

United States Courts
Southern District of Texas
FILED

JAN 24 2024

1 James-Thomas: English,
17111 Dewberry Ln
2 Rosharon Tx Republic
484-764*5793 |
3 Kingsemajl@Fastmail.com

Nathan Ochsner, Clerk of Court

4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT HOUSTON SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

5 JURISDICTION

6 PLAINTIFF'S NAME,
7 James-Thomas: English, (King Semaj of The English
8 Estate, The living Man),
9 vs.

Case No.: 58024901

BILL OF THE COMPLAINT IN EQUITY & CIVIL
COMPLAINT

10 DEFENDANT'S NAME,
11 United States of America Principal, Pearland Municipal
Court & The State OF Texas, Judge Farme. Prosecutor
12 Kevin Inglehart

13 PARTIES

14 The Plaintiff James-Thomas: English Known as King Semaj Of The English Estate the living man at all times
15 relevant hereto is an private citizen of the State of Texas Republic. The Defendant is the United States of America
16 Principal, Pearland Municipal Court & The State OF Texas, Judge Farme. Prosecutor Kevin Inglehart

17 COMPLAINT

18 **BILL OF COMPLAINT IN EQUITY PRESENTMENT TO VOID PROCEEDINGS AND JURISDICTION**

19 **INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND** with memorandum of Law (Exhibit A) COMES NOW, James -
20 Thomas : English a natural living man of majority status conducting the style condition of The Principal and
21 Beneficial Equitable title Holder, and not an infant/minor, hereinafter "Complainant". As such I am exercising as
22 well as retaining and reserving all rights, natural, private commercial, incorporeal or otherwise and does tender this
23 claim and makes the claim that the tender was special deposited on the accounts receivables books of the court, via
24 the respondent's commercial filings and/or other deposits into the courts registry, who by their own admission of the
25 complaint showing or causing to show the existence of a qualified endorsement. The respondent has come into this
26 matter related to a trust in the capacity that is unsustainable, and thus is perceived as standing in its unadulterated
27 non-immune capacity and is liable for all damages incurred, assessments as well as penalties. On its face it appears
28 that the Respondent's intent and purpose was to take up the election to treat the within reference complaint as a
BILL OF THE COMPLAINT IN EQUITY & CIVIL COMPLAINT - 1

1 draft, rather than a promise to pay. A complaint is a promise to pay, and a draft is an order to pay, and the person
2 holding the instrument can treat it as either. The court converted the complaint to a draft (a form of currency
3 conversion). There might be cause for one to raise and/or complain that they lack understanding, that such
4 information is foreign to them; and it is at that time that such an individual documents their lack of knowledge, for
5 overseeing such a matter that specifically deals with an express trust and the estate of an infant, which invokes
6 exclusive jurisdiction and not concurrent jurisdiction. This court acts as an administrative venue as a result of the
7 administrative acts and the presidential proclamation 2038, 2039, and 2040- for which the presidents for the United
8 States have exercised "Emergency Powers Jurisdiction" continuously, from 1933 to the present, according to the
9 Senate report on national emergencies associated with the National Emergencies Act. To ensure this information is
10 not ambiguous, nor is it foreign to the government, for the Senate of the United States Congress has verified the
11 aforementioned facts.

12 Equities Implied Expression of a trust. Minor means an individual under the age of 18 years. The term minor is also
13 used to refer to an individual who has attained the age of 18 years but has not yet taken control of the securities
14 contained in his or her minor account. Minor account means an account that a custodian controls on behalf of a
15 minor, this is referred to as a resulting trust the definition of a resulting trust is: A resulting trust (from the Latin
16 'resalire' meaning 'to jump back') is the creation of an implied trust by operation of law, where property is
17 transferred to someone who pays nothing for it; and then is implied to have held the property for benefit of another
18 person.

19 I, James-Thomas: English, bring forth a grievance related to an accident whereupon I called for a peace officer to
20 address the situation. During this incident, law enforcement issued a ticket for "No registration" in the state of
21 Texas, in apparent disregard of Texas Transportation Code 502.003 Section (b). This code clearly stipulates that
22 there is no requirement for the registration of a private automobile, aligning with my First Amendment right to
23 contract and the right not to be forced into commerce.

24 Upon receipt of the ticket, I diligently submitted motions to dismiss based on these premises. However, the court
25 denied my motions without providing substantive facts, and an inscribed note referencing Texas Transportation
26 Code 502.040 was appended. I wish to assert the misapplication of this code and clarify the legal context:

27 **Transportation Code 502.003 and 502.040 Distinction:**

28 BILL OF THE COMPLAINT IN EQUITY & CIVIL COMPLAINT - 2

- 1 • The court misunderstood the necessity of registration by citing Transportation Code 502.040. However, this
2 section pertains to license plate visibility, not the obligatory nature of registration.
- 3 • It is crucial to differentiate between reasonable suspicion or probable cause for a traffic stop (502.003) and
4 the operational aspects of license plates (502.040).

5 **Due Process and Broader Legal Context:**

- 6 • The absence of a license plate does not definitively establish a lack of registration, as valid reasons may
7 exist for non-display.
- 8 • It is essential to uphold due process, considering that registration and license plate requirements are
9 governed by distinct statutes and should not be conflated.
- 10 • Despite my efforts to rectify these misconceptions, the court issued a warrant for my arrest, alleging debt,
11 which I contest on multiple grounds:

12 **14th Amendment Protection:**

- 13 • As a non-U.S. citizen, I invoke protections under the 14th Amendment, emphasizing the illegality of
14 imprisonment for debt.

15 **Sixth Amendment Right to Clarification:**

- 16 • I sought clarification on the nature and cause of charges, a fundamental right under the Sixth Amendment.

17 **First Amendment Right to Privacy:**

- 18 • Concerns were raised about my right to privacy, protected by the First Amendment, challenging the
19 legitimacy of the arrest.

20 **Necessary and Proper Clause:**

- 21 • Emphasizing that the Necessary and Proper Clause supports actions within the scope of federal power,
22 without infringing upon individual rights.

23 **Texas Transportation Code Section 502.003:**

- 24 • As a private citizen, I assert the right not to register my vehicle, as explicitly stated in Tex. Transp. Code §
25 502.003.

26 **13th Amendment Protection:**

- 27 • Invoke the 13th Amendment, as imprisonment for debt is unconstitutional.

1 **Texas and Federal Law Violations by Court and Debt Collectors:**

- 2 • Reference Texas Constitution Article 1, Section 18, Texas Finance Code Chapter 392, Subchapter D, and
3 Sections of Title 15 of the U.S. Code, outlining violations by court and debt collectors.

4 **Definition of Crime and Clearfield Trust Co vs. United States:**

- 5 • Contend that the act of not registering a private automobile does not meet the traditional criteria of a crime,
6 as per Clearfield Trust Co vs. United States.

7 **27 CFR. § 72.11, "ALL CRIMES ARE COMMERCIAL"**

- 8 • In the realm of commerce, governed by 27 CFR, the foundational principles of equity come into play.
9 Applying the equitable maxims "equity will not complete an imperfect gift" and "equity will not aid a
10 volunteer," it is crucial to recognize that all crimes within the commercial domain adhere to these
11 principles. A volunteer, in this context, refers to the grantee of an imperfect deed or assignment lacking
12 acceptance and restricted signatures for continuing interest.
- 13 • In commercial transactions, the absence of a restricted signature for continuing interest signifies an
14 incomplete transfer or gift. Analogous to the concept of an imperfect title from infancy, where no
15 acceptance or recording has taken place, the lack of perfection in the transfer renders it inequitable.
16 Consequently, these equitable maxims underpin daily commercial interactions.
- 17 • Drawing from this understanding, it is asserted that, within the commercial framework, every crime is
18 inherently based on the violation of these equitable maxims. This perspective is vital in asserting that,
19 lacking a contract with the State of Texas, any charges purportedly criminal in nature are fundamentally
20 flawed. Without a discernible injured party, and recognizing that the state cannot assume such a role, the
21 charges stand in violation of constitutional rights.

22 **Texas and Federal Law**

23 **Texas Constitution, Article 1, Section 18**

- 24 • This provision in the Texas Constitution ensures that no person shall ever be imprisoned for debt.
25 • Texas Finance Code Chapter 392, Subchapter D
26 • These sections of Texas law outline deceptive, threatening, and abusive behavior that debt collectors(court)
27 and original creditors cannot engage in. These behaviors include: falsely accusing you of a crime, using
28

1 profane or obscene language, using a false name (Name Copyrighted), misrepresenting that their
2 communications are coming from an official government source. (A warrant for debt and using a
3 supposedly crime as justification)

4 **Sections 1692d(1) and 1692d(2) in Title 15 of the U.S. Code**

- 5 • Under the FDCPA, third-party debt collectors cannot use profane or obscene language. They cannot
6 threaten you with violence or other criminal acts. (Threat with a warrant & making me the surety)

7 **Section 1692e in Title 15 of the U.S. Code**

- 8 • This section of the federal Fair Debt Collection Practices Act lists false or deceptive statements that a third-
9 party debt collector is prohibited from using.

10 **Section 1692f(6) in Title 15 of the U.S. Code**

- 11 • This section of the FDCPA states that a third-party debt collector cannot threaten to repossess property if it
12 was not collateral for the debt in question, if it is exempt from repossession by law, or if they do not intend
13 to actually repossess it.

14 The definition of a Crime traditionally involves an injured party or damaged property, and the act of not registering
15 a private automobile does not inherently meet this criterion.

- 16 • A state entity cannot be considered an injured party, as it lacks the personal attributes necessary for
17 victimhood.
- 18 • The act of compelling me to register my private automobile implies forcing me into commerce, contrary to
19 my First Amendment right to freely engage in contracts.
- 20 • The absence of a harmed party or damaged property challenges the fundamental elements required for an
21 action to be considered criminal.

22 In light of these constitutional and legal arguments, I demand a fair and impartial trial to address these violations of
23 rights and the improper issuance of a warrant. This request aligns with my Sixth Amendment right to a speedy and
24 fair trial, essential for upholding justice and safeguarding individual liberties.

25 **Cause of Action: Violations of Constitutional, Inalienable, and Human Rights**

26 **1. Intimidation by Gang and Forced into Commerce:**

1 Allegations of intimidation by a group and coercion into commercial activities constitute severe violations
2 of individual rights. The undue influence and coercion exerted during the arrest and subsequent legal
3 proceedings raise fundamental concerns about the abuse of power.

4 **2. Violation of First Amendment Right to Privacy & Right to Contract:**

5 The arrest and legal proceedings have infringed upon the First Amendment right to privacy and the right to
6 contract. The production of a separation form from the United States entity, clearly distinguishing the living
7 man from the created entity, has been ignored. This refusal to recognize the distinction attempts to force the
8 living man into an implied surety role for charges that lack the basis of being crimes.

9 **3. Violation of 13th Amendment (Back in Slavery):**

10 The false arrest, absent any legitimate crime, leading to detainment, draws alarming parallels to involuntary
11 servitude, a direct violation of the 13th Amendment. Such actions raise significant concerns about the
12 infringement of basic human rights and dignity. This the intent of a warrant

13 **4. Violation of 14th Amendment:**

14 The violation of due process, equal protection, and the failure to recognize the World Passport constitute
15 violations of the 14th Amendment. The denial of due process and equal protection under the law
16 undermines the very foundations of a fair legal system.

17 **5. International Law Violations:**

18 The refusal to recognize international documents, specifically the World Passport, stands in contravention of the
19 Charter of the United Nations and customary international law. This refusal disregards established norms that
20 recognize and respect the validity of international identification documents.

21 **6. Rule of Law - Federalist 78:**

22 Reference is made to Federalist 78, emphasizing the supremacy of the Constitution over mere codes and statutes.
23 The actions taken, in the absence of a legitimate crime, under the guise of codes and statutes, are akin to acting in
24 the color of the law. This contravenes the principles laid out in Federalist 78, which asserts that the Constitution
25 should prevail over statutes.

26 **7. 18 USC 241/242 - Extortion and Threats:**

27 The absence of an actual crime to support criminal charges for failure to register a private automobile, coupled with
28 threats of violating the 13th Amendment unless compelled to contract with the state, constitutes potential violations

1 of 18 USC 241/242. The use of legal processes to coerce and extort compliance is antithetical to the principles of
2 justice and individual liberty.

3 **8. Failure to Address International Tort Administrative Process:**

4 Despite completing an international tort administrative process and submitting it to risk management, the lack of
5 response or acknowledgment underscores a systemic failure to address the violations. As a private citizen, your
6 constitutional, inalienable, and human rights deserve protection, and the disregard for the administrative process
7 compounds the severity of the infractions.

8 critical matter that requires immediate consideration. It pertains to a lack of acknowledgment and understanding by
9 Pearland Municipal Court regarding the distinction between my legal entity, JAMES THOMAS ENGLISH, and my
10 individual identity as King Semaj Of The English Estate, the Trustee of the estate.

11 **9. Legal Entity vs. Individual Identity:**

12 JAMES THOMAS ENGLISH holds legal recognition with specific identifiers, such as a Duns and Bradstreet
13 number of 119026518 and an EIN number of 98-6118415. It is crucial to comprehend that this legal entity is owned
14 by King Semaj Of The English Estate, who serves as the Trustee of the estate.

15 **Legal Framework:**

16 Laws enacted by State, County, and Municipal corporations are designed for legal "persons" and entities, not living
17 individuals. As a living individual, I explicitly reserve my rights and do not automatically consent to the application
18 of such laws unless voluntarily agreed upon through a contractual arrangement.

19 **10. Executive Orders:**

20 Executive Orders issued by the President hold authority over the United States corporation and its employees within
21 the 10-mile square of Washington, D.C. However, these Orders do not automatically extend to me as a private
22 individual unless I have provided explicit consent or entered into a contractual agreement.

23 **11. Deprivation of Rights:**

24 I assert that no agency of the corporate government network has the authority to deprive living individuals of their
25 unalienable rights without written consent or voluntary agreement. Any enforcement actions limiting these rights
26 must be accompanied by full disclosure and written consent, as stipulated in the Supreme Court case of Bond v.
27 United States (529 US 334, 2000).

1 This comprehensive cause of action addresses multifaceted violations of constitutional, inalienable, and human
2 rights, seeking redress and restitution for the egregious violations perpetrated during the arrest and subsequent legal
3 proceedings.

4 **12. Crucial Recognition of Jurisdictional Limits and Common Law Supremacy:**

5 It is imperative to acknowledge that the state of Texas oversteps its jurisdictional bounds when issuing tickets to
6 natural beings or private citizens based on codes and statutes that carry the color of law, as defined under 18 USC
7 241. As a private citizen within the Republic of Texas, I vehemently assert that common law stands as the supreme
8 law of the land, a position substantiated by an abundance of legal precedents.

9 In various notable legal cases, the distinction between statutes and laws is evident. In *Cruden v. Neale*, it is clarified
10 that the government formulates rules for its own operations, not to subjugate the people. Therefore, private citizens
11 cannot be subjected to codes and statutes without their explicit consent or contractual agreement.

12 Moreover, the rational connection between statutory presumptions and the presented facts is essential, as
13 underscored in *Tot v United States*. A presumption lacking this connection is deemed constitutionally unsustainable.

14
15 Statutes are explicitly designed for state-created entities, predominantly corporations, as elucidated in *Colonial*
16 *Pipeline v. Triangle*. This confines their application within the jurisdiction of the legislature, particularly with
17 individuals residing outside that jurisdiction, as clarified in *Bond v Jay*.

18 A categorical distinction between statutes and laws is reinforced by legal precedents such as *Flournoy v. First Nat.*
19 *Bank of Shreveport* and *In Re Self v Rhay*. While statutes may govern internal regulations within the government,
20 they do not supersede common law applicable to private citizens in their distinct status, governed by common law.

21 Asserting my immunity as a private citizen from the jurisdiction of legalism, as per *Rodriques v Ray Donovan*,
22 statutes lacking clarity in their applicability to "natural persons" deprive individuals of fair notice. Such statutes are
23 construed for artificial corporate entities or those under contractual employment with the government.

24 Applying the *Clearfield Trust Co. v. United States* doctrine, the government loses its sovereign status when using
25 private commercial paper, requiring full disclosure and a contractual agreement for specific performance from
26 private citizens.

1 Emphasizing that police departments and government entities are private contractors and for-profit businesses,
2 distinct from the Executive Branch of the State government, as affirmed by Judge Mays and upheld in judicial
3 review by Judge Ridgeway, underscores that private citizens should not be subject to statutory enforcement.

4 In conclusion, as a private citizen within the Texas Republic, I assert my rights under common law. Devoid of a
5 contractual relationship with the government compelling adherence to codes and statutes, any attempt to enforce
6 such laws upon private citizens by the state of Texas violates the supreme law of the land.

7 **13. Competency and Addressing Charges with Due Tax Considerations:**

8 I wish to communicate my comprehensive understanding of the court proceedings surrounding the case of JAMES
9 THOMAS ENGLISH. As the executor representing the legal entity JAMES THOMAS ENGLISH, I, King Semaj Of
10 The English Estate, am acutely aware of the court's nature and its affiliation with the BAR Association.

11 The charges leveled against the legal entity JAMES THOMAS ENGLISH are, in my assessment, false. Importantly,
12 I recognize the intent to impose taxes on this case. However, I want to underscore that, in line with the ruling in
13 Bond vs. United States, JAMES THOMAS ENGLISH, being a legal entity, should not be subjected to illegal
14 proceedings.

15
16 Furthermore, I acknowledge that on the private side, the circuit remains open. Designated as the Original Issuer
17 Discounter by the Internal Revenue Service, I am recognized as the original issuer of the credit sought to settle the
18 alleged debt associated with these charges. Consequently, it is incumbent upon the District Attorney to fulfill tax
19 obligations or face potential tax evasion consequences. This necessitates the filing of Form 1099OID, Form 1096,
20 and Form 1040 for return to source. Failure to comply would result in an imbalanced financial record.

21 In light of these considerations, I have included a completed W9 form with this Motion, urging its comprehensive
22 completion to facilitate the filing of Form 1099OID. Given my unawareness of the specific charge amounts, I am
23 making a reasonable assumption for filing purposes. I am also requesting your Tax ID number, and any refusal to
24 provide it will be duly noted on Form 1099OID. Additionally, an estimated charge amount will be reported on my
25 Form 1040 to ensure the proper processing of my return.

26 My sincere aspiration is to resolve this matter in a peaceful and lawful manner, upholding my responsibilities as the
27 executor and trustee of the estate. I assure you that my actions align with established legal principles and precedents
28 in relevant cases. Your cooperation in this matter is greatly appreciated.

1 **14. Created Martial Law = No Law:**

2 The charges brought forth by Pearland County lack a foundational basis as no crime, act, or omission has been
3 established or defined by statute, as stipulated under Texas law. The principle upheld in Dawson v. Vance (329 F.
4 Supp. 1320, DC Tex. 1971) asserts that an offense must be explicitly created by legislative action, and any potential
5 exceptions to its application must be specified within the same legislative enactment. The Texas Court of Criminal
6 Appeals decision in Williams v. State (176 SW2nd 177, Tex Cr App 1943) further underscores that the legislature
7 has the authority to both create offenses and include exceptions within the same statute. Given the absence of any
8 statutory foundation for the charges, it is evident that no crime has been committed, and no injured party or property
9 has been identified, thereby highlighting a significant deficiency in the legal basis for the charges brought against
10 the Plaintiff.

11 **15. The Pearland County Court,**

12 Despite being characterized as a court of general jurisdiction, assumes an inferior or limited jurisdiction status
13 concerning the specific matter at hand. Established legal precedents, such as State v. Mobile G., R. Co. (108 Ala. 29,
14 18 So. 801), Goodwater Warehouse Co. v. Street (137 Ala. 621, 34 So. 903), and Gunn v. Howell (27 Ala. 663, 62
15 Am. Dec. 785), emphasize that when special statutory authority, derogating from common law, is granted to courts
16 of general jurisdiction, those courts effectively transform into courts of inferior or limited jurisdiction for the
17 specific purpose defined by the statute. Despite the recognition of such legal principles, the judge presiding over the
18 case continued proceedings with the knowledge that the Plaintiff is not a U.S. citizen. This raises concerns about the
19 court's adherence to jurisdictional requirements and the equitable treatment of the Plaintiff within the scope of the
20 law.

21 **16. The Supreme Law of the Land, as per the U.S. Constitution Article VI, Clause 2,**

22 Clearly establishes that the Constitution and the laws of the United States, along with treaties made under the
23 authority of the United States, are the supreme law of the land. Judges in every state are bound by this mandate, and
24 any provisions in the constitution or laws of any state contrary to this are overridden. The Plaintiff contends that
25 their constitutional rights were not adequately acknowledged or upheld throughout the legal proceedings, as the
26 judge failed to dismiss the case or rectify the prosecutor's use of codes and statutes designed for corporations, not
27 living individuals. This failure on the part of the court amounts to a disregard for the supreme law of the land and a
28 breach of the judge's duty to uphold the Constitution.

1 Furthermore, the Plaintiff asserts a blatant violation of their Sixth Amendment rights, which guarantee the accused
2 the right "to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation." The court's failure to ensure that the charges
3 were clearly explained and rooted in lawful procedures is a direct infringement on this fundamental constitutional
4 right. The Plaintiff's repeated requests for clarity and adherence to legal principles were overlooked, underscoring a
5 disregard for the Sixth Amendment and the principles of due process.

6 It is crucial to highlight that when the judge of the municipal court acts to enforce statutes and their subsequent
7 amendments up to the present date, they are functioning as an administrative officer and not in a judicial capacity.

8 According to legal precedent, courts administering or enforcing statutes do not act judiciously but merely
9 ministerially. The judge, in this context, acts as an extension or agent for the involved agency but only in a
10 ministerial and not a discretionary capacity, as established in *Thompson v. Smith* 154. This misalignment with their
11 judicial duty and the oath to uphold constitutional rights has been detrimental to the Plaintiff, who, as the chief
12 executor of their estate, had a legitimate expectation for the judge to act judiciously and in line with their sworn
13 obligations. The resultant harm and damages incurred by the Plaintiff, including numerous court appearances and
14 dealings with bond agents, underscore the severity of the deviation from judicial responsibilities.

15 16 JURISDICTION & VENUE

17 Jurisdiction is proper "other jurisdiction" where the Constitution, whereby Judicial Power, SECTION authorizes
18 such out of necessity. The Judicial power shall be vested in one Supreme Court, (who may extend such powers in a
19 Court of Appeals, in District Courts, in County Courts, in Metropolitan Courts), and in such other courts and may be
20 established by positive law i.e. equity, as equity is the law, as equity is everything and law without equity must still
21 render equity. Therefore, this court has the power to decree inequity upon the Express Trust matter in-
22 camera/chambers and may enforce the Bill of Rights put forth in this bill as expressed in the Constitution.

23 We must remember as shall be discussed briefly in a moment, that an attorney who represents an individual who has
24 not yet attained the age of majority, is said to represent a ward of the court. An attorney holds an administrative
25 position as an officer of the court and as such, the attorney becomes for the ward an appointed guardian ad
26 litem. Now in proof that the trust exists, and is for all necessities and purposes a "RESULTING TRUST", in that
27 upon attaining majority, the securities, assets, properties of the infant estate become the rightful property of the
28 beneficiary who has attained the age of majority. Seeing that this is a "Resulting Trust", by operation of

1 law and as a result of the principles of equity, and that it involves a minor and or/infant and/or the properties of
2 infant, the proper jurisdiction is that of equity who has and maintains a right to such inherent jurisdiction.

3
4 **RULE OF LAW**

5 Whereby this cause, being a complaint in exclusive equity jurisdiction, (as it directly involves the
6 property/estate/securities of an infant/minor), cites the rule of law as follows upon: Bill of Rights No person's (to
7 include infants/minors) property shall be taken, damaged or destroyed for or applied to public use without adequate
8 compensation being made, unless by the consent of such person, and , when taken, except for the use of the State,
9 such compensation shall be first made, or secured by deposit of money.

10
11 **JURISDICTION OF COURTS OVER THE ESTATES OF INFANTS**

12 Jurisdiction over the estate of an infant is inherent in equity, but it may also be vested by administrative
13 constitutional and administrative statutory provisions in particular courts; the administrative institution of
14 proceedings affecting an infant's property makes the infant a ward of the court (held in trust, for such the seizures of
15 rights and/or property could only be instituted as a result of prior relationship i.e. special relationship, whereby the
16 infant/minor is the beneficiary, the state (court) the settlor and its agents and/or officers trustees, constituting a trust
17 relationship, in equity), which has broad powers and the duty to protect his or her interests. Courts of equity have

18 **GENERAL AND INHERENT JURISDICTION**

19 over the property of infants. Primary jurisdiction over the estate of infants may, under administrative constitutional
20 or administrative statutory provisions, be vested in the probate, county, district, or other specific court. The
21 jurisdiction can be exercised only when the court has acquired jurisdiction as to the particular infant/minor or subject
22 matter (jurisdiction over estates/trusts are exclusive in nature over which courts of equity have exclusive
23 jurisdiction, and such matters must be heard at equity). The commencement of proceedings affecting the infant's
24 property vest the court with jurisdiction over his or her estate, pursuant to which the court acts in loco parentis or as
25 a guardian, and the infant becomes its ward. It is the duty of the court to safeguard the infant's property interest with
26 great care i.e. in trust. After the jurisdiction of the court has attached, either through an appearance which equates to
27 submitting to the court's jurisdiction , and/or a plea being entered by the infant/minor, the court in its administrative
28 capacity has broad, comprehensive and plenary power over the estate of the infant/minor, however, courts of equity

1 have exclusive jurisdiction over the property of the infant/minor. This court may adjudicate the rights and equities of
2 the infant and property, yet only in equity, and it may cause to be : done whatever may be necessary to preserve and
3 protect the infant’s estate which includes the property/assets of said estate. However, the exercising of such powers
4 must be tempered with reasonable limitations, and one major limitation is that courts of equity have exclusive
5 jurisdiction over the property/assets of an infant. Therefore, the court cannot act in violation of administrative
6 constitutional or statutory limitations on its powers, or permit the impounding of the infants funds for the creation of
7 a trust, which the court of parties have done by establishing the instant matter, and thus attempt to deprive the
8 infant/minor of the right to the absolute enjoyment of the funds of one who has come forth now, and is appearing at
9 the age of majority in correction of any presumptions by previous actions or appearances in this manner. An infant is
10 not competent to waive the administrative statutory requirements enacted for his other benefit and protection, with
11 respects to the manner in which the jurisdiction of the court may be exercised, unless and until the attain the age of
12 majority, then they can either petition for the removal of minor’s disabilities and or express the trust.

13
14 **JURISDICTION OF COURTS OVER ESTATES OF INFANTS/MINORS-JUDICIAL ALLOWANCES**
15 **FOR SUPPORT, MAINTENANCE, AND EDUCATION.**

16 Respondent(s) could not have had a valid claim against infant/minor without personal knowledge and a copy of
17 Photo, Finger-prints, A Forced Plea, Coercion, Threats, False imprisonment, a false commercial claim is/are not
18 considered lawful evidence and/or knowledge, because such copies are held as a forgery, evidence of involuntary
19 servitude. Furthermore, courts in conducting “Commercial” Business of the court must give/disclose to or upon a
20 party upon demand the bookkeeping entries (both receivables and payables) with an affidavit, and demand is hereby
21 made for immediate production or all the evidence is hearsay evidence into the court. The infant/minor having
22 attained the age of majority hereby challenges the bookkeeping and demands the full accounting on the accounts
23 receivables and accounts payable and all dividends, profits, rents, escrows, etc. resulting from the deposit of
24 TRUST/Estate of the ward/Beneficiary onto the courts accounts receivables and other general intangibles.

25 Movement for Relief Complainant is entitled to the relief of damages in equity, as ‘equity must cause equity to be
26 done, though the heavens fall’, Complainant is entitled to relief in the form of damages for the following reasons:

27 Respondent(s) has taken the private property of the complainant under extreme duress and threat of violence against

28 Complainant’s life, property, liberties without just compensation, without the expressed and/or written consent of

1 Complainant. Respondent had a duty to respond to all complaints and questions because of the legal special
2 relationship of the parties and by not responding the Respondent is in breach of trust because the infant estate and
3 duty of care associated therewith/thereto is an express trust: "Verified Memorandum of Principles of Law and Points
4 of Authorities on Express Special Relationship Trust" The court and its officers are legal title holders of not only the
5 express trust, but also the constructive trust. As now has been placed on the record I share the same or similar name
6 as the named defendant in their case #. However, for clarification, I am NOT now acting in the capacity as the
7 named defendant, I am the beneficiary and equitable title holder. None of this information is foreign to the court,
8 this matter must proceed in equity, failure and/or refusal to proceed at equity, under exclusive jurisdiction will
9 constitute contempt of Justice.

10 **ELEMENTS OF A TRUST:** 1. Settlor/Grantor/Trustor - intended to create a trust, which is perceived by the
11 reasonable observer, as in the case of the New Deal and the several Federal Acts and associated State Regulations.
12 The Emergency Banking Relief Act of March 9th, 1933 b. The Social Security Act of 1934, the Trust Indenture Act
13 c. The Social Security Trust d. The Treasury Trust Fund e. The Public Trust and the Administration thereof These
14 are each Specific and Special

15 RELATIONSHIP Agreements, as they are specifically designed and voluntarily submitted to as required by the 13th
16 Amendment Authorizing such. 2. Rights Must Be Identified a. As evidenced by Due Process of Statutory Provisions
17 and the 14th Amendment section 1 & 4 3. Identification of Beneficiary- Whom the property is held on behalf of
18 (held in-trust) 4. Shares/Assets/Property must be Identified 5. The Trust Must Be Workable 6. Must have an ending
19 i.e. can't last forever All Elements of a Trust Are Present- 31 C.F.R. 363.6 Minor means an individual under the age
20 of 18 years. The term minor is also used to refer to an individual who has attained the age of 18 years but has not yet
21 taken control of the securities contained in his or her minor account. Minor account means an account that a
22 custodian controls on behalf of a minor, that is linked to the custodian's primary account. (see 31 CFR 363.10 and
23 363.27 for more information about minor accounts.) The Settlor is the Federal Government directly and through the
24 state and local governments (this indication is specified by the use of the Lower Cased "state" and "government",
25 and other proper nouns.) Through various acts of Congress, and through the Age of Majority Act. Page 9 of 13 The
26 identity of the Equitable Beneficial Title Holder is the Minor both un-attained and attained, until they control the
27 Securities/Shares in the trusted account. The Rights are Identified by the right to attain the Age of Majority, to gain
28 control of Securities Held in one's Minor Account, and to be free from Minors Disabilities . The Trust is workable
BILL OF THE COMPLAINT IN EQUITY & CIVIL COMPLAINT - 14

1 in that the Custodian/Fiduciary/Trustee/Ministerial Clerk must hold the minor/infant account in trust on/for the
2 benefit/benefit of a minor/infant, that is linked to the custodian's primary account (in Most Instances the Federal and
3 State Treasuries). The Trust may not last forever as it and the duties of all parties end upon the attaining the age of
4 Majority, and documenting such in a definitive manner by attaching an affidavit attesting such to his or her

5
6 **BIRTH CERTIFICATE-NOTE THE PRINCIPLE:** "The register of titles is authorized to receive for registration
7 of memorial upon any outstanding certificate of an official birth certificate pertaining to a registered owner named
8 and said certificate of title showing the date of birth of said registered owner, providing there is attached to said
9 certificate an affidavit of an affiant who states that he/she is familiar with the facts recited, stating that the party
10 named and said birth certificate is the same party as one of the owners name and said certificate of title, and that
11 thereafter the register of titles shall treat registered owner as having obtained the age of majority as of the date of 18
12 years after the date of birth shown on said certificate" Page 10 of 13 The aforementioned is a general court rule,
13 meaning that it applies in principle in all birth certificate attaining related matters, and administrative proceedings. A
14 Power of Attorney titled in part- "James-Thomas: English power-of-attorney-general IN FACT", A PRIVATE
15 SPECIAL RELATIONSHIP EXPRESS TRUST, encompassing all related matters and associated properties is at
16 issue invoking

17 **EXCLUSIVE JURISDICTION AT/IN EQUITY.** This matter does not involve a statutory and/or constitutional
18 provision respecting a minor and or infant, this matter exclusively and specifically involves an estate/trust and the
19 property of an infant/minor under equitable law. Generally, an infant may acquire property rights, but he or she is
20 not regarded as capable of managing his or her property. Hence, the law does not entrust him or her with the custody
21 or control of his or her estate. The reason, an infant/minor is not capable of managing his or her own property, is
22 because they have not yet attained the age of 18 and or taken control of the securities, assets, properties held in their
23 minor account, a general principle of equitable law. Generally, as an equitable principal, the statute of limitations, is
24 suspended as against infants during their disability, or either do not begin to run against an infant until the obtaining
25 of majority, or where infancy does not toll the statutes, the infant disallowed a statutory period after attaining
26 majority to contest any adverse possession which commence during infancy. Here, the inference is upon the infant
27 attaining the age of majority, the same with respect to a minor and/or juvenile, and as noted, such a

28 person/individual shall remain a minor and or infant until such time as they gain control of the assets held in their
BILL OF THE COMPLAINT IN EQUITY & CIVIL COMPLAINT - 15

1 minor account through equity. With this supporting affidavit, the Complainant states that this court in good
2 conscience and good reason shall aid the complainant in his prayer or show cause via facts and conclusions of
3 equitable law why he is not entitled to just compensation and other equitable relief to which he is entitled as
4 equitable beneficial title Holder. The complainant prays to this court for damages in the amount as specified in the
5 contract and the value of the full estate plus interest, for the court is under obligation in the exercise of its inherent
6 equitable powers to do equity. Complainant additionally prays for an injunction to issue against Respondent and the,
7 Attorney for an attempted taking of trust property, private information and solicitation against the complainant
8 where he is not entitled to act against the trust with just or any other cause, for such is construed as intermeddling
9 with the estate of the infant/minor, for which they are strict and severe penalties. Sources Cited: 336. Damages-The
10 power to award damages in a proper case, as a necessary incident to other purely equitable relief and in the same
11 decree, is fully admitted , and even to award damages alone in very special cases; but the jurisdiction has been
12 exercised with the utmost caution and reserve. See

13 **JUDICIAL INTERPRETATION OF JURISDICTION**, Pomeroy, Equity Jurisprudence A court of equity grants
14 the relief of compensatory damages in connection with some other specific relief, and under very peculiar
15 circumstances it decrees the payment of damages alone. Several kinds of equitable suits are wholly pecuniary in their
16 relief, as those for contribution and exoneration. See

17 **JUDICIAL INTERPRETATION OF JURISDICTION.**, Pomeroy, Equity Jurisprudence: Maxims of Equity and
18 Adjudication States that a court of equity (56) to protect and enforce rights to property the object of suits in
19 chancery. The term “property,” as used in this section, includes that is the subject of exclusive individual ownership;
20 or, to be more specific, includes not only landsm houses, goods and chattels, rights and credits, but , also, a man’s
21 person, and his wife and minor children, and his right to work, and to sell and acquire property, and engage in any
22 lawful business, and his and their reputation, health and capacity to labor, and his and their right to enjoy the senses
23 of sight, smell , hearing and taste, and his and their right of speech and locomotion, and his and their right to enjoy
24 their sense of moral propriety when normal. As men live by their labor and property, no man is presumed to part
25 with either without receiving or expecting an equivalent in value. Hence, whenever one person has obtained either
26 the aor or property of another he should pay or account therefore, unless he can prove it was a gift; and so, whatever
27 injury one person does to another’s property or capacity to labor should be made good. I declare under the laws of
28 the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct.

DEMAND FOR TRIAL

Formally demand a trial in response to the legal proceedings associated with Case No. 58024901. The charges brought against me involve allegations that merit careful consideration and examination in a court of law.

The cause of action encompasses severe violations of my constitutional, inalienable, and human rights during the arrest and subsequent legal proceedings. The specific points of concern include:

Intimidation by Gang and Forced into Commerce:

Allegations of intimidation and coercion into commercial activities during the arrest raise fundamental concerns about the abuse of power.

Violation of First Amendment Right to Privacy & Right to Contract:

The arrest and legal proceedings have infringed upon my First Amendment right to privacy and the right to contract. The refusal to recognize the distinction between the living man and the created entity attempts to force me into an implied surety role for charges lacking the basis of being crimes.

Violation of 13th Amendment (Back in Slavery):

The false arrest, absent any legitimate crime, leading to detainment, raises concerns about a violation of involuntary servitude, a direct violation of the 13th Amendment.

Violation of 14th Amendment:

The violation of due process, equal protection, and the failure to recognize the World Passport constitute violations of the 14th Amendment, undermining the foundations of a fair legal system.

International Law Violations:

The refusal to recognize international documents, specifically the World Passport, stands in contravention of international law.

Rule of Law - Federalist 78:

Actions taken under the guise of codes and statutes, without a legitimate crime, contravene the principles laid out in Federalist 78, emphasizing the supremacy of the Constitution.

18 USC 241/242 - Extortion and Threats:

Potential violations of 18 USC 241/242 arise from the absence of an actual crime and threats to violate the 13th Amendment unless compelled to contract with the state.

1 I believe that a trial is necessary to thoroughly address these concerns and to seek redress and restitution for the
2 violations perpetrated. I request a fair and impartial trial in accordance with the principles of justice.

3 **Court's Ignoring of Legal Notices and Constitutional Rights:**

4 Despite the court receiving comprehensive documentation and legal notices, including UCC-1 Financing Statement,
5 common law copyright, Fee Notice, legal demand notice, assumed name certificates, and numerous affidavits and
6 demands, the court consistently ignored these notifications. These documents explicitly highlighted the plaintiff's
7 status as a secured party, the chief executor of their estate, and their legal demands for a fair resolution.

8 **Neglect of Legal Notices:**

9 The court received clear and legally substantiated notices outlining the plaintiff's legal status and demands, including
10 UCC-1 Financing Statement, common law copyright, and assumed name certificates. Despite this, the court
11 proceeded without due consideration for the plaintiff's legal standing.

12 **Violation of Constitutional Rights:**

13 The court repeatedly violated the plaintiff's constitutional rights, including the Sixth Amendment, which guarantees
14 the right to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation. The court proceeded without providing a proper
15 basis for the charges, ignoring the fundamental principles of due process.

16 **Colorable Law and Violation of Rights:**

17 The plaintiff explicitly raised concerns about the court's potential adherence to colorable law (18 USC 241/242) and
18 its violation of constitutional rights. Questions were posed regarding the court's jurisdiction and the nature of the
19 criminal action, emphasizing the need for clarity and adherence to legal principles.

20 **Proceeding Without Element of a Crime:**

21 Despite legal notices asserting the absence of elements constituting a crime, the court continued to prosecute without
22 regard for constitutional, human, and unalienable rights. This persistence in relying on codes and statutes as actual
23 law undermined the plaintiff's rights.

24 **Disregard for Sixth Amendment Rights:**

25 The court failed to address the plaintiff's rightful demand to understand the nature and cause of the alleged criminal
26 actions, a violation of the Sixth Amendment's guarantee. This disregard for essential legal procedures further
27 compounds the injustice faced by the plaintiff.

1 The court's consistent neglect of legal notices, constitutional rights, and demands for a fair resolution raises serious
2 concerns about the adherence to lawful procedures and principles in the legal proceedings. These actions warrant a
3 thorough review and redress to ensure justice and uphold the plaintiff's rights.

4 **Civil Relief Request – Financial Damages, Land Allocation, Restitution, and Equitable Relief**

5 Formally request civil relief in light of the numerous violations of rights and damages endured as a result of the
6 actions associated with my case. The multifaceted approach outlined below aims to address the various dimensions
7 of harm suffered and restore justice.

8 **Financial Damages:**

9 I seek compensation for the significant losses incurred, encompassing economic, emotional, and reputational harm.
10 The violations perpetrated have had extensive and lasting effects on various aspects of my life. Accordingly, I
11 request financial compensation in the amount of \$4,493,466,000, reflecting the comprehensive nature of the
12 damages suffered.

13 **Allocation of Land – Transfer of 300 Acres:**

14 In acknowledgment of the severity of the violations and as a symbolic gesture of restitution, I request the allocation
15 of 200 acres of land. This allocation is intended to signify a commitment to rectifying the wrongs endured and to
16 symbolize the restoration of justice in the aftermath of the infringed rights.

17 **Equitable Relief – Expungement of Private Information:**

18 I demand the immediate expungement of private information from databases, with a particular emphasis on
19 protecting privacy rights. As the chief executor of my estate, this includes the removal of any information from
20 public records that has been unlawfully disclosed or used.

21 This comprehensive approach to civil relief reflects the various dimensions of the injustices and violations I have
22 experienced. I believe that a combination of financial compensation, symbolic restitution, specific property
23 replacement, and equitable relief is necessary to rectify the extensive harm suffered.

24 **Compensation for Therapy:** I have endured significant emotional trauma as a result of the warrant for arrest and
25 the ongoing stress associated with court proceedings. To facilitate my emotional healing and mental well-being, I
26 request compensation for therapy expenses incurred during and after this distressing period.

1 **Acknowledgment of Agony:** The agony of navigating through the legal system, maintaining my freedom, and
2 ensuring the well-being of my family has been extensive. I seek acknowledgment of this undue hardship imposed
3 upon me during the process, recognizing the emotional toll it has taken on both myself and my family.

4 **Compensation for Damages:** The stress of explaining my innocence to business associates and others in my
5 community has caused substantial harm. I request compensation for damages incurred as a result of the false
6 allegations and the consequential impact on my personal and professional relationships.

7 **Compensation for Inconvenience and Travel Expenses:** Given the plaintiff's non-residence in the state of Texas
8 and the repeated inconvenience caused by the necessity to appear in court, the plaintiff requests compensation for
9 travel expenses, time, and any associated costs incurred during court appearances. The inconvenience was
10 exacerbated by the initial denial of remote participation, compelling the plaintiff and their family to repeatedly travel
11 for matters that were not criminal in nature.

12 **Refund of Unearned Interest (15 US Code Statute 1615):** The plaintiff insists on the full refund of unearned
13 interest, as mandated by 15 US Code Statute 1615. This entails the return of all cash payments made to the account,
14 ensuring that the plaintiff is restored to the position prior to the defendant's actions

15 **Forma Pauperis Request:**

16 The United States District Court Southern District Houston Judge has denied my forma pauperis request, mandating
17 the provision of 402 Federal Reserve Notes as legal tender for filing the case against the United States as principal.
18 This denial and imposition of a filing fee go against the principles outlined in the trust vs. Clearfield doctrine, stating
19 that sovereignty, especially when dealing with commercial paper and legal tender, does not constitute settling a debt,
20 as legal tender itself is a promise to pay. Therefore, the costs associated with filing the case should be considered
21 and added to the suit accordingly.

- 22 • On January 22, 2024, I submitted a Forma Pauperis request to the United States District Court
23 Southern District Houston, seeking relief from the obligation to pay standard filing fees based
24 on my inability to afford such fees.
- 25 • On January 22, 2024, the Honorable District Judge denied my Forma Pauperis request,
26 mandating the payment of 402 Federal Reserve Notes for filing the case against the United
27 States as the principal defendant.

- This denial and imposition of a filing fee present a conflict, as the Forma Pauperis is intended for individuals lacking the financial means to pay legal tender, and I am challenging the United States, which inflicted harm upon me.

Request for Relief:

- I request that the court reconsider the denial of my Forma Pauperis request, recognizing the conflict presented in demanding legal tender for filing fees.
- I seek an order allowing the costs associated with filing the case to be added to the suit, as the denial of Forma Pauperis is based on the use of Federal Reserve Notes.

Disclaimer:

I, James-Thomas: English,(aka King Semaj of The English Estate) hereby issue the following disclaimer with regard to the use of Federal Reserve Notes in the legal matter between myself, the Plaintiff, and the United States of America, the Defendant, in the United States District Court Southern District Houston:

Jurisdiction Clarification:

The use of Federal Reserve Notes in any transaction, submission, or legal process is not an acknowledgment of jurisdiction on the part of the United States over me, the Plaintiff. It is explicitly stated that any such use is for practical purposes and not a voluntary surrender of sovereignty or rights.

Reservation of Rights:

I explicitly reserve all rights afforded to me under the Constitution of the United States

FACTS

PART I

The following is a list of the human rights obligations on the Government of the United States of America and the State of Texas with regard to King Semaj of the English Estate.

The State of Texas and the United States of America’s Obligation to Respect the Right to Freedom of Movement and to Recognize the World Passport

The following declarations and treaties, which the United States of America has adopted or ratified, along with the United States Constitution and the Constitution of the State of Texas, obligate the Government of the United States of America and the State of Texas to recognize the validity and legality of the World Passport and to respect the

1 fundamental human rights of King Semaj of the English Estate, such as the right to freedom of movement, including
2 travel, and the right to possess and use the passport. The following list of multilateral treaties and international
3 conventions is not exhaustive and is not the only source of obligation for the United States of America to recognize
4 the validity and legality of the World Passport. The Government of the State of Texas and the United States of
5 America must respect the right to freedom of movement, including travel, using the World Passport, and the right to
6 possess the passport, no matter the “national origin” status with which Semaj may be associated.

7
8 Constitution of the United States

9 (Ratified on 21 June 1788)

- 10
11 • Article VI states: “All treaties made, or which shall be made under the Authority of the United States, shall be
12 supreme Law of the Land...”
13 • The Fifth Amendment states that no person shall “be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of
14 law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.”
15 • The Ninth Amendment states: “The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights shall not be construed to deny
16 or disparage others retained by the people.” One of these un-enumerated rights is the right to identify oneself as a
17 human being/world citizen and to identify oneself with documentation to that effect, i.e. the WSA World Passport.

18 Constitution of the State of Texas

19 (Ratified on 15 February 1876)

- 20
21 • Article I Section 1 states: “Texas is a free and independent state, subject only to the Constitution of the United
22 States, and the maintenance of our free institutions and the perpetuity of the Union depend upon the preservation of
23 the right of local self-government, unimpaired to all the States.”
24 • Article 1 Section 9 states: “The people shall be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and possessions, from all
25 unreasonable seizures or searches, and no warrant to search any place or to seize any person or thing, shall issue
26 without describing them as near as may be, nor without probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation.”
27 • Article I Section 19 states: “No citizen of this state shall be deprived of life, liberty, property, privileges or
28 immunities, or in any manner disfranchised, except by the due course of the law of the land.”

1 Charter of the United Nations

2 (Signed in San Francisco on 26 June 1945 by United Nations member states)

3
4 Member-States are required to uphold all human rights in treaties promulgated by the United Nations, including the
5 Charter of the United Nations.

6 • Article 55 states: Governmental Representatives are bound to “promote universal respect for, and observance of,
7 human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion.”

8 • Article 56 states: “All Member-States pledge themselves to take joint and separate action in cooperation with the
9 Organization for the achievement of the purposes set forth in Article 55.”

10
11 Universal Declaration of Human Rights

12 (Adopted in Paris by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 10 December 1948)

13
14 Member-States are required to uphold all human rights in declarations promulgated by the United Nations, including
15 the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Failure to uphold these declarations violates customary international
16 law. This requirement is outlined in the Charter of the United Nations. Articles 2, 6, and 13 of the Declaration
17 require signatories to uphold fundamental human rights such as freedom of identification and travel.

18 • Article 2: “Everyone is entitled to all rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration, without distinction of any
19 kind, such as race, color, sex, language religion, political, or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth,
20 or other status.”

21 • Article 6, states: “Everyone has the right to recognition everywhere as a person before the law.”

22 • Article 13 Section (1) states: “Everyone has the right to freedom of movement and residence within the borders of
23 each state.”

24 • Article 13 Section (2) states: “Everyone has the right to leave any country, including his own, and to return to his
25 country.”

26 The American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man

27 (Adopted by the Ninth International Conference of American States, Bogotá, Colombia, 1948)

1 The American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man is binding on the United States under customary
2 international law.

3 • The Preamble affirms that the United States of America recognizes that “the essential rights of man are not derived
4 from the fact that he is a national of a certain state, but are based upon attributes of his human personality.”

5 The American Convention on Human Rights

6 (Adopted by the United States on 1 June 1977)

7
8 The American Convention on Human Rights has been ratified by over 25 countries in the western hemisphere. This
9 Convention is binding on the United States under customary international law.

10 • The Preamble affirms that the United States of America recognizes that “the essential rights of man are not derived
11 from one's being a national of a certain state, but are based upon attributes of the human personality, and that they,
12 therefore, justify international protection in the form of a convention reinforcing or complementing the protection
13 provided by the domestic law of the American states.”

14 • Article 3 states: “Every person has the right to recognition as a person before the law.”

15 • Article 22 Section (1) and (2) state: “Every person lawfully in the territory of a State Party has the right to move
16 about in it, and to reside in it subject to the provisions of the law” and “Every person has the right to leave any
17 country freely, including his own.”

18
19 The State of Texas and the United States of America’s Obligation

20 to Respect the Right to Own Property

21
22 The arbitrary confiscation of the World Passport of King Semaj of the English Estate is a violation of the right to
23 own property (in this case the World Passport), which has been reaffirmed in the following:

24 Constitution of the United States (Ratified on 21 June 1788)

25 • Article VI states: “All treaties made, or which shall be made under the Authority of the United States, shall be
26 supreme Law of the Land...”

27 • The Fifth Amendment states that no person shall “be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of
28 law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.”

BILL OF THE COMPLAINT IN EQUITY & CIVIL COMPLAINT - 24

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

The American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man

(Adopted by the Ninth International Conference of American States, Bogotá, Colombia, 1948)

- Article XXIII states: “Every person has a right to own such private property as meets the essential needs of decent living and helps to maintain the dignity of the individual and of the home.”

The American Convention on Human Rights

(Adopted by the United States on 1 June 1977)

- Article 21(1) states: “Everyone has the right to the use and enjoyment of his property. The law may subordinate such use and enjoyment to the interest of society.”

- Article 21(2) states: “No one shall be deprived of his property except upon payment of just compensation, for reasons of public utility or social interest, and in the cases and according to the forms established by law.”

Universal Declaration of Human Rights

(Adopted in Paris by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 10 December 1948)

Articles 17(1), 17(2), and 12 of the Declaration require the United States of America to respect the right to be free from arbitrary interference with or confiscation of personal property.

- Article 17, Sections 1 and 2 states: “Everyone has the right to own property alone as well as in association with others” and “No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his property.”

- Article 12 states: “No one shall be subjected to arbitrary interference with his privacy, family, home or correspondence, nor attacks upon his honor and reputation. Everyone has the right to protection of the law against such interference or attacks.”

Part II

Should the Government of Texas make a negative determination contravening the above-mentioned treaties and customary international law, we expect that the Government will provide written proof, based on the Government’s national and state laws or statutes, that it does not recognize the World Passport. Without reference to a specific law, please be advised that whatever a government does not expressly prohibit, it implicitly allows.

1 With this in mind, the WSA requests that the Government of the State of Texas support a failure to recognize the
2 legitimacy of the World Passport by providing legal proof that state laws, national statutes, national immigration
3 laws, or the Constitution prohibit the Government from recognizing specifically the World Passport.

4 The State of Texas and the United States of America's obligation to respect innate and unalienable human rights,
5 including the fundamental right of freedom of travel and the right to own property, supersedes all lower-level
6 agreements. When two levels of law are in conflict, the higher level of law, in this case fundamental rights, always
7 prevails. Therefore, even if the Government could cite a state or national law to support a refusal to officially
8 recognize the World Passport, the Government must then be able to legally explain how that law conforms to the
9 Government's duty to uphold fundamental human rights according to the United Nations Charter, the Universal
10 Declaration of Human Rights, the American Convention on Human Rights, the American Declaration, the United
11 States Constitution and the Constitution of the State of Texas.

12 Please note that a citation of part 41.104, Note 4 of Volume 9 of the "Foreign Affairs Manual" does not explain how
13 the failure to recognize a World Passport is in conformity with your Government's obligations to respect and uphold
14 human rights. The "Foreign Affairs Manual" and the "Immigration and Nationality Act" do not ultimately prohibit
15 the recognition of World Passports, as discretion is afforded to the Attorney General, to the Secretary of Homeland
16 Security, and to the Director of Citizenship and Immigration Services as well as to individual embassy, consular,
17 border, transportation security, state government, and police officials.

18 Furthermore, we are not aware of any definition of the term "passport" and "competent authority" anywhere in the
19 Foreign Affairs Manual or the Immigration and Nationality Act that excludes specifically the World Passport. INA
20 Section 101 (a)(30) states: "The term 'passport' means any travel document issued by competent authority showing
21 the bearer's origin, identity, and nationality if any, which is valid for the admission of the bearer into a foreign
22 country." However, it fails to define what a "competent authority" is for the purposes of recognizing the World
23 Service Authority as a legitimate issuing authority of World Passports. The WSA World Passport falls under the
24 United States Government definition of "passport" and the WSA is a competent issuing authority because the World
25 Passport clearly indicates the bearer's origin, identity, and nationality or political allegiance (world citizenship). The
26 bearer's world citizenship status is identified on the passport as it is issued by the World Government of World
27 Citizens' administrative branch, the World Service Authority. Additionally, the definition of "passport" includes the


1 phrase “nationality if any” (emphasis added), which reveals that nationality is irrelevant to one’s right to travel and
2 identification.

3 Moreover, the U.S. Government has on many occasions on a de facto basis recognized the World Passport by
4 placing immigration, entry, and exit stamps in WSA passports. This recognition confirms the U.S. Government’s
5 ongoing acceptance of the World Service Authority as a competent authority.

6 Because the US Constitution under Article VI, affirms that “all treaties made, or which shall be made under the
7 Authority of the United States, shall be supreme Law of the Land...”, any foreign affairs manual or immigration
8 laws notwithstanding, the State of Texas and the U.S. Government, therefore are obliged to uphold the human rights
9 upon which the WSA passport is based and, in turn, the passport.

10 Lastly, should the State of Texas still refuse to recognize the World Passport, the State of Texas cannot legally
11 confiscate the document. The World Passport is not false, counterfeit, or forged because it does not purport to be
12 anything other than a World Passport issued by the WSA, as the administrative branch of the World Citizen
13 Government. Consequently, the Government of Texas and the United States of America are obliged to uphold
14 Semaj’s right to possess and use the World Passport as identification, and to exercise his right to freedom of
15 movement, as fundamental, innate, and unalienable human rights.

16 Dated this day December 19, 2023

17 
18 By: James-Thomas: English, Agent