common law lien upon a raft of lumber for towage services was withheld and upheld, *Waring v Clark*.

These are the original constitutional grants of law as defined in the federal Judicial Act of 1789 and the judicial code of the jurisdiction of law and of admiralty/maritime and they are fixed and inflexible." This is set in cement. We have common law remedy regarding any issue that our common law courts are competent to address which is everything, including maritime and admiralty. Now we may not be competent for Brits, but when we are addressing our own affairs in our own waters, and it's our own people, that's a whole bailiwick in and of itself which belongs to us.

The Saving to Suitors Clause is a right and the way we exercise it is by taking the Maritime/Admiralty court case and bringing it to our Arkansas State Court. We serve notice on the British Territorial Court for removal, which we did. The Arkansas State Court is in session and is competent to adjudicate all matters that come before our court.

That is the education on how the Federal Republic and the Common Law Courts and Admiralty/ Maritime Courts and their limited jurisdiction was set up, how the common law courts are the superior Courts of this great Land, the difference between Land jurisdiction and Sea Jurisdiction, and the fixed limits set on the Admiralty / Maritime jurisdiction. There is no more excuse for ignorance of the law, and your duty to uphold and adhere to the Constitutions. It is also your duty to hold those STATE OF STATE OFFICIALS and COUNTY OFFICIALS accountable for their blatant disregard for the Constitutional guarantees owed to the Claimant and for violating her unalienable rights. Those rights cannot be taken away, and those

OFFICIALS who violate them according to the Arkansas Constitution (1836), are to be held liable.

20. SEC. 26. Of the Arkansas Constitution states, "*The Governor Secretary of State Auditor Treasurer and all the Judges of the Supreme Circuit and inferior Courts of law and equity and the prosecuting Attorneys for the State shall be liable to impeachment for any mal-practice or misdemeanor in office; but judgment in such cases shall not extend further than removal from office and disqualification to hold any office of honor trust or profit under this state. The party impeached whether convicted or acquitted shall nevertheless be liable to be indicted, tried and punished according to law.*"

The General Verdict and Final Judgment from the Arkansas State Court – Common Law trial by jury is in your possession and it is your duty to honor the Constitution and it is your duty to release the Claimant Sherrel Jean Courvelle from this false imprisonment and it is your duty to compel the verdict to the inferior Courts. If you do not, then you are liable for Claimants false imprisonment as well as the others. And the next step will be to take this matter to the Military. You have been properly noticed of liability. You have been educated and have a responsibility to the people on Arkansas and the Constitutions The General Verdict and Final Judgment CANNOT be re-examined by any court of the United States and it MUST be recognized by all the courts in operation.

CONCLUSION

Now to address the fact that many of the STATE OF ARKANSAS Officials are calling the Arkansas State Court a joke; apparently, they have forgotten that our courts hold Superior, Concurrent, General jurisdiction with respect to all matters and subjects that the Common Law is able to act upon, which we have proven above is everything. Please see the Saving to Suitors Clause of the Judiciary Act incumbent upon The Constitution of the United States of America. Because of The STATE OF ARKANSAS Officials dereliction of duty, it was necessary to take this action to the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia for a formal removal and remand to the Arkansas State Court.

It has been shown that the Arkansas State Courts are in Session as provided for under Ex-Parte Milligan and it should be no surprise that a competent lawful tribunal has rendered judgement under Common Law in the case of Sherrel Jean Courvelle, a duly provenanced, declared, recorded, and published member of The Arkansas Assembly.

As you are undoubtedly aware, with or without an Oath, ALL of these STATE OF ARKANSAS Officials are occupying a position of Public Trust in Arkansas, and operating a System of Administrative, Maritime Commerce, and Admiralty Courts at the State level. The Admiralty Courts operate under the State of Arkansas and administer the Estates of deceased British Territorial Seamen; the STATE OF ARKANSAS COURTS address issues arising under Maritime Commerce, while the Administrative Courts have been repeatedly reduced to considering matters of internal corporate administration. Your System does not administer the Common Law Courts in this country, but that in no way changes their authority with respect to the Americans known as Arkansans living within the physical borders of the State.

Upon consideration the Arkansas State Court convened and found a consistent pattern of malicious prosecution, trespass and impersonation, seeking to misrepresent the Claimant, Sherrell Jean Courvelle, who holds the only survivorship interest in the SHERRELL JEAN COURVELLE Estate, and to manipulate court venues so as to secure convictions against a series of Legal Fictions including SHERREL JEAN COURVELLE, while pursuing a course of trespass, illegal confiscation, personage, barratry, and dereliction of Usufructuary duty.

Enclosed is a standard information packet for Justices, Judges, Attorneys, and Counselors at Law regarding the situation in which we find ourselves. All administrators and employees of the FEDERAL MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS and their STATE-OF-STATE FRANCHISES are under strict orders to Cease and Desist all illegal confiscations, all acts of trespass, all claims of damages against Legal PERSONS only presumed to exist, which have been constructed on the basis of unconscionable, non-consensual foreign registrations and probate processes that are unlawful, illegal, and immoral --- and all predicated on Mercenary Conflicts misrepresented as wars.

You will no doubt remember the “Vietnam Conflict”. The American Civil War and all wars since then have been fought as Mercenary Conflicts and are not wars owed any dignification under the Law of War.

The American Public, your Employers, the people that ultimately pay your paycheck, those who you are supposed to be serving in “good faith” have been mischaracterized, misrepresented, and pillaged under the False Pretense that this country is a “battlefield” and that they are Unknown Combatants in this phony “war”.

They have also been impersonated as voluntary shareholders in a perpetually bankrupt MUNICIPAL CORPORATION and imagined to be bankrupt shareholders liable for the debts of the parent company as franchises under MARITIME COMMERCIAL Law.

Enough of this bunko; insomuch as “all crimes are commercial in nature” the State of Arkansas, Inc. and STATE OF ARKANSAS, INC., have both committed crimes of trespass, personage, and barratry, inland Piracy, and Human Trafficking against the Lawful Person and Estate of Sherrell Jean Courvelle and the findings of the Arkansas State Court take precedence and apply; it is up to you to show your leadership and own up to the responsibility of your assumed office and bring these and similar actions to a stop.

It is also your duty as an Officer of the Court to honor your Usufructuary Duty and hold the living American known as Sherrell Jean Courvelle harmless and repair her Good Name and Estate, dissolve any presumed State Trust interest in the Estate in the presence of the living heir, return her property, dismiss and vacate ALL MARITIME/ ADMIRALTY cases, release Sherrel Jean Courvelle from Captivity, remand the General Verdict and Final Judgment to the INFERIOR COURTS for enforcement, and fully inform your Prosecutors to leave her and her property alone. Sherrel Jean Courvelle stands under the Land jurisdiction, not the Sea Jurisdiction, and she is neither your responsibility nor your property to manage.

So long as, Sherrel Jean Courvelle does not voluntarily enter upon a Federal Jurisdiction delegated under one or the other of the operant Constitutions, or otherwise ratified by our States of the Union as a new Amendment, and accepting this delegation being subject to

regulation published in the Congressional Record, Sherrel Jean Courvelle is not subject to any law but God's Law and American Common Law. And you, have cause to know that.

The Arkansas State Court, the Court holding proper jurisdiction over the actual subject matter, the Lawful Person and Heir of the Sherrel Jean Courvelle Estate, has found the State of Arkansas/STATE OF ARKANSAS acting in collusion against the property and person of Sherrel Jean Courvelle, an American who never went to sea and had no cause to do so; an American who is owed every jot of Article IV of both The Constitution of the United States and The Constitution of the United States of America.

What are you going to do about this? Laugh and think that the Courts of the actual and physical State, to whom and to which you owe everything, are powerless?

Let's get this straight – the United States of America, Incorporated, is a Municipal Corporation in the District of Columbia; it operates under The Constitution of the United States of America 1789, which created the British Territorial Federal Subcontractor. All State of State franchise operations such as the State of Arkansas are obligated as franchises to operate under the same constraints with respect to the Americans, they are under contract to serve in good faith.

Similarly, the United States, Incorporated, and any Successors to Contract, operate as a second Municipal entity in the District of Columbia, under The Constitution of the United States, 1790. Its STATE OF STATE franchises, such as the STATE OF ARKANSAS, are also obligated to serve under the constitutional constraints and obligations to serve in good faith.

Securing undisclosed and unconscionable registrations of an American infant and using this as an excuse to evade your responsibilities and obligations to her, as Claimant under these Constitutional Service Contracts is an act of conspiracy against the Constitutions that is punishable by death, not only as treason against Arkansas and its People, but under international law as well.

Allowing, Sherrel Jean Courvelle©, the living woman, to suffer what she have suffered at the hands of her own employees is indeed a crime meriting the most implacable prosecution. Sherrel Jean Courvelle©, the living woman, is by no means naturally subject to any statute,

code, rule, ordinance, or regulation promoted for the instruction of her employees and the Pretense that she is, based on unconscionable and undisclosed contracts, is abhorrent to justice.

As the appropriate Justice, it is up to you to set your employees straight --- from the most Senior Prosecutor to the least clerk in the smallest County Court under your supervision. Do not address, do not trespass upon, and do not harass any Arkansan who has declared their birthright political status; do no damage to their property, do not address any bills of attainder to them, or allege any debts based on the use of Federal Reserve Notes. The Special Admiralty Courts are no longer needed and have no natural jurisdiction related to these people.

If, by chance, such an Arkansan has entered into a simple commercial agreement with a Federal Agency, such as the BLM, do not assume that that agreement is undertaken in the realm of Maritime Commerce; these Americans can undertake commerce on the land and have posted their indemnity bonds with the U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY to do so. Thus, both the appearance and the actions of the Federal and State of State employees engaged in trespassing upon Sherrell Jean Courvelle and her private Estate, were indeed trespasses in the literal and legal sense of the word.

Sherrel Jean Courvelle©, the living woman, did not, it should be noted, transgress against any of you and did not harm any "Federal Property" --- the mustangs and Burro she purchased from BLM (Bureau of Land Management), are in fact part of the property interest she inherited, while all these employees, including the BLM Employees, are merely acting in a presumed custodial capacity with respect to my property.

These and other intolerable Legal Presumptions on the part of our Employees are flagrant personage crimes and are unsupported by the undisclosed and unconscionable "birth registrations" used to justify these actions before the Courts, and in fact represent Fraud upon the Courts.

If I were you, as Justice, I would be outraged by this prosecutorial incompetence and the personage, barratry, inland piracy, and human trafficking that has been employed against Claimant, Sherrel Jean Courvelle© a kindly and simple woman in gross violation of her clearly

stated immunity against Bills of Attainder and the equally clearly stated obligation under Article IV of both active Federal Constitutions to protect her "person" --- not deliberately mischaracterize her and prey upon artificial persons constructed "in her name" by those acting as Public Usufructs --- and then abandoning their post and obligation to hold Sherrel Jean Courvelle, the living woman, harmless and unharmed by their acts.

These usufructuary obligations pertain equally to the Federal parent corporations and the state-of-state franchises and their operations.

It is the first time in a long while that a properly defined peerage has been assembled to create a State Jural Assembly in Arkansas and exercise their State Court with respect to their members and their member's property rights. We the people at large wish to see justice done and a reasonable bar established between the Employers and the Employees. We also wish to see the Employees properly instructed and redirected and advised that they are surrounded by millions of people who are in fact Arkansans, and fully enabled to object to any supposition or improperly obtained registration saying otherwise.

Finally, it is the wish of the Arkansas State Court, the Arkansas State Grand Jury, The Arkansas State Trial by Jury, the wish of the people at large on Arkansas and the wish of Sherrel Jean Courvelle to be released from False imprisonment, to have all charges vacated and or dismissed from the INFERIOR COURTS, and that the Arkansas State Court General Verdict and Final Judgment be compelled to the INFERIOR COURTS and recognized.