

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: N

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 Instrument – Bill of Attainder / Bill of Exchange styled as OMNIBUS ORDER filed on August 5, 2020, by Laura A. Cordero.

Stare Decisis Law

Melo v. United States, 505 F. 2d. 1026 *("Once jurisdiction is challenged, the court cannot proceed when it clearly appears that the court lacks jurisdiction, the court has no authority to reach merits, but, rather, should dismiss the action.").*

I am in receipt of your misrepresented instrument offer titled OMNIBUS ORDER dated August 5, 2020, which you addressed to the fictitious corporate person – nom de guerre RYAN D. CARTWRIGHT (Race: black) under color of law in want of jurisdiction within purview of the plausible 14th Amendment. Your OMNIBUS ORDER instrument is unconstitutional, notwithstanding, null and void ab initio for lack of jurisdiction and fraud for the following reasons:

1. I am not the fictitious corporate person – nom de guerre RYAN D. CARTWRIGHT (race: black); nor do I except any liability for RYAN D. CARTWRIGHT (race: black); nor do I consent to stand as surety for RYAN D. CARTWRIGHT (race: black) at any point, at any moment, or at any time. By you attempting to conceal my identity and misrepresent me under such false identity in your OMNIBUS ORDER instrument constitutes fraud! 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 / she deliberately conceals material information from them he / she is guilty of fraud. See **McNalley v. United State, 483 U.S. 350, 371-378, quoting United States v. Holzer, 861 F.2d. 304, 307.**
2. The Affidavit of Fact: Writ of Error [Exhibit: L] which you received on or about June 29, 2020, was not a "motion" or a "reconsideration" made to the SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (Inc.) as you have erroneously indicated in your OMNIBUS ORDER instrument. It was an exercise of my retained rights and reserved powers which are guaranteed to be secured under the 9th and 10th Amendments of the Constitution for the United States of North America. An exercise of right / power does not require a "motion" or "reconsideration" and you know that to be stare decisis law! Where rights secured by the Constitution are involved, there can be no rule-making or legislation, which would abrogate them. See **Miranda v. Arizona 384 US 436, 125.**

3. To give the proceedings in this case 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**. It has been clearly shown in the records of this case by prima facie evidence and conclusive proof, i.e., the Affidavit of Fact: Revised Default Judgment [Exhibit: E] filed January 31, 2020, and the Affidavit of Fact: Amendment to Revised Default Judgment [Exhibit: M] filed July 27, 2020, that the SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (Inc.) is not an Article III – constitutional court of competent jurisdiction, and lack's jurisdiction. Also, it is entirely separate from the republican government which is guaranteed to every state in the union per Article IV, section 4 of the Constitution for the United States of North America. The SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (Inc.) is a private foreign corporate entity operating de facto within purview of the plausible 14th Amendment U.S. corporate citizenship clause. Therefore, the SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (Inc.) and its corporation rules, as well as the proceedings in this case, are ineffective, invalid, null, void and unconstitutional! See attachment **Exhibit: N1** – copy of authenticated Congressional Record Proceedings and Debates of the 90th Congress, 1st Session, Volume 113 – Part 12, June 12, 1967, to June 20, 1967, Page 15641 (highlighted parts).

ORDER

Wherefore, it is hereby **ORDERED** that you, Laura A. Cordero, are in **ERROR**;

It is further **ORDERED** that you, Laura A. Cordero, are guilty of **FRAUD** and **TREASON**;

It is further **ORDERED** that the misrepresented instrument – bill of attainder / bill of exchange styled as OMNIBUS ORDER filed on August 5, 2020, by Laura A. Cordero is **INEFFECTIVE, INVALID, NULL, VOID,** and **UNCONSTITUTIONAL,** and is **DENIED** for lack of jurisdiction and fraud;

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this case and all attachments associated thereto shall be forthwith **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE** and **CLOSED** for lack of jurisdiction and fraud.

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 28th day of August, 2020.

Ryan-El

Affiant: Ryan Delevan Cartwright-El, sui juris [Judge]
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 Aqsá.
North-West Amexen.

Duly subscribed and affirmed on this 27th day of August, 1441 M.C.Y. [C.C.Y. 2020], before me, a Consul and General Vizir (Public Minister) for the Moorish National Republic Federal Government and Moorish American Consulate.

WITNESS my hand and official seal:

Signature: _____

Appellation (printed): Lamont Maurice El

My commission is permanent.

Affidavit of Fact

Certificate of Service

I, Ryan Delevan Cartwright-El, hereby certify that on this 28th day of August, 2020, the enclosed Affidavit of Fact: Writ of Error [Exhibit: N] and attachment Exhibit: N1 – copy of authenticated Congressional Record Proceedings and Debates of the 90th Congress, 1st Session, Volume 113 – Part 12, June 12, 1967, to June 20, 1967,was sent via efiling 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]

Ryan-EI

C.C.: Howard N. Bierman, Attorney of BWW LAW GROUP, LLC.
Michael R. Pompeo, United States Secretary of State
William P. Barr, United States Attorney General
Moorish American Consulate
Wayne Salzgaber, Director of INTERPOL Washington
Michelle Bachelet Jeria, United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
Embassies and Consulates of the International Community and other interested persons

Exhibit: N1

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 90th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 113—PART 12

JUNE 12, 1967, TO JUNE 20, 1967

(PAGES 15309 TO 16558)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1967

groups from other nations. This bipartisan organization is doing something more than just talking about international understanding—it is doing something about it.

If mankind is ever to abolish war from the face of the earth, we first must break down the barriers of mistrust and suspicion among the peoples of the world. There is no better way to accomplish this than through just such programs as this one conducted by the American Council of Young Political Leaders.

These young people will be the leaders of the world in years to come. They will be better leaders, more understanding and tolerant leaders, if they are able to expand their knowledge of other nations, other peoples, and other political systems.

This is why, Mr. Speaker, I am so pleased with the work being done by the American Council of Young Political Leaders. They have my wholehearted support in their program to further world understanding.

THE 14TH AMENDMENT—EQUAL PROTECTION LAW OR TOOL OF USURPATION

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. RARICK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, arrogantly ignoring clearcut expressions in the Constitution of the United States, the declared intent of its drafters notwithstanding, our unelected Federal judges read out prohibitions of the Constitution of the United States by adopting the fuzzy haze of the 14th amendment to legislate their personal ideas, prejudices, theories, guilt complexes, aims, and whims.

Through the cooperation of intellectual educators, we have subjected ourselves to accept destructive use and meaning of words and phrases. We blindly accept new meanings and changed values to alter our traditional thoughts.

We have tolerantly permitted the habitual misuse of words to serve as a vehicle to abandon our foundations and goals. Thus, the present use and expansion of the 14th amendment is a sham—serving as a crutch and hoodwink to precipitate a quasi-legal approach for overthrow of the tender balances and protections of limitation found in the Constitution.

But, interestingly enough, the 14th amendment—whether ratified or not—was but the expression of emotional outpouring of public sentiment following the War Between the States.

Its obvious purpose and intent was but to free human beings from ownership as a chattel by other humans. Its aim was no more than to free the slaves.

As our politically appointed Federal judiciary proceeds down their chosen path of chaotic departure from the peoples' government by substituting their personal law rationalized under the 14th amendment, their actions and verbiage brand them and their team as secessionists—rebels with pens instead of guns—seeking to divide our Union.

They must be stopped. Public opinion must be aroused. The Union must and shall be preserved.

Mr. Speaker, I ask to include in the RECORD, following my remarks, House Concurrent Resolution 208 of the Louisiana Legislature urging this Congress to declare the 14th amendment illegal. Also, I include in the RECORD an informative and well-annotated treatise on the illegality of the 14th amendment—the play toy of our secessionist judges—which has been prepared by Judge Leander H. Perez, of Louisiana.

The material referred to follows:

H. CON. RES. 208

A concurrent resolution to expose the unconstitutionality of the 14th admendment to the Constitution of the United States; to interpose the sovereignty of the State of Louisiana against the execution of said amendment in this State; to memorialize the Congress of the United States to repeal its joint resolution of July 28, 1868, declaring that said amendment had been ratified; and to provide for the distribution of certified copies of this resolution

Whereas the purported 14th Amendment to the United States Constitution was never lawfully adopted in accordance with the requirements of the United States Constitution because eleven states of the Union were deprived of their equal suffrage in the Senate in violation of Article V, when eleven southern states, including Louisiana, were excluded from deliberation and decision in the adoption of the Joint Resolution proposing said 14th Amendment; and Resolution was not presented to the President of the United States in order that the same should take effect, as required by Article 1, Section 7; the proposed amendment was not ratified by three-fourths of the states, but to the contrary fifteen states of the then thirty-seven states of the Union rejected the proposed 14th Amendment between the dates of its submission to the states by the Secretary of State on June 16, 1866 and March 24, 1868, thereby nullifying said Resolution and making it impossible for ratification by the constitutionally required three-fourths of such states; said southern states which were denied their equal suffrage in the Senate had been recognized by proclamations of the President of the United States to have duly constituted governments with all the powers which belong to free states of the Union, and the Legislatures of seven of said southern states had ratified the 13th Amendment which would have failed of ratification but for the ratification of said seven southern states; and

Whereas the Reconstruction Acts of Congress unlawfully overthrew their existing governments, removed their lawfully constituted legislatures by military force and replaced them with rump legislatures which carried out military orders and pretended to ratify the 14th Amendment; and

Whereas in spite of the fact that the Secretary of State in his first proclamation, on July 20, 1868, expressed doubt as to whether three-fourths of the required states had ratified the 14th Amendment, Congress nevertheless adopted a resolution on July 28, 1868, unlawfully declaring that three-fourths of the states had ratified the 14th Amendment and directed the Secretary of State to so proclaim, said Joint Resolution of Congress and the resulting proclamation of the Secretary of State included the purported ratifications of the military enforced rump legislatures of ten southern states whose lawful legislatures had previously rejected said 14th Amendment, and also included purported ratifications by the legislatures of the States of Ohio and New Jersey although they had withdrawn their legislative ratifications several months previously, all of which proves absolutely that said 14th Amendment was not adopted in accordance with the mandatory constitutional requirements set forth in Article V of the Constitution and therefore the Constitution itself strikes with nullity the purported 14th Amendment.

Now therefore be it resolved by the Legislature of Louisiana, the House of Representatives and the Senate concurring:

(1) That the Legislature go on record as exposing the unconstitutionality of the 14th Amendment, and interposes the sovereignty of the State of Louisiana against the execution of said 14th Amendment against the State of Louisiana and its people;

(2) That the Legislature of Louisiana opposes the use of the invalid 14th Amendment by the Federal courts to impose further unlawful edicts and hardships on its people;

(3) That the Congress of the United States be memorialized by this Legislature to repeal its unlawful Joint Resolution of July 28, 1868, declaring that three-fourths of the states had ratified the 14th Amendment to the United States Constitution;

(4) That the Legislatures of the other states of the Union be memorialized to give serious study and consideration to take similar action against the validity of the 14th Amendment and to uphold or support the Constitution of the United States which strikes said 14th Amendment with nullity; and

(5) That copies of this Resolution, duly certified, together with a copy of the treatise on "The Unconstitutionality of the 14th Amendment" by Judge L. H. Perez, be forwarded to the Governors and Secretaries of State of each state in the Union, and to the Secretaries of the United States Senate and House of Congress, and to the Louisiana Congressional delegation, a copy hereof to be published in the Congressional Record.

VAIL M. DELONY,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
C. C. AYCOCK,
Lieutenant Governor and President of the Senate.

THE 14TH AMENDMENT IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL

The purported 14th Amendment to the United States Constitution is and should be held to be ineffective, invalid, null, void and unconstitutional for the following reasons:

1. The Joint Resolution proposing said Amendment was not submitted to or adopted by a Constitutional Congress. Article I, Section 3, and Article V of the U.S. Constitution.

2. The Joint Resolution was not submitted to the President for his approval. Article I, Section 7.

3. The proposed 14th Amendment was rejected by more than one-fourth of all the States then in the Union, and it was never ratified by three-fourths of all the States in the Union. Article V.

I. THE UNCONSTITUTIONAL CONGRESS

The U.S. Constitution provides:

Article I, Section 3. "The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State * * *"

Article V provides: "No State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate."

The fact that 23 Senators had been unlawfully excluded from the U.S. Senate, in order to secure a two-thirds vote for adoption of the Joint Resolution proposing the 14th Amendment is shown by Resolutions of pro-

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 90th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

SENATE

MONDAY, JUNE 12, 1967

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by Hon. FRED R. HARRIS, a Senator from the State of Oklahoma.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, in times heavy with crisis, Thou hast called us to play our part in one of the creative hours in human history.

In this day of destiny for us, and for the world, make us worthy of our high calling as keepers of the sacred flame. Thou unseen source of beauty, goodness, and truth: though the people imagine a vain thing, Thou still art God, sitting above the floods of human turmoil: Thy mercy endureth through all human denials and betrayals.

As we bow before Thee, open our eyes, we pray, to the faults and failings which mar the life of our Republic. Make us conscious of the evils in ourselves that we so readily condemn in others.

With the light of Thy wisdom and the strength of Thy grace, enable those who in these baffling times have been entrusted with the stewardship of the national welfare to be true servants of Thine in the advancement of Thy kingdom's cause. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., June 12, 1967.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. FRED R. HARRIS, a Senator from the State of Oklahoma, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. HARRIS thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 953) to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964 for the purpose of authorizing appropriations for fiscal years subsequent to the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9029) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to amendments of the Senate numbered 7, 21, 30, and 41 to the bill, and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 11, 12, 16, and 20 to the bill, and concurred therein severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6133) to authorize appropriations for the saline water conversion program, to expand the program, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 1769) for the relief of Luis Tapia Davila, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 1769) for the relief of Luis Tapia Davila, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, June 8, 1967, was dispensed with.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Adm. Thomas H. Moorer, U.S. Navy, for appointment as Chief of Naval Operations in the Department of the Navy.

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Hiram R. Cancio, of Puerto Rico, to be U.S. district judge for the district of Puerto Rico;

Milton Pollack, of New York, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of New York;

Newell Edenfield, of Georgia, to be U.S. district judge for the northern district of Georgia;

Lawrence A. McSoud, of Oklahoma, to be U.S. attorney for the northern district of Oklahoma;

Robert M. Morgenthau, of New York, to be U.S. attorney for the southern district of New York;

Walter Dunbar, of California, to be a member of the Board of Parole; and

Isaac G. Stone, of Massachusetts, to be an examiner in chief, U.S. Patent Office.

By Mr. SMATHERS, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Joe Eaton, of Florida, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of Florida; and

Ben Krentzman, of Florida, to be U.S. district judge for the middle district of Florida.

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Paul X. Williams, of Arkansas, to be U.S. district judge for the western district of Arkansas.

By Mr. DIRKSEN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Robert D. Morgan, of Illinois, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of Illinois.

By Mr. SCOTT, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Francis L. Van Dusen, of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. circuit judge, third circuit;

Thomas A. Masterson, of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania;

E. Mac Troutman, of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania; and

Charles R. Weiner, of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committee, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.