

Moorish National Republic Federal Government
 Moorish Divine and National Movement of the World

Northwest Amexem / Northwest Africa / North America / 'The North Gate'

~ 'Temple of the Moon and Sun' ~

~ Societas Republicae Ea Al Maurikanos ~

The True and De jure Natural Peoples ~ Heirs of the Land

Affidavit of Fact
WRIT OF ERROR
 International Document

Notice to Agent is Notice to Principal – Notice to Principal is Notice to Agent

Exhibit: J

Re: Case Number: 2019 CA 000509 R(RP)

Laura A. Cordero, (acting as) Administrative officer
 Pamela Hunter, (acting as) Director/Administrative clerk
 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (Inc.)
 500 Indiana Avenue, North West
 Washington, District of Columbia Republic [Near. 20001]

Re: Misrepresented Instruments titled Order dated March 2, 2020; and Order Granting Motion to Ratify Sale dated March 2, 2020.

Stare Decisis

See *Old Wayne Mut. L Assoc. v. McDonough*, 204 U.S. 8, 27 S.Ct. 236 (1907) (“A court cannot confer jurisdiction where none existed and cannot make a void proceeding valid. It is clear and well-established law that a void order can be challenged in any court.”)

For the record, I am Ryan Delevan Cartwright-El, an aboriginal and indigenous Moorish American National and Rightful Heir of the Empire of Morocco in North America. I am a sovereign *free White Person* (sundry free Moor) of this land and as such, you and your private foreign for-profit entity styled as SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (Inc.) does not have lawful jurisdiction to hear, present, or pass judgment in any matter concerning my property or my affairs under your quasi-civil non-sanctioned de facto administrative agency practicing color of law private foreign process. Also, I am not to be falsely construed as the nom de guerre/fictitious corporate person RYAN DELEVAN CARTWRIGHT, a 14th Amendment U.S. fictitious corporate citizen-subject; and I have never identified myself to you as such nom de guerre in any of my affidavits and documents which are recorded and certified in the records of this case. For you to willfully address me under that non-human nom de guerre for the sake of assuming jurisdiction in order to make this void proceeding appear to be valid under color of law, as you erroneously did in your recently filed misrepresented instruments titled Order dated March 2, 2020, and Order Granting Motion to Ratify Sale dated March 2, 2020, (et al.) constitutes misrepresentation, denationalization, dehumanization, identity theft and fraud!

To give this proceeding any validity, there must be a tribunal competent by its constitution – that is, by the law of its creation – to pass upon the subject-matter of the suit. See **Pennoyer v. Neff, 95 U.S. 733, 24 L.Ed. 565**. Due to me being an indigenous Moorish American National of North America protected by treaty law, and NOT a citizen of the United States, the only court that has jurisdiction to hear and determine this case is an Article III court, i.e., a Consular court of competent jurisdiction being ordained and established under Article III, sections 1 and 2 of the United States Republic Constitution, and in accordance with Articles 20

and 21 of the Treaty of Peace and Friendship of 1836 between the United States of North America and the Empire of Morocco; and NOT your *kangaroo court* which you admitted was established under color of law, i.e., "D.C. Code § 11-921(a)". The 'D.C. Code' is the color of law system of the private foreign for-profit corporate entity styled as the DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA GOVERNMENT (Inc.), which is entirely separate from the de jure republican government, and which operates de facto as a 'democracy' under color of authority by the use of unconstitutional private foreign corporate commercial paper (Federal Reserve Notes) and securities (Checks), contrary to the 'Gold and Silver' clause under Article I, section 10, clause 1, and contrary to the 'Republican Form of Government' clause under Article IV, section 4 of the United States Republic Constitution. See **Clearfield Trust Company vs. United States** 318 U. S. 363 – 371 (1942), (*"Governments descend to the level of a mere private corporation, and take on the characteristics of a mere private citizen ... where 'private corporate commercial paper' [Federal Reserve Notes (FRNs)] and 'Securities' [Checks] are concerned. ... For purposes of suit, such corporations and individuals are regarded as entities entirely separate from government."*).

Is it your position that the 'D.C. Code' is superior to the United States Republic Constitution? No state legislator or executive or judicial officer can war against the Constitution without violating his undertaking to support it. See **Ableman v. Booth**, 21 How. 506, 62 U.S. 524. Your assertions in your misrepresented instruments titled Order dated March 2, 2020, and Order Granting Motion to Ratify Sale dated March 2, 2020, where you stated that your "Court's authority [i.e., the SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (Inc.)] is vested by virtue of D.C. Code § 11-921(a)", and that "Jurisdiction in this case is proper as the property at issue is located in the District of Columbia and Plaintiff brought the lawsuit in the District of

Columbia”, as if to say that Article III, sections 1 and 2 of the United States Republic Constitution was inferior to the D.C. Code § 11-921(a). This is a clear and blatant attempt to overthrow the United States Republic Constitution under color of law which is an ‘Act of War’ against the United States Republic, and constitutes treason under Article III, section 3 of the said Constitution, which aver the following:

Section 3. (1) Treason against the United States, shall consist only in levying War against them, or in adhering to their Enemies, giving them Aid and Comfort. No Person shall be convicted of Treason unless on the Testimony of two Witnesses to the same overt Act, or on Confession in open Court.

The United States Republic Constitution, as well as the Treaty of Peace and Friendship of 1836 between the United States of North America and the Empire of Morocco secures my treaty rights whenever a citizen of the United States has a dispute with me. Anything contrary to the ‘supreme Law of the Land’, including your ‘D.C. Code’, is notwithstanding and void of law per Article VI, clause 2 of the said Constitution, which aver the following:

Article VI. (2) This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof; and all Treaties made, or which shall be made, under the Authority of the United States, shall be the supreme Law of the Land; and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby, any Thing in the Constitution or Laws of any state to the Contrary notwithstanding.

Article III, section 2 of the United States Republic Constitution was established for the judicial power to extend to all Cases and Controversies in Law and Equity arising under the said Constitution, the Laws of the United States, and Treaties made, or which shall be made under

their authority, and the 5th Amendment was established for the protection of one's life, liberty and property in accordance with the prerequisites of 'Due Process of Law'. Furthermore, Article III, section 2 only refers to actual 'cases and controversies' between the parties to it. You have claimed in your misrepresented instrument titled Order dated March 2, 2020, that my property was located in the "District of Columbia", and that the plaintiff, PENNYMAC LOAN SERVICES, LLC., brought the lawsuit in the "District of Columbia". However, you know this information to be false and misleading because the DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (Inc.) is NOT the land, nor does it have ANY jurisdiction over the land. Furthermore, the plaintiff, PENNYMAC LOAN SERVICES, LLC., as well as the DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (Inc.) are artificial persons, abstractions, and are creatures of the mind only. The imaginary, having neither actuality nor substance, are foreclosed from creating and attempting parity with the tangible (i.e., myself). The legal manifestation of this is that no government, as well as any law, agency, aspect, court, etc. can concern itself with anything other than corporate, artificial persons and the contracts between them. See **Penhallow v. Doan's Administrators, 3 U.S. 54, 1 L.Ed 57**. The plaintiff, PENNYMAC LOAN SERVICES, LLC., did not satisfy the requirement of 'standing' as an actual injured party in this case, and cannot bring a lawsuit against me due to it being a fictitious corporate entity and not an actual identifiable natural person (human being). Furthermore, there is no accusation signed under penalty of perjury by any natural person (human being) claiming to be an alleged injured party and asserting personal injury. See **Allen v. Wright, 468 U.S. 737, 751 (1984)** (*"The requirement of standing, however, has a core component derived directly from the Constitution. A plaintiff must allege personal injury fairly traceable to the defendant's allegedly unlawful conduct and likely to be redressed by the requested relief."*). This case is, therefore, a collusive action brought under color of law within

purview of the plausible 14th Amendment by and for the benefit of you and the third person representatives of PENNYMAC LOAN SERVICES, LLC., (et al.) whom are not parties in this matter. This case is null and void ab initio due to it being without substance and founded on fraud.

You are also purporting or pretending to act as an 'administrative officer/clerk' of the SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (Inc.), which means this case was presented *coram non iudice* (in the presence of a person not a judge). Administrative officers/clerks are NOT judicial officers (judges), and you cannot exercise judicial (judge) power which was not conferred to you by law. See **Thompson v. Smith, 154 SE 583** ("*When acting to enforce a statute and its subsequent amendments to the present date, the judge of the municipal court is acting as an administrative officer and not in a judicial capacity; courts in administering or enforcing statutes do not act judicially, but merely ministerially*"). When a suit is brought and determined in a court which has no jurisdiction in the matter, then it is said to be *coram non iudice*, and the judgment is void. See **Manufacturing Co. v. Holt, 51 W. Wa. 352, 41 S. E. 351**. This means that your misrepresented instruments titled Order Granting Motion for Summary Judgment dated December 4, 2019; Judgment Order dated December 4, 2019; Order dated March 2, 2020; and Order Granting Motion to Ratify Sale dated March 2, 2020, and any other attachments associated thereto are null and void for lack of jurisdiction. See **Elliot v. Peirsol, 26 U.S. 328, 340 (1828)** ("*Courts are constituted by authority and they cannot act beyond the power delegated to them. If a court 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.”).

In response to your assertion that my several affidavits were “difficult to comprehend,” your response clearly supports your incompetency to sit in any constitutional court of competent jurisdiction. All of my affidavits were clearly written with proper diction for any person to read and comprehend. Alternatively, you lack the competency to hear and decide actual ‘cases and controversies’ arising under Article III, section 2 of the United States Republic Constitution. You are using lack of comprehension as an excuse for you to continue with your *ultra vires* acts and corruption in order to deprive me of my property under color of law, absent of a lawful warrant and without due process of law which is a violation of my secured rights under the 4th and 5th Amendments of the United States Republic Constitution.

In response to your misrepresented assumption that you have the right to “bar” my claim of inheritance, and that such claim was a “defense”, you are in error! You do not have the right or authority to bar my claim, nor was my claim a defense because there was nothing to defend against in this colorable void action which was not founded upon an actual controversy. As mentioned before, the plaintiff is a fictitious corporate entity and lack’s standing. My claim of inheritance was made for the record as an exercise of my treaty right to inherit as rightful heir under Article 22 of the Treaty of Peace and Friendship of 1836 between the United States of North America and the Empire of Morocco, and my treaty rights cannot be denied or disparaged under your color of authority via your private corporate rules and codes. See **Kolovrat v. Oregon, 366 U. S. 187, 194, 81 S.Ct. 922 (1961)** (*“A state cannot refuse to give foreign nationals their treaty rights because of fear that valid international agreements may possibly not work completely to the satisfaction of state authorities. Under the supremacy clause of the*

United States Constitution Art. VI, clause 2, state policies as to the rights of aliens to inherit must give way to overriding federal treaties and conflicting arrangements.”).

In response, and in correction to your statement that my “seven affidavits sought reconsideration” as if you are construing my ‘affidavits’ to be ‘motions’, they were NOT motions as you have alluded to by error. My documents that you referred to were introduced as ‘Affidavits’ and marked as evidence. Affidavits cannot be denied and must be answered. You have arbitrarily tampered with evidence by misrepresenting my affidavits to be ‘motions’. A ‘Motion’ is subject to discretion, and is an assumption that permission must be requested to exercise a constitutionally secured right. An exercise of right is not a request, and you know this to be ‘Stare Decisis Law’ and the Law of the Land. See **Miranda v. Arizona, 384 U.S. 436, 125** (*“Where rights secured by the Constitution are involved, there can be no rule-making or legislation, which would abrogate them.”*). For you to deliberately tamper with my evidence in order to conceal its true nature by misrepresenting them to be something that they’re not is a federal violation, a clear act of corruption, and constitutes fraud. See **McNalley v. United States, 483 U.S. 350, 371-378, quoting United States v. Holzer, 861 F.2d. 304, 307** (*“Fraud in its elementary common law sense of deceit...includes the deliberate concealment of material information in a setting of fiduciary obligation. A public official is a fiduciary toward the public,...and if he deliberately conceals material information from them he is guilty of fraud.”*). The restrictions that you are attempting to impose upon me under your private ‘corporation rules’ are unconstitutional and notwithstanding, and they arbitrarily hinder my ‘Due Process Rights’ which are secured under the 5th Amendment. My affidavits were an exercise of my retained rights and reserved powers which are guaranteed to be secured under the 9th and 10th Amendments of the United States Republic Constitution, which aver the following:

Amendment 9. The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

Amendment 10. The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

The United States Republic Constitution only guarantees a 'Republican form of Government' per Article IV, section 4. A 'republican government' is one in which the powers of sovereignty are vested in the people and are exercised by the people, either directly, or through representatives chosen by the people, to whom those powers are specially delegated. See in re **Duncan**, 139 U.S. 449, 11 S.Ct. 573, 35 L.Ed. 219. Also, jurisdiction can be challenged at any time, and jurisdiction, once challenged, cannot be assumed and must be decided. See **Basso v. Utah Power and Light Co.** 495 F.2d 906, 910. I made a 'special appearance' in this case and challenged your jurisdiction, in full life, *in propria persona, sui juris*, due to you purporting or pretending to exercise the sovereign powers of the republican government as a 'judicial officer' (judge), and you failed to prove it. Per the prima facie evidence which stands as conclusive proof, i.e., the Affidavit of Fact: Notice of Default [Exhibit: C] entered in this case on January 16, 2020, and the Affidavit of Fact: Revised Default Judgment [Exhibit: E] entered in this case on January 31, 2020, (which replaced the initial Affidavit of Fact: Default Judgment [Exhibit: E] entered in this case on January 24, 2020), it was clearly shown that you and the SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (Inc.) do not have jurisdiction in this case and were not delegated judicial authority from Congress under Article III, section 1 of the United States Republic Constitution to exercise the 'judicial power' of the republican government. See **Hagans v. Lavine**, 415 U.S. 533 ("*The law requires proof of jurisdiction to appear on the record of the administrative agency and all administrative proceedings.*"). Thus, the powers of

sovereignty are reserved to me, and I have the retained right to exercise such powers in this case per the 9th and 10th Amendments.

Consensus facit legem (Consent makes the law. A contract is law between the parties agreeing to be bound by it.). Should you intend to demand, to enforce, or to compel me to some specific performance based upon your private corporation rules and codes, i.e., the 'D.C. Code' and the 'Super. Ct. R. Civ. P.', then you must be a 'Holder - in - Due - Course' of a valid and verifiable 'Contract' or other evidentiary proof of a 'Commercial Agreement' mutually made between you, as authorized representative of the SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (Inc.) and the DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA GOVERNMENT (Inc.), and myself, upon which your compelling rules or demands for specific performance are made; and you must be willing to enter the physical, manifest 'Contract' or 'Commercial Agreement' into evidence even before trying to enforce your company's private commercial demands, called 'D.C. Code' and 'Rules'. There must be an agreement between you and I which consists of an offer and acceptance, consideration and contractual intention for a simple contract to exist, and my agreement must have been entered into freely. However, no such 'Contract' or 'Commercial Agreement' reflects in the record, nor did it ever exist and you know it!

Your misrepresented instruments and your unlawful *ultra vires* actions clearly show your intent to conspire with others in order to oppress me under your color of authority, and willfully deprive me of my inherited allodial private property under color of law, absent of my constitutionally secured 'due process rights' under Article III, section 2, and the 5th Amendment. Thus, you (et al.) are guilty of violating Title 18 United States Code § 241 – Conspiracy against rights, and § 242 – Deprivation of rights under color of law. The law always provides a remedy.

WHEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that you, Laura A. Cordero, are in **ERROR** and **WANT OF JURISDICTION**;

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, that your several misrepresented instruments styled as Order Granting Motion for Summary Judgment dated December 4, 2019, Judgment Order dated December 4, 2019, Order dated March 2, 2020, and Order Granting Motion to Ratify Sale dated March 2, 2020, and any other attachments associated thereto are **NULL** and **VOID** and are **NOT ENFORCEABLE** due to lack of jurisdiction and fraud, and such instruments are stricken from the record;

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, that all of my affidavits and documents which were entered into this case shall stand in the record as **CONCLUSIVE PROOF** of the lack of jurisdiction of the SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (Inc.);

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, that the proceedings in this case, including the alleged sale conducted on February 5, 2020, are **NULL** and **VOID AB INITIO**;

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, that this case is **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE** for lack of jurisdiction and fraud, and is now **CLOSED**;

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, that any future administrative hearing that you, Laura A. Cordero, shall schedule, which includes the administrative status hearing that you arbitrarily set for June 12, 2020, at 02:00 PM, are **DENIED** and **VACATED**.

SO ORDERED, SUI JURIS.

AFFIDAVIT

I affirm by virtue of Divine Law; under the Zodiac Constitution; and upon the United States Republic Constitution; and upon the honor of my Foremothers and Forefathers that the foregoing Writ of Error and Affidavit is true and correct.

Executed this 11th day of March, 2020.

Ryan - El

Affiant: Ryan Delevan Cartwright-El, sui juris,
authorized representative, ex rel.

RYAN DELEVAN CARTWRIGHT;

All Rights Reserved: UCC 1-207/1-308; UCC 1-103.

C/o 10903 Adler Court,

Upper Marlboro, Maryland Republic [Zip Exempt]

Non-Domestic/Non-Resident/Non-Subject

Maghrib al Aqsa.
North-West Amexen.


Duly subscribed and affirmed on this 11th day of March, 1439 M.C.Y. [C.C.Y. 2020], before me, a Vizir (Public Minister) of the Moorish National Republic Federal Government, personally appeared the above signatory, Ryan Delevan Cartwright-El, personally known to me or proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose appellation is signed herein and acknowledged that he/she/they executed the same.

WITNESS my hand and official seal:

Seal:



Signature:



Appellation (printed):

Laurent Maurice El

My commission is permanent.

Affidavit of Fact
Certificate of Service

I, Ryan Delevan Cartwright-El, hereby certify that on this 12th day of March, 2020, the enclosed Affidavit of Fact: Writ of Error [Exhibit: J] was sent via hand delivery to the following addressee:

Pamela Hunter, (acting as) Director/Administrative clerk
SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (Inc.)
500 Indiana Avenue NW
Washington, District of Columbia Republic [Near. 20001]

And was sent via certified mail to the following addressee:

Howard N. Bierman, (acting as) Attorney for
David A. Spector, Chief Executive Officer
PENNYMAC LOAN SERVICES, LLC.
6003 Executive Blvd., Suite 101
Rockville, Maryland Republic [Near. 20852]

Ryan - El

All Rights Reserved.

C.C.: Michael R. Pompeo, United States Secretary of State
William P. Barr, United States Attorney General
Michelle Bachelet Jeria, United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
Moorish American Consular Court
Et al.