

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

---

CHRISTINA CLEMENT and  
HH EMPRESS QUEEN CHRISTINA LOCS IS OUR ARTIFACT OF FAITH

Plaintiff,

v.

Attorney General Merrick Garland;  
Chief Justice John Roberts Jr.,  
Secretary General of the United Nations;  
Registrar-Peace Palace Carnegie Pleinz et al in their official capacity

Defendant,

**Civil No: 1:24-cv-00479-RC**

**Respondent MOTION FOR Additional Supplemental Pleadings**

**Response to “LEAVE TO FILE GRANTED”**

**Case 1:24cv 00479-RC Document 13 Filed 5/28/2024 Page 1 of 8**

**Status Conference-Motion for Expedited Decision- Writ of Mandamus: Marbury vs  
Madison; Administrative Procedure Act of 1946 5 USC 551-559; Article III of the  
Constitution**

In the matters of Class Action for restitution for kidnapping during the Atlantic slave trade genocide (Revealed the Kingdom of Locs Nazirite Vow Continues Volume 1-3 including glossary, culture and heritage) I proved the governments cause with the Sergeant and colonial Willie and Charles Lynch included in the Case 1:24 cv 00479-rc Document 1 Filed 02/13/2024 which received copy returned missing the pages of what is known as the “Willie Lynch letter”; The cause of the kidnapping was to farm cotton this cotton was used to created the American dollar. The American dollar is 75% cotton and within this judicial review I arise the various Congress enactments of slave related laws that violate the constitutional principles including but not limited to the Slave acts, both before and after the Civil War, such as:

**RECEIVED**

**JUN 21 2024**  
Clerk, U.S. District & Bankruptcy  
Court for the District of Columbia

1. Fugitive Slave Act of 1793: This law required the return of escaped enslaved people to their enslavers and imposed penalties on anyone who helped them escape.
2. Slave Trade Act of 1807: This act prohibited the importation of enslaved people into the United States, effective January 1, 1808.
3. Missouri Compromise of 1820: This compromise admitted Missouri as a slave state and Maine as a free state, maintaining the balance of power. It also prohibited slavery in the Louisiana Territory north of the 36°30' parallel.
4. Compromise of 1850: A package of five laws intended to resolve disputes over the status of territories acquired during the Mexican-American War. Key elements included the admission of California as a free state, the establishment of Utah and New Mexico with the question of slavery to be decided by popular sovereignty, and the enactment of a stronger Fugitive Slave Act.
5. Fugitive Slave Act of 1850: Part of the Compromise of 1850, this law strengthened the provisions of the 1793 act, making it easier for enslavers to recover escaped enslaved people and imposing harsher penalties on those who aided fugitives.
6. Kansas-Nebraska Act of 1854: This act created the territories of Kansas and Nebraska, leaving the question of whether to allow slavery in these territories to be decided by popular sovereignty, effectively repealing the Missouri Compromise.
7. 13th Amendment to the Constitution (1865): Although not an act of Congress in the traditional sense, this amendment was passed by Congress and ratified by the states, officially abolishing slavery throughout the United States.

These acts reflect the contentious and evolving nature of slavery legislation in the United States leading up to and following the Civil War. With the winning participation of Black, Native, Indigenous, Aboriginal and loc Nationites soldier (s) of every war that credited America as superpower our involvement also provides that right to enact laws to protect the majority party from the tyranny of minority party with tyranny being evident throughout 500 years of genocide and injustices. In the Case 1:24 cv 00479-RC you will find substantial and specific evidence to support claims of constitutional violations and systemic injustices.

The Federalist Papers, written by Alexander Hamilton, James Madison, and John Jay, discuss various aspects of the proposed U.S. Constitution, including the judiciary's role and the principle of judicial review. Key Federalist Papers that touch on judicial review include Federalist No. 78 and Federalist No. 81.

Federalist No. 78 Author: Alexander Hamilton

Key Points:

- Independence of the Judiciary: Hamilton argues that the judiciary must be independent to protect against legislative encroachments and to serve as a check on the other branches of

government. Is it safe to argue that this was in the same mind frame to instill Public Trust and Governance, Accountability, Stewardship and responsibility, transparency in the very constitutional principles? How has this concept not fail the people I represent if the constitution was created to "Protect the minority from the tyranny of the majority" by creating Bill of Rights which ensures that fundamental rights of individuals and minority groups are safe guarded against potential encroachments by the majority; Separation of Powers which established a system of checks and balances among the three branches of government thereby protecting minority interest from potential abuses by the majority faction dominating one branch; federalism the division of powers between the federal government and state governments provides another layer of protection for minority rights; judicial review even this process established by Marbury vs Madison 1803 allows federal courts to review the constitutionality of laws and executive actions to ensure that laws passed by the minority do not violate the rights protected by the Constitution.

This fact Is evidence that there is a lack of laws that protect the majority from the abuse and tyranny of the minority until now. Case 1:24 cv 00479 RC

- Judicial Review: He asserts that the courts have the duty to interpret laws and determine their constitutionality. Hamilton writes, "The interpretation of the laws is the proper and peculiar province of the courts. A constitution is, in fact, and must be regarded by the judges, as a fundamental law." Fundamental law is providing stability and consistency; supreme legal authority? How is this the case when the system is knowingly created to protect the minority party? Basic legal principles that are considered essential to the functionality of a legal system, principles such as due process, equality before the law, and the rule of law itself. These principles have failed the communities I represent even in this case 1:24 cv 00479 equality would have been to grant the default judgement in April 2024 according to Rule 55. And the same equality was not considered with the Fugitive slave act that was passed by congress which failed the people I represents great grands of the past.

- Protection of Rights: Judicial review serves to protect individual rights by ensuring that neither the legislature nor the executive exceeds its constitutional authority. I have shown and submitted facts and evidence that there is a lack of protection for the majority party against the tyranny of the minority. Which then can rest the argument to the various injustices felt by the Afro, indigenous, native, aboriginal communities. How can a judiciary role be done with the absence of governing laws to adhere to for the majority party? I submitted An Act and Charter to fill that gap with the State of Loc Nations legal framework to govern and contribute to the constitution as that was the original intent of King henry II when he introduced the English Common law framework for the judicial consistency and fairness. Also mentioned was several detrimental consequences that can arise to a specific group should consistency and fairness in the administration of justice fails. 1. Injustice 2. Loss of Trust 3.Social Unrest 4. Cycle of

disadvantage 5. Legal precedent 6. Human rights violations and to date that is the consistent outcry of grievance which means there are cases of prejudices tainting the system of Justice which needs to be eradicated and remedied. Case 1:24 cv 00479- RC Document 26 06/20/24 1-16

Excerpts:

- "No legislative act, therefore, contrary to the Constitution, can be valid. To deny this, would be to affirm, that the deputy is greater than his principal; that the servant is above his master; that the representatives of the people are superior to the people themselves; that men acting by virtue of powers, may do not only what their powers do not authorize, but what they forbid." According to this excerpt that would point the light to all legislative laws that promoted, supported and enforced the violation and protection of the individual rights of the communities I represent to date. IF a legislative act conflicts with the constitution it lacks validity and cannot be enforced. However, a severe traumatic history along with the brutal genocide of the slavery history and the stolen lands even presented in the trail of tears speaks truth to fact the amendments added to now protect those rights, partially. Is acknowledgement that this principle was not adhere to. Which further provides evidence any action of law by the government that contradicts the constitution would imply that the government is placing itself above the constitution which undermines the rule of law. The statutes are corrupted with such decisions for the people I represent who have been wrongfully convicted for years and to date.

- "The interpretation of the laws is the proper and peculiar province of the courts. A constitution is, in fact, and must be regarded by the judges, as a fundamental law." I have submitted enough facts and evidence to assist the Judge with his duty to interpret those laws and provide ruling based on the interpretation in the favor of the plaintiff for all prayers for relief sought without undue influence and external pressure and offered a viable solution to prevent further infractions in the future adhering to the principals of consistent and fair application. I called for this Judicial review in hopes of obtaining the proper closure with the remedy to grant the max restitution and all prayers for relief.

Federalist No. 81 Author: Alexander Hamilton

Key Points:

- Scope of Judicial Power: Hamilton discusses the scope of judicial power, including appellate jurisdiction and the balance between state and federal courts. The case 1:24 cv 00479 RC was brought for said balance with the complaint to contest oath of office, unfair practices in the election for independent party of State of Loc Nation, sovereign state, majority party Hyper power to the Super Power. However, in the process the right to speedy trial was violated, amongst pages being altered, clerk errors and certain pages not stamped during clerk processing. This issue has been pointed out in email correspondence with the clerks along with notifying the

Ant deficiency act rep because the clerk failed to notify them in the immediate time according to the Anti deficiency act. I help her/him be in compliance with my email directly alerting the appropriate parties noted on Document 19 Case 1:24 cv 00479-RC. Court notations were revised, after my email sent to representatives of goa.gov, with "19 Entered in error....Notice of Filing ,,,,,sent to chambers for review."

- Judicial Review Reaffirmed: He reinforces the idea that the judiciary has the authority to invalidate laws that conflict with the Constitution. There is no conflict with the constitution, there is a lack of constitutional protection for the majority party. Inclusion of State of Loc Nations Legal framework cures that gap.

- Separation of Powers: Hamilton emphasizes the importance of maintaining a clear separation of powers among the branches of government, with the judiciary serving as a check on legislative and executive actions. This separation must also include the protections of the majority party to be separate and in harmony.

Excerpts:

- "It is not contended that acts of the larger society which are not pursuant to its constitutional powers, but which are invasions of the residuary authorities of the smaller societies, will become the supreme law of the land. These will be merely acts of usurpation, and will deserve to be treated as such."

This is not the case, in fact, I have followed the constitution and US Code and because there lack any governance I enact the inclusion of laws to govern the majority party from the tyranny of the minority party. The house and senate operates by "majority rules" therefore assuming the position with grounds of our forefathers participation in the wars won by the efforts and blood of our great grands. Article II and further 12<sup>th</sup> amendment operates on a majority rules within each state which grants me Christina Clement President Candidate to win the presidency with the communities I represent. The population was submitted in Case 1:24 cv 00479 RC Document15 Filed 06/01/2024 also can be referenced in "Revealed the Kingdom of Locs Nazirite Vow continues Volume 2" authored by HH Empress Queen Christina Clement 725 pages ISBN-13 979-8218228460 including the Practitioners guide from ICJ.

Significance of the Federalist Papers on Judicial Review

The Federalist Papers laid the intellectual foundation for the concept of judicial review, even though the Constitution itself does not explicitly grant this power. Hamilton's writings in Federalist No. 78 and No. 81 articulate the rationale for an independent judiciary that can act as a

safeguard against unconstitutional legislative and executive actions. These ideas were later solidified in practice by the landmark Supreme Court case *Marbury v. Madison* (1803), where Chief Justice John Marshall cited the principles espoused in *The Federalist Papers* to assert the Court's authority to review and nullify unconstitutional laws.

At the 1787 Constitutional Convention, a proposal to include the phrase, "new States shall be admitted on the same terms with the original States", was defeated. It was feared that the political power of future new western states would eventually overwhelm that of the established eastern states. Once the new Constitution went into effect, however, Congress admitted Vermont and Kentucky on equal terms and thereafter formalized the condition in its acts of admission for subsequent states, declaring that the new state enters "on an equal footing with the original States in all respects whatever." Thus the Congress, utilizing the discretion allowed by the framers, adopted a policy of equal status for all newly admitted states.<sup>[3]</sup> With the growth of states' rights advocacy during the antebellum period, the Supreme Court asserted, in *Lessee of Pollard v. Hagan* (1845), that the Constitution mandated admission of new states on the basis of equality.

Violation in Question with Case 1:24 cv 00479 RC and need to submit laws that protect the majority party against the tyranny of the minority in all laws and specific to

- Freedom of religion
- Freedom of speech
- Freedom of the press
- Freedom of assembly
- Right to petition
- Freedom of association

- Right to privacy
- Freedom from slavery
- Due process
- Equal protection
- Voting rights
- Right to candidacy
- Comprehensible rules

Expected Principles the Courts are to adhere to:

- Separation of powers
- Individual rights
- Rule of law
- Federalism

- Republicanism
- Equal footing
- Strict scrutiny

In the matter of Contesting the oath of office, how can any oath be committed to when the constitution is designed to protect a group that was written against them. Without the insert of laws to protect the majority party each officer is in violation because the constitution is to protect all individuals and groups not just a select view. Title 8 Chapter 4 under Freedman has no laws and I submitted to insert the State of loc Nation legal framework to govern the communities I represent under Title 53 which is reserved.

In the matter of Contesting the election, I have submitted the unfair amount of signatures required from me as an independent party leading to a huge disadvantage and unfair public awareness of all parties running for president which is violation of the USC code

Unfair or restrictive signature requirements imposed by states can violate several constitutional principles and federal laws:

1. First Amendment (Freedom of Speech and Assembly): Excessively burdensome signature requirements could infringe upon individuals' rights to freedom of speech and assembly. If the requirements make it unduly difficult for candidates or initiatives to gather support or express their views effectively, it may be seen as a violation of the First Amendment. The results can be seen from the fundraising initiative of to date \$100. Because the community expects to see me campaigning on tv and in various press conferences and groupings that can't happen when the press expects to see your name on the ballot before covering your campaign and a candidate can't fundraise without public awareness. Even the case 1:24 cv 00479-rc was not introduced to the press as stated in courts very own Reporters Guide to Applications for Summary Judgements and Injunctive Relief.

2. Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment: The Fourteenth Amendment prohibits states from denying any person within their jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws. If signature requirements disproportionately burden certain groups or individuals, such as independent candidates or minority and majority parties, they have violated this clause. I have included as a remedy to add my name Rev Dr Christina Clement to all State ballots and alert media to provide equal time as all 2024 Presidential Candidates.

3. Voting Rights Act of 1965: Under the Voting Rights Act (VRA), practices that have a discriminatory impact on minority voters can be challenged. This includes signature requirements that make it disproportionately difficult for minority candidates or parties to access the ballot. This is also a hindrance to the majority party as well since they rely on the normality of Press public awareness. There is no main stream media press to date that has covered my 2024 Presidential campaign.



4. Reynolds v. Sims (1964) part of a series of Warren Court cases: This Supreme Court decision established the principle of "one person, one vote," ensuring that electoral districts are roughly equal in population size. While not directly related to signature requirements, it underscores the principle of fairness and equal access in electoral processes, which could inform challenges to overly restrictive signature rules. I have submitted the population for State of Loc Nation a population of every Afro Class; indigenous, aboriginal, native and loc Nationites in calculation which gives us majority vote and elects me Christina Clement as President. The letter to US General Services Administration Robin Carnahan was included Case 1:24 cv 00479-RC Document 23 Filed 6/10/24 Pages 1-18

5. Federal Statutory Law: Depending on the specific nature of the signature requirements, they might also be challenged under federal statutory law if they conflict with federal election regulations or requirements. See chart provided in Case 1:24 cv 00479-RC Document 1-1 filed 2/13/2024 page 27-30. This document also is missing pages from the original submitted document.

The State of Loc Nation legal basis and precedents with International recognition was submitted Case 1:24 cv 00479-RC Document 16 Filed 06/02/2024 Pages 1-9; Ancestry contributions and legal recognitions Case 1:24 cv 00479-RC Document 17 filed 06/04/24 Pages 1-17.

All submitted documents support the motion to Grant Plaintiff relief and writ to execute all max restitution prayed for within the case. Due to clerks' omission of documents I can resubmit original files if needed.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. Should the Court require any further information or documentation, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Respectfully submitted, Thank you for your attention to this matter.



Rev. Dr. Christina Clement, Presidential Candidate of the US 2024  
8 The Green, Suite A

Dover, DE 19901

678-780-5557

Rule 5 (c) Signing. Amade through a person's electronic –filing account and authorized by that person, together with that person's name on a signature block, constitutes the person's signature.



**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on June 21, 2024, I electronically emailed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court using the email address [dcd\\_cmecf@dcd.uscourts.gov](mailto:dcd_cmecf@dcd.uscourts.gov) and [dcd\\_intake@dcd.uscourts.gov](mailto:dcd_intake@dcd.uscourts.gov), which clerk will send notice to all parties.

“CHRISTINA CLEMENT, PM