

**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;
et al

Defendant,

Civil No: 24-cv-00479-RC

**Affidavit of Service, Motion for entry of Default, Motion to Default Judgement; 08/22/2024;
Writ**

Affidavit of Service

I, CHRISTINA CLEMENT and HH EMPRESS QUEEN CHRISTINA LOCS IS OUR
ARTIFACT OF FAITH hereby certify that on 08/22/2024, I served a true and correct copy of the
following document(s) pursuant to Rule 4(i):

- District court submitted Summons and Plaintiff's Complaint to the following party(ies):
Secretary General of the UN and Chief Justice John Roberts, JR by:

☒ FEDEX EXPRESS 2 day delivery Service

☐ Hand Delivery

☐ Electronic Mail

☐ Other (specify): _____

RECEIVED

SEP 16 2024

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

1. Name: Attorney General Merrick Garland; al in their official capacity

Address: 1600 Pennsylvania Ave NW, Washington DC 20500

Documents: (2) Summons sheet and Case file 1:24 cv 00479 RC; Complaint

Tracking: 9589071052701815351346 Certified USPS Date: 07/15/2024

2. Name: Chief Justice John Roberts Jr., in their official capacity

Address: One First Street NE, Washington DC 20543

Documents: (1) Court stamped Summons and Case file 1:24 cv 00479 RC Complaint

Tracking: 778131139332 Fed Ex Delivery Date: 08/22/2024

3. Name: Secretary General of the United Nations; in their official capacity

Address: 3 Sutton Place Manhattan NYC 10022

Documents: (1) Court stamped Summons and Case file 1:24 cv 00479 RC Complaint

Tracking: 778131020776 Fed Ex Delivery Date: 08/22/2024

4. Name: Registrar-Peace Palace Carnegie Plein et al in their official capacity

2 2517 KJ The Hague Netherlands

Virginia Apostille delivery Case file 1:24 cv 00479 Complaint

Executed on 08/22/2024:

Motion for entry of Default

Entry of Default Judgment Pursuant to Rule 55(b) and Bill of Costs

I, Rev. Dr. Christina Clement, the Plaintiff in this case, hereby submit this Motion for Entry of Default Judgment against Chief Justice John Roberts Jr., Secretary General of the United Nations, Registrar of the Peace Palace, and other named defendants, pursuant to Rule 55(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. This motion is also submitted in support of the Bill of Costs due by 09/07/2024 and Explanation of Costs, seeking final judgment in favor of the Plaintiff for all relief requested.

Grounds for Motion:

1.Failure to Respond in Accordance with Rule 12(a)(i):

- All defendants have been duly served with the Complaint and Summons, as outlined in the accompanying Affidavit of Service served on 08/22/2024. Despite proper service, none of the defendants, including high-ranking officials such as Chief Justice John Roberts Jr. and Secretary General of the United Nations, have responded within the legally prescribed time under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(a).

- Rule 12(a)(i) mandates that defendants respond within 21 days to “court summons” (and Rule 12(2) 60 days for federal officials in their official capacity to the “complaint”). More than 60 days with an additional 21+ days have passed since the service on these officials, and they have failed to file an answer or responsive pleading. (See all Affidavit of Service and Certification of Service in case 1:24 cv 00479 RC)

2. Corruption and Judicial Misconduct:

- The fact that high-ranking officials have failed to respond to this lawsuit demonstrates a violation of the principle that “no one is above the law”. What is rule of law? The rule of law, as enshrined in the “U.S. Constitution”, requires that “government officials”, including judges and heads of state, are held to the same legal standards as any other party. By failing to respond, the defendants are receiving special treatment, which constitutes judicial misconduct and a form of corruption in violation of the “Policy Framework for Preventing and Eliminating Corruption and Ensuring the Impartiality of the Judicial System”. This core action is the same core neglect evidence of this case.

- This pattern of misconduct is also evidenced by the court's failure to hold these individuals accountable to the same standards applied to any ordinary defendant, proving systemic corruption and favoritism in the judiciary, would you agree? Right is Right.

This conduct is again evident with my original grievance with focus on the disproportionate requirements for an independent presidential candidate in terms of signature collection, as well as the lack of main stream media coverage of not only my campaign but also this case, does the public not have a right to know their full options for representation and the stance happening for their, our grievances? The argument of systemic favoritism and unfairness in the judiciary system is evident as mentioned when pertaining to the tyranny of the minority against the majority, undisputed

.

3. Undisputed Case: Rule 56(d)

- Since no defendant has responded or disputed the allegations in the Plaintiff's complaint, the case is again "undisputed" along with the over 5,000 victim statements submitted. Under Rule 55(b)(2), the Plaintiff is entitled to default judgment when the defendant fails to appear or defend the case. The factual allegations in the Plaintiff's Complaint must be taken as true and default judgement granted Rule 56(d) a default Judgement against the United States may be entered against the US, its officers, or its agencies if claimant establishes a claim or right to relief by evidence. The various Acts established for the protection of the majority party along, with the undisputed historical Facts of wrongs presented within this case; Grants this Rule in favor of the plaintiff.

4. Equal Application of the Rule of Law and Discrimination Against Independent Candidates:

- The unequal treatment faced by the Plaintiff in this legal proceeding is not an isolated incident, but rather part of a broader pattern of systemic favoritism and discrimination against independent political candidates. Since the laws were created with primary focus on minority party, this proves the root cause of such unequal treatment and plaintiff addressed the solution by establishing the legal framework for the majority protection against such tyranny behavior of the minority.

- The Plaintiff has previously raised concerns regarding the unfair signature requirements imposed on independent candidates running for President of the United States. These requirements place an undue burden on those who do not represent the traditional two-party system, creating significant obstacles to political participation. This is a violation of equal protection under the law, as guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution as written.

- Furthermore, the mainstream media's failure to provide equal coverage of the Plaintiff's presidential campaign, while other major candidates receive extensive coverage, exacerbates this issue. The media's role in influencing public opinion and shaping political discourse is significant, and the lack of impartiality in media coverage denies the Plaintiff a fair opportunity to present their platform to the electorate.

6. Public Trust and Integrity:

- The Plaintiff submits that public trust in both the judiciary and the political system is being eroded by these continued patterns of unequal treatment. The judicial system's failure to hold high-ranking officials accountable in this case, alongside the discriminatory

election processes that disadvantage independent candidates, demonstrates that the principles of fairness and impartiality are not being upheld.

- The Policy Framework for Preventing and Eliminating Corruption calls for ensuring the impartiality of judicial and political systems, and yet, independent candidates like the Plaintiff are disenfranchised by the disproportionate signature requirements and the lack of equal media coverage. This is further evidence of systemic corruption that favors established political actors and undermines the democratic process.

Conclusion:

Given the Defendants' failure to respond, the undisputed nature of the case, the discrimination against independent political candidates, and the constitutional imperative that “no one is above the law”, the Plaintiff respectfully requests that this Court enter default judgment and grant the relief sought. Right is Right.

Equal Application of the Rule of Law:

- The U.S. legal system is based on the principle that everyone is equal before the law. Allowing these defendants—who hold influential and high-ranking positions—to ignore the lawsuit violates this fundamental principle. The failure to act against them would endorse a system in which the law does not apply equally to both powerful officials and ordinary citizens.

6. Public Trust and Integrity:

- The Plaintiff submits that public trust in the judiciary will be significantly eroded if the court continues to overlook the defendants' failure to respond. As outlined in the Policy Framework for Preventing and Eliminating Corruption, the judiciary must be transparent, accountable, and impartial. Failure to grant this default judgment would further perpetuate the continued perception of corruption and undermine the very foundation of judicial impartiality. To be a solution, we must be the solution to reform America.

Demand for Relief:

In light of the above, the Plaintiff respectfully demands that this Honorable Court:

1. Enter Default Judgment in favor of the Plaintiff for all relief sought in the Bill of Cost due 9/7/2024, due to the Defendants' failure to respond or otherwise defend the case;

2. Grant the Bill of Costs submitted with this motion, covering the expenses incurred regarding this litigation;

3. Enter a judgment for maximum restitution as detailed in the Explanation of Costs;

4. Issue any other relief deemed just and necessary, including establishing new monetary policies and contracts as outlined in this case.

Motion to Default Judgement 08/22/2024

I, REV. DR. CHRISTINA CLEMENT, president candidate of the United States of America, the plaintiff in the above-captioned case, hereby submit this **Motion to Default Judgement** on Chief Justice John Roberts Jr., Secretary General of the United Nations; et al., as parties to the case pursuant to DC Civil Rule 55 of the District Court of Columbia Rules of Civil Procedure.

- The plaintiff, Rev Dr Christina Clement, President Candidate, initiated this action against the defendant/respondent for failure of defense and objections set forth in Civil Rule 12-(A) defendant must serve an answer within 21 days after being served with the summons and complaint and (2) The United States or the District of Columbia and the Agencies, Officers, or Employees of Either Sued in an Official Capacity. The United States or the District of Columbia or an agency, officer, or employee of either sued only in an official capacity must serve an answer to a complaint, counterclaim, or crossclaim within 60 days after service on the United States attorney (in suits involving the United States) or the Attorney General for the District of Columbia (in suits involving the District of Columbia). (3) United States or District of Columbia Officers or Employees Sued in an Individual Capacity. A United States or District of Columbia officer or employee sued in an individual capacity for an act or omission occurring in connection with the duties performed on the United States' or the District of Columbia's behalf must serve an answer to a complaint, counterclaim, or crossclaim within 60 days after service on the officer or employee or service on the United States attorney (in suits involving the United States) or the Attorney General for the District of Columbia (in suits involving the District of Columbia), whichever is later.
- Furthermore, according to Policy Framework for Preventing and Eliminating Corruption and Ensuring the Impartiality of the Judicial System where the rule of law in the US Constitution guarantees the rule of law by ensuring that no one, including the highest-ranking official, is **above the law**.
 - ❖ Government action must be based on law².
 - ❖ The law must be clear, accessible, and understandable¹²³.
 - ❖ Human rights and individual freedoms must be respected¹³.
 - ❖ Everyone is equal before the law and entitled to a fair trial²³.

- ❖ Courts and institutions must be independent, impartial, transparent, and accountable
- Despite being duly served as per **DC Civil Rule 5**, as various dates have been noted on the sent **Affidavit of Service. Summons from the court was issued August 12th, 2024 for Secretary General of the United Nations and Chief Justice John Roberts, Jr.**
- **Below affidavit of service shows these summonses were sent again by mail on August 22,2024 with tracking #778131020776 and # 778131139332 both received by each defendant, delivered by FedEx delivery;** the defendant(s) has failed to file an answer or otherwise respond to the allegations within the time prescribed by law according to DC Civil Rule 12.
- **See ECF 62 for Motion for Default Judgment against Attorney General Garland in his capacity; clerk confirmed on August 18, 2024 “No defendant party has entered their appearance in the listed case”.**
- In accordance with Civil Rule 55 of the District Court of Columbia Rules of Civil Procedure, when a party against whom a judgment for affirmative relief is sought has failed to plead or otherwise defend as provided by these rules and that fact is made to appear by affidavit or otherwise, **the clerk shall enter the party's default.**
- Moreover, I draw the Court's attention to the **Policy Framework for Preventing and Eliminating Corruption and Ensuring the Impartiality of the Judicial System**, which underscores the importance of ensuring fair and impartial adjudication of legal matters. It is imperative that the judicial system upholds integrity and impartiality in its proceedings to maintain public trust and confidence. (attached reference of document titled Policy Framework for Preventing and Eliminating Corruption and Ensuring the Impartiality of the Judicial System)
- Part of this framework, it was agreed that increasing public awareness and providing encouragement to the public to participate in the process of exposing, preventing and eliminating corruption in the judicial system, and so to increase public confidence in the judiciary; yet the courts have failed to notify the press of the Declaratory Judgement that was filed and received on February 13, 2024 (A Reporter’s Guide to Application Pending Before the Court of the United States)

Application of Rule 57 of D.C. Civil Code: Rule 57 of the D.C. Civil Code further supports this motion by providing guidance on correcting errors and omissions in legal proceedings. This rule emphasizes the importance of ensuring the fair and efficient administration of justice, which includes correcting any oversights that may arise during the course of litigation.

- Because the constitution protects the minority from the majority, I find that the community I represent is at a disadvantage within the legal system. Tyranny of the

Majority - Federalist #51 (founderoftheday.com) The framers of the constitution worked to prevent severe government or conduct, yet the court can discover years of severe conduct against the afro community globally who is the majority as described by the founders.

Given the defendant's failure to respond and has refused service as proven by mail submitted to the clerks, to the allegations within the prescribed timeframe and considering the gravity of the claims asserted by the plaintiff, I respectfully request that this "Honorable Court enter a default judgment in favor of the plaintiff and entering max restitution requested within the Bill of Cost ECF 66; (explanation of Bill of cost ECF 67) and against the defendants in their capacity, assume succession of Presidency et al, make the public aware of the default judgement; apostille all documents.

The plaintiff also seeks relief requested established in all acts presented in this case.

*Local Rules May 2022 0.pdf (uscourts.gov); Tyranny of the Majority - Federalist #51 (founderoftheday.com)

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. 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 September 16, 2024, I electronically emailed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court using the email address dcd_intake@dcd.uscourts.gov, which clerk will send notice to all parties
_CHRISTINA CLEMENT, PM



August 31, 2024

Dear Customer,

The following is the proof-of-delivery for tracking number: 778131139332

Delivery Information:

Status:	Delivered	Delivered To:	Mailroom
Signed for by:	J.FLANAGAN	Delivery Location:	
Service type:	FedEx 2Day		
Special Handling:	Deliver Weekday; No Signature Required		WASHINGTON, DC,
		Delivery date:	Aug 26, 2024 09:51

Shipping Information:

Tracking number:	778131139332	Ship Date:	Aug 22, 2024
		Weight:	1.0 LB/0.45 KG
Recipient:		Shipper:	
WASHINGTON, DC, US,		DOVER, DE, US,	

Thank you for choosing FedEx



August 31, 2024

Dear Customer,

The following is the proof-of-delivery for tracking number: 778131020776

Delivery Information:

Status:	Delivered	Delivered To:	Residence
Signed for by:	Signature not required	Delivery Location:	
Service type:	FedEx 2Day		
Special Handling:	Deliver Weekday; Residential Delivery		NEW YORK, NY,
		Delivery date:	Aug 26, 2024 10:33

Shipping Information:

Tracking number:	778131020776	Ship Date:	Aug 22, 2024
		Weight:	0.5 LB/0.23 KG
Recipient:		Shipper:	
NEW YORK, NY, US,		DOVER, DE, US,	

Thank you for choosing FedEx





6280 Roswell Rd NE
Atlanta, GA 30328
404.257.1881

August 22, 2024 2:43 PM
Receipt #: PDKKK00100247

FedEx Express \$9.75
FedEx 2Day
778131020776

Recipient Address

Secretary General of the UN
3 Sutton Pl
NEW YORK, NY 10022, US
678-780-5557

Scheduled Delivery Date: 08/26/2024

Pricing Option: One Rate

Package Information: FedEx Envelope

Additional Services:

No Signature Required

FEDEX_ONE_RATE

Package Weight: .15 lb (S)

Declared Value: \$100

FedEx Express \$9.75
FedEx 2Day
778131139332

Recipient Address

Chief Justice John Roberts JR
1 1ST ST NE
WASHINGTON, DC 20543-0001, US
678-780-5557

Scheduled Delivery Date: 08/26/2024

Pricing Option: One Rate

Package Information: FedEx Envelope

Additional Services:

No Signature Required

FEDEX_ONE_RATE

Package Weight: .95 lb (S)

Declared Value: \$100

Express Subtotal \$19.50

Tax \$0.00
Total \$19.50

***** PURCHASE *****
APPROVED

**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;
et al

Defendant,

Civil No: 24-cv-00479-RC

**Affidavit of Service, Motion for entry of Default, Motion to Default Judgement; 08/22/2024;
Writ**

Affidavit of Service

I, CHRISTINA CLEMENT and HH EMPRESS QUEEN CHRISTINA LOCS IS OUR
ARTIFACT OF FAITH hereby certify that on 08/22/2024, I served a true and correct copy of the
following document(s) pursuant to Rule 4(i):

- District court submitted Summons and Plaintiff's Complaint to the following party(ies):
Secretary General of the UN and Chief Justice John Roberts, JR by:

☒ FEDEX EXPRESS 2 day delivery Service

☐ Hand Delivery

☐ Electronic Mail

☐ Other (specify): _____

1. Name: Attorney General Merrick Garland; al in their official capacity
Address: 1600 Pennsylvania Ave NW, Washington DC 20500

Documents: (2) Summons sheet and Case file 1:24 cv 00479 RC; Complaint

Tracking: 9589071052701815351346 Certified USPS Date: 07/15/2024

2. Name: Chief Justice John Roberts Jr., in their official capacity
Address: One First Street NE, Washington DC 20543

Documents: (1) Court stamped Summons and Case file 1:24 cv 00479 RC Complaint

Tracking: 778131139332 Fed Ex Delivery Date: 08/22/2024

3. Name: Secretary General of the United Nations; in their official capacity
Address: 3 Sutton Place Manhattan NYC 10022

Documents: (1) Court stamped Summons and Case file 1:24 cv 00479 RC Complaint

Tracking: 778131020776 Fed Ex Delivery Date: 08/22/2024

4. Name: Registrar-Peace Palace Carnegie Plein et al in their official capacity
2 2517 KJ The Hague Netherlands
Virginia Apostille delivery Case file 1:24 cv 00479 Complaint

Executed on 08/22/2024:

Motion for entry of Default

Entry of Default Judgment Pursuant to Rule 55(b) and Bill of Costs

I, Rev. Dr. Christina Clement, the Plaintiff in this case, hereby submit this Motion for Entry of Default Judgment against Chief Justice John Roberts Jr., Secretary General of the United Nations, Registrar of the Peace Palace, and other named defendants, pursuant to Rule 55(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. This motion is also submitted in support of the Bill of Costs due by 09/07/2024 and Explanation of Costs, seeking final judgment in favor of the Plaintiff for all relief requested.

Grounds for Motion:

1.Failure to Respond in Accordance with Rule 12(a)(i):

- All defendants have been duly served with the Complaint and Summons, as outlined in the accompanying Affidavit of Service served on 08/22/2024. Despite proper service, none of the defendants, including high-ranking officials such as Chief Justice John Roberts Jr. and Secretary General of the United Nations, have responded within the legally prescribed time under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(a).

- Rule 12(a)(i) mandates that defendants respond within 21 days to “court summons” (and Rule 12(2) 60 days for federal officials in their official capacity to the “complaint”). More than 60 days with an additional 21+ days have passed since the service on these officials, and they have failed to file an answer or responsive pleading. (See all Affidavit of Service and Certification of Service in case 1:24 cv 00479 RC)

2. Corruption and Judicial Misconduct:

- The fact that high-ranking officials have failed to respond to this lawsuit demonstrates a violation of the principle that “no one is above the law”. What is rule of law? The rule of law, as enshrined in the “U.S. Constitution”, requires that “government officials”, including judges and heads of state, are held to the same legal standards as any other party. By failing to respond, the defendants are receiving special treatment, which constitutes judicial misconduct and a form of corruption in violation of the “Policy Framework for Preventing and Eliminating Corruption and Ensuring the Impartiality of the Judicial System”. This core action is the same core neglect evidence of this case.

- This pattern of misconduct is also evidenced by the court's failure to hold these individuals accountable to the same standards applied to any ordinary defendant, proving systemic corruption and favoritism in the judiciary, would you agree? Right is Right.

This conduct is again evident with my original grievance with focus on the disproportionate requirements for an independent presidential candidate in terms of signature collection, as well as the lack of main stream media coverage of not only my campaign but also this case, does the public not have a right to know their full options for representation and the stance happening for their, our grievances? The argument of systemic favoritism and unfairness in the judiciary system is evident as mentioned when pertaining to the tyranny of the minority against the majority, undisputed

.

3. Undisputed Case: Rule 56(d)

- Since no defendant has responded or disputed the allegations in the Plaintiff's complaint, the case is again "undisputed" along with the over 5,000 victim statements submitted. Under Rule 55(b)(2), the Plaintiff is entitled to default judgment when the defendant fails to appear or defend the case. The factual allegations in the Plaintiff's Complaint must be taken as true and default judgement granted Rule 56(d) a default Judgement against the United States may be entered against the US, its officers, or its agencies if claimant establishes a claim or right to relief by evidence. The various Acts established for the protection of the majority party along, with the undisputed historical Facts of wrongs presented within this case; Grants this Rule in favor of the plaintiff.

4. Equal Application of the Rule of Law and Discrimination Against Independent Candidates:

- The unequal treatment faced by the Plaintiff in this legal proceeding is not an isolated incident, but rather part of a broader pattern of systemic favoritism and discrimination against independent political candidates. Since the laws were created with primary focus on minority party, this proves the root cause of such unequal treatment and plaintiff addressed the solution by establishing the legal framework for the majority protection against such tyranny behavior of the minority.

- The Plaintiff has previously raised concerns regarding the unfair signature requirements imposed on independent candidates running for President of the United States. These requirements place an undue burden on those who do not represent the traditional two-party system, creating significant obstacles to political participation. This is a violation of equal protection under the law, as guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution as written.

- Furthermore, the mainstream media's failure to provide equal coverage of the Plaintiff's presidential campaign, while other major candidates receive extensive coverage, exacerbates this issue. The media's role in influencing public opinion and shaping political discourse is significant, and the lack of impartiality in media coverage denies the Plaintiff a fair opportunity to present their platform to the electorate.

6. Public Trust and Integrity:

- The Plaintiff submits that public trust in both the judiciary and the political system is being eroded by these continued patterns of unequal treatment. The judicial system's failure to hold high-ranking officials accountable in this case, alongside the discriminatory

election processes that disadvantage independent candidates, demonstrates that the principles of fairness and impartiality are not being upheld.

- The Policy Framework for Preventing and Eliminating Corruption calls for ensuring the impartiality of judicial and political systems, and yet, independent candidates like the Plaintiff are disenfranchised by the disproportionate signature requirements and the lack of equal media coverage. This is further evidence of systemic corruption that favors established political actors and undermines the democratic process.

Conclusion:

Given the Defendants' failure to respond, the undisputed nature of the case, the discrimination against independent political candidates, and the constitutional imperative that “no one is above the law”, the Plaintiff respectfully requests that this Court enter default judgment and grant the relief sought. Right is Right.

Equal Application of the Rule of Law:

- The U.S. legal system is based on the principle that everyone is equal before the law. Allowing these defendants—who hold influential and high-ranking positions—to ignore the lawsuit violates this fundamental principle. The failure to act against them would endorse a system in which the law does not apply equally to both powerful officials and ordinary citizens.

6. Public Trust and Integrity:

- The Plaintiff submits that public trust in the judiciary will be significantly eroded if the court continues to overlook the defendants' failure to respond. As outlined in the Policy Framework for Preventing and Eliminating Corruption, the judiciary must be transparent, accountable, and impartial. Failure to grant this default judgment would further perpetuate the continued perception of corruption and undermine the very foundation of judicial impartiality. To be a solution, we must be the solution to reform America.

Demand for Relief:

In light of the above, the Plaintiff respectfully demands that this Honorable Court:

1. Enter Default Judgment in favor of the Plaintiff for all relief sought in the Bill of Cost due 9/7/2024, due to the Defendants' failure to respond or otherwise defend the case;

2. **Grant the Bill of Costs submitted with this motion, covering the expenses incurred regarding this litigation;**
3. **Enter a judgment for maximum restitution as detailed in the Explanation of Costs;**
4. **Issue any other relief deemed just and necessary, including establishing new monetary policies and contracts as outlined in this case.**

Motion to Default Judgement 08/22/2024

I, REV. DR. CHRISTINA CLEMENT, president candidate of the United States of America, the plaintiff in the above-captioned case, hereby submit this **Motion to Default Judgement** on Chief Justice John Roberts Jr., Secretary General of the United Nations; et al., as parties to the case pursuant to DC Civil Rule 55 of the District Court of Columbia Rules of Civil Procedure.

- The plaintiff, Rev Dr Christina Clement, President Candidate, initiated this action against the defendant/respondent for failure of defense and objections set forth in Civil Rule 12-(A) defendant must serve an answer within 21 days after being served with the summons and complaint and (2) The United States or the District of Columbia and the Agencies, Officers, or Employees of Either Sued in an Official Capacity. The United States or the District of Columbia or an agency, officer, or employee of either sued only in an official capacity must serve an answer to a complaint, counterclaim, or crossclaim within 60 days after service on the United States attorney (in suits involving the United States) or the Attorney General for the District of Columbia (in suits involving the District of Columbia). (3) United States or District of Columbia Officers or Employees Sued in an Individual Capacity. A United States or District of Columbia officer or employee sued in an individual capacity for an act or omission occurring in connection with the duties performed on the United States' or the District of Columbia's behalf must serve an answer to a complaint, counterclaim, or crossclaim within 60 days after service on the officer or employee or service on the United States attorney (in suits involving the United States) or the Attorney General for the District of Columbia (in suits involving the District of Columbia), whichever is later.
- Furthermore, according to Policy Framework for Preventing and Eliminating Corruption and Ensuring the Impartiality of the Judicial System where the rule of law in the US Constitution guarantees the rule of law by ensuring that no one, including the highest-ranking official, is **above the law**.
 - ❖ Government action must be based on law².
 - ❖ The law must be clear, accessible, and understandable¹²³.
 - ❖ Human rights and individual freedoms must be respected¹³.
 - ❖ Everyone is equal before the law and entitled to a fair trial²³.

- ❖ Courts and institutions must be independent, impartial, transparent, and accountable
- Despite being duly served as per **DC Civil Rule 5**, as various dates have been noted on the sent **Affidavit of Service. Summons from the court was issued August 12th, 2024 for Secretary General of the United Nations and Chief Justice John Roberts, Jr.**
- **Below affidavit of service shows these summonses were sent again by mail on August 22, 2024 with tracking #778131020776 and # 778131139332 both received by each defendant, delivered by FedEx delivery;** the defendant(s) has failed to file an answer or otherwise respond to the allegations within the time prescribed by law according to DC Civil Rule 12.
- **See ECF 62 for Motion for Default Judgment against Attorney General Garland in his capacity; clerk confirmed on August 18, 2024 “No defendant party has entered their appearance in the listed case”.**
- In accordance with Civil Rule 55 of the District Court of Columbia Rules of Civil Procedure, when a party against whom a judgment for affirmative relief is sought has failed to plead or otherwise defend as provided by these rules and that fact is made to appear by affidavit or otherwise, **the clerk shall enter the party's default.**
- Moreover, I draw the Court's attention to the **Policy Framework for Preventing and Eliminating Corruption and Ensuring the Impartiality of the Judicial System**, which underscores the importance of ensuring fair and impartial adjudication of legal matters. It is imperative that the judicial system upholds integrity and impartiality in its proceedings to maintain public trust and confidence. (attached reference of document titled Policy Framework for Preventing and Eliminating Corruption and Ensuring the Impartiality of the Judicial System)
- Part of this framework, it was agreed that increasing public awareness and providing encouragement to the public to participate in the process of exposing, preventing and eliminating corruption in the judicial system, and so to increase public confidence in the judiciary; yet the courts have failed to notify the press of the Declaratory Judgement that was filed and received on February 13, 2024 (A Reporter’s Guide to Application Pending Before the Court of the United States)

Application of Rule 57 of D.C. Civil Code: Rule 57 of the D.C. Civil Code further supports this motion by providing guidance on correcting errors and omissions in legal proceedings. This rule emphasizes the importance of ensuring the fair and efficient administration of justice, which includes correcting any oversights that may arise during the course of litigation.

- Because the constitution protects the minority from the majority, I find that the community I represent is at a disadvantage within the legal system. Tyranny of the

Majority - Federalist #51 (founderoftheday.com) The framers of the constitution worked to prevent severe government or conduct, yet the court can discover years of severe conduct against the afro community globally who is the majority as described by the founders.

Given the defendant's failure to respond and has refused service as proven by mail submitted to the clerks, to the allegations within the prescribed timeframe and considering the gravity of the claims asserted by the plaintiff, I respectfully request that this “Honorable Court enter a default judgment in favor of the plaintiff and entering max restitution requested within the Bill of Cost ECF 66; (explanation of Bill of cost ECF 67) and against the defendants in their capacity, assume succession of Presidency et al, make the public aware of the default judgement; apostille all documents.

The plaintiff also seeks relief requested established in all acts presented in this case.

*Local Rules May 2022 0.pdf (uscourts.gov); Tyranny of the Majority - Federalist #51 (founderoftheday.com)

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. 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 September 16, 2024, I electronically emailed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court using the email address dcd_intake@dcd.uscourts.gov, which clerk will send notice to all parties
_CHRISTINA CLEMENT, PM

Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Rule 4 Summons

Rule 4. Summons

(a) Contents; Amendments.

(1) *Contents*. A summons must:

- (A) name the court and the parties;
- (B) be directed to the defendant;
- (C) state the name and address of the plaintiff's attorney or—if unrepresented—of the plaintiff;
- (D) state the time within which the defendant must appear and defend;
- (E) notify the defendant that a failure to appear and defend will result in a default judgment against the defendant for the relief demanded in the complaint;
- (F) be signed by the clerk; and
- (G) bear the court's seal.

(2) *Amendments*. The court may permit a summons to be amended.

(b) *Issuance*. On or after filing the complaint, the plaintiff may present a summons to the clerk for signature and seal. If the summons is properly completed, the clerk must sign, seal, and issue it to the plaintiff for service on the defendant. A summons—or a copy of a summons that is addressed to multiple defendants—must be issued for each defendant to be served.

(c) Service.

(1) *In General*. A summons must be served with a copy of the complaint. The plaintiff is responsible for having the summons and complaint served within the time allowed by [Rule 4\(m\)](#) and must furnish the necessary copies to the person who makes service.

(2) *By Whom*. Any person who is at least 18 years old and not a party may serve a summons and complaint.

(3) *By a Marshal or Someone Specially Appointed*. At the plaintiff's request, the court may order that service be made by a United States marshal or deputy marshal or by a person specially appointed by the court. The court must so order if the plaintiff is authorized to proceed in forma pauperis under [28 U.S.C. §1915](#) or as a seaman under [28 U.S.C. §1916](#).

(d) Waiving Service.

(1) *Requesting a Waiver*. An individual, corporation, or association that is subject to service under [Rule 4\(e\)](#), [\(f\)](#), or [\(h\)](#) has a duty to avoid unnecessary expenses of serving the summons. The plaintiff may notify such a defendant that an action has been commenced and request that the defendant waive service of a summons. The notice and request must:

- (A) be in writing and be addressed:
 - (i) to the individual defendant; or
 - (ii) for a defendant subject to service under [Rule 4\(h\)](#), to an officer, a managing or general agent, or any other agent authorized by appointment or by law to receive service of process;
- (B) name the court where the complaint was filed;
- (C) be accompanied by a copy of the complaint, 2 copies of the waiver form appended to this Rule 4, and a prepaid means for returning the form;
- (D) inform the defendant, using the form appended to this Rule 4, of the consequences of waiving and not waiving service;
- (E) state the date when the request is sent;

(F) give the defendant a reasonable time of at least 30 days after the request was sent—or at least 60 days if sent to the defendant outside any judicial district of the United States—to return the waiver; and

(G) be sent by first-class mail or other reliable means.

(2) *Failure to Waive*. If a defendant located within the United States fails, without good cause, to sign and return a waiver requested by a plaintiff located within the United States, the court must impose on the defendant:

(A) the expenses later incurred in making service; and

(B) the reasonable expenses, including attorney's fees, of any motion required to collect those service expenses.

(3) *Time to Answer After a Waiver*. A defendant who, before being served with process, timely returns a waiver need not serve an answer to the complaint until 60 days after the request was sent—or until 90 days after it was sent to the defendant outside any judicial district of the United States.

(4) *Results of Filing a Waiver*. When the plaintiff files a waiver, proof of service is not required and these rules apply as if a summons and complaint had been served at the time of filing the waiver.

(5) *Jurisdiction and Venue Not Waived*. Waiving service of a summons does not waive any objection to personal jurisdiction or to venue.

(e) *Serving an Individual Within a Judicial District of the United States*. Unless federal law provides otherwise, an individual—other than a minor, an incompetent person, or a person whose waiver has been filed—may be served in a judicial district of the United States by:

(1) following state law for serving a summons in an action brought in courts of general jurisdiction in the state where the district court is located or where service is made; or

(2) doing any of the following:

(A) delivering a copy of the summons and of the complaint to the individual personally;

(B) leaving a copy of each at the individual's dwelling or usual place of abode with someone of suitable age and discretion who resides there; or

(C) delivering a copy of each to an agent authorized by appointment or by law to receive service of process.

(f) *Serving an Individual in a Foreign Country*. Unless federal law provides otherwise, an individual—other than a minor, an incompetent person, or a person whose waiver has been filed—may be served at a place not within any judicial district of the United States:

(1) by any internationally agreed means of service that is reasonably calculated to give notice, such as those authorized by the Hague Convention on the Service Abroad of Judicial and Extrajudicial Documents;

(2) if there is no internationally agreed means, or if an international agreement allows but does not specify other means, by a method that is reasonably calculated to give notice:

(A) as prescribed by the foreign country's law for service in that country in an action in its courts of general jurisdiction;

(B) as the foreign authority directs in response to a letter rogatory or letter of request; or

(C) unless prohibited by the foreign country's law, by:

(i) delivering a copy of the summons and of the complaint to the individual personally; or

(ii) using any form of mail that the clerk addresses and sends to the individual and that requires a signed receipt; or

(3) by other means not prohibited by international agreement, as the court orders.

(g) *Serving a Minor or an Incompetent Person*. A minor or an incompetent person in a judicial district of the United States must be served by following state law for serving a summons or like process on such a defendant in an action brought in the courts of general jurisdiction of the state where service is made. A minor or an incompetent person who is not within any judicial district of the United States must be served in the manner prescribed by [Rule 4\(f\)\(2\)\(A\)](#), [\(f\)\(2\)\(B\)](#), or [\(f\)\(3\)](#).

(h) Serving a Corporation, Partnership, or Association. Unless federal law provides otherwise or the defendant's waiver has been filed, a domestic or foreign corporation, or a partnership or other unincorporated association that is subject to suit under a common name, must be served:

(1) in a judicial district of the United States:

(A) in the manner prescribed by Rule [4\(e\)\(1\)](#) for serving an individual; or

(B) by delivering a copy of the summons and of the complaint to an officer, a managing or general agent, or any other agent authorized by appointment or by law to receive service of process and—if the agent is one authorized by statute and the statute so requires—by also mailing a copy of each to the defendant; or

(2) at a place not within any judicial district of the United States, in any manner prescribed by [Rule 4\(f\)](#) for serving an individual, except personal delivery under [\(f\)\(2\)\(C\)\(i\)](#).

(i) Serving the United States and Its Agencies, Corporations, Officers, or Employees.

(1) *United States*. To serve the United States, a party must:

(A)(i) deliver a copy of the summons and of the complaint to the United States attorney for the district where the action is brought—or to an assistant United States attorney or clerical employee whom the United States attorney designates in a writing filed with the court clerk—or

(ii) send a copy of each by registered or certified mail to the civil-process clerk at the United States attorney's office;

(B) send a copy of each by registered or certified mail to the Attorney General of the United States at Washington, D.C.; and

(C) if the action challenges an order of a nonparty agency or officer of the United States, send a copy of each by registered or certified mail to the agency or officer.

(2) *Agency; Corporation; Officer or Employee Sued in an Official Capacity*. To serve a United States agency or corporation, or a United States officer or employee sued only in an official capacity, a party must serve the United States and also send a copy of the summons and of the complaint by registered or certified mail to the agency, corporation, officer, or employee.

(3) *Officer or Employee Sued Individually*. To serve a United States officer or employee sued in an individual capacity for an act or omission occurring in connection with duties performed on the United States' behalf (whether or not the officer or employee is also sued in an official capacity), a party must serve the United States and also serve the officer or employee under [Rule 4\(e\)](#), [\(f\)](#), or [\(g\)](#).

(4) *Extending Time*. The court must allow a party a reasonable time to cure its failure to:

(A) serve a person required to be served under [Rule 4\(i\)\(2\)](#), if the party has served either the United States attorney or the Attorney General of the United States; or

(B) serve the United States under [Rule 4\(i\)\(3\)](#), if the party has served the United States officer or employee.

(j) Serving a Foreign, State, or Local Government.

(1) *Foreign State*. A foreign state or its political subdivision, agency, or instrumentality must be served in accordance with [28 U.S.C. §1608](#).

(2) *State or Local Government*. A state, a municipal corporation, or any other state-created governmental organization that is subject to suit must be served by:

(A) delivering a copy of the summons and of the complaint to its chief executive officer; or

(B) serving a copy of each in the manner prescribed by that state's law for serving a summons or like process on such a defendant.

(k) Territorial Limits of Effective Service.

(1) *In General*. Serving a summons or filing a waiver of service establishes personal jurisdiction over a defendant:

(A) who is subject to the jurisdiction of a court of general jurisdiction in the state where the district court is located;

(B) who is a party joined under [Rule 14](#) or [19](#) and is served within a judicial district of the United States and not more than 100 miles from where the summons was issued; or

(C) when authorized by a federal statute.

(2) *Federal Claim Outside State-Court Jurisdiction.* For a claim that arises under federal law, serving a summons or filing a waiver of service establishes personal jurisdiction over a defendant if:

(A) the defendant is not subject to jurisdiction in any state's courts of general jurisdiction; and

(B) exercising jurisdiction is consistent with the United States Constitution and laws.

(l) Proving Service.

(1) *Affidavit Required.* Unless service is waived, proof of service must be made to the court. Except for service by a United States marshal or deputy marshal, proof must be by the server's affidavit.

(2) *Service Outside the United States.* Service not within any judicial district of the United States must be proved as follows:

(A) if made under [Rule 4\(f\)\(1\)](#), as provided in the applicable treaty or convention; or

(B) if made under [Rule 4\(f\)\(2\)](#) or [\(f\)\(3\)](#), by a receipt signed by the addressee, or by other evidence satisfying the court that the summons and complaint were delivered to the addressee.

(3) *Validity of Service; Amending Proof.* Failure to prove service does not affect the validity of service. The court may permit proof of service to be amended.

(m) Time Limit for Service. If a defendant is not served within 90 days after the complaint is filed, the court—on motion or on its own after notice to the plaintiff—must dismiss the action without prejudice against that defendant or order that service be made within a specified time. But if the plaintiff shows good cause for the failure, the court must extend the time for service for an appropriate period. This subdivision (m) does not apply to service in a foreign country under [Rule 4\(f\)](#), [4\(h\)\(2\)](#), or [4\(j\)\(1\)](#), or to service of a notice under [Rule 71.1\(d\)\(3\)\(A\)](#).

(n) Asserting Jurisdiction over Property or Assets.

(1) *Federal Law.* The court may assert jurisdiction over property if authorized by a federal statute. Notice to claimants of the property must be given as provided in the statute or by serving a summons under this rule.

(2) *State Law.* On a showing that personal jurisdiction over a defendant cannot be obtained in the district where the action is brought by reasonable efforts to serve a summons under this rule, the court may assert jurisdiction over the defendant's assets found in the district. Jurisdiction is acquired by seizing the assets under the circumstances and in the manner provided by state law in that district.

**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