

To Be Filed:

In the Circuit Court of the 1st
Judicial Circuit, in and for
Escambia County, Florida

STATE OF FLORIDA

(Plaintiff)

vs

Case No.: 25-CF-002851 A

Case No.: 25-CF-002852 A

[Chief] Judge: _____

DURAN CODNER

(Defendant)

Notice of Special Appearance

Comes Now, DURAN CODNER the Defendant, by and through Duran Codner, Beneficiary & Jah Rastafari Malchizedek, Interested Person for the said Defendant (DURAN CODNER), to inform the Court that We intend to present ourselves in special appearance(s) on the date/time/room appointed to hear Case. Defendant demand the right to know the court's intent and for Interested Person to be heard in the above Case [with reference to property expressed].

Defendant was misrepresented by the Public Defender's office, which was lawfully dismissed from case for ineffective assistance of counsel and not authorized to speak for nor enter any plea on behalf of Defendant.

A Notice of Withdrawal of Plea and a Demand to Prove Jurisdiction is pending before the Court and necessary in the process of fairness to all parties and for the just administration of law.

Defense was not given full disclosure to understand the terms/ conditions of plea, and also states that this Court cannot move forward, according to the constitutional laws, without the issue of personal and/or subject matter jurisdiction first being resolved.

Respectfully,



(Signature: U.C.C. 1- 308)

Duran Codner
www.DURANCODNER.com
New Jerusalem, State of Jah
10534 SW 18 Street, Hollywood, FL
Representative for Defendant
randolphcodner@yahoo.com
(305)342-6528

Declaration of Truth


City of New Jerusalem,
State of Jah

"Indeed, no more than (affidavits) is necessary to make the prima facie case." United States v. Kls, 658 F.22,526,536 (7th Cir. 1981); Cert Denied, 50 V.S. L.W. 2169; 5. Ct. March 22, 1982.

I and I, Duran Codner, the living god and conscious prince, being the master of self, say and declare by signature that the following facts are true, correct and complete to the best of knowledge:

1. That the Word of the LORD God, as recorded in the holy Bible, is Our sacred Truth;
2. I am "Who" I am in JAH (as revealed in Psalms 68:4);
3. No one except the Lord has Power of Attorney, by law, to speak for Us or as Us on lawful and godly matters;
4. No one else has Power of Attorney, by lawful consent, over the children and the sovereign People of God to represent them without proper authority and constitutional powers;
5. The State of Jah, as recorded, is the sovereign People's true state of being in Earth;
6. Salem, other-wise called New Jerusalem as recorded, is the Sovereign's heavenly kingdom established in various ways and forms for the People's eternal benefits (as revealed in Rev. 21:2);
7. The Lord has fulfilled all requirements of the Law, recorded and published the documents in proving, approving and/or improving the state of being wherein "I am".


NOTE: Maxim of Law; 1. In Commerce - Truth is Sovereign; 2. For a matter to be resolved, it must be expressed Point of Law - Silence equates to agreement. Further Affiant Saith Not.




Duran Codner, Authorized Representative, Attorney-In-Fact in behalf of
DURAN CODNER ®, Ens legis

Acknowledgement

Seal:




Jah Rastafari Malchizedek (Signature)

To Be Filed:

In the 1st Judicial Circuit Court, in
and for Escambia County, Florida

STATE OF FLORIDA

(Plaintiff)

vs

Case No.: 25-CF-002851 A

Case No.: 25-CF-002852 A

Judge: _____

DURAN CODNER

(Defendant)

Declaration of Status

Comes Now, **Duran Codner**, the true, real and living international person(s) with interest in the above Defendant (**DURAN CODNER**), with this Declaration of Status to inform the Court that We are separate and different from the said Defendant; so the Court can resolve the Demand to Prove Jurisdiction pending before it, and in order for defense to move forward with a fair and speedy trial [by jury in proceeding] according to law if necessary. Let the Court correct status for the record, grant leave and release Beneficiary from certain trusted responsibilities on account of said Defendant and/or dismiss charges on account of said Defendant immediately if jurisdiction is unproven. Let the Court take judicial notice that the brand name '**DURAN CODNER**' is (1) a national trademark, (2) name of Trust, (3) name of flag ship (vessel), (4) name of 508 C (1) A non-profit church ministry, to which We reserve all rights and of which use is prohibited without lawful permission from Us.




(Signature: U.C.C. 1- 308)

Certificate of Service

I and I, Duran Codner, certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing is hereby furnished to the parties of the above proceeding, in person or by USPS mail at the addresses listed below on February 23rd, 2026:

1. Pam Childers, Clerk of Court, 190 W. Government Street, Pensacola, FL 32502;
2. Bruce A. Miller, Office of the Public Defender, 190 W. Government Street, Pensacola, FL 32502;
3. Ginger Bowden Madden, Office of State Attorney, 190 W. Government Street, Pensacola, FL 32502;
4. John Miller, Chief/Trial Judge, 190 W. Government Street, Pensacola, FL 32502;

Duran Codner
www.DURANCODNER.com
New Jerusalem, State of Jah
10534 SW 18 Street, Hollywood, FL
randolphcodner@yahoo.com
(305)342-6528


(Signature: U.C.C. 1- 308)

To Be Filed:

In the First Judicial Circuit
Court, in and for Escambia
County, Florida

STATE OF FLORIDA

(Plaintiff)

vs

Case No.: 25-CF-002851 A
Case No.: 25-CF-002852 A

[Chief] Judge: _____

DURAN CODNER

(Defendant)

Dismissal of Court Appointed Attorneys

Comes Now, DURAN CODER, the above Defendant, by and through Jah Rastafari Malchizedek an Interested Person and Duran Codner a Beneficiary for the said Defendant, with this Dismissal of Court Appointed Attorney for ineffective assistance of service and failure to disclose important information (which places the Defendant in jeopardy) in order to (1) present Ourselves properly in making special appearance(s), (2) lawfully prepare defense(s), and (3) Be heard rightfully on the Demand(s) made which are pending before the Court.


For the record: the Public Defender is not a party to the Trust and did not give full disclosure to the Defendant for the Office of the Public Defender to represent Defendant; nor did the Constitution grant attorneys any authority to assert themselves between the People and their government(s), as reason for Court to appoint any attorney to speak for or in behalf of the living person in any manner, shape or form.

Furthermore, the Defendant chooses to exercise his constitutional right(s) to properly present his own Person and/or have effective assistance of counsel to represent him in a court of law, to properly defend against the State's false charges in the above case(s).

Let the Court now dismiss the State appointed attorney(s) and/or regional counsel that failed to correctly "Stand By" the Defendant, according to Law, as the constitution permits him to have options.

Respectfully,

Duran Codner
www.DURANCODNER.com
New Jerusalem, State of Jah
10534 SW 18 Street, Hollywood, FL
randolphcodner@yahoo.com
(305)342-6528



(Signature: U.C.C. 1- 308)

To Be Filed:

**In the Circuit/County Court of
the First Judicial Circuit, in and
for Escambia County, Florida**

STATE OF FLORIDA

(Plaintiff)

vs

**Case No.: 25-CF-002851 A
Case No.: 25-CF-002852 A**

DURAN CODNER

(Defendant)

Judge: _____

Notice of Withdrawal of Plea


Comes Now, **DURAN CODNER**, the above Defendant, by and through Duran Codner a Beneficiary & Jah Rastafari Malchizedek, an Interested Person for the said Defendant, with this **Notice of Withdrawal of Plea** to withdraw all pleadings and motions made by the Public Defender, for the Court to hear the Defendant's Demand to Prove Jurisdiction which is pending before this Court; And states the following: (1) Defendant does not understand the nature & cause of the accusation against him; (2) Defendant seeks to know the court's intent in order to prepare defense; (3) Defendant was misrepresented by Public Defender who is not a party to the Trust, does not have lawful consent to represent Defendant & who was dismissed for ineffective assistance of counsel; (4) Defendant was uninformed or misinformed,

threatened, forced and/or coerced by policy enforcers into submission.

Defendant also states that this Court cannot move forward according to the constitutional laws, without the issue of personal and/or subject matter jurisdiction first being resolved.

Therefore, let this Court set the time and date convenient to hear this cause and notify all parties of the proceedings according to law.

Respectfully,



(Signature: U.C.C. 1-308)

Duran Codner
www.DURANCODNER.com
New Jerusalem, State of Jah
10534 SW 18 Street, Hollywood, FL
Representative for Defendant
randolphcodner@yahoo.com
(305)342-6528

To Be Filed:

**In the Circuit/County Court of the 1st Judicial Circuit in
and for Escambia County, Florida**

STATE OF FLORIDA

(Plaintiff)

Vs

Case No.: **25-CF-002851 A**

Case No.: **25-CF-002852 A**

JUDGE: _____

DURAN CODNER

(Defendant)

DEMAND TO PROVE JURISDICTION

Comes now, **DURAN CODNER** the above Defendant, by and through Duran Codner a Beneficiary and Jah Rastafari Malchizedek an Interested Person of the said Defendant, who is hereinafter known as the Accused, with this Demand to Prove Jurisdiction and states the following:

1. The Accused was wrongfully arrested, falsely charged and coerced into making court appearances associated with the above case under threat and duress, which voids the promise to appear, which forms an unconscionable contract. Knowing failure to disclose material information necessary to prevent statement from being misleading, or making

representation despite knowledge that it has no reasonable basis in fact, are actionable as fraud under Florida law. *Rubinstein v. Collins*, 20 F.3d 160, 1990.

2. The Accused was not paid consideration to perform the obligation of the promise to appear under the Uniform Commercial Code.

3. No antecedent obligation of the Accused to be subjected to a liability associated with the above case has been submitted into evidence.

4. The Accused was not involved in commerce at the time of the 'so called' incident or alleged crime.

5. The Accused's body is not a vessel as described in 18 U.S.C. 7(1).

United States Code Title 18 § 7. Special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States defined

The term "special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States", as used in this title, includes:

(A) The high seas, any other waters within the admiralty and maritime jurisdiction of the United States and out of the jurisdiction of any particular State, and any vessel belonging in whole or in part to the United States or any citizen thereof, or to any corporation created by or under the laws of the United States, or of any State, Territory, District, or possession thereof, when such vessel is within the admiralty and maritime jurisdiction of the United States and out of the jurisdiction of any particular State.

(B) Any vessel registered, licensed, or enrolled under the laws of the United States, and being on a voyage upon the waters of any of the Great Lakes, or any of the waters

connecting them, or upon the Saint Lawrence River where the same constitutes the International Boundary Line.

6. There is no contract between the Plaintiff and the Accused which gives the Plaintiff interest in the Accused and no evidence of such interest has been admitted into evidence.

7. There is no contract between the Plaintiff and the Accused which gives the plaintiff interest in the Accused's private automobile and no evidence of such interest has been admitted into evidence.

8. The Accused has been denied the Nature and Cause of the accusations associated with the above case. The constitutional right to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation entitles the defendant to insist that the indictment apprise him of the crime charged with such reasonable certainty that he can make his defense and protect himself after judgment against another prosecution on the same charge. *United States v. Cruikshank*, 92 U.S. 542, 544, 558 (1876); *United States v. Simmons*, 96 U.S. 360 (1878); *Bartell v. United States*, 227 U.S. 427 (1913); *Burton v. United States*, 202 U.S. 344 (1906).

9. The prosecution has the burden of proof to show that the court has subject matter jurisdiction. **"A man must assign a good reason for coming (to the court). If the fact is denied, upon which he grounds his right to come (into the court), he must prove it. He, therefore, is the actor in the proof, and, consequently, he has no right, where the point is contested, to throw the onus probandi on the defendant."** *Maxfield's Lessee v. Levy*, 4 U.S. 330. [Emphasis added]

10. The Accused demands this court to take Judicial Notice that it does not have subject matter jurisdiction.

When a judge knows that he lacks jurisdiction, or acts in the face of clearly valid statutes expressly depriving him of jurisdiction, judicial immunity is lost. Rankin v. Howard, (1980) 633 F.2d 844, cert. den. Zeller v. Rankin, 101 S.Ct. 2020, 451 U.S. 939, 68 L.Ed 2d 326.

A judge must be acting within his jurisdiction as to subject matter and person, to be entitled to immunity from civil action for his acts. Davis v. Burris, 51 Ariz. 220, 75 P.2d 689 (1938).

When a judicial officer acts entirely without jurisdiction or without compliance with jurisdiction requisites he may be held civilly liable for abuse of process even though his act involved a decision made in good faith, that he had jurisdiction. Little v. U.S. Fidelity & Guaranty Co., 217 Miss. 576, 64 So. 2d 697.

"No judicial process, whatever form it may assume, can have any lawful authority outside of the limits of the jurisdiction of the court or judge by whom it is issued; and an attempt to enforce it beyond these boundaries is nothing less than lawless violence." Ableman v. Booth, 21 Howard 506 (1859).

"We (judges) have no more right to decline the exercise of jurisdiction which is given, than to usurp that which is not given. The one or the other would be treason to the Constitution." Cohen v. Virginia, (1821), 6 Wheat. 264 and U.S. v. Will, 499 U.S. 200.

Typically, challenges to a court's jurisdiction pertain to

criminal proceedings and prosecutions -- whereby an accused, or a defendant, may challenge a court's jurisdiction to adjudicate a criminal case. The maxim of law therefore, substantiated by numerous cases cited, is that once challenged, a court's jurisdiction must be proven.

"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." Melo v. US, 505 F2d 1026.

"Court must prove on the record, all jurisdiction facts related to the jurisdiction asserted." Latana v. Hopper, 102 F. 2d 188; Chicago v. New York, 37 F Supp. 150.

"The law provides that once State and Federal Jurisdiction has been challenged, it must be proven." Main v. Thiboutot, 100 S. Ct. 2502 (1980).

"Jurisdiction can be challenged at any time." and "Jurisdiction, once challenged, cannot be assumed and must be decided." Basso v. Utah Power & Light Co., 495 F 2d 906, 910.

"Defense of lack of jurisdiction over the subject matter may be raised at any time, even on appeal." Hill Top Developers v. Holiday Pines Service Corp., 478 So. 2d. 368 (Fla 2nd DCA 1985)

"Once challenged, jurisdiction cannot be assumed, it must be proved to exist." Stuck v. Medical Examiners, 94 Ca 2d 751. 211 P2d 389.

"There is no discretion to ignore that lack of jurisdiction." Joyce v. US, 474 F2d 215.

"The burden shifts to the court to prove jurisdiction." Rosemond v. Lambert, 469 F2d 416.

"A universal principle as old as the law is that proceedings of a court without jurisdiction are a nullity and its judgment therein without effect either on person or property." Norwood v. Renfield, 34 C 329; Ex Parte Giambonini, 49 P. 732.

"Jurisdiction is fundamental and a judgment rendered by a court that does not have jurisdiction to hear is void, ab initio." In Re Application of Wyatt, 300 P. 132; Re Cavitt, 118 P2d 846.

"Thus, where a judicial tribunal has no jurisdiction of the subject matter on which it assumes to act, its proceedings are absolutely void in the fullest sense of the term." Dillon v. Dillon, 187 P 27.

"Where a court failed to observe safeguards, it amounts to denial of due process of law, court is deprived of juris." Merritt v. Hunter, C.A. Kansas 170 F2d 739.

"An action by Department of Motor Vehicles, whether directly or through a court sitting administratively as the hearing officer, must be clearly defined in the statute before it has subject matter jurisdiction, without such jurisdiction of the licensee, all acts of the agency, by its employees, agents, hearing officers, are null and void." Doolan v. Carr, 125 US 618; City v. Pearson, 181 Cal. 640.

"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". Thompson v. Smith, 154 SE 583.

"A judge ceases to sit as a judicial officer because the governing principle of administrative law provides that courts are prohibited from substituting their evidence, testimony, record, arguments, and rationale for that of the agency. Additionally, courts are prohibited from substituting their judgment for that of the agency. Courts in administrative issues are prohibited from even listening to or hearing arguments, presentation, or rationale." ASIS v. US, 568 F2d 284.

"Ministerial officers are incompetent to receive grants of judicial power from the legislature, their acts in attempting to exercise such powers are necessarily nullities." Burns v. Sup. Ct., SF, 140 Cal. 1.

"The elementary doctrine that the constitutionality of a legislative act is open to attack only by persons whose rights are affected thereby, applies to statute relating to administrative agencies, the validity of which may not be called into question in the absence of a showing of substantial harm, actual or impending, to a legally protected interest directly resulting from the enforcement of the statute." Board of Trade v. Olson, 262 US 1; 29 ALR 2d 105.

Whereas, the Accused states that this court lacks personal & subject matter jurisdiction and demands that the above case(s) be "Nolle Pros" as in previous incidents (reference to Case # 16008725CF10A - State v Codner, Broward County & Case # B-25-004273 - State v Codner, Dade County) or

charges dismissed as the Accused and/or Interested Person will be specially appearing for the matter/cause.

Estoppel by Silence: Failure to respond in a timely manner according to law constitutes tacit withdrawal of the claim.

Respectfully,

Duran Codner


www.DURANCODNER.com

New Jerusalem, State of Jah

10534 SW 18 Street, Hollywood, FL

randolphcodner@yahoo.com

(305)342-6528

By: 

(Signature: W/O Prejudice U.C.C. 1-308)

Exhibit # 11

STATE OF JAH
CERTIFICATION
OF BIRTH

This certifies that

Duran Jamal

*was reborn on the 21st of February 1994 A.D. to Randolph and Crystal in
the house of Godner*

FOR THE GLORY OF GOD

July 24, 2024

DATE

Jah Rastafari Malchizedek

WITNESS

Certificate of Service

I and I, Duran Codner, certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing is hereby furnished to the parties of the above proceeding, via USPS at the addresses listed below on, February, 23rd, 2026:

1. Pam Childers, Clerk of Court, 190 W. Government Street, Pensacola, FL 32502;
2. Bruce A. Miller, Office of the Public Defender, 190 W. Government Street, Pensacola, FL 32502;
3. Ginger Bowden Madden, Office of State Attorney, 190 W. Government Street, Pensacola, FL 32502;
4. John Miller, Chief/Trial Judge, 190 W. Government Street, Pensacola, FL 32502;
5. *Chip Simmons. Sheriff. 1700 W. Leonard Street, Pensacola, FL 32501.*

Duran Codner
www.DURANCODNER.com
New Jerusalem, State of Jah
10534 SW 18 Street, Hollywood, FL
randolphcodner@yahoo.com
(305)342-6528



(Signature: U.C.C. 1- 308)