**District Court Of The United States, District of Maryland**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  Plaintiff,v.CARMEN JOHNSON [sic, misnomer] et. Al, *in personam*  Named Defendant, | ))))))))))))) | CASE NO. DKC – 14 CR 0352 |

**STIPULATION AS TO CLARIFICATION OF JURISDICTION ASSERTED**

COMES NOW, Carmen Ramona, of the family Johnson, with Plaintiff, The United States of America, a federal corporation, for purposes of making a complete record and stipulates to the following:

1. The jurisdiction being asserted against Ms. Johnson is a civilian jurisdiction in a court of competent jurisdiction, said court being constituted under Article III of the Constitution for The United States of America, a Republic.
2. The “United States Of America” referenced in the preceding paragraph being a republic, not a federal corporation as defined in 28 U.S.C. § 3002 (15)(A), and *United States v. Coumantaros*, 165 F. Supp. 695 (D. Md. 1958) “United States is ‘person’or ‘corporation’ entitled to proceed under the nonresident attachment provisions of the Maryland Code.”
3. Said civilian jurisdiction per Article III was confirmed orally by Magistrate Judge William Connelly on 14 August 2014.
4. There is good cause to confirm the nature and extent of the jurisdiction asserted against Ms. Johnson, as the court failed to directly corroborate on the record, excepting Magistrate Judge William Connelly’s oral statement, the exact jurisdiction asserted.
5. The good cause lies in the fact that different jurisdictions afford different rights, duties, immunities and privileges.

Because [Article III of the United States Constitution](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Article_III_of_the_United_States_Constitution) vests the judicial powers in courts to which the judges are appointed for life (and which are therefore called Article III tribunals), decisions of a magistrate judge are subject to review and either approval, modification or reversal by a district judge of that court, except in civil cases where the parties consent in advance to allow the magistrate judge to exercise the jurisdiction of the district judge. The magistrate judges therefore operate under the authority of Congress to appoint "inferior courts", set forth in [Article I](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Article_I_of_the_United_States_Constitution), making them [Article I tribunals](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Article_I_tribunals).

The Supreme Court most thoroughly delineated the permissible scope of Article I tribunals in [*Northern Pipeline Construction Co. v. Marathon Pipe Line Co.*](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Northern_Pipeline_Construction_Co._v._Marathon_Pipe_Line_Co.),[[3]](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_States_magistrate_judge#cite_note-3) striking down the [statute](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Statute) that created the original U.S. bankruptcy court. The Court noted in that opinion that the framers of the Constitution had developed a scheme of [separation of powers](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Separation_of_powers) which clearly required that the [judicial branch](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Judicial_branch) be kept independent of the other two branches via the mechanism of lifetime appointments. However, the Court also found that Congress has the power under Article I to create *adjunct tribunals*, so long as the "essential attributes of judicial power" stay in Article III courts. This power derives from two sources. First, when Congress *creates* rights, it can require those asserting such rights to go through an Article I tribunal. Second, Congress can create non-Article III tribunals to help Article III courts deal with their workload, but only if the Article I tribunals are under the control of the Article III courts. The magistrate judges fall within this category of "adjunct" tribunals. All actions heard in an Article I tribunal are subject to [*de novo* review](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Trial_de_novo) in the supervising Article III court, which retains the exclusive power to make and enforce final judgments.

The Supreme Court later noted, in [*Commodity Futures Trading Commission v. Schor*](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Commodity_Futures_Trading_Commission_v._Schor),[[4]](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_States_magistrate_judge#cite_note-4) that parties to litigation could voluntarily waive their right to an Article III tribunal, and thereby submit themselves to a binding judgment from an Article I tribunal.

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_States_magistrate_judge#Review_by_an_Article_III_tribunal>

1. Ms. Johnson possesses the right to have disclosed to her the exact nature of the jurisdiction asserted, due to several conflicting facts, as addressed below.
2. A civilian jurisdiction asserted per Article III, affords Ms. Johnson, as a woman, the inherent unalienable, God given rights (all rights), more specifically enumerated, but not limited to, the Bill of Rights, as relevant, controlling, and applicable to the instant matter, as the Constitution is the Supreme Law of The Land in an Article III court.
3. A civilian jurisdiction also construes the privileges and immunities clause, U.S. Const. Art. IV, § 2, cl.1, to include the aforementioned inherent, unalienable rights that cannot be waived.
4. Good cause also exists due to the fact that other jurisdictions can be asserted without one’s knowledge or consent due to ignorance.

**I. Jurisdiction Determined By The Law Of The Flag**

1. Examples being--entering into the jurisdiction (control) of a foreign “state” when one enters into a foreign enclave such as an embassy compound (four corners) that is governed by the law of the flag. Further precise examples being—1) the Turkish embassy governed by Turkish law, 2) the Spanish embassy governed by Spanish (civil) law, or 3) the United Nations headquarters in New York where the UN flag flies above the United States of America flag, as dominant and superior to the United States of America per 4 U.S.C. § 7(c) to wit:

“[n]othing in this section shall make unlawful the continuance of the practice heretofore followed of displaying the flag of the United Nations in a position of superior prominence or honor, and other national flags in positions of equal prominence or honor, with that of the flag of the United States at the headquarters of the United Nations.”

1. The law of the flag doctrine governs the jurisdiction being asserted when one unwittingly subjects oneself to a foreign jurisdiction.
2. Every nation of the world accepts the law of the flag doctrine, as it regulates the laws under which contracts entered into will be governed.
3. The United States did not start putting flags with a yellow fringe on them in government buildings and public buildings until 1959.
4. The relevance of the law of the flag to the instant matter is the fact that the flag flying in the United States District Court For The District of Maryland, Greenbelt Division, is plainly and unambiguously a military flag as defined by former President Dwight D. Eisenhower in Executive Order 10834 on August 21, 1959. It is printed in the Federal Register at 24 F.R. 6865 and states in part (emphasis bold):

“A military flag is a flag that **resembles** the regular flag of the United States, except that it **has a yellow fringe border on three sides**.”

1. A gold fringe flag stands inside the four walls of a military court that sits in summary court’s martial proceedings against civilians as evidenced below (emphasis in bold):

"Ancient custom sanctions the use of the fringe on regimental colors and standards, but there seems to be **no good reason or precedent** for its **use on other flags**." The Adjutant General of the Army, March 28, 1924, (1925); 34 Ops. Atty. Gen. 483, 485.

According to Army Regulations, (AR 840-10, Oct. 1, 1979.) "the Flag is trimmed on three sides with Fringe of Gold, 2 1/2 inches wide," and "such flags are **flown indoors, ONLY in military courtrooms**."

The gold-fringed flag only stands inside military courts that sit in summary court martial proceedings against civilians. These courts are partially governed by local rules, but more especially by "The Manual of Courts Martial", U.S., 1994 Ed., at Art. 99, (c)(1)(b), pg. IV-34, PIN 030567-0000.

1. If a civilian jurisdiction is being asserted against Ms. Johnson in an Article III “court”, then the “court” admits it is just a coincidence that the chosen flag to fly inside the federal courtrooms just happens to be a military flag.
2. The court further admits that the type of flag flown has no significance as to identifying the jurisdiction asserted. In other words, the gold fringe flag is just a “decorative” flag with no relevance to the “court”, proceedings, or jurisdiction asserted against Ms. Johnson.

**II. Jurisdiction Asserted By A Commercial Enterprise**

1. Good cause also exists to clear up any confusion as to whether the United States District Court For The District of Maryland, being a lawfully constituted Article III court, is operating as a commercial enterprise in commerce.
2. The “Judicial Branch of The U.S. Government” has the following DUNS number:

Search Results- DUNS Number 956858625, Single Location

City and State—DC

Name Search--Judicial Branch of US Gov

Address--Federal Building, Wilmington, Delaware 19801

(302) 573-6108 (number not in service)

1. The Judicial Branch of The U.S. Government has the following Delaware Department of State, Division of Corporations File Number 3383789

Entity Name-- U.S. GOV'T LAW COURT ADMIN SUPREME & U.S. DISTRICT, APPELLATE, VETERANS PROBATE, BANKRUPTCY, STATE(S) COURTS, INC.

Entity Kind- Corporation, Entity Type-- General

Incorporation Date—24 April 2001

Residency—Domestic, State—Delaware

Registered Agent—The Company Corporation

1. The “Supreme Court Of The United States” has the following DUNS number and exact same address as the courthouse in which this case is captioned, per Dun and Bradstreet:

Search Results- DUNS Number 125795844, Branch Location

City and State—DC and Maryland

Name Search—Supreme Court, United States Of The

Address-- 6500 Cherrywood Lane, Greenbelt, MD 20770-1249
(301) 344-8018—Connects to United States Bankruptcy Court For The District of Maryland, Greenbelt Division.

1. The good cause shown to clear up the confusion is the fact that the United States District Court For The District of Maryland, Greenbelt Division, at 6500 Cherrywood Lane, Greenbelt, Maryland 20770 is listed as a “branch location” of the Supreme Court Of The United States on the Dun and Bradstreet Commercial Registry with DUNS Number: 125795844.
2. Dun and Bradstreet is a global provider of information on businesses (emphasis in bold).

"D&B is proud to be the world's leading source of commercial information and insight on **businesses** for over 170 years…”

“A D&B business credit report typically lists, among other things, how many days a **company** generally takes to pay bills, including trade credit extended by vendors.”

http://online.wsj.com/news/articles/SB10001424052702303277704579349180265356854

1. Dun and Bradstreet issues and maintains unique nine digit identification numbers called “DUNS” (Data Universal Numbering System) numbers. The DUNS number has become the standard for how businesses identify each other and manage their corporate relationships. The DUNS number works like the corporate version of an individual’s Social Security Number and is used for establishing a business’s credit and its identity.

http://www.dandb.com/smallbusiness/why-is-having-a-db-d-u-n-s-number-so-crucial-for-my-business/

1. A reasonable person, such as a juror has to ask, “If the jurisdiction asserted against Ms. Johnson is a civilian jurisdiction in a court of competent jurisdiction, constituted and given its authority by the people, per the Constitution for The United States of America, Article III, then why is the very same “court” listed on a commercial registry as doing business in commerce?”
2. It may be just a “coincidence” that the Article III United States District Court For The District Of Maryland is listed on a commercial registry, but it is not engaged in any commercial transactions, relevant to Ms. Johnson and the instant case.

**III. Necessity To Clarify And Stipulate As To Jurisdiction Asserted**

1. Ms. Johnson, looking to the government of the people as the role model and example for ethical and moral conduct, possesses the right to ensure there is no “hidden” jurisdiction asserted against her, before the merits of the claims against her can be meaningfully addressed.
2. Supreme Court Justice Louis Brandeis agreed in eloquently affirming his condemnation of abuses practiced by Government officials and that government teaches the whole by its example. In *Olmstead vs. U.S*. 277 US 438, 48 S.Ct. 564, *575;* 72 L ED 944 (1928) he declared (emphasis in bold):

“Decency, security, and liberty alike demand that **Government officials shall be subjected to the same rules of conduct that are commands to the Citizen**. In a Government of laws, existence of the Government will be **imperiled if it fails to observe the law scrupulously**. **Our Government is the potent, the omnipresent teacher**. For good or for ill, it **teaches the whole people by its example**. Crime is contagious. If the Government becomes a law-breaker, it breeds contempt for law; it invites every man to become a law unto himself; it invites anarchy. To declare that in the administration of the law the end justifies the means could bring a terrible retribution. Against that pernicious doctrine, this Court should resolutely set its face.”

1. Ms. Johnson will address the merits of the case after the exact nature of jurisdiction asserted is meaningfully and conclusively affirmed.
2. Full disclosure will ensure Ms. Johnson’s civilian due process rights are not violated, that would lead to reversible error on appeal.
3. As the “court” did not directly respond to Ms. Johnson’s Motion for Clarification as to the exact nature of the jurisdiction being asserted against her at the two prior hearings and/or arraignments, and the evidence of confusing and conflicting information presented, Ms. Johnson has good cause to seek this joint stipulation.
4. As there would be a conflict and variance between controlling law being either-- 1) commercial and/or contract law if the “court” as a “person” was operating as a commercial enterprise per the DUNS number, 2) Manual of Court’s Martial if a military tribunal was asserting a martial process, and 3) the Supreme Law Of The Land, being the Constitution for the United States of America, Art. III---this joint stipulation is appropriate to clear up any confusion as to the nature of the jurisdiction asserted to ensure Ms. Johnson’s civilian due process rights are preserved.

WHEREFORE, 1) to provide clarity, avoid ambiguity and conflict as to law form; 2) to ensure Ms. Johnson’s right to a civilian due process, both substantive and procedural; 3) the fact Magistrate Judge William Connelly, stated on the record on 14 August 2014 that the court asserting jurisdiction against Ms. Johnson is a civilian tribunal, granted its authority by the people, per Article III of the Constitution for the United States of America, a republic, Ms. Johnson and the United States Of America enter into this joint stipulation stating the exact nature of the jurisdiction asserted.

That jurisdiction is not a military jurisdiction, a commercial jurisdiction, or a jurisdiction consented to by contract in an inferior tribunal. The specific and particularized paramount nature of the jurisdiction asserted against Ms. Johnson is governed by “the supreme law of the land” as provided for in Art. IV, cl. 2 of the Constitution for the United States of America. The supremacy clause is only applicable if Congress is acting in pursuance of its constitutionally authorized powers, with the presumption and agreement that Congress is acting in pursuance of said powers.

Dated this \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ 2014.

 \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

 United States of America Carmen Ramona Johnson

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

 I \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ certify that on this \_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ 2014 a copy of foregoing document was personally served upon the following parties.

U.S. Attorney

Address

City, State, xx

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing statement is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Executed this \_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_2014, at \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ County, Maryland.

 \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

 Carmen Ramona Johnson

: