Ohio Circuit Court of Record
seated at Chillicothe

Luciana Constantino Claimant,	)	
		Case No. 21-CUY-001
-vs-		
Thomas Desmarteau, Marty Vittardi, John Spellacy, Thomas Conway, Timothy Dobeck, Timothy Gilligan, Thomas Siedlecki, Dean DePiero, [c/o] 5555 Powers Boulevard, Parma, Ohio [44129], and Michael Maloney, [c/o] 23969 Stonehedge Drive, Westlake, Ohio; Respondents	)	JUDGMENT ENTRY

Filed of Record

JAN 21 2022

Ohio Circuit Court of Record

NOW ON this _____ day of January, 2022, this Court, upon being duly convened, having been lawfully formed after having provided all lawful public Notices and now being a Constitutional court of record administering common law, bowing only to the ultimate sovereignty of the Creator, consistently with the 1787 Constitution for the united states of America, the Declaration of Independence, the Northwest Ordinance, and Magna Carta, among other treatises and founding documents, having reviewed Claimant Luciana Constantino's verified Petition, attached Notices, exhibits, proofs of service and affidavits of non-response, FINDS that the Respondents above named in their capacities as living men, not as corporate fictional entities or "persons", were lawfully served with Notices of Liability as to which they are now in default. This Court further FINDS that such Notices contain on their face all relevant terms of a binding self-executing contract and that this Court accepts the parties' authorization to incorporate the terms of said Contract into a Judgment binding said Respondents and Claimant Constantino. We FIND that each Respondent was granted a minimum of fourteen (14) days in which to respond to the first Notice, dated June 1, 2021, as well as additional response times of 5 days each for the second and third Notices, dated June 8, 2021 and June 17, 2021 respectively. This Court caused service of Claimant's Petition, with attachments including Summons and instructions, upon Respondents above named, on or about November 16, 2021. On that date Respondents' apparent agent, one Jennifer Meyer, acknowledged receipt of the Petition, summons and related documents by email. Our clerk provided Meyer with the physical address of this Court as well as its email address. Neither Meyer nor any of said Respondents having submitted or filed with us any responses thereto during the ten (10) additional days we allowed them for response, we hereby grant Judgment to Claimant on her defaulted claims and related Orders as set forth hereinbelow.

We further FIND that at all times relevant to the claims before us, Respondents have each acted as living people and also as agents for the entities known as PARMA POLICE DEPARTMENT, PARMA CITY OF (INC), PARMA MUNICIPAL COURT, and STATE OF OHIO, among possible other affiliated, subsidiary, or parent entities and/or corporations. This Entry also

applies to all other, unnamed agents of said entities to the degree that any such unnamed agents may hereafter purport to commit any further acts harming Claimant of the type for which we impose liability today upon Respondents Desmarteau, Vittardi, Spellacy, Conway, Dobeck, Gilligan, and Siedlecki. We also reserve and retain jurisdiction over this matter for purposes of enforcing this Judgment and updating it in the event Respondents or their fellow agents fail to comply with the terms hereof. Upon a thorough review of the Petition and associated documents, we hereby further FIND by a preponderance of the uncontroverted evidence, as follows:

1 Respondents Desmarteau, Vittardi, Spellacy, Conway, Dobeck, Gilligan, and Siedlecki, by their multiple defaults and by continuing to engage in the offensive acts described in Claimant's Petition and attached Notices herein, have admitted to the truth of all statements of fact and conclusions of law contained therein, and have consented to the Contract created thereby which establishes their liabilities. Each of said Respondents acted in concert with one another and are all agents of the corporation(s) doing business as PARMA MUNICIPAL COURT, PARMA CITY OF (INC), CITY OF PARMA, STATE OF OHIO, and/or of other "governmental" corporations or other bodies which are affiliates, subsidiaries, or parent corporations with regard to Respondents' principal(s) for whom Respondents claim to act.

2 Respondents Desmarteau, Vittardi, Spellacy, Conway, Dobeck, Gilligan, Siedlecki, have consented to be bound by all terms of the Contract created by Claimant's Notices, as the Notices informed them they would be, by their (a) silence and by (b) continued demands for payment accompanied by threats of "arrest" of Claimant Constantino. Her unrebutted affidavit stands as truth, even in Respondents' corporate legal fiction world [UCC Sec. 1-206] as well as in the world of people who live under God. 1 Pet. 1:25; Heb. 6:13-15.

3 Notwithstanding their defaults and contractual duties to Claimant, said Respondents have continued to act in derogation of their admitted lack of authority or subject matter jurisdiction to do so. Their actions have admittedly harmed and continue to harm Claimant. We further FIND that, instead of making any attempt to mitigate that harm, Respondents, in particular Respondent Gilligan, escalated it by continuing his assaultive threats, then directing acts of common law kidnapping, battery and statutory identity theft to be inflicted on Claimant Luciana Constantino Respondent Gilligan, while aided and abetted before and after the fact by Respondents Vittardi, Spellacy, Conway, Dobeck, and Siedlecki and by unnamed other agents of the PARMA and/or STATE OF OHIO corporations, commenced these unlawful actions on June 1, 2021, within moments of Respondent Gilligan's physical receipt of Claimant's June 1, 2021 dated Notice.

4 Respondents Desmarateau, Vittardi, Spellacy, Conway, Dobeck, Gilligan, and Siedlecki and all of those men and women acting in concert with them have at all relevant times admittedly assumed and continue to assume non-existent authority to restrain the freedom of movement and right to travel, of Claimant Luciana Constantino. They have each committed these acts and persist in committing them to this day without even the appearance of authority to do so. Respondents' admissions against interest and their own records confirm this. They have thus trespassed on Claimant's rights as a living woman by ongoing extortionate demands, assaults of all types, most currently in the form of kidnapping threats contained in unverified "warrants", and by batteries, including injury-producing batteries, conversion and by acts constituting identity theft committed during Respondents' *ultra vires* "booking" procedures.

5. Respondents' acts set forth hereinabove are creating private and public nuisances according to definitions contained in Black's Law Dictionary (4th Ed.) since their extortionate acts harm, annoy and physically disturb living people such as Claimant in the peaceful enjoyment of their God-given right to travel the public roadways unimpeded

6. According to online corporate records of PARMA MUNICIPAL COURT bearing identifying number 21 TRD 04900, even while Respondents acquiesced to having no authority to commit any of the acts they were committing against Claimant, they continue to retaliate further, now demanding even larger payments from Claimant and sending out directives to their fellow corporate agents throughout the STATE OF OHIO cabal of corporate governance bodies in the form of so-called arrest "warrants". Unlike arrest warrants that are consistent with the Fourth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, Respondents' "arrest warrants" are supported by no Constitutionally mandated affidavit of probable cause, nor even by any allegation that Claimant had caused injury, harm, or loss to anyone. We FIND any such "arrest warrants" to be void

7. We make no finding at this time as to any participation by Respondents Maloney and DePiero in the crimes, offenses, torts, and other harm admittedly committed by their fellow agents, the other named Respondents. We reserve jurisdiction to make appropriate findings pertaining to Respondents Maloney and DePiero and other agents of the corporations acting as *de facto* branches of "government". Any future findings as to Respondents Maloney, DePiero or as to *de facto* agents yet unnamed will be based on their conduct in regard to assistance in the proper enforcement of these Orders. As Respondents have admitted, Notice to them constitutes Notice to their principals as well as to their agents

8. In assessing the agreed-to compensation set forth by the parties' defaulted Contract, we FIND it reasonable to conclude that Claimant lives in a condition of fear that she will again be kidnapped and battered for which continuing harm she should be compensated as agreed.

9. While the findings this Court makes today are based on a mere preponderance of the evidence, the absence of any dispute about the facts and the crimes that such facts support, leads us to conclude that the interests of justice would best be served by referring the actions of the Respondents in this matter to a common law grand jury for further investigation

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED as follows

1. All proceedings bearing PARMA MUNICIPAL COURT identifying number 21 TRD 04900 or P2103697 are hereby declared to be utterly null, of no effect, and void *ab initio*.

2. All Respondents are hereby ENJOINED from directly or indirectly engaging in further communications, publications, or other acts threatening the use of violence to demand payment or serve "warrants" under the auspices of corporate item number 21 TRD 04900. All agents of PARMA MUNICIPAL COURT and of associated entities are hereby PROHIBITED from any contact with Claimant Luciana Constantino or committing any act interfering in any way with her rights to freely travel

3. Judgment is hereby GRANTED to Claimant Luciana Constantino and against Respondents Desmarteau, Vittardi, Spellacy, Conway, Dobeck, Gilligan, Siedlecki, jointly and severally, in

the agreed-to sums of $19,000.00 (Nineteen Thousand Dollars), representing $500 00 (Five Hundred Dollars) per day, from April 23, 2021 until June 1, 2021, and the additional sum of $5,000 (Five Thousand Dollars) per day from June 1, 2021 until the file-stamped date of this Judgment Entry. Per the parties' agreement, said sums are due and owing by each said Respondent, jointly and severally, upon the file-stamped date of this Judgment of liability. This Judgment is based on the definition of a dollar as a measure of weight according to the Coinage Act of 1792 and 1900, which defines a dollar as being 24 8 grains of gold, or 371 25 grains of silver. The use of debt-based currency to discharge this liability will not be acceptable.

4 Respondent Siedlecki and all the above named Respondents shall forthwith return Claimant's stolen identity documents, including without limitation all fingerprint and "mug shot" records and Claimant's unique DNA samples taken from her on or about June 1 or June 2, 2021. Failure to restore said property as ORDERED shall result in new liabilities for Respondents as this Court may hereafter determine

5. We hereby reserve jurisdiction to impose additional sanctions, including new liabilities, against Respondents or any other man or woman who violates any of our Orders. We intend to proceed upon our receipt of any verified Notice reporting new or continuing instances of Respondents' extortionate conduct committed against Claimant either directly or indirectly, contrary to this Judgment and Order

6 Respondents are herby Ordered to ABATE the public and private nuisances they have created by their scheme consisting of (a) creating roadway emergencies where none had existed; and (b) extorting fines and fees from Claimant or assaulting or battering her under any guise while she exercises her Constitutionally protected right to travel unimpeded on the public roadways of Ohio. Upon Notice to Respondents and to this Court of refusals to comply with this Order of Abatement, any Respondent or other code enforcer having Notice of these Orders and found participating in the nuisance scheme shall be required to post a bond of Five Thousand United States dollars with this Court, secured by a lien against his or her private property.

7. Respondents have agreed to and SHALL waive any and all claims any of them may have against the members of this Court or any man or woman acting to enforce this Judgment. Respondents SHALL hold any such enforcement agents harmless for any acts performed for the purpose of, or incident to, the enforcement of said Contract or judgment arising therefrom

RESPONDENTS SHALL GOVERN THEMSELVES ACCORDINGLY

Katherine Hine

Katherine Hine

William Loucks

William Loucks

Michael Plaster

Executed by us as Members of this Court on the date indicated hereinabove without the UNITED STATES and without STATE OF OHIO, their affiliates, subsidiaries, and parent corporations

Ohio Circuit Court of Record
seated at Chillicothe

Luciana Constantino, *sui juris*
Claimant,

-vs-

Thomas Desmarteau, *et al*
Respondents.

Case No. 21-CUY-001

OPINION SETTING FORTH FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

In further explanation for our Judgment, this Court makes the following further FINDINGS and CONCLUSIONS based on the record before us. This Court does not recognize corporate "caselaw", statutes, codes, administrative regulations or "Orders" based on them, as anything other than corporate bylaws that apply to its agents or others who freely consent to them. They do not apply to living people. It is no coincidence that the terms man and woman are not used in the corporate legal world. Respondents themselves do not dispute that common law is a superior form of jurisdiction to corporate statutory proceedings of any type.

Since much of what passes for the STATE corporations' "caselaw", statutes, and codes do apply to STATE actors and do occasionally contain admissions against interest, we who govern ourselves according to common law and the law of God remain free to use such admissions as we choose. Such admissions are among the sources we use in order to fully support the Judgment we reach here today. We are not limited to such sources.

Clearly, the crux of this matter is the issue of subject matter jurisdiction or other authority for Respondents' acts perpetrated against Claimant. Even more seminal than jurisdiction is the misunderstood and often maligned term "sovereignty". Respondents seem to be operating under the delusion that government was instituted of, by and for the corporations and not of, by and for the people. When Respondents' delusions of authority are stripped away, we can only conclude that the true nature of the acts Respondents admit to, is more akin to a joint venture to commit crimes and torts for financial gain, i.e. a public nuisance. We operate to resolve and in this case, to finalize disputes between the living people above named. We do not deal with the roles they may assume as legal fictions, strawmen, attorneys or corporate agents. Nor do we recognize Respondents' stated or unstated presumptions unless we indicate otherwise. All parties before us are living people living on the land mass known as Ohio, the original republic. Neither CITY OF PARMA, nor PARMA POLICE DEPARTMENT, nor PARMA, CITY OF (INC.), nor their associated entities, nor STATE OF OHIO constitutes a land mass (or a republic). All are legal fiction corporations or other legal fiction entities, as Respondents have admitted. Living people such as Claimant and Respondents are unable to live on or in a legal fiction.

It is of no concern to us whether Respondents consider themselves to be agents of an administrative tribunal, an admiralty or maritime "court", a military tribunal, a statutory or legislative "court", or of some other entity. They make no such claims, despite ample opportunities on three (3) occasions to do so. What those entities clearly are *not*, are courts of

record, as Respondents all admit, because they do not administer common law even according to Respondent's own authorities. E.g. Black's (4th). Moreover, even within the limited scope of Respondents' claims to limited and inferior authority, the practices of the PARMA agents are also *ultra vires*. We set forth a few of the more salient particulars below:

I. ABSENCE OF SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION OF THE PARMA ENTITIES

(A) *Respondents' actions are outside of their own corporate authority*

Respondents have admitted that Claimant engaged in no activity that ever caused harm, loss or injury to any living being. Respondents likewise make no ownership claim to the public roadway upon which Claimant and others travel and financially support. Undeterred by this fact, on April 23, 2021 Respondent Desmarteau began the process of interfering with Claimant's liberty when he used his red flashing light to signal that there was some emergency. When Desmarteau handed Claimant a "ticket" he never signed, he cited no corporate code that addressed anything about rate of speed or condition of her conveyance.

Desmarteau at no time gave sworn testimony, either orally and subject to cross examination, or in the form of affidavit. The "ticket" merely cited one of the corporate STATE's bylaws, i.e. Ohio Rev. Code Sec. 333.03(B). However, that code section says not a word about "speeding" or what that might mean to corporate agents. It defines various usages of the term "school" but is silent as to rates of speed. No evidence exists to suggest that the area of roadway in question on April 23, 2021 was what the corporation refers to as a "school zone". Respondent Desmarteau himself makes no allegation to that effect, despite an easy opportunity for him to have checked the box labeled "school" on the form. Instead he checked the box labeled "business". Desmarteau checked other boxes on the "ticket" indicating road conditions at the time. He marked the box showing the roadway was "dry", the one showing no "adverse weather conditions", the one showing traffic was "moderate", and the one showing there had been no "crash". Although there was a box for the rate of speed being allegedly "unsafe for conditions", Respondent Desmarteau declined to check it.

The for-profit venture in which Respondents are engaged on behalf of their corporate employers is not unlimited in scope. For example, the parent or affiliate corporations limit any such claimed powers to interfere with the right to travel in 18 U.S.C. Sec. 31(a)(6). That code section defines a "motor vehicle" to be

> "every description of carriage or other contrivance propelled or drawn by mechanical power and used for commercial purposes on the highways in the transportation of passengers, passengers and property, or property or cargo"

Yet neither Respondent Desmarteau nor any of the other Respondents ever alleged any facts from which it could possibly be inferred that Claimant had any such "commercial purpose" when he targeted her while she traveled on the public roadway.

Respondents have not bothered to claim *any* authority to define *any* of the conduct of the people who travel the public roadways Respondents admittedly do not own. Even in Respondents' corporate world, the absence of any such allegation of "commercial purpose" means that no

claim against Claimant was stated. Respondent Desmarteau failed to bring Claimant within the *de facto* authority of any of the corporations which are his principals. But this did not deter him from delivering a written threat of violence, which Respondents call "arrest". Respondents concede that it was this assaultive threat which propelled Claimant in the first instance, into attending the corporate proceedings Desmarteau directed towards the legal fiction name.

Notwithstanding the inapplicability of their corporate code to Claimant, other PARMA Respondents have continued to conduct themselves outside their corporate authority ever since Desmarteau's initial assault. Following that assault, other Respondents continued Desmarteau's initial corporate interference with Claimant's right to travel. Such interference has long been prohibited to Respondents according to admissions by other STATE actors who are tasked with supervision of lower ranking agents such as Respondents. E.g. *Kent v. Dulles*, 357 U.S. 116, 125 (1958)(tracing the right to travel as an inherent element of liberty per Magna Carta) In the matter of *Chicago Motor Coach vs. Chicago* 169 NE 22 (Ill. 1929), corporate judicial agents admitted that:

> "The use of the highways for the purpose of travel and transportation is not a mere privilege, but a common and fundamental Right of which the public and the individual cannot be rightfully deprived."

Agents of other cabal "courts" have been in accord. In the case of *Thompson vs. Smith, Chief of Police* 154 SE 579 (Va 1930), the concession was made that

> "The right of the citizen to travel upon the public highways and to transport his property thereon, either by horse drawn carriage or by automobile, is not a mere privilege which a city can prohibit or permit at will, but a common right which he has under the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. It includes the right in so doing to use the ordinary and usual conveyances of the day; and under the existing modes of travel includes the right to drive a horse-drawn carriage or wagon thereon, or to operate an automobile thereon, for the usual and ordinary purposes of life and business."

Yet Respondents not only purported to prohibit this admittedly common right, they now seek to criminalize it.

We are not unmindful that, over the years, cabal tribunals have created fictitious concepts and presumptions to chip away at these and others of the people's God-given rights. Such concepts include without limitation "police power", "necessity" (which curiously seems to not be a defense available to the people (e.g. *State v.Green* 470 S.W.2d 565 (Mo. 1971)), "expedience", the supposed "contempt power" belonging only to sovereigns, the notion of a "living, breathing Constitution", and others. Respondents may even imagine they are operating a "military tribunal" without disclosing that belief. We note that Respondents' superiors long ago tried such a strategy but the purported use of "military tribunals" was long ago conceded to have been unconstitutional where a civilian court is available. *Ex Parte Milligan*, 71 U.S. 2 (1866). We the people of this Court are not bound by such self-serving artifices by whatever name.

As all Respondents have repeatedly conceded, there is no corporate legal fiction, such as PARMA MUNCIPAL COURT, that may claim facts or even corporate theories to justify

Desmarteau's original assaultive stop. Despite the absence of any such facts, Respondents continued with more assaultive threats as soon as Claimant, reacting in reasonable fear of the threats of battery contained on the Desmarteau ticket, entered the public courtroom being administered by Respondent Spellacy on May 25, 2021. With no power of attorney or other authority justifying his actions, Respondent Spellacy ignored the defects apparent on the face of the unsigned "ticket" and took it upon himself to speak for Claimant or her all caps name, and proclaimed that she (or it) was pleading "not guilty" regardless of Claimant's immediate objections to these acts and Spellacy's total lack of authority to speak for Claimant.

On June 1, 2021, Respondent Gilligan resumed and exacerbated the assaults. We listened to the recording of Gilligan's threats and directives to armed agents to kidnap Claimant. [Claimant's Exhibit B] We also reviewed the June 1, 2021 eye witness affidavit. This evidence, along with Respondents' repeated admissions, clearly shows that, far from providing Claimant an opportunity to freely consent (or not) to stand in for the all caps name, Respondent Gilligan, though unprovoked, became aggressive. He interrupted Claimant as she attempted to answer his questions and threatened her with violence in an obvious attempt to coerce her into providing him with the answers he desired about the all caps name. When Claimant insisted on asserting her rights to define her own legal character merely by spelling her name, a right admittedly recognized by treaty and Executive Order 13132, Respondent Gilligan followed through on his threats of violence against Claimant by ordering her to be kidnapped and battered. Claimant remained kidnapped and battered from June 1, 2021 through June 2, 2021. Respondents can label their actions as anything they like, but we will call their actions by their proper names.

On June 2, 2021, following some 24 hours into Claimant's abduction, after suffering multiple batteries, painful, visible injuries admittedly diagnosed as parasthesia, hospital batteries in which she was hand-cuffed to a bed, and Respondents' conversion of her identity documents during "booking", for their own corporate purposes, Respondent Conway approached Claimant. He made her an offer few could refuse. Conway urged Claimant to avoid the 29 more days of torture which Gilligan had already "ordered", by accepting a new fictitious charge and conforming her answers to Gilligan's questions to be more to his liking. We might expect such tactics in the Star Chamber, but not during proceedings being conducted supposedly in the land of the free, home of the brave. When Claimant succumbed to Conway's coercion, Respondents invented a new fictitious "loud muffler" charge out of thin air and continued their abusive conduct until Gilligan finally was able to extract Claimant's coerced "consent" to his demands that she pay a different sum as extortion fees associated with the fictitious muffler accusation. Consent is not generated at the barrel of a gun.

We note that nowhere in the posted "public" records of this matter, did Respondent Vittardi ever post or otherwise document Claimant's June 1, 2021 – June 2, 2021 kidnapping, not even by using any of Respondents' euphemisms, such as "incarceration." In light of Vittardi's ongoing threats and admissions of culpability, we consider this omission from PARMA corporate records to evidence his clear consciousness of wrongdoing and an effort to cover up his fellow Respondents' crimes. Undeterred by their own admissions to having acted without jurisdiction, Respondents continue to this day to act without even the pretense of any authority to do so, repeatedly ignoring principles expressed by their own legal authorities. Even in the corporate world where Respondents operate, whenever there is no jurisdiction over subject matter, there is

likewise no discretion to ignore the lack thereof. *Joyce v. U.S.*, 474 F.2d 215, 219 (C.A.3 Pa.)(1973).

(B) *Respondents have been conducting sham proceedings that punish Claimant's internationally recognized rights to define the moral, political, and legal character of her life.*

Since Respondents are operating as corporate agents, their principals cannot exercise the functions of a true court, a court of record. Neither the municipal corporate tribunal nor the county corporate tribunal is a "court of record" nor a true Constitutional court, thus rendering all its process void *ab initio*. *The Bank of the United States v. Planters Bank of Georgia*, 22 U.S. 904 (1824).

The corporations operating the so-called "Municipal Courts" of STATE OF OHIO are merely inferior administrative tribunals which do not meet the definition of being courts of record. The respondents, who are admittedly agents of one or more of the corporations known as PARMA POLICE DEPARTMENT, PARMA CITY OF (INC), PARMA MUNICIPAL COURT, and STATE OF OHIO, are operating without full public disclosure of the corporate, for-profit nature of their operations. The public is entitled to know that Respondents are acting for private interests, and necessarily guided only by the profit motive, and not by any interests of justice. Respondents' concealment from the public of their massive conflicts of interest means that they are fraudulently operating in the absence of any notion of informed consent from the people. Certainly Respondents herein are operating in the absence of any meaningful consent by Claimant. Specifically, the Dun & Bradstreet website, as well as Respondents' own admissions, reveal that the entity known as PARMA MUNICIPAL COURT is itself a corporation, and/or a project or subsidiary of one or more of the aforementioned corporations, including without limitation, STATE OF OHIO.

Respondents have also conceded that Respondent BAR members Gilligan, Spellacey, Dobeck, Conway, and possible others, receive emoluments directly or indirectly from a foreign power, namely the British Bar Association and associated corporate entities. That foreign power indeed does direct their actions and their codes of "ethics". Respondents' admitted violations of the Foreign Agents Registration Act establish the *ultra vires* nature of their actions even within their realm. Moreover, as Respondents admit, the original 13th Article of the 1787 U.S. Constitution prohibits these "esquires" and other emolument holders from holding positions of public trust, as does Article I, Sec. 9, Cl.7.

(C) *Claimant has every right to not consent to claim the legal fiction name she did not create.*

This matter originally began on April 23, 2021when Respondent Desmarteau without lawful or even statutory authority detained Claimant on a public roadway in Cuyahoga County and handed her an unsigned, unverified check-the-box document commonly known as a traffic "ticket". On its face the "ticket" was addressed to LUCIANA CONSTANTINO, a moniker we refer to herein as the all caps name or the legal fiction name. Yet, agents of the *de facto* legal system have long considered the use of fictitious names to be a matter of mere privilege. E.g. *Burton v. Ullman*, 147 Conn. 48, 156 A.2d 508, 514 (1959) ("granted only in the rare case where the nature of the issue litigated and the interest of the parties demand it and no harm can be done to the public interest"). However Respondents have steadfastly persisted in using the legal fiction name, even

refusing to allow Claimant to speak to correct the record when the mere spelling of her name could question Respondents' unprivileged use of the legal fiction name.

Moreover, the legal fiction all caps name is a non-standard bastardization of English grammar rules applicable to proper names, according to the corporate cabal's own style manuals (https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/GPO-STYLEMANUAL-2016/pdf/GPO-STYLEMANUAL-2016.pdf). Other style manuals in common usage in the legal world agree. E.g. *Chicago Manual of Style* (14th Ed.), *Manual on Usage & Style*, (8th Ed.), ISBN 1-878674-51-X (1995; Tex. L. Rev.) Section D (prohibiting the usage of all caps to refer to litigants); NASA/SP-7084: NASA Special Publication: Grammar, Punctuation, and Capitalization, a Handbook for Technical Writers and Editors (1998; NASA Langley Research Center, Hampton, Va.) Sec. 4.1 (specifically prohibiting all caps usages such as "STATE OF NEW YORK"). Yet Respondents lavishly use the term STATE OF OHIO as well as the all caps name for living people.

Obviously there is a reason, an undisclosed reason, that Respondent Gilligan, as revealed by Claimant's Exhibit "B", became irate when Claimant answered his questioning by attempting to spell her name according to normal English grammar style and usage and also according to the style manuals that Respondents are required to use themselves.

Notwithstanding their own style manuals, it is common knowledge that the corporate tribunals operated by agents of STATE OF OHIO and subsidiaries invariably *do* use the legal fiction names in their preliminary documents. Respondents do not assert that Claimant Luciana Constantino ever consented to be treated as the entity known as LUCIANA CONSTANTINO. Her sworn Declaration dated June 1, 2021 in support of her Notice of the same date, which she hand delivered to Respondent Gilligan also on the same date, specifically states, at paragraphs 6 and 8, that she is not a legal fiction "person" as that term is defined by corporate code, such as Ohio Rev. Code Sec. 1.59(C). Respondents do not assert that Claimant created the legal fiction "person" or the all caps name that ostensibly represents it. Respondents do not dispute that Claimant had already formally rebutted any presumptions created by signatures on birth registration, Social Security, or other corporately created documents. She stated as much in her Affidavit, which remains undisputed.

We are aware of various theories explaining the persistent corporate usage of the all caps name in corporate documents, including in so-called "pleadings", but we make no specific findings in that regard at the present time. It is a matter of record that agents of the fifty corporations claiming to be the people's "state governments", using one pretext or another, have been involved since at least 1933 in "registering" births and reporting the data to the "U.S. BUREAU OF THE CENSUS". Related bureaucratic practices provide for the "registration" of the all caps name, from the birth registration documents through SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION documents, marriage registration documents, death certification documents, insurance contracts and an assortment of other adhesion contracts, *all without the informed consent of the living people affected*. Notwithstanding the fact that the corporate legal system agents are highly particular about the written language of the terms they use to identify people, acts, and the public names of their own principals, their persistent disregard of grammar and style restrictions dictated by their own "style manuals" is nonsensical. Indeed it appears fraudulent.

As is common knowledge, the name on the Social Security card is invariably in all capital letters This is not because the mother of the man or woman, who is the holder of the card, knowingly assigned that all caps name to her son or daughter at birth. Living people did not create and do not own the SS card that invariably displays an all caps name, which the SSA in 1946 admitted in writing was "not for identification". Agents of the corporate entity known as SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION claim on behalf of that legal fiction that it owns of the card that its agents created. To be specific, 20 CFR Sec. 422.103 (d) states in pertinent part.

> "Social security number cards are the property of SSA and must be returned upon request."

Why would corporate STATE actors go to the trouble of enacting legislation to claim ownership in the cheap piece of cardboard the card is made of? It must be the all caps NAME printed on the card that they are claiming ownership of. In Respondents' legal world, is the all caps name one of the identifiers of the Social Security trust fund over which SSA agents announce having not just trusteeship status, but full ownership? If so, would this not be a violation of the fiduciary duty that SSA agents owe to the man or woman who is the beneficiary of that trust? Would such SSA claims not also therefore constitute a fraud upon the beneficiary, the living man or woman? The identifier on the SS card is invariably the fictional entity the corporate state created at the time of birth, commonly known as the legal fiction "straw man". The *normal* spelling of a man or woman's name is never part of the corporate STATE's way of identifying the people. The normally spelled name is a part of the people's language, and is commonly considered a written representation of the name given to the man or woman by his or her mother and father at birth. What some suggest is that the fiction that is SSA can deal only with another fiction, namely the all caps name, which had to be created for that purpose. We express no opinion on the precise nature of Respondents' motives, schemes and artifices. Historical record, however, makes the following telling observation about motive, as expressed by one of Respondents' predecessor agents. A document found in President Woodrow Wilson's papers, a letter from his trusted advisor Edward Mandell House describes the plan to make the American people "our chattels"

> "Very soon, every American will be required to register their biological property in a national system designed to keep track of the people and that will operate under the ancient system of pledging. By such methodology, we can compel people to submit to our agenda, which will affect our security as a charge back for our fiat paper currency. Every American will be forced to register or suffer not being able to work and earn a living. They will be our chattels and we will hold the security interest over them forever by operation of the law merchant under the scheme of secured transactions. Americans, by unknowingly or unwittingly delivering the bills of lading to us will be rendered bankrupt and insolvent, secured by their pledges.
> They will be stripped of their rights and given a commercial value designed to make us a profit and they will be none the wiser, for not one man in a million could ever figure out our plans and, if by accident one or two should figure it out, we have in our arsenal plausible deniability. After all, this is the only logical way to fund government, by floating liens and debts to the registrants in the form of benefits and privileges.
> This will inevitably reap us huge profits beyond our wildest expectations and leave every American a contributor to this fraud, which we will call 'Social Insurance.' Without realizing it, every American will insure us for any loss we may incur and in this manner

> every American will unknowingly be our servant, however begrudgingly. The people will become helpless and without any hope for their redemption and we will employ the high office of the President of our dummy corporation to foment this plot against America."
> [illegible]

The above explanation appears as plausible as any. Respondents have avoided all opportunities Claimant has provided them in which to offer any alternative explanation. In any event, it is clear from Exhibit B that on June 1, 2021 Claimant had ample grounds to voice her refusal to consent to *being* the legal fiction all caps name. Her right to define her own legal and political character has been conceded. What makes most sense to us is that Respondent Gilligan, having been unsuccessful in obtaining the desired (and generally expected) response to the oral question "Are you LUCIANA CONSTANTINO?" became assaultive over what seems to be his inability to avoid Claimant's exposure of Respondents' extortion scheme.

(D) *Respondents continue to engage in mail fraud to assault Claimant in the guise of "warrants" and "contempt" sanctions and continue to convert for their own purposes her identity documents extracted during coerced "booking procedures", thereby continuing to inflict harm on Claimant.*

Respondent Vittardi continues to send fraud-based threats of further abductions in the form of unsigned, unverified "warrants" through the UNITED STATES mail to the entity known as LUCIANA CONSTANTINO. To do so, Vittardi and those Respondents who created the bogus "warrants" had to disregard, and continue to disregard the fact that no crime or even offense was ever charged, as well as the restrictions to which each Respondent is subject by the 4th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, which states

> "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." [emphasis supplied]

Probable cause admittedly means that there are sufficient facts to lead a person of ordinary caution to honestly believe that a criminal act has been committed and that the one named in the warrant likely committed the crime. *Illinois v. Gates*, 462 U.S. 213 (1983). Yet Respondents are using no affidavit at all and make no allegation even that an infraction of corporate code had ever occurred. In the absence of Claimant's consent to be the legal fiction names, or allegations that Claimant harmed anyone, and despite Respondents' admitted lack of authority to interfere in any manner with Claimant's freedom to travel, no "warrant" would be lawful. Indeed it is void.

II. Subject Matter Jurisdiction Lies in the Ohio Circuit Court of Record [OCCR]

A. Foundational documents

It is a fundamental principle since the founding of the confederation of state republics that only the people are endowed by the Creator with certain unalienable rights. *De facto* corporate entities are not. Each of the 50 states, upon joining the Union were required to guarantee to the people who created them, a republican form of government, i.e. one in which the powers of sovereignty are vested in the people and are exercised by the people. Even when the people delegate some of

those rights, they remain free always to take them back, as described in the 1776 Declaration of Independence

> "But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariable the same object, evidences 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."

Congressional enactments concede that the Declaration is one of "The organic Laws of the United States of America." [1 US Code xxxv-xxxvii (1982 ed.)]

On July 13, 1787 Congress enacted "An Ordinance for the Government of the Territory of the United States North-West of the River Ohio". At Section 4 of said Ordinance, the "inhabitants" of the Ohio territory were conceded to have the following rights, among others:

> "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 NorthWest Ordinance further guarantees that

> "The inhabitants of the said territory shall always be entitled to the benefits * * * of judicial proceedings according to the course of the common law."

Respondents do not dispute that their employer or employers are for-profit corporations and cannot function in more than an administrative capacity. Even the corporation known as UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT is limited in its powers by the Constitution. The people are clearly under no such constraint. The people yield their sovereignty not to those who serve them but to the Almighty, the ultimate Sovereign. It has long been acknowledged that just beneath divine sovereignty, even as far back as

> "...at the Revolution, the sovereignty devolved on the people, and they are truly the sovereigns of the country, but they are sovereigns without subjects...with none to govern but themselves; the citizens of America are equal as fellow citizens, and as joint tenants in the sovereignty." *Chisholm v Georgia*, 2 U.S. 419, 471-472 (1793)

Over one hundred years later, agents of that same UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT conceded that

> "[t]he very meaning of 'sovereignty' is that the decree of the sovereign makes law." *American Banana Co. v. United Fruit Co.*, 213 U.S. 347, 358 (1909)[citing *Kawananakoa v. Polyblank*, 205 U. S. 349, 353 (1907)]

Respondents, being mere corporate actors and, at most, servants of the people, have no sovereignty, nor do their corporate principals. Provisions of the Tenth Amendment to the 1791 Constitution prohibit those purporting to act as the national government, whether the corporate UNITED STATES or its subsidiaries such as the PARMA entities, from exercising rights reserved to the people. The powers the people once delegated to the general government are named in the Constitution, and all not there named, either expressly or by implication are reserved to the people and can be exercised only by them. *U.S. v. Williams*, N.Y. 194 U.S. 295

(1904) There is nothing to suggest that rights once delegated cannot be withdrawn. Otherwise the concept of government by consent would be meaningless.

The claims submitted in the Petition in this case are based on common law and invoke a broader form of jurisdiction that is superior to the administrative or legislative functions of tribunals such as the one Respondents are operating. That superiority has long been acknowledged as far back in Anglo-American law as in Sir Edward Code's Opinion in *Dr. Bonham's Case*, 8 Co. Rep. 114 (Ct/ Common Pleas, 1610)("when an act of Parliament is against common right or reason, or repugnant, or impossible to be performed, the common law will control it and adjudge such act to be void.") Common law concerns itself with vindicating the basic premise of freedom for all living men and women so long as they harm no one else and fulfill their promises. Common law does not recognize legal fictions, presumptions, corporate codes, or statutes except for those who consent to be ruled by such means. Clearly agents of the corporate PARMA entities doing business as a tribunal that administers corporate code cannot and do not proceed according to common law. The people's only recourse, then, is to form their own courts of record and then to so proceed. People who disagree always remain free to consent to stand in for the legal fiction name and knowingly consent to be subjected to the corporate administrator. This is the nature of a republican form of government. Voluntary servitude remains an option. *"Consent" created at gunpoint is not consent.* Respondent Gilligan's zealous efforts to physically force and coerce Claimant into some type of "consent" to stand in for the legal fiction name was ineffective as a matter of law.

Subject matter jurisdiction over the claims submitted in this case lies in the Ohio Circuit Court of Record, a common law court which Claimant selected for her claims. Black's Law Dictionary (4th) concedes that to be a court of record it must administer common law. OCCR is comprised of Ohioans who understand and assert their individual and collective sovereignties. Each has formally rescinded any presumed effect that their prior signatures on corporate STATE documents may have ever been deemed to have created. Court members have all rescinded their fraudulently induced signatures on voter registration documents, repudiated UNITED STATES corporate "citizenship", and rebutted all presumptions that the *de facto* legal system may deem itself to have created as a result of signatures that were coerced without prior full disclosure of material facts, particularly those presumptions the corporate STATE may have created at the time of his or her birth.

Some three (3) Public Notices have been published detailing the formation of OCCR during 2020 and another set of 3 Public Notices published as to the formation of this Court in 2021. Following public notice, OCCR members were sworn into office on September 24, 2021 at Chillicothe, all without objection from any member of the public or from any agent of the STATE OF OHIO corporate tribunal either. As a matter of courtesy, we have provided individualized Notices of OCCR's formation to *de facto* agents Maureen O'Connor and David Yost. Neither has voiced any objection. It is noteworthy that O'Connor and Yost are both agents of corporations operating as part of the "governance" scheme being operated by STATE OF OHIO. Neither has authority over living people who do not consent to such corporate "governance" or those who have harmed no one.

Katherine Hine — Justice Katherine Hine

William Loucks — Justice Willliam Loucks

Justice Michael Plaster

Cc: The clerk is directed to serve copies of this Judgment Entry and Opinion to the following.

Thomas Desmarteau, Marty Vittardi, John Spellacy, Thomas Conway, Timothy Dobeck, Timothy Gilligan, Thomas Siedlecki, Dean DePiero, and Jennifer Meyer
[c/o] 5555 Powers Boulevard, Parma, Ohio [44129]; and
Michael Maloney
[c/o] 23969 Stonehedge Drive, Westlake, Ohio [44145]
And by fax to: 440-617-4249 and 440-887-7380

Carolyn J. Kovach
[c/o] 6611 Ridge Road
Parma, Ohio [44129]
Fax: (440) 885-8012

Daniel J. Waterman
[c/o] 28 Mentor Avenue
Painesville, Ohio [44077]
Fax: (440) 352-2609

Ken Gunsch
[c/o] 8500 Civic Center Boulevard
Mentor, Ohio [44060]
Fax: (440) 974-5775

Michael McGrath
[c/o] 1300 Ontario Street
Cleveland, Ohio [44113]
Fax: (216) 623-5584

Lawrence Reik
[c/o] 35150 Lakeshore Boulevard
Eastlake, Ohio [44095]
Fax: (440) 951-7781

Richard S. Fambro
[c/o] 1970 West Broad Street
Columbus, Ohio [43223]
Fax: (614) 752-8410

Joseph Morbitzer
[c/o] 1560 State Route 56 SouthWest
London, Ohio [43140]
Fax: (866) 239-5524

Randall J. Meyer
[c/o] 30 East Broad Street, Suite 2940
Columbus, Ohio [43215]
Fax: (614) 644-9504

Dave Yost
[c/o] 30 East Broad Street, 14th Floor
Columbus, Ohio [43215]
(614) 466-5087

Maureen O'Connor
[c/o] 65 South Front Street
Columbus, Ohio [43215]
(614) 387-9539 and (614) 387-9709

Joseph Caligiuri
[c/o] 250 Civic Center Dr, Suite 325
Columbus, Ohio [43215]
(614) 461-7205
Email:

Charlie Norman
[c/o] 1970 West Broad Street
Columbus, Ohio [43223]
Email:

Mike Bodson
[c/o] 55 Water Street Null
New York, New York [10041]