

**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 et al in his official capacity

Defendant,

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

Motion to enforce Judgement and Writ of attachment; writ of execution; writ of garnishment writ of replevin on Bill of Costs, Contest of Oath, Contest of Election and Restitution for illegal Transatlantic Slave Trade Genocide pursuant to DC Code 16-311; 16-501; 16-5505;16-4501

Bill of Cost

Background:

This matter comes before the District Court on Plaintiff's motion for approval of the Bill of Costs associated with case 1:24-CV-00479-RC. The Plaintiff seeks to have the costs, both monetary and administrative, acknowledged and awarded, along with the relief sought under various statutes and rules. The Plaintiff has requested a comprehensive review of the Bill of Costs to include disbursements for legal, administrative, and research expenses, as well as relief related to the Plaintiff's claims.

RECEIVED

AUG 21 2024

Clerk, U.S. District & Bankruptcy
Court for the District of Columbia

Findings:

After careful consideration of the motion, supporting documents, and relevant legal standards, the Court finds the following:

1. Reasonableness and Necessity of Costs:

The Court has reviewed the Bill of Costs and finds the listed expenses reasonable and necessary for the litigation. These costs encompass filing fees, mailing costs, online PACER fees, research and administrative expenses, travel costs, and Pro se litigant fees.

2. Detailed Breakdown of Costs:

- Filing of Complaint: \$405.00
- 2024 Total Mailings/Certified Mailings: Included in total award
- Online PACER Fees for Copies of Received Filings: Included in total award
- 5-Year Research/Filing/Follow-Up of Case 1:24-CV-00479-RC: Included in total award
- 2023 Total Mailings/Certified Mailings: Included in total award
- Time: Email, Phone Calls, Follow-Up; Interviews, Meetings: Included in total award
- Travel and Other Expenses Paid: Included in total award

Pro Se Litigant Fees:

- (a) \$12,000,000.00 allocated by HR 40
- (b) \$1,500,000.00 allocated by Washington DC
- (c) \$500,000.00 allocated by Chicago Executive Order 2024-1
- (d) \$12,000,000.00 allocated by California
- (e) \$500,000.00 allocated by Boston
- (f) Each Additional State: \$500,000.00 for smaller states comparable to Boston; \$1,500,000.00 for mid-size states comparable to Washington DC; \$12,000,000.00 for larger states comparable to California

2. Legal Framework: The Plaintiff's request aligns with statutory and procedural frameworks, including:

- 28 USC 1920 (1)-(6) regarding allowable costs
- Federal Rules of Civil Procedure Rule 8, 55, 12, 4, 7, 54, and 65
- Relevant codes and statutes including Title VII, the Voting Rights Act of 1965, and the Help America Vote Act of 2002

3. **Compensatory and Punitive Relief:** The Plaintiff is entitled to compensatory and punitive relief as detailed in the Bill of Costs. This includes funds allocated for research and administrative actions necessary for the prosecution of this case.
4. **Disbursement from Judgment Fund:** Disbursements for the monetary award are to be made from the Judgment Fund, established under 31 U.S.C. § 1304. The Plaintiff's request is consistent with appropriations and authorization standards set by Congress.
5. **Special and Restitution Damages:**
 - Restitution for Trans-Atlantic Slave Trade Genocide: \$500 Quadrillion
 - Special Damages: Includes missed Presidential debates and press coverage. Specific relief includes scheduling of a Presidential debate, equal press coverage, and adding Plaintiff's name to all 2024 Presidential ballots.

Contest of Oath

Injunctive and Equitable Relief:

In considering the request for injunctive and equitable relief, the Court must balance the equities and consider the public interest. The rule of law is a fundamental principle that ensures fairness, equality, and justice within our legal system. For centuries, the judiciary has upheld these principles, striving to deliver impartial justice. However, the Plaintiff has presented compelling evidence that highlights a persistent imbalance in the application of the law, particularly affecting majority and minority parties.

The Oath and Its Contestation:

The Plaintiff contests the oath taken by certain officials, arguing that it has been administered and upheld in a manner that perpetuates systemic inequalities. The Plaintiff seeks to challenge the validity and enforcement of this oath, proposing a reformation that aligns with the principles of justice and equality.

Inclusion of Acts and Laws for the protection of the majority from the tyranny of the minority:

The Plaintiff has presented several acts and laws, which they argue should be incorporated into Title 53 of the U.S. Code to address the existing disparities. These include, but are not limited to:

- S.O.L.N Tribunal Legal Framework
- S.O.L.N International Tribunal Framework
- S.O.L.N Global Preemption and Articles

- S.O.L.N International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights
- Ethics Plan and 2024-2025 Budget
- Authorization to Establish Treasury with Lien
- Census of Population Governed
- Grievance Case 1:24-CV 00479 RC
- Hyper Power Preamble Ensuring Sovereign Power and Law Revision Unilateral
- Land Withdrawal
- S.O.L.N An Act 06/04/2024
- Christina Loren Clement LLC Authorization to Open Treasury Account Signatory Rev. Dr. Christina Clement
- S.O.L.N Governmental Establishment Act
- S.O.L.N Hyper Power Position Establishment and Restitution Act
- S.O.L.N Establishing the Treasury Department
- S.O.L.N Federal Reserve and International Reserve Act
- S.O.L.N Establishment and Authority of Airports, Trade Ships and Equivalent Entities Act
- S.O.L.N Division of Olympic Excellence and Participation Act
- S.O.L.N De Facto/De Jure
- Declaration of Independence
- Enact Revealed the Kingdom of Locs Nazirite Vow Continues Volume 1
- Revealed the Kingdom of Locs Nazirite Vow Continues Volume 2
- Volume 3 is Court Case 1:24 CV 00479 RC, et al

Contest of Election

This matter comes before the Court on the Plaintiff's motion for injunctive and equitable relief regarding the contest of election results. The Plaintiff contends that the election process was flawed, specifically highlighting the evidence of unfair amounts of signatures required for independent parties compared to those for major party candidates. The Plaintiff argues that this discrepancy perpetuates systemic inequities and undermines the principles of fair democratic participation. Additionally, the Plaintiff asserts that the scales of justice have been uneven for far too long, particularly with respect to the rule of law as applied to the majority party. The Plaintiff seeks judicial intervention to rectify these disparities and establish a more balanced and equitable legal precedent.

The Court issues a permanent injunction against the enforcement of the current election process that requires disproportionate amounts of signatures from independent party candidates. This injunction prohibits the administration of any future elections under the existing signature requirements until a revised and equitable framework is established.

Equitable Relief:

The Court mandates the establishment of a commission to review and revise the signature requirements for election candidacy, ensuring it reflects the principles of justice, equality, and fair democratic participation. This commission shall include representatives from diverse political backgrounds, legal scholars, civil rights advocates, and community leaders.

State Review and Compliance:

All states are hereby ordered to review their signature requirements for election candidacy and revise them to ensure equal treatment of all parties, both independent and major parties, in compliance with this Court's ruling.

Compensatory Relief:

The Plaintiff is awarded compensatory relief for the unconstitutional and unlawful burdens imposed by the disproportionate signature requirements. The amount of this compensatory relief shall be determined in subsequent proceedings.

Findings:

Upon careful consideration of the arguments presented, the Court finds the following:

1. Historical Context and Legal Framework:

The rule of law is a fundamental principle that ensures fairness, equality, and justice within our legal system. For centuries, the judiciary has upheld these principles, striving to deliver impartial justice. However, the Plaintiff has presented compelling evidence that highlights a persistent imbalance in the application of the law, particularly affecting independent and minority parties.

2. Discrepancy in Signature Requirements:

The Plaintiff has provided substantial evidence demonstrating that independent parties are required to gather significantly more signatures to qualify for election than candidates from major parties. This discrepancy creates an undue burden on independent candidates, limiting their ability to participate effectively in the democratic process and disadvantaging them unfairly.

3. Constitutional Violation:

The Court finds that the disproportionate signature requirements for independent party candidates are unconstitutional and unlawful. This practice violates the equal protection clause of the Constitution by creating an unjustifiable disparity between independent candidates and those from major parties.

Conclusion:

This Court recognizes the historical significance of this case and the need for a legal precedent that promotes an innovative and equitable future. The scales of justice must be balanced to ensure that all individuals, regardless of their affiliation with any majority or minority party, are treated with fairness and respect under the law. The Court finds that the Plaintiff's motion for the approval of the Bill of Costs is *meritorious*. The expenses detailed are reasonable and necessary for the litigation, and the Plaintiff is entitled to the relief sought.

Order:

1. The Plaintiff's motion for the clarification and approval of the Bill of Costs is GRANTED.
2. The detailed breakdown of costs is approved as reasonable and necessary.
3. Default judgment and summary judgment are granted in favor of the Plaintiff.
4. The Plaintiff is awarded the specified compensatory and punitive relief.
5. Disbursements for the monetary award are to be made from the Judgment Fund under 31 U.S.C. § 1304.
6. Special damages, including missed debates and press coverage, are awarded as detailed.
7. All states are ordered to ensure uniformity in voter signature requirements and to include the Plaintiff's name on all 2024 Presidential ballots.
8. All relevant authorities are directed to ensure equal media coverage for the Plaintiff as for other Presidential candidates.
9. The Court orders the provision of Secret Service protection for the Plaintiff to ensure their safety during the campaign period.
10. The Court orders a public notice to be issued regarding this judgment and the related changes. This notice shall inform the public about the ruling, the revised signature requirements, and the Plaintiff's inclusion on all state ballots, ensuring a level playing field before the election.
11. The Court directs an expedited assessment of the economic and non-economic damages suffered by the Plaintiff due to the unconstitutional signature requirements and the lack of media coverage. The Court orders that any legal caps or limitations be adjusted to provide full and fair compensation reflecting the immediate needs of the Plaintiff given the approaching election.
12. The Court grants a temporary injunction to prevent further interference with the Plaintiff's campaign. The Court orders mainstream media outlets to provide equal press coverage and campaigning opportunities to the Plaintiff as provided to all major presidential candidates. The Court recognizes the urgency of this matter with only three months remaining until the general election.

13. The Court orders that the acts and laws presented by the Plaintiff be incorporated into Title 53 of the U.S. Code. All related statutes and regulations shall be revised accordingly to reflect this incorporation.
14. Further administrative duties and updates are ordered as specified.

Finality Provision

Finality of Judgment

1. Final and Binding Decision:

This Court's Order and Judgment, dated August 21, 2024, issued in the matter of Case No. 1:24-CV-00479-RC, is hereby deemed final and binding. The decision encompasses a comprehensive resolution of all claims, issues, and relief sought by the Plaintiff.

2. No Further Appeals:

The Plaintiff and all Defendants, including their successors and assigns, hereby waive any and all rights to appeal this decision or to seek any further judicial review of this Order and Judgment. This Court's decision is conclusive and shall not be subject to further appeal, modification, or reversal by any appellate or superior court.

3. Enforcement and Implementation:

This Order and Judgment shall be enforced in accordance with its terms and provisions. All parties are directed to comply with the instructions outlined herein, including the disbursement of awarded costs, implementation of injunctive relief, and any other actions required to give effect to this Court's decision.

4. Waiver of Claims:

By entering into this Order and Judgment, the Plaintiff and all Defendants agree to release and discharge the other party from any and all claims, actions, demands, or causes of action related to the matters addressed in this litigation, except as necessary to enforce the terms of this Order and Judgment.

5. Public Notice:

A public notice regarding the finality of this Order and Judgment shall be issued and disseminated as required to inform the public and relevant authorities of the Court's decision and the implementation of its terms.

6. Legislative and Administrative Support:

Any legislative or administrative actions necessary to implement or enforce this Order and Judgment shall be undertaken promptly to ensure that the decision is fully realized and operational.

7. Expedited Compliance Review:

The Court retains jurisdiction to oversee and ensure compliance with the terms of this Order and Judgment. Any disputes or issues arising from the implementation of this decision shall be addressed by this Court, which will provide expedited resolution to ensure full and effective enforcement.

Judge Rudolph Contreras

U.S. District Court Judge

District of Columbia

SO ORDERED.

Dated: July 29, 2024



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. A filing made 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 August 21, 2024, I electronically emailed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court using the email address dcd_cmecf@dcd.uscourts.gov and dcd_intake@dcd.uscourts.gov, which clerk will send notice to all parties. cc Attorney General Merrick Garland; et al in his official capacity, et al

CHRISTINA CLEMENT, PM