NO._____

IN THE
SUPREME COURT
OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

A.C. Benson

aka Alexis Carberry Benson, Alexis Carberry

Sui Juris and in Propria Persona

and as the Authority over

The 144 Center LLC NGO, &
Quantum Universal Ministries LLC.

Plaintiffs

vs.

The State of South Carolina
&
The United States of America

Defendants

ARTICLE III, SECTION 2
ORIGINAL JURISDICTION

INTEREST OF ALL NATIONS

1. If the Declaration of Independence of US of America clearly states, " becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the Laws of Nature and of Nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.

   Exhibit A Declaration of Independence of Amerkaba

   Exhibit B The Constitution of Amerkaba

2. "By what Authority, if any, did the legal status of the 144,000-acre Catawbaw Reservation change after the Treaty of Augusta in 1763 and/or After American Independence in 1776, if the land was NEVER a part of the Colony of North or South Carolina, thus never apart of the united states?"

The Catawbaw Indian Nation existed as a Sovereign Indigenous Nation for **THOUSANDS of years**. It spanned over, what is now, 4 states along the Appalachian mountains. As European settlers continued to occupy their land, the Treaty of Pine Tree Hill, 1760, and the Treaty of Augusta 1763, **Exhibit D**, was signed. The British Crown recognized a 225 sq mile reservation, EXACTLY 144,000 acres each corner facing the 4 Navigational Directions, for the Catawbaw Indian Nation. Please see **Exhibit F** is a survey and Map and Proclamation from the King is **Exhibit C** . (E reserved)

- The Royal Proclamation of 1763 established that Indian land was reserved to Indigenous nations unless ceded to the Crown through authorized treaty processes.
- The United States did not yet exist in 1763.
- The Land was never a part of the Colony of South Carolina nor the State of South Carolina, Never having any authority or jurisdiction to; grant, sell, rent, title, deed, mortgage or any other banking, legislative, executive, administrative, or judicial action or transaction for land, certainly not with the use of fictitious and fraudulent maritime terminology substituted for the guarantees of the LIVING, including the earth.

The legal status of the 144,000 acres after 1763 and after American independence remained Sovereign SACRED Indigenous Indian Land, was not subject to "INDEPENDANCE" in or around 1776, as it already was INDEPENDANT. This Living Land has been denied and deprived of due process through both the Judicial Systems of the Catawbaw Nation, and the United States of America and now sits and sits forever more before the Universal Court, in the AS ABOVE Jurisdiction.

Although the 144,000 acres of Catawba reservation was never derived from a state grant, other constitutional concerns and Global legal questions made more central, such as:

- USA Congress's self appointed constitutional 'authority' over Native Indian affairs that took place for thousands of years before European 'settlers';
- 'Administrative Remedies' such as The Catawba Indian Claims Settlement Act of 1993 do not have any legal standing or jurisdiction, Political Theater.

I. Parties

[HERE] and [NOW] does the Living Human and Plaintiff, A.C.Benson aka Alexis Carberry, Alexis Carberry Benson, Sui Juris and in propria persona, and by/for/through, The 144 Center LLC and Quantum Universal Ministries LLC, Appointed by The Creator to establish this case against, The State of South Carolina Inc. by and through Attorney General Alan Watts, at 1000 Assembly st. Room 519, Columbia South Carolina; and The United States of America Inc. by and through US Attorney General, Todd Blanche, U.S. Department of Justice, 950 Pennsylvania Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20530 .

II. Jurisdiction and Venue

Plaintiffs invoke the judicial power established by Article III, §§1 and 2 of the Constitution of the United States. Article III, §2, cl. 1 extends the judicial power to cases arising under the Constitution, laws, and treaties of the United States and to controversies within the additional categories enumerated therein.

Plaintiffs invoke the original jurisdiction of this Court under Article III, §2, cl. 2, which provides in pertinent part that "in all Cases ... in which a State shall be Party, the supreme Court shall have original Jurisdiction."

Plaintiffs further invoke 28 U.S.C. §1251 to the extent the controversy falls within a category of original jurisdiction Congress has provided therein.

Plaintiffs allege an actual case or controversy concerning the constitutional and legal

rights identified in the Complaint and the actions of the governmental defendants identified therein.

"Admiralty and maritime jurisdiction."

Article III unquestionably extends federal judicial power to admiralty and maritime cases. Admiralty jurisdiction concerns legally cognizable maritime matters; contract law, in which **Fictional** 'PERSONS' are considered under. "DOC delivers from WATER at BIRTH" and makes the LIVING HUMAN and PRODUCT rather than SOVEREIGN a Natural RIGHT of the LIVING.

Article III Clause Clause 2 gives SCOTUS original jurisdiction in cases "in which a State shall be Party."

"Citizens of the same State claiming Lands."

In this case, the United States, The state of South Carolina, Catawba Nation and Nation of Amerkaba "CLAIM" the **territory** of 144,000 acres.

III. Statement of Facts and Procedural History

1. Catawba Nation vs State of South Carolina; United States of America et al. Has substantial Evidence in the Record with and or within the jurisdictions of the entities named as the defendants.

2. Neither Party has properly done impartial Due process according to Natural Law, in the

correct jurisdictional tribunal or administrative governement, that be it territorial, subject matter and personal jurisdiction of Catawbaw Nation, their people and their " property" or Land. Jurisdiction can be challenged at ANY TIME, EVEN AFTER an Order, judgement or passing of a law etc.

3. Thus plaintiff declares that every and all orders, decisions, acts, ordinances, laws, statues, or laws etc. in or about the 144,000 thousand acres of living land and the inhabitants of that land CURRENTLY is "NULL AND VOID as though it was never passed at all".

4. With out Harm, war, violence or deceit, the plaintiff establishes through PEACE and Justice, and through Natural Law, a written record in the Jurisdiction Below, LAW, from The heavens above, the Kingdom Nation of Amerkaba, in association with the 144 Center LLC a Non-governemental Organization and Quantum Universal Christ Ministries, a 5013c Religious Church Ministry.

5. How did God lead me here?

6. Starting in 2021, The State of South Carolina Inc, began depriving, colluding and conspiring against A.C. Benson, her child's, and her child's father, of their Constitutionally protected **Natural Rights,** including but not limited to impartial due process, freedom of religion, disability rights and educational rights.

7. On December 8, 2021 and March 2, 2022 an State Appeal Administrative Decision was made against Fort Mill Public School District for a denial of Free and Appropriate Public Education, under IDEA.

8. The Director of SPED's credibility was questioned and, "particularly concerning", to the State Review Officer, Avni Gupta Kagan.

9. Data and evidence indicated that these were systemic violations at the local and state level, using statistical practices such as but not limited to the " Law of Large Numbers".

10. The Plaintiff began to Advocate for Children with Disabilities and for their parents, through Angel Advocates 4 Special Education LLC, which she founded.

11. The 2 Federal Lawsuit were filed in the District Court of SC:

    Case no:22-614-SAL-SVH and **22-cv-01912-SAL-SVH**

12. Appeals were filed in the 4th circuit; **22-2104 , 22-2310 and 24-1173.** Justice was not served.

13. A writ of Certiorari filed with SCOTUS was not heard. Justice was never served.

    Case no. 23-5007

14. During the approximate dates August and September of 2021, there were numerous calls for domestic abuse. The Lancaster County Sheriff's Office failed to act appropriately, timely and failed to protect and serve. Anthony Charles Benson was charred with his 2nd charge of DV, against the plaintiff in September, 2021. It wasn't until July 10th 2026 where the state of SC initiated to bring the case to court. It never was and was disposed of on July 1st, 2026. Justice has not been/ was not served.

15. The Plaintiff was stopped by Lancaster Sheriffs on Halloween 2021 at 8:30 pm and was arrested unlawfully. When she appeared at the courthouse and magistrate staff and

deputies officers from Lancaster County then denied her right to due process on or about November/ December 2021 when she refused to "Wear a Mask" in the court building (not a law), she was charged and arrested a second time, WITHOUT INDICTMENT OF GRAND JURY nor without just cause, for disorderly conduct. She spent the night in prison, false imprisonment. **Case no. 0:23-cv-04838 SAL-SVH** in the district court of SC and **24- 1852** in the 4th circuit. Justice has not been/ was not served.

16. As an Advocate, A.C. Benson also was successful with an administrative hearing for other parents. In 2022, an administrative hearing under the IDEA was held without proper decision from the LHO. It was appealed and another State Review Officer, Perry Zirkle, reversed the decision.

17. A Lawsuit was filed in the District Court of SC **case no: 23-cv-05029-TMC-KFM and case no. 23-cv-05162,** and in the 4th circuit of **appeals case no 25-2505.** Justice has not been/ was not served.

18. After transferring districts, Lancaster County School and the State of South Carolina continued the denial of the same rights. Civil Action was filed, **case no. 23-cv-04838-JDA** and **23- cv- 1488-JDA**. Appeals in the 4th circuit **no. 24-1232.** Justice has not been/ was not served.

19. Her Civil rights were also violated as an advocate while helping a student in the Darlington School district. Additional denial of rights were filed case no. **0:23-cv-04565-SAL** and **0:24-cv-01991-JDA**. 4th circuit appeals case no: **24-119, 24-1853.** Justice has not been/ was not served.

20. Fraudulent "Foreclosure", by Ameri- First Financial also was/is DBA Union Home Mortgage (and sold the "NOTE" to themselves" on RELIGIOUS property that is "deeded" to the Church, in which ITS Founding Documents takes precedence.

21. The State of South Carolina are purposefully defrauding the Plaintiffs and attempting to deprive constitutionally protected rights including but not limited to impartial due process, right to reserve/ exercise the right to a jury trial citing inferior administrative Procedural rules that abridge the constitution. **Case no : SC 2025-cp-2901641.** Please see **Exhibit G**

22. Home Owners Associations are in and of themselves Unconstitutional. Black Horse Run, an HOA, Along with the SC HOA ACT which is also unconstitutional, has also deprived and continue to deprive NATURAL rights against the plaintiff.

case no: SC- 2025-cp-2900999 and **2026-cp-29-00390 .**

23. Additional DOCUMENTATION which highlight concerning "practices" and purposefully obstruct justice, from the Clerk of Court and Judges within the Court of Common Pleas are viewable in **Exhibit H.**

24. Un constitutional traffic stops and tribunal procedures with no jurisdiction or cause of action were captured on the record for traffic case no **SC # 302P1101851 and x 52.** **Exhibit I.** Lancaster County Magistrate Refuses to dismiss the case, committing Piracy, and even scheduled a jury trial WITHOUT providing PROOF OF NATURE AND CAUSE, when Jurisdiction was questioned **3 times**.

25. FMSD Director of Special Education Amy Maziarz participated in defamation of the Plaintiff Benson affidavit is **Exhibit J** and **Case no : 2025-cp-46-02210** and state **appeal no 2025-cp-46-02210**, where items are missing from the docket and orders are not signed by a judge in both the Court of Common Pleas and the SC Appeals Court, **Exhibit K.**

26. During the Hearing for the defendant Ms Maziarz Motion to Dismiss, Meredith Seibert was hired by the School District and was paid for by TAXPAYERS and was represented by the school district's attorney.

27. Judge Coble was unethical, unlawful and deprived the plaintiffs constitutionally protected rights to impartial due process, and falsely imprisoned the plaintiff by holding her in contempt of Court. When Ms Benson asked for the legal and lawful reason to be stated on and for the record, he refused and was unable to site one. **Exhibit L.**

28. There is documented proof of collusion and conspiracy between all 3 branches, executive, administrative and judicial under the State of South Carolina; between Judges , Attorneys through the PRIVATE association, the SCBAR. Specifically Meredith Seibert ESQ., Dave Duff Esq. and Barbara Drayton ESQ and the South Carolina Department of Education.

29. Realizing there is no such thing as constitutional due process in SC, and in order to perform due diligence at every level, a Writ of Mandamus was written to the Supreme Court of South Carolina for denial of rights, collusion and conspiracy to deprive rights. **Case: no- 2026-001384**, which, not surprisingly, is not able to be pulled up on the public record under appeals or supreme court of The State of South Carolina. **Exhibt M.**

30. The Majority of the Office of Civil Rights complaints the plaintiff filed as a mother or Advocate, and even from other advocates, are/were not handled appropriately, lawfully nor are/were they given ethical fact finding reviews. While they "STRIVE" to reach resolutions in 6 months most cases are left open for **YEARS.** These include but are not limited to case no: 11-25-4129, 11-25-1339, 11-24-1288, 11-24-1934, 11-24-4101, 11-25-4012, 1-25-1086, 11-25-4013, 11-25-4014, 11-24-1153, 11-25-1005, 11-24-1796, 11-24-1153, 11-25, 1005, 11-24-1746,11-19-1353, 11-17-1410, 11-21-1364, 11-25-1005, 11-24-1886, 11-24-1108, 11-23-1577.

31. An additional dozen or so state complaints were also filed with the SCDOE for PART B violations of IDEA. Resolutions purposefully omitted " investigation" on the specific points of the alleged violations of the actual written complaint. Instead they offered conclusions to specific items which were not indicated on the complaint. This is to CONTINUE to create false documentation purposefully and with ill will and to obstruct justice. **Exhibit N**

32. FERPA Complaint CRICKETS. **Exhibit O**

33. The plaintiffs **natural rights** protected by the Constitution continued to be violated, including but not limited to, impartial due process / justice for ALL, Freedom to travel, Freedom of religion, freedom of speech, Free and Fair Elections.

34. A judicial complaint with the SCBAR is unproductive and not impartial as it is a PRIVATE association and in the past have not seen appropriate resolutions.

Please see **Exhibit P.**

35. In May of 2026, Plaintiffs right to access public property, the school, to advocate to a child with disabilities was threatened with arrest by York Deputies and Clover SD unable to state any LAWFUL reason when asked in writing and in person. (Writ of Mandamus.)

36. Awakening and realizing over the course of the last few years that 99% of society is unaware and ignorant to the fact that all government at every level on both sides, and including in the Federal Courts, that they are either incompetent or compromised; in addition to 99% of living "people" are unable to hold their servant leaders accountable for a massive list of reasons, God began to push me to ask the basic questions and seek the basic answers of, who/what/when/where/why. As EYE sought , EYE found.

37. God in the [AS ABOVE JURISDICTION] commanded the Establishment of the Kingdom Nation of Light, where CHRIST is King, as the Creator intended, a MERKABA. IT is SO. But Where, on what land? As EYE sought, EYE found.

38. The State of SOUTH Carolina, and ANY other Nation or State etc., HAS **NO** JURISDICTION over anyone or anything, dead or alive, on/in/of/at a **MINIMUM**, the territory of 144,000 of Catawba Land. BEFORE 1762, the King of England himself proclaimed his Treaty with the Natives, referending **Exhibit C and D.** It was never part of any colony and it was never a part of the United States of America, before and after 1892 when America was made into a Corporation.

39. The Acreage precisely 144,000 is no coincidence and includes connections biblically, mathematically, musically, and vibrationally and in many other ways in Creation.

40. California v. Arizona, 440 U.S. 59 (1979). California sought to quiet title against Arizona

and the United States, and the Court separately analyzed its jurisdiction over the State-State controversy and the State-United States controversy. That case illustrates exactly why the identity and legal status of every plaintiff and defendant matter, rather than simply the subject matter involving land.

IV. Statement of Claims

I. CLAIMS OF A.C. BENSON AGAINST SOUTH CAROLINA AND THE UNITED STATES

Claim One — Deprivation of Due Process

Plaintiff A.C. Benson alleges that she has repeatedly been deprived of liberty, property, access, and protected interests without constitutionally adequate due process. Plaintiff alleges that these deprivations occurred through administrative proceedings, judicial proceedings, law-enforcement actions, educational proceedings, contempt proceedings, and other governmental actions described in the Statement of Facts.

Plaintiff specifically alleges denial of meaningful notice and opportunity to be heard, impartial adjudication, access to the courts, proper consideration of filings, and other procedural protections guaranteed by the Constitution. Plaintiff alleges that these actions caused loss of liberty, property, reputation, professional opportunity, financial injury, emotional injury, and deprivation of constitutional rights.

Claim Two — Denial of an Impartial Tribunal

Plaintiff alleges that she was entitled to proceedings before neutral and impartial decision-makers. Plaintiff alleges that administrative and judicial proceedings described herein involved conflicts, coordination, bias, irregular procedures, improper handling of documents, and/or circumstances that created an unconstitutional risk of partiality.

Plaintiff alleges that she repeatedly sought impartial consideration of her claims but was denied a meaningful remedy.

Claim Three — Freedom of Speech, Petition and Advocacy

Plaintiff alleges that she exercised protected rights by advocating for children with disabilities, challenging governmental conduct, filing complaints and lawsuits, criticizing public institutions, seeking judicial relief, and petitioning governmental agencies.

Plaintiff alleges that governmental actors subsequently subjected her to adverse treatment, interference, exclusion, harassment, restrictions on advocacy, and other actions because of or in response to those activities. Plaintiffs alleges that such conduct unlawfully burdened her rights of speech, petition, association, and advocacy.

Claim Four — Freedom of Religion and Conscience

Plaintiff alleges that she possesses sincerely held religious beliefs and has exercised those beliefs individually and through religious ministry. Plaintiff alleges governmental interference with her exercise of religion, religious association, religious property, and freedom of conscience.

Plaintiff alleges that governmental actors have attempted to subject protected religious

exercise and property to governmental actions without providing constitutionally adequate consideration of her asserted religious rights.

Claim Five — Unlawful Arrest, Detention and Deprivation of Liberty

Plaintiff alleges that she was arrested, detained, imprisoned, held in contempt, summoned, and/or otherwise deprived of liberty during the incidents described in the Statement of Facts. Plaintiff alleges that certain such actions occurred without probable cause, constitutionally adequate process, or other lawful justification.

Plaintiff alleges resulting loss of liberty and consequential damages.

Claim Six — Denial of Access to Courts and Redress

Plaintiff alleges interference with her constitutional right to seek redress through the courts. Such interference allegedly included refusal to accept or properly docket documents, issuance of allegedly unauthorized documents or orders, procedural irregularities, failure to consider properly presented claims, and other conduct identified in the exhibits.

Plaintiff alleges that these actions caused actual prejudice to her ability to prosecute claims, defend proceedings, obtain review, and secure remedies.

Claim Seven — Disability-Rights Advocacy and Retaliation

Plaintiff alleges that she engaged in advocacy concerning rights protected by the IDEA, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act, and the ADA.

Plaintiff alleges that governmental actors interfered with and retaliated against her

because of protected disability-rights advocacy, including advocacy undertaken on behalf of children with disabilities and their families.

Claim Eight — Injury to Reputation and Livelihood

Plaintiff alleges that governmental actors and other responsible persons engaged in conduct intended to interfere with her reputation and ability to work as a special-education advocate.

Plaintiff alleges resulting loss of income, clients, professional opportunities, reputation, and other economic and noneconomic injury.

II. CLAIMS OF QUANTUM UNIVERSAL MINISTRIES LLC AGAINST SOUTH CAROLINA AND THE USA

Claim Nine — Interference With Religious Exercise

Plaintiff Quantum Universal Ministries LLC ("QUM") alleges that it exists for religious and ministerial purposes and exercises religion through its ministry, property, activities, expression, association, and community.

QUM alleges that governmental conduct described in the Statement of Facts has substantially interfered with or burdened its religious exercise. QUM alleges violations of rights protected by the First Amendment and any applicable federal protections for religious exercise.

Claim Ten — Religious Property and Due Process

QUM alleges an interest in property used or designated for religious purposes.

QUM alleges that foreclosure and/or other governmental judicial processes affecting that property proceeded without adequate determination of QUM's asserted property and religious rights, jurisdictional objections, and constitutional defenses.

QUM alleges deprivation of property without constitutionally sufficient process.

Claim Eleven — Freedom of Religious Association and Expression

QUM alleges that governmental action has interfered with its ability to associate, worship, minister, communicate its religious teachings, use its property for religious purposes, and carry out its religious mission.

QUM seeks protection against governmental interference that violates applicable constitutional or statutory protections.

III. CLAIMS OF THE 144 CENTER LLC AGAINST SOUTH CAROLINA AND THE USA

This section requires particularly careful pleading because your factual statement presently asserts a conclusion about Catawba land sovereignty and title that would require considerably more historical and legal support before being alleged as an established fact.

Claim Twelve — Controversy Concerning Land, Territory and Jurisdiction

Plaintiff The 144 Center LLC alleges an interest in questions concerning the historical 144,000-acre tract associated with the Catawba Nation and the 1760 and 1763 agreements

identified in the Statement of Facts and Exhibits.

Plaintiff alleges that the historical documents recognize a fifteen-mile-square tract associated with the Catawba people. Plaintiff disputes the lawful historical basis upon which governmental jurisdiction, title, or authority over that territory was subsequently asserted.

Plaintiff seeks determination, to the extent Plaintiff possesses standing and a legally cognizable property or sovereign interest, concerning the effect of the historical instruments and subsequent governmental actions.

Claim Thirteen — Declaratory Relief Concerning Historical Instruments

Plaintiff seeks appropriate declaratory relief concerning the meaning and legal effect, where properly justiciable, of the historical instruments identified in its exhibits, including the relevant 1760 and 1763 agreements and subsequent instruments affecting the territory.

Plaintiff alleges that governmental authority over the property cannot properly be determined without consideration of the complete historical chain of title and applicable treaties, agreements, statutes, and constitutional provisions.

Claim Fourteen — Due Process Concerning Property and Territorial Interests

To the extent The 144 Center establishes a legally protected property interest, Plaintiff alleges that such interest cannot constitutionally be deprived without due process of law. Plaintiff therefore challenges governmental action affecting any such established interest where constitutionally sufficient notice, hearing, jurisdiction, and opportunity for review were allegedly absent. The Declaration of the Kingdom Nation of Amerkaba is an exhibit that is part of the

historical record to establish.

IV. CLAIMS OF ALL PLAINTIFFS AGAINST THE USA

Claim Fifteen — Constitutional Due Process

All Plaintiffs allege that federal governmental actors participated in, permitted, maintained, or failed to provide constitutionally adequate remedies for governmental actions affecting Plaintiffs' asserted liberty and property interests.

Plaintiffs allege that, where the Constitution imposed a duty upon the particular federal actor involved, the challenged conduct deprived Plaintiffs of constitutionally protected interests without due process.

Claim Sixteen — Right to Petition Government for Redress

All Plaintiffs allege that they exercised or attempted to exercise their right to petition the Government for redress through federal litigation, appellate proceedings, petitions, complaints, and other lawful processes.

Plaintiffs allege that the governmental conduct identified in the Statement of Facts interfered with meaningful consideration of their claims and requests for relief.

Claim Seventeen — Constitutional Supremacy and Limits Upon Governmental Authority

Plaintiffs allege that all governmental power exercised against them remains subordinate to the United States Constitution and that no statute, regulation, procedural rule, administrative

practice, or governmental custom may lawfully authorize conduct prohibited by the Constitution.

Plaintiffs seek adjudication of actual constitutional controversies within the jurisdiction of the Court rather than an advisory determination concerning governmental conduct generally.

Claim Eighteen — Declaratory Judgment

Plaintiffs seek declarations concerning actual controversies between the parties, including, where Plaintiffs establish standing, that the constitutionality of the challenged governmental actions; the existence and scope of Plaintiffs' asserted constitutional rights; the legality of challenged procedures; the jurisdiction and authority asserted against Plaintiffs; and the respective rights and obligations of the parties.

Claim Nineteen — Prospective Injunctive Relief

To the extent Plaintiffs establish continuing or imminently threatened violations, Plaintiffs seek narrowly tailored prospective relief preventing future deprivation of constitutional or statutory rights.

Claim Twenty — Restoration and Appropriate Relief

Plaintiffs seek restoration of rights and property interests proven to have been unlawfully impaired and all other relief authorized by the particular causes of action established in this proceeding.

Plaintiffs request declaratory and prospective injunctive relief, compensatory or nominal relief where legally available, costs and statutory remedies where authorized, and such other relief as the Court possesses jurisdiction and authority to award.

V. Additional Claims of All Plaintiffs

42 U.S.C. §1983 — Deprivation of Constitutional Rights Under Color of State Law, 18 U.S.C. §241 — Conspiracy Against Rights, 18 U.S.C. §242 — Deprivation of Rights Under Color of Law, 18 U.S.C. §1503 — Obstruction of Judicial Proceedings, 18 U.S.C. §1505 — Obstruction of Agency Proceedings, 18 U.S.C. §1512 — Witness/Evidence/Official-Proceeding Obstruction, 18 U.S.C. §1519 — Destruction, Alteration, Concealment or Falsification of Records

Claim/Count 21- FEDERAL OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE 18 U.S.C. §§ 1503, 1505, 1512, and 1519

Plaintiffs incorporate the Statement of Facts, Procedural History, exhibits, judicial records, administrative records, correspondence, docket records, and other evidence identified therein.

Plaintiffs alleges that, beginning in or about 2021 and continuing thereafter, multiple state, local, educational, administrative, and other actors engaged in a continuing course of conduct that Plaintiff contends interfered with, impeded, influenced, or attempted to influence judicial and administrative proceedings involving Plaintiff, her family, her advocacy activities, and children with disabilities.

Plaintiff requests that the conduct described below be evaluated under applicable federal obstruction statutes and other federal law. Plaintiff does not allege that the mere existence of an adverse judicial or administrative ruling constitutes obstruction; rather, the allegations concern the specific intentional acts involving records, proceedings, filings, evidence, investigations, and administration of justice described below.

Federal Judicial Proceedings

- 22-614-SAL-SVH;
- 22-cv-01912-SAL-SVH;

- 0:23-cv-04838-SAL-SVH;
- 23-cv-05029-TMC-KFM;
- 23-cv-05162;
- 0:23-cv-04565-SAL; and
- 0:24-cv-01991-JDA.

Related appeals included Fourth Circuit Nos.:

22-2104; 22-2310; 24-1173; 24-1852; 25-2505; 24-1232; 24-119; and 24-1853.

Plaintiff further sought Supreme Court review

No. 23-5007.

These proceedings constitute concrete judicial proceedings against which any alleged obstructive act must be compared.

Claim/Count Twenty Two- 18 U.S.C. §1503 — Obstruction of the Due Administration of Justice

Section 1503 prohibit, among other things, corruptly influencing, obstructing, impeding, or endeavoring to influence, obstruct, or impede the due administration of justice.

The Supreme Court requires a meaningful nexus between the allegedly obstructive act and a judicial proceeding, together with the requisite corrupt intent. DOJ's description of Fourth Circuit authority likewise recognizes intent as an essential component.

Plaintiff alleges that, during the pendency of identified judicial proceedings, acts occurred that she contends included:

a. withholding, omitting, refusing to docket, or otherwise preventing documents from becoming part of judicial records;

b. creating, using, transmitting, or maintaining allegedly false or materially inaccurate records;

c. issuing or entering documents represented as judicial orders that Plaintiff alleges were not properly executed or authorized by a judge;

d. interfering with Plaintiff's ability to place evidence, objections, jurisdictional challenges, and other matters before the appropriate tribunal;

e. using judicial or administrative processes for purposes Plaintiff alleges were intended to impede meaningful adjudication of federally protected rights; and

f. coordinating actions among persons or institutions with knowledge of pending proceedings and with the alleged purpose of preventing or impairing adjudication of Plaintiff's claims.

Plaintiff's attached Statement specifically alleges missing docket items and orders she contends were unsigned in litigation involving Case No. 2025-CP-46-02210 and related appellate proceedings.

Plaintiff further identifies documentation concerning allegedly obstructive practices by clerks and judges within the South Carolina Court of Common Pleas as **Exhibit H.**

Plaintiff alleges these acts were not merely negligent procedural mistakes but, where supported by the referenced evidence, were undertaken knowingly and for the purpose of affecting the administration or outcome of judicial proceedings.

Claim/ Count TENTY THREE- 18 U.S.C. §1519 — Falsification, Concealment, Alteration, or Destruction of Records

Section 1519 is potentially much closer to some of the factual allegations you have made.

It reaches a person who knowingly alters, destroys, conceals, covers up, falsifies, or makes a false entry in a record or document, with intent to impede, obstruct, or influence a matter within the jurisdiction of a federal department or agency, including conduct undertaken in contemplation of such a matter.

Plaintiff alleges that records relevant to federal and state proceedings were intentionally omitted, altered, concealed, inaccurately characterized, or created in a materially false form.

Plaintiff specifically alleges irregularities involving court dockets and judicial orders, and identifies supporting materials as **Exhibits H and K.**

Plaintiff further alleges that numerous complaints submitted to the South Carolina Department of Education concerning IDEA Part B violations resulted in resolution documents that omitted investigation of issues actually raised while addressing matters Plaintiff contends were not presented in the complaints. Plaintiff alleges that these records were knowingly created in a misleading form for the purpose of establishing an inaccurate administrative record and impeding subsequent review.

To establish §1519 criminally, however, evidence would have to establish not simply that a record was erroneous or incomplete, but that the responsible person knowingly engaged in the prohibited conduct with the statutorily required intent concerning a matter within federal jurisdiction, which through discovery can be found.

Claim/ Count TWENTY FOUR- 18 U.S.C. §1505 — Obstruction of Agency Proceedings

Plaintiff further alleges potential interference with federal administrative processes. The attached Statement identifies numerous complaints submitted to the Office for Civil Rights, including:

11-25-4129, 11-25-1339, 11-24-1288, 11-24-1934, 11-24-4101, 11-25-4012, 1-25-1086, 11-25-4013, 11-25-4014, 11-24-1153, 11-25-1005, 11-24-1796, 11-24-1746, 11-19-1353, 11-17-1410, 11-21-1364, 11-24-1886, 11-24-1108, and 11-23-1577, among those listed.

Plaintiff alleges that these and other administrative matters were delayed, improperly investigated, inaccurately documented, or otherwise impeded.

For obstruction liability, however, the evidence would have to establish more than delay, disagreement with an agency's conclusions, negligence, or poor administration. It would need to establish the statutory elements—including the requisite intentional/corrupt interference with a covered proceeding.

Claim/Count TWENTY FIVE- 18 U.S.C. §1512 — Evidence, Witnesses, and Official Proceedings

To the extent evidence establishes that any person knowingly or corruptly:

- altered, destroyed, mutilated, or concealed evidence;
- attempted to prevent evidence from being available for an official proceeding;
- improperly influenced testimony or communications;
- hindered communication of information concerning a possible federal offense; or
- otherwise engaged in conduct falling within §1512,

Plaintiff requests investigation under the applicable subsection of §1512. The existence of

an actual disagreement, adverse testimony, unfavorable ruling, or erroneous document standing alone would not establish obstruction. Evidence of the act, nexus, knowledge, and required intent would be necessary.

Alleged Pattern and Intent

Plaintiff alleges that the events should not be evaluated solely as isolated procedural disagreements.

Plaintiff alleges repeated irregularities across educational administrative proceedings, South Carolina courts, federal litigation, appellate proceedings, OCR matters, and other governmental proceedings.

The Statement identifies, among other matters, a South Carolina Supreme Court mandamus proceeding, No. 2026-001384, which Plaintiff alleges could not be located through the public appellate/Supreme Court record, and identifies the supporting material as **Exhibit M.**

Plaintiff also alleges repeated SCDOE complaint-resolution practices involving omission of allegations actually presented in IDEA complaints, which Plaintiff characterizes as intentional creation of false documentation designed to obstruct review.

Plaintiff alleges that evidence contained in the exhibits, docket records, correspondence, metadata, administrative files, court filings, orders, transcripts, recordings, and communications will establish whether these events resulted from mistake or negligence or instead constituted knowing and intentional interference with the administration of justice.

Claim/Count TWENTY SIX- Related Federal Civil-Rights Offenses

Separate from Chapter 73 obstruction offenses, the allegations may warrant examination under other federal criminal statutes if their elements are supported by evidence.

For example, 18 U.S.C. §242 criminalizes certain willful deprivations of federal rights by persons acting under color of law. The government must establish an identified federal right, action under color of law, and the required willful intent to deprive the person of that right.

Where two or more persons allegedly agreed to deprive someone of federally protected rights, 18 U.S.C. §241 can present a separate criminal question. But again, the evidence—not merely the existence of several adverse decisions—would have to establish the agreement and required criminal intent.

Requested Action

Plaintiff requests preservation and examination of the original records associated with the proceedings identified herein, including docket entries, electronically filed documents, audit trails, filing timestamps, document metadata, internal correspondence, administrative investigative files, original signed orders, communications concerning filing or rejection of documents, and records associated with the complaints and proceedings identified above.

Plaintiff further requests that any competent federal investigative or prosecutorial authority determine whether the evidence establishes violations of 18 U.S.C. §§1503, 1505, 1512, 1519, 241, 242, or other applicable federal criminal law.

CLAIM/ COUNT — DEPRIVATION OF CONSTITUTIONAL AND FEDERAL RIGHTS UNDER COLOR OF STATE LAW 42 U.S.C. § 1983

Plaintiffs incorporate by reference all preceding allegations, the Statement of Facts and Procedural History, and the exhibits identified therein.

Plaintiffs alleges that, beginning in approximately 2021 and continuing thereafter, individual state and local officials, employees, agents, and other persons acting under color of statutes, regulations, customs, practices, policies, procedures, or asserted authority of the State of South Carolina subjected, or caused Plaintiff to be subjected, to deprivations of rights, privileges, and immunities secured by the Constitution and laws of the United States.

42 U.S.C. §1983 provides a civil remedy when a person acting under color of state law subjects another person to the deprivation of federally protected rights.

A. Protected Rights Allegedly Deprived

Plaintiff alleges that the conduct described in the Statement of Facts deprived her of federally protected rights including, where applicable to the particular Defendant and occurrence:

First Amendment rights, including freedom of speech, religious exercise, association, advocacy, and petitioning government for redress of grievances; Fourth Amendment rights, including protection against unreasonable seizure, arrest, and detention; Fifth Amendment rights, including procedural due process, equal protection, and adjudication by a constitutionally impartial tribunal; access to the courts and meaningful judicial redress; and rights arising under federal disability and educational law, ADA, IDEA, Rehabilitation ACT of 1973 Section 504, to the extent those rights are independently enforceable through §1983.

Plaintiff's allegations arise in part from her activities beginning after administrative

decisions concerning denial of FAPE under IDEA and her subsequent establishment of Angel Advocates 4 Special Education LLC to advocate for children with disabilities and their parents.

B. Exercise of Federally Protected Rights

Plaintiff alleges that she repeatedly exercised constitutional and federal rights by: challenging governmental action; advocating for children with disabilities; participating in IDEA administrative proceedings; filing complaints with state and federal agencies; commencing civil actions; pursuing appeals; seeking Supreme Court review; requesting public officials establish their authority and jurisdiction; submitting evidence and court filings; seeking jury trials; asserting religious rights; and petitioning government for redress.

Plaintiff thereafter commenced or participated in federal litigation including D.S.C. Nos. 22-614-SAL-SVH, 22-cv-01912-SAL-SVH, 0:23-cv-04838-SAL-SVH, 23-cv-05029-TMC-KFM, 23-cv-05162, 0:23-cv-04565-SAL, and 0:24-cv-01991-JDA, together with numerous appeals to the Fourth Circuit. Plaintiff also petitioned the Supreme Court of the United States in Case No. 23-5007.

C. Alleged Deprivation of Due Process

Plaintiff alleges that state actors, acting under color of state authority, deprived her of constitutionally sufficient due process through acts including, but not limited to:

- refusing or failing to properly accept,
- preserve, or docket filings;
- failing to provide meaningful consideration of jurisdictional and constitutional objections;

- using procedures that Plaintiff alleges prevented meaningful presentation of evidence or claims;
- creating or maintaining allegedly inaccurate judicial or administrative records;
- issuing or maintaining documents Plaintiff alleges were not properly authorized or executed;
- denying meaningful opportunity to be heard;
- and subjecting Plaintiff to proceedings allegedly lacking an impartial decision-maker.

Plaintiff specifically alleges missing docket materials and unsigned orders associated with Case No. 2025-CP-46-02210 and other state and appellate proceedings.

Plaintiff additionally identifies documentation concerning practices of clerks and judicial officers that she alleges obstructed access to meaningful judicial review, identified in her Statement of Facts as **Exhibit H.**

D. Alleged Unreasonable Seizure and Deprivation of Liberty

Plaintiff alleges that state and local officials acting under color of law unlawfully stopped, arrested, detained, imprisoned, and/or otherwise seized her without constitutionally sufficient justification.

Plaintiff specifically alleges an October 2021 traffic stop and subsequent courthouse arrest and overnight confinement associated with matters ultimately litigated in D.S.C. No. 0:23-cv-04838-SAL-SVH and Fourth Circuit No. 24-1852.

Plaintiff alleges that these actions deprived her of liberty in violation of federally

protected rights and caused actual damages.

E. First Amendment Retaliation

Plaintiff alleges that she engaged in constitutionally protected speech, advocacy, religious activity, litigation, criticism of governmental institutions, and petitions for governmental redress.

Plaintiff alleges that certain Defendants thereafter subjected her to adverse governmental actions because of those protected activities.

Plaintiff alleges that such conduct included interference with her special-education advocacy, exclusion or threatened exclusion from public facilities, law-enforcement involvement, adverse administrative actions, and interference with her ability to advocate for children with disabilities.

For example, Plaintiff alleges that in May 2026 she was threatened with arrest while attempting to access a public school to advocate for a child with disabilities and that York County deputies and Clover School District personnel failed to provide a lawful reason when challenged.

Plaintiff alleges a causal relationship between her protected activities and the adverse actions and alleges that the conduct would deter a person of ordinary firmness from continuing to exercise protected constitutional rights.

F. Interference With Access to Courts

Plaintiff alleges that responsible state actors intentionally interfered with her ability to

seek judicial redress by refusing or failing to properly file documents, maintaining allegedly incomplete records, issuing or relying upon allegedly unauthorized documents, interfering with the presentation of evidence, and otherwise preventing meaningful consideration of claims and defenses.

Plaintiff alleges that these acts caused actual injury to identifiable litigation and impaired her ability to obtain judicial review.

Plaintiff identifies, among other proceedings, South Carolina Supreme Court matter No. 2026-001384, which Plaintiff alleges could not subsequently be located through the public appellate/Supreme Court record.

G. Disability-Rights Advocacy and Retaliation

Plaintiff alleges that she engaged in protected advocacy concerning children with disabilities under IDEA, Section 504, the ADA, and related federal protections.

Plaintiff alleges that state and local governmental actors knew of this advocacy and thereafter interfered with her ability to advocate, communicate with educational institutions, participate in educational proceedings, and access public educational facilities.

Plaintiff alleges that these actions were undertaken, at least in part, because she repeatedly challenged alleged violations of federally protected disability and educational rights.

H. Alleged Joint and Coordinated Conduct

Plaintiff alleges that certain individual Defendants acted jointly or in concert with other persons under color of state authority.

Plaintiff alleges that the conduct was not limited to isolated adverse decisions but involved coordinated actions concerning administrative proceedings, court proceedings, records, educational complaints, advocacy activities, and governmental enforcement.

Plaintiff's Statement of Facts specifically alleges coordination among persons associated with state governmental institutions, educational institutions, attorneys, and other actors.

Plaintiff alleges that discovery, including communications, electronic records, metadata, docket audit trails, administrative records, correspondence, and other documentary evidence, will further establish the identity, participation, knowledge, intent, and actions of the individual participants.

I. Causation and Injury

Plaintiff alleges that the acts and omissions of the responsible Defendants were the actual and proximate cause of constitutional injuries and resulting damages, including deprivation of liberty, interference with protected advocacy, impairment of access to judicial and administrative remedies, reputational and professional injury, financial loss, emotional injury, and other compensable harm.

Plaintiff alleges that the constitutional injuries were caused by identifiable governmental actors exercising or purporting to exercise authority under state law.

J. Relief

Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §1983 and other applicable law, Plaintiff seeks all relief legally

available for proven constitutional violations, including declaratory relief, prospective injunctive relief where available, compensatory damages against legally proper defendants, nominal damages, punitive damages against individual defendants where the governing standard is satisfied, costs and other relief authorized by law.

Plaintiff further seeks appropriate prospective relief against continuing violations of federal law and such other relief as the Court determines lawful and just.

V. Certification and Closing

Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 11, by providing my autograph below, I certify to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief that this complaint: (1) is not being presented for an improper purpose, such as to harass, cause unnecessary delay, or needlessly increase the cost of litigation; (2) is supported by existing law or by a nonfrivolous argument for extending, modifying, or reversing existing law; (3) the factual contentions have evidentiary support or, if specifically so identified, will likely have evidentiary support after a reasonable opportunity for further investigation or discovery; and (4) the complaint otherwise complies with the requirements of Rule 11.

V. Prayer and Relief

Many Indigenous Tribes have ancient prophecies for this time in humanity's existence. Although not a part of any one particular tribe, the 8th fire prophesy speaks of this moment in time of humanity's existence.

The Seventh Fire speaks of a generation of "New People" who will seek out the teachings that were nearly lost. One of the best-known teachings associated with the Seventh Fire is that humanity comes to a crossroads.....

- a path leading toward continued exploitation, materialism, and destruction;
- a path leading toward respect, reconciliation, balance and care for the Earth and all living things.

If the right choices are made, the Seventh Fire will light the Eighth and final Fire—an eternal fire of peace, love, brotherhood, and sisterhood.

From Darkness to Light, the Veil has been/is Lifted. To God be the Glory for Ever and Ever, Amen. May His Kingdom Come, May His Will be Done, on EARTH [LAW] land, air, water, as it is in HEAVEN. As Above, So Below.

#Consciouschange

A.C. Benson
All Rights Reserved
the144center@gmail.com/ quantumuniversalministries@gmail.com
235 Straightaway lane
Indian Land, 29707

September 11th, 2026

The Supreme Court of the United States of America

A.C. Benson & The 144 Center LLC, & Quantum Universal Ministries LLC.	)	Case no:_____
Plaintiffs	)	
v.	)	**Certificate of Service**
The State of South Carolina Inc, through AG Alan Watts; The United States of America Inc. through AG Todd Blanche.	)	
Defendants	)	

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy was served upon the following by certified USPS FLAT rate mail, September 10, 2026;

Original Jurisdiction Civil Law Suit

To The following Persons

Alan Wilson SC Attorney General 1000 Assembly St. Room 519 Columbia SC 29201	Todd Blanche U.S. Department of Justice, 950 Pennsylvania Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20530

Alexis Carberry Benson

Autograph

Index

A. Declaration of Independence of Amerkaba
B. Constitution of Amerkaba
C. King Proclamation 1764
D. Treaty of August 1763
E. Reserved
F. Survey and Map of 144,000 acres Catawbaw Nation and
   235 Straightaway Lane Amerkaba Survey.
G. UHM Procedural and Ethical Violations Clerk of Court CP and Judges
H. BHR Ethical and procedural violations Clerk of Court and Judges.
I. Traffic Court Exhibits
J. Maziarz Affidavit
K. Procedural and Ethical Violations Clerk of Court Common pleas and Court of Appeals
   Collusion and conspiracy. M. Seibert esq. , B.Drayton esq. D. Coble
L. Reserved
M. Time stamped, amended Writ of Mandamus SCOTSSC
N. IDEA state Complaint samples of false documentation/ obstruction.
O. FERPA Complaint
P. Judicial Misconduct Complaint

The Supreme Court of the United States of America

A.C. Benson & The 144 Center LLC, & Quantum Universal Ministries LLC.)
)
)

Case no:_____

Plaintiffs)
)

v.)
)

Certificate of Service

The State of South Carolina Inc, through AG Alan Watts; The United States of America Inc. through AG Todd Blanche.)
)
)

Defendants

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy was served upon the following by certified USPS FLAT rate mail and the email listed on the official Public Government Website, September 10, 2026;

Original Jurisdiction Civil Law Suit

To The following Persons

Alan Wilson - info@scag.gov SC Attorney General 1000 Assembly St. Room 519 Columbia SC 29201	Todd Blanche-todd.blanche40@usdoj.gov U.S. Department of Justice, 950 Pennsylvania Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20530

Alexis Carberry Benson

_____

Autograph