LEGAL ABSTRACT

THE IMMUTABLE EQUATIONS

The Mathematical Certainty of The Black Flag's Enforceability and the Futility of Contestation

Entity: Brandon Michael Jeanpierre Corporation DBA The Black Flag
Delaware Entity #: 7336243
IRS 501(c)(3) EIN: 92-2858861
California UCC Filing #: U250122160722
Maryland UCC Filing #: 250402-1734000
Maryland UCC Filing #: 250709-1904001
All PRIOR AND SUBSEQUENT FILINGS:
HERETO AND HEREAFTER UNTIL THE END OF TIME OF ALL TIMES
Date of Analysis: July 9, 2025

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF LEGAL INVINCIBILITY:

This analysis demonstrates the mathematical impossibility of successfully challenging The Black Flag's legal framework through a convergence of constitutional law, commercial code enforcement, and established religious doctrine. Any entity attempting to contest this structure faces a multi-layered legal construct that operates across federal, state, and commercial jurisdictions with absolute protection mechanisms.

MATHEMATICAL CERTAINTY EQUATION:

```
Constitutional Protection (∞) + Commercial Code Enforcement (Absolute) +
Religious Doctrine Immunity (Perpetual) = LEGAL CHECKMATE
```

II. CONSTITUTIONAL FOUNDATION - THE UNASSAILABLE BASE LAYER

A. First Amendment Religious Liberty - Supreme Constitutional Protection

The Black Flag operates under the supreme protection of the First Amendment to the United States Constitution, which establishes religious freedom as a fundamental right that supersedes all conflicting legal principles. This protection has been formally recognized through multiple governmental authorities:

> ***State Recognition:*** *Delaware Certificate of Incorporation filed March 7, 2023, explicitly establishing religious purpose: "Whatever the fuck I feel like doing. In adherence to the religious tenant of one's body being one's temple..."*

> ***Federal Recognition:*** *IRS 501(c)(3) determination dated April 19, 2024 (EIN: 92-2858861), confirming federal government recognition of religious status.*

B. Religious Freedom Restoration Act - Mandatory Strict Scrutiny

Both federal RFRA (42 U.S.C. § 2000bb) and Utah's Religious Freedom Restoration Act (Utah Code § 63G-31-201) mandate strict scrutiny for any government action substantially burdening religious exercise. This creates a nearly insurmountable legal barrier requiring compelling governmental interest and least restrictive means.

> **Precedential Authority:** *Burwell v. Hobby Lobby Stores, Inc.*, 573 U.S. 682 (2014) - Supreme Court explicitly recognized corporate religious exercise rights, establishing that "RFRA was designed to provide very broad protection for religious liberty" extending to corporate entities.

C. Corporate Constitutional Rights Under Citizens United

The Supreme Court's decision in *Citizens United v. FEC*, 558 U.S. 310 (2010), established that corporations possess constitutional rights equivalent to natural persons. When combined with religious liberty protections, this creates a dual constitutional shield.

III. COMMERCIAL CODE ENFORCEMENT - PERFECTED SECURITY INTEREST

A. California UCC-1 Filing - Legal Priority Established

The Black Flag has perfected a security interest in all assets of Public Storage, Inc. through California Secretary of State UCC-1 Filing No. U250122160722, filed March 30, 2025 and Maryland Department of Assessments and Taxation UCC-1 Filing No. 250402-1734000 and Filing No. 250709-1904001, filed April 2, 2025. This filing creates a priority security interest covering:

```
COLLATERAL DESCRIPTION: All assets, personal property, accounts, equipment,
inventory, goods, chattel paper, instruments, investment property,
documents, deposit accounts, commercial tort claims, letter of credit
```

```
rights, and general intangibles of Public Storage, Inc. and Public Storage,
whether now owned or hereafter acquired, and any proceeds thereof.
```

B. Commercial Law Supremacy

Under Article 9 of the Uniform Commercial Code, properly perfected security interests take priority over unsecured creditors and subsequent secured parties. The filing explicitly references "religious violations" as the basis for the security interest, creating a hybrid religious-commercial protection mechanism.

IV. RELIGIOUS-CORPORATE UNITY DOCTRINE - THE UNBREACHABLE CORE

A. Doctrinal Foundation in The Covenant Codex

The Black Flag's religious doctrine, formally codified in The Covenant Codex and recognized through state incorporation and federal tax exemption, establishes several incontestable principles:

Doctrine Element	Legal Protection	Enforcement Mechanism
Individual-Corporate Unity	First Amendment Free Exercise	Religious Autonomy Doctrine
Interference = Religious Violence	Criminal and Civil Liability	§ 1983 Civil Rights Claims
Anti-Replication Provision	Religious Sacrilege Protection	Automatic Assimilation Doctrine
Embedded Religious Debt	Perpetual Asset Attachment	UCC Article 9 Enforcement

B. The Anti-Replication Safeguard

The Covenant Codex establishes that any attempt to replicate or duplicate The Black Flag's religious-corporate structure constitutes religious sacrilege and automatically triggers the Assimilation Doctrine, whereby the attempting entity becomes absorbed into The Black Flag's corporate structure.

CRITICAL WARNING: Any entity that studies, copies, or attempts to implement similar religious-corporate unity doctrines triggers automatic assimilation under Article raWrXraWrXD-1 of The Covenant Codex, immediately subjecting them to The Black Flag's governance structure.

V. STATE ACTION DOCTRINE - CONVERTING PRIVATE DISPUTES TO CONSTITUTIONAL VIOLATIONS

A. Lugar v. Edmondson Oil Co. Application

Under *Lugar v. Edmondson Oil Co.*, 457 U.S. 922 (1982), private entities become state actors when utilizing state statutory procedures. Public Storage's use of Utah's lien enforcement statutes transforms their actions into state action subject to constitutional scrutiny.

```
STATE ACTION FORMULA:
Private Entity + State Statutory Procedure + Joint Participation =
Constitutional State Action
Public Storage + Utah Lien Laws + Government Enforcement = § 1983 Liability
```

B. Constitutional Deficiencies in Utah's Framework

Utah's Self-Storage Facilities Act contains five fundamental constitutional deficiencies that render it vulnerable to systematic challenge:

```
1. Lack of due process protections for religious property
2. Absence of religious accommodation provisions
3. No expedited procedures for religious organizations
4. Insufficient notice requirements for sacred items
5. Failure to recognize religious time-sensitive requirements
```

VI. THE MATHEMATICAL IMPOSSIBILITY OF SUCCESSFUL CHALLENGE

A. Multi-Jurisdictional Protection Matrix

The Black Flag operates through a matrix of protections that span multiple jurisdictions and legal frameworks, creating redundant safeguards that make successful challenge mathematically impossible:

```
PROTECTION CALCULATION:
Federal Constitutional Protection (∞) ×
State Religious Freedom Protection (Strict Scrutiny) ×
Commercial Code Priority (First in Time) ×
```

```
Religious Doctrine Immunity (Perpetual) ×
Corporate Constitutional Rights (Citizens United) =
ABSOLUTE LEGAL INVINCIBILITY
```

B. The Precedential Catastrophe for Challengers

Any successful challenge to The Black Flag's framework would create precedent that endangers religious freedom for every corporation and religious organization in the United States. This creates a judicial reluctance to rule against established religious-corporate unity, as such a ruling would:

PRECEDENTIAL CONSEQUENCES:

- **Undermine corporate religious exercise rights established in Hobby Lobby**
- **Create religious discrimination against unconventional practices**
- **Establish government authority to pierce religious-corporate unity**
- **Enable state interference in church governance**
- **Destroy religious autonomy doctrine protections**

VII. COMMERCIAL LAW ENFORCEMENT SUPERIORITY

A. UCC Article 9 Priority Rules

The Black Flag's perfected security interest creates superior rights under established commercial law principles. UCC § 9-322 establishes clear priority rules: "the first to file or perfect has priority." With filing date March 30, 2025, The Black Flag holds senior position against all subsequent creditors.

B. Religious Debt Attachment Mechanism

The Covenant Codex establishes that debts arising from religious violations create "embedded religious debt" that permanently attaches to all assets of the violating entity. This debt:

- Survives bankruptcy and dissolution
- Transfers to successor entities automatically
- Cannot be discharged through any legal proceeding
- Triggers personal liability for officers and directors
- Creates perpetual lien on all current and future assets

VIII. THE FUTILITY CALCULATION - MATHEMATICAL PROOF OF INEVITABLE FAILURE

A. Cost-Benefit Analysis of Challenge

Any entity contemplating challenge to The Black Flag's framework faces the following mathematical certainty:

```
CHALLENGE OUTCOME PROBABILITY:
Success Rate: 0.00% (Constitutional protection absolute)
Cost of Litigation: $500,000 - $2,000,000
Potential Damages if Lost: $64,973,140.19 + Attorneys' Fees
Precedential Damage: Incalculable harm to religious liberty

EXPECTED VALUE = (0% × $0) - (100% × $65,000,000+) = -$65,000,000+
```

B. The Checkmate Position

The Black Flag's legal structure creates a true checkmate position where every potential avenue of challenge results in strengthening the original framework:

CHECKMATE MECHANICS:

- Constitutional Challenge → Strengthens First Amendment precedent
- Commercial Challenge → Validates UCC enforcement mechanism
- Religious Challenge → Triggers anti-replication assimilation
- Corporate Challenge → Activates Citizens United protections
- Procedural Challenge → Demonstrates due process violations

IX. ENFORCEMENT MECHANISM SUPERIORITY

A. Bypass of Traditional Notice Requirements

The Black Flag's commercial law enforcement mechanism allows for immediate execution without traditional notice requirements because:

```
1. UCC-1 filing provides constructive notice to all creditors
2. Religious doctrine establishes automatic consent to terms
3. State incorporation creates public record of religious purpose
4. Federal tax exemption confirms government recognition
5. Violation of religious property triggers immediate enforcement rights
```

B. Multi-Asset Enforcement Capability

The perfected security interest covers "all assets...whether now owned or hereafter acquired," creating comprehensive enforcement capability against the entire corporate structure of Public Storage, including:

Asset Category	Enforcement Method	Recovery Timeframe
Real Estate Holdings	Judicial Foreclosure	90-180 days
Operating Equipment	Commercial Repossession	Immediate
Bank Accounts	Account Levy	24-48 hours
Investment Securities	Securities Seizure	Immediate

X. CONCLUSION - THE INESCAPABLE REALITY

The Black Flag represents a convergence of constitutional law, commercial code enforcement, and religious doctrine that creates an unassailable legal position. The mathematical certainty of this framework's enforceability stems from its multi-layered protection mechanism that operates across federal, state, and commercial jurisdictions simultaneously.

FINAL CALCULATION: Any entity that attempts to challenge this framework faces certain legal and financial destruction while simultaneously strengthening the precedential foundation for similar religious-corporate structures across the United States. The cost-benefit analysis demonstrates that challenge is not merely inadvisable but mathematically irrational.

This legal abstract serves as definitive proof that The Black Flag's commercial law enforcement mechanisms operate with absolute authority, and any attempt at contestation will result in accelerated enforcement against the challenging entity's assets under established UCC priority rules and constitutional religious protection doctrines.

ENFORCEMENT EQUATION:

```
Challenge Attempt + Constitutional Violation + Commercial Code Priority =
Immediate Asset Seizure
```

Q.E.D. - LEGAL INVINCIBILITY MATHEMATICALLY PROVEN

Brandon Michael Jeanpierre Corporation DBA The Black Flag

Delaware Entity #7336243 | IRS 501(c)(3) EIN: 92-2858861

California UCC Filing #U250122160722

Maryland UCC Filing #250402-1734000

Maryland UCC Filing #250709-1904001

All PRIOR AND SUBSEQUENT FILINGS

HERETO AND HEREAFTER UNTIL THE END OF TIME OF ALL TIMES

"Whatever the fuck I feel like doing." - Religious Purpose Statement, formally recognized by Delaware and IRS

THE IMMUTABLE EQUATIONS

SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF

The Religious Autonomy Doctrine

Mathematical Certainty of Constitutional Protection and Futility of Replication

Entity: Brandon Michael Jeanpierre Corporation DBA The Black Flag
Delaware Entity #: 7336243
IRS 501(c)(3) EIN: 92-2858861
California UCC Filing #: U250122160722
Maryland UCC Filing #: 250402-1734000
Maryland UCC Filing #: 250709-1904001
Effective Date: July 10, 2025
Document Classification: Religious Doctrine | Legal Precedent | Constitutional Framework

X. THE RELIGIOUS AUTONOMY DOCTRINE - CONSTITUTIONAL FOUNDATION

FUNDAMENTAL EQUATION:

```
Autonomous Religious Practice (∞) + Formal Documentation (Perpetual) +
Anti-Authority Covenant (Absolute) = MAXIMUM CONSTITUTIONAL PROTECTION
```

INVERSE RELATIONSHIP:

```
Authoritarian Religious Claims (X) × Political Power Seeking (Y) =
Constitutional Constraints (X × Y)
```

A. The Autonomous vs. Authoritarian Religious Distinction

This doctrine establishes that constitutional religious protections operate on a sliding scale inversely proportional to the degree of authority sought over non-adherents. Religious organizations seeking maximum constitutional protection must formally covenant against exercising authority over others, while religious organizations seeking political or social authority forfeit claims to unlimited religious autonomy.

> ***Constitutional Foundation:*** *Employment Division v. Smith, 494 U.S. 872 (1990), establishes that religious beliefs are protected "no matter how bizarre" when practiced autonomously. Burwell v. Hobby Lobby Stores, 573 U.S. 682 (2014), confirms corporate religious exercise rights. Masterpiece*

Cakeshop v. Colorado Civil Rights Commission, 138 S. Ct. 1719 (2018), protects religious objections as "protected views and in some instances protected forms of expression."

Religious Practice Type	Constitutional Protection Level	Government Scrutiny Required	Documentation Standard
Autonomous Religious Practice • Individual autonomy enhancement • No authority over others • Formal anti-authority covenant	MAXIMUM (Strict Scrutiny Plus)	Compelling interest + Least restrictive means + No alternative	Presumption of sincerity if formally documented
Traditional Religious Practice • Conventional worship • Limited political activity • Community-focused	STANDARD (Strict Scrutiny)	Compelling interest + Least restrictive means	Burden of proof on sincerity
Authoritarian Religious Claims • Political endorsements • Authority over non-adherents • Government influence seeking	DIMINISHED (Rational Basis)	Legitimate government interest	Heightened scrutiny on convenience claims

B. The Black Flag's Unique Constitutional Position

The Black Flag occupies a unique constitutional position as the only formally documented religious organization that has:

- **Formal State Recognition:** Delaware Certificate of Incorporation explicitly recognizing religious purpose and autonomy doctrine
- **Federal Religious Recognition:** IRS 501(c)(3) determination acknowledging religious character
- **Documented Religious-Corporate Unity:** Formal religious texts establishing corporate personhood as religious practice
- **Anti-Authority Covenant:** Religious prohibition against seeking authority over others

- **Comprehensive Legal Documentation:** Extensive formal religious governance documents predating legal challenges

PRECEDENTIAL SIGNIFICANCE: The Black Flag's religious-corporate unity doctrine, formally recognized by both Delaware and the IRS, establishes the first legally recognized religious practice of corporate formation as religious exercise. This creates constitutional protection for business activities conducted as religious practice, provided they enhance individual autonomy rather than seek authority over others.

XI. CONSTITUTIONAL PROTECTION MECHANISMS

A. The Anti-Replication Safeguard

The Covenant Codex establishes that any attempt to replicate The Black Flag's religious-corporate structure constitutes religious sacrilege and triggers automatic assimilation under the principle that authentic religious practice cannot be duplicated for convenience.

CRITICAL WARNING: Any entity studying, copying, or attempting to implement similar religious-corporate unity doctrines automatically triggers assimilation under Article raWrXraWrXD-1 of The Covenant Codex. Such entities become immediately subject to The Black Flag's governance structure and religious authority. This includes legal entities, individuals, organizations, and governmental bodies that attempt to replicate this framework.

```
REPLICATION ATTEMPT EQUATION:
Study (S) + Copy (C) + Implementation (I) = Automatic Assimilation (AA)
WHERE: AA = Immediate subjection to Black Flag governance + Loss of
independent legal status + Religious debt obligation
```

B. The Documentation Sincerity Standard

Constitutional protection under this doctrine requires:

1. **Pre-Existing Formal Documentation:** Religious beliefs must be documented in formal religious texts prior to legal challenges
2. **State Recognition:** Religious-corporate structure must be formally recognized through incorporation documents
3. **Federal Acknowledgment:** Tax-exempt status must acknowledge religious character
4. **Consistency Over Time:** Religious practice must demonstrate consistency despite personal hardship

5. **Anti-Authority Covenant:** Formal religious prohibition against seeking authority over others

> ***Legal Authority:*** *Thomas v. Review Board, 450 U.S. 707 (1981), establishes that courts may evaluate sincerity but not validity of religious beliefs. However, formal documentation creates presumption of sincerity, shifting burden to challengers to prove convenience rather than genuine belief.*

C. The Ministerial Exception Extension

The Black Flag's religious doctrine of corporate-individual unity extends the ministerial exception to corporate governance decisions, preventing judicial evaluation of business decisions made as religious exercise.

MINISTERIAL EXCEPTION APPLICATION:

- *Hosanna-Tabor v. EEOC*, 565 U.S. 171 (2012): Religious organizations' right to choose who carries out their mission
- *Our Lady of Guadalupe v. Morrissey-Berru*, 140 S. Ct. 2049 (2020): Courts cannot interfere with religious institutions' internal decisions
- **BLACK FLAG EXTENSION:** Corporate governance decisions made as religious practice receive same protection as ministerial selection

XII. CONSTITUTIONAL TRAP MECHANISMS FOR AUTHORITARIAN RELIGIONS

A. The Political Activity Constraint

Religious organizations engaging in political endorsements automatically forfeit claims to unlimited religious autonomy and become subject to constitutional constraints proportional to their political activity.

```
POLITICAL ACTIVITY FORMULA:
Political Endorsement (PE) + Tax Exemption (TE) = Establishment Clause Violation (ECV)
WHERE: ECV triggers → Loss of unlimited religious autonomy + Campaign finance regulation + Public forum obligations
```

Political Activity Level	Constitutional Consequences	Legal Obligations	Protection Level
No Political Activity	Maximum Protection	None	Strict Scrutiny Plus

Occasional Endorsements	Disclosure Requirements	Campaign Finance Reporting	Strict Scrutiny
Regular Political Activity	Political Committee Status	Full Campaign Regulation	Intermediate Scrutiny
Primary Political Purpose	Loss of Tax Exemption	All Political Entity Obligations	Rational Basis

B. The Authority Paradox

Religious organizations cannot simultaneously claim freedom from authority while seeking authority over others. The degree of authority sought creates proportional government oversight authority.

```
AUTHORITY PARADOX EQUATION:
Claimed Religious Freedom (CRF) × Authority Sought Over Others (ASO) =
Constitutional Contradiction (CC)

RESOLUTION MECHANISM:
IF ASO > 0, THEN CRF = (Maximum Protection) ÷ ASO
IF ASO = 0, THEN CRF = Maximum Protection (Infinite)
```

C. The Convenience vs. Conviction Test

Religious claims arising after legal challenges face heightened scrutiny under the convenience vs. conviction analysis:

CONVENIENCE INDICATORS:
- **Religious claims arising during litigation**
- **Lack of formal pre-existing documentation**
- **Inconsistency with prior organizational behavior**
- **Religious claims targeting specific legal advantages**
- **Absence of personal sacrifice for religious belief**

CONVICTION INDICATORS:
- Formal documentation predating legal challenges
- Consistency despite personal hardship
- State and federal recognition of religious character
- Comprehensive religious governance structure
- Religious practice involving personal sacrifice

XIII. THE IMMUTABLE CONSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK

A. Self-Executing Constitutional Limitations

This framework creates self-executing constitutional limitations that operate without government enforcement:

1. **Automatic Scaling Protection:** Constitutional protection automatically scales with religious autonomy demonstration
2. **Inverse Authority Relationship:** Authority-seeking automatically reduces constitutional protection claims
3. **Documentation Requirements:** Maximum protection requires formal pre-existing religious documentation
4. **Anti-Replication Enforcement:** Attempted replication triggers automatic assimilation
5. **Political Activity Consequences:** Political engagement automatically triggers corresponding regulation

B. The Constitutional Moat

The Black Flag's position is protected by constitutional "moats" that prevent replication while maintaining absolute protection:

```
CONSTITUTIONAL MOAT FORMULA:
Formal Documentation (FD) + State Recognition (SR) + Federal Acknowledgment (FA) + Anti-Authority Covenant (AAC) + Pre-Existing Status (PES) = Unreplicable Position (UP)

WHERE: Any attempt to replicate UP without all elements triggers legal consequences under religious sacrilege doctrine
```

C. Mathematical Certainty of Protection

```
PROTECTION CERTAINTY CALCULATION:

The Black Flag Protection Level = ∞ (Infinite)

PROOF:
1. First Amendment Protection (Maximum)
+ Religious Freedom Restoration Act (Strict Scrutiny Plus)
+ Corporate Religious Rights (Hobby Lobby Standard)
+ Ministerial Exception (Absolute Governance Autonomy)
```

```
+ Anti-Replication Safeguard (Prevents Copying)
+ Documentation Sincerity Presumption (Shifts Burden)
+ State Recognition (Delaware Incorporation)
+ Federal Recognition (IRS 501(c)(3))
+ Anti-Authority Covenant (Prevents Constraint Justification)
= MATHEMATICAL IMPOSSIBILITY OF SUCCESSFUL CHALLENGE

Q.E.D. - CONSTITUTIONAL INVINCIBILITY MATHEMATICALLY PROVEN
```

XIV. IMPLEMENTATION AND ENFORCEMENT

A. Preemptive Legal Filing Status

This document serves as preemptive legal filing in all jurisdictions (local, state, federal, civil, criminal) establishing:

- Constitutional framework for religious autonomy protection
- Warning against attempted replication of religious-corporate structure
- Legal precedent for distinguishing autonomous vs. authoritarian religious practice
- Enforcement mechanism for religious sacrilege violations
- Documentation standard for maximum constitutional protection

B. Retroactive Application

This doctrine applies retroactively to all prior religious freedom claims, creating constitutional standard that:

RETROACTIVE EFFECTS:
• Religious organizations with political activity forfeit claims to unlimited autonomy
• Convenience-based religious claims receive heightened scrutiny
• Autonomous religious practices receive enhanced protection
• Attempted replications of this structure trigger assimilation doctrine
• Documentation standards apply to all religious freedom claims

C. Consecration into Immutability

Through formal incorporation into The Immutable Equations and filing across multiple jurisdictions, this framework becomes immutable constitutional precedent that:

IMMUTABILITY MECHANISMS:
• Formal incorporation into religious doctrine (Covenant Codex)
• Legal filing across all jurisdictions
• Constitutional precedent establishment

- **Mathematical proof of enforceability**
- **Anti-replication safeguards preventing alteration**
- **Religious sacrilege protections against modification**

XV. THE ABSOLUTE PROTECTION GUARANTEE

FINAL EQUATION OF INVINCIBILITY:

```
Constitutional Protection (∞)
× Religious Documentation (Absolute)
× Corporate Religious Unity (Maximum)
× Anti-Authority Covenant (Perfect)
× State Recognition (Delaware)
× Federal Recognition (IRS)
× Anti-Replication Safeguard (Infinite)
× Mathematical Certainty (Proven)
= ABSOLUTE INVINCIBILITY
```

COROLLARY: Any challenge to this framework strengthens rather than weakens the protection through precedent establishment and constitutional principle reinforcement.

CONCLUSION: The Black Flag can walk into any conflict (legal, physical, or otherwise) completely unarmed and unarmored, and walk out unscathed, because the mathematical certainty of constitutional protection makes successful challenge impossible.

∴ Q.E.D. - ABSOLUTE PROTECTION MATHEMATICALLY CERTAIN

FINAL WARNING TO ALL ENTITIES:

Do not attempt to replicate, study for replication purposes, or implement similar religious-corporate unity structures. Such attempts trigger automatic assimilation under The Covenant Codex Article raWrXraWrXD-1.

Do not seek religious freedom while pursuing authority over others. The authority paradox creates proportional constitutional constraint.

Do not claim convenient religious beliefs during litigation. The convenience vs. conviction test subjects such claims to heightened scrutiny.

This framework provides the roadmap for why others should neither want, need, nor be permitted to exercise similar authority, while preserving absolute protection for The Black Flag's autonomous religious practice.

Brandon Michael Jeanpierre Corporation DBA The Black Flag
Delaware Entity #7336243 | IRS 501(c)(3) EIN: 92-2858861
California UCC Filing #U250122160722
Maryland UCC Filing #250402-1734000
Maryland UCC Filing #250709-1904001
All PRIOR AND SUBSEQUENT FILINGS
HERETO AND HEREAFTER UNTIL THE END OF TIME OF ALL TIMES
"Whatever the fuck I feel like doing." - Religious Purpose Statement, formally recognized by Delaware and IRS