

STATE OF MISSOURI)
) SS.
RANDOLPH COUNTY)

IN THE 16TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT COURT OF MISSOURI

Denny Ray Hardin)
)
 Movant,)
)
 vs.) Case No. 0916-CV33861
)
 STATE OF MISSOURI,)
)
 Respondent.)

AMENDED MOTION TO VACATE JUDGMENT AND SENTENCE

FIRST AMENDED MOTION UNDER RULE 29.15

COMES NOW, Denny Ray Hardin to lawfully challenge his incarceration as unconstitutional, immoral, unethical and unlawful. Movant presents this petition, in the "16th Judicial Circuit Court", a "Constitutional Court" as clearly established by Article V, Section 1 of the Constitution of Missouri. Movant accepts W. Stephen Nixon's "Oath of Office" lawfully required by Article VII, Section 11, of the Constitution of Missouri, as his lawfully binding contract with the people of Missouri that he will support the "Constitutions". Movant presents his cause of action in this "Court of Record" (RSMo 476.010) to lawfully challenge his incarceration and regain his liberty, that has been taken without due process of law, in violation of the 5th Amendment of the "Constitution for the United States of America". Movant submits the following First Amended Motion under V.A.M.R. Crim.Rule 29.15 and in support thereof states the following:

09 DEC 14 AM 8:43

FILED-CRIMINAL DIVISION
JACKSON COUNTY MO
12/14/09

1. Movant's motion under Rule 29.15 filed in this Court is incorporated by reference as if fully set forth herein, with the additions noted below.

2. Paragraph 8 of Movant's Motion to Vacate, Set Aside or Correct the Judgment or Sentence is hereby amended to add the following allegations, and is not intended or meant in any way to subtract from those allegations previously made.

3. Common Law Action:

All "Constitutional Courts" of Missouri shall receive "Common Law" as lawfully established by the Rules of Evidence RSMo 490.080. The following is the "Common Law" of this cause of action.

a. The "Constitution for the United States of America" is the "Supreme law of the land" as established by Article VI. Because the "16th Judicial Circuit Court" is an "inferior court" of the United States of America as established in Article III, Section 1 this "Common Law" is lawfully binding on W. Stephen Nixon. It is absolute in its determinations. This "Common Law" is presented into evidence as if it was entirely read into this "Court of Record".

b. The "Constitution of Missouri" is the source of power, authority, jurisdiction, limitation and prohibitions of all "Constitutional Courts" established under Article V. This "Common law" is lawfully binding on all "Judges" of Missouri as a lawfully binding contract of all "Public Officials" with the people of Missouri. This "Common law" is presented into evidence as if it was entirely read into this "Court of Record".

The foregoing "Common law" is lawfully required to be upheld in all Courts of Missouri. All Judges of Missouri are bound by their "Oath of Office" to support this "Common law". W. Stephen Nixon is lawfully required to have an "Oath of Office" by Article VI of the "Constitution for the United States of America" as codified in 28 U.S.C 372, the "Constitution of Missouri" Article VII, Section 11 and is lawfully required of all Judges of Missouri before entering their "Public Office" by RSMo 476.280. This "Common law" establishes the lawful "duty" of W. Stephen Nixon in this "Court of Record".

4. Evidence of this "Court of Record"

a. Movant now enters all warrants, indictments, docket entries, transcripts of all proceedings by all courts and grand jury, all orders and judgments in Case No. 0616-CR01640 and Case No. 0616-CR01640-01 as "Evidence" within the Rules of Evidence RSMo 490.130 that says all records of court shall be received as evidence of the official acts of the court.

b. Movant enters the "JACKSON COUNTY HOME RULE CHARTER" into "Evidence", as evidence of the "Corporate Status" of "JACKSON COUNTY, MISSOURI" within the "Rules of Evidence" RSMo 490.250 that says records of corporation shall be received into evidence. This record establishes "JACKSON COUNTY, MISSOURI" is a "Corporation" as defined in Article XI, Section 1 of the "Constitution of Missouri".

5. Lack of Jurisdiction:

The "Corporate Court" of "IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF JACKSON COUNTY, MISSOURI AT KANSAS CITY" is an "Administrative Court" fraudulently conducting "Judicial Processes" without authority of law. This "Corporation" is unlawfully exercising "Police Powers" of Missouri in violation of Article XI, Section 3 of the Constitution of Missouri that strictly prohibits use of "Police Powers" by any "Corporation". This "Corporation" is defrauding the people of Missouri with its fraudulent claim of being a lawful "Circuit Court". The "Constitution of Missouri" condemns this "Corporation" and its conduct. All "Circuit Courts" of Missouri are "Constitutional Courts" as required by Article V, Section 1 of the "Constitution of Missouri". The only lawful "Circuit Court" of "Jackson County, Missouri" is the "16th Judicial Circuit Court of Missouri" located at the "County Seat" in "Independence, Missouri". This "Corporation" has annexed the "County seat" and changed the name of the court, without voter consent in violation of Article VI, Section 6 of the Constitution of Missouri. All Constitutionally chartered "Circuit Courts" of Missouri are limited to three judges by Article VI, Section 7 and all judges must be elected. The "Corporation" has unlawfully established a "Corporate Court" that has no authority of law or jurisdiction to conduct any "Judicial Process".

The docket entries and transcripts clearly show that the "jurisdiction" of this "Corporate Court" was repeatedly challenged throughout the proceedings and these were ignored, denied or dismissed by the imposter judges of this "Corporate Court". Movant believes based upon all established law, that this "Corporate Court" has no authority of law or jurisdiction. Because no "jurisdiction" was established in the record, the record of the court supports Movant's claim this "Corporate Court" lacks personal and subject matter "jurisdiction".

6. Unlawful arrest without lawful warrant:

The "Corporate Court" unlawfully issued a warrant for the arrest of the person of Denny Ray Hardin. The Capital Police, of Jefferson City, Missouri, believing it was a lawful warrant arrested Denny Ray Hardin on March 15, 2006. When provided a copy of the warrant, issued by the imposter judge Robert Beard, it was learned the warrant was not signed by Robert Beard in clear violation of Rule 22.04(6). To date no signed "Statement of Probable Cause", signed under the penalty of perjury has ever been produced. For these reasons, Movant lawfully challenges the

legal validity of this warrant for issuance in violation of the 4th Amendment, that lawfully requires "probable cause" for issuance of all warrants within the United States of America. The warrant, in the record of the court, supports Movant's claims.

7. "Information" of Case No. 0616-CR01640:

The initial unsigned "Information" of this cause of action, was lawfully challenged by a "Motion to Dismiss" that was ignored in clear violation of the 5th Amendment. This Motion lawfully "Answered" the "Complaint" and presented the clear "Conflict of Interest" of Robert Beard to act in this cause of action. Movant terminated Robert Beard in 1991 for incompetence and ineffective assistance of counsel. Robert Beard issuing a warrant without signing it was a clear violation of Rule 22.04(6). RSMo 476.180 prohibits a judge who is interested, shall not sit on the case. Therefore, Robert Beard claimed "Conflict of Interest" and did not arraign Movant on the warrant as lawfully required by Rule 22.07. The "Motion to Dismiss" establishes clear evidence the Complaint was lawfully challenged and Movant was ignored to allow prosecutors to continue their unlawful prosecution. Robert Beard unlawfully transferred the case to Preston Dean for arraignment, instead of granting the "Dismissal" supported by law. This poisonous tree, has been allowed to grow for over three years now and all acts are fruits of this criminal conduct. This clearly shows "Conspiracy against rights" 18 USC 241. These facts are clearly established in the record of this court.

8. "Arrest/Indictment" Case No 0616-CR01640-01:

The "foreign agent" 22 U.S.C. 611, Charlene Wright, fraudulently entered her appearance on behalf of the "STATE OF MISSOURI" and produced an "Indictment" that lacked the lawfully required by Rule 23.02(f), Intent to injure. Preston Dean put Movant in the JACKSON COUNTY JAIL for "Contempt" for entering a "Court of Record" in his court. In his court, presenting law is a "crime", the crime of contempt. Movant suffered the indignation of being told to "shut up" repeatedly in front of 15 witnesses present. Preston Dean refused the "Common Law Plea" of "Court of Record" and acted in "Judicial Misconduct" to enter a "Not Guilty Plea" over Movant's objections. Preston Dean acted as imposter judge and defense counsel in clear "Conflict of Interest".

The final act of the "foreign agent" Charlene Wright was to petition the imposter judge Preston Dean to quash the Subpoenas issued for defense witnesses. Movant claimed his 6th Amendment right to compulsory process for witnesses. Preston Dean violated the 6th Amendment and quashed Movant's subpoenas in violation of Article V, Section 5 of the Constitution of Missouri that prohibits any rule that impairs the examination of witnesses. Movant believes this arraignment was clear "Prosecutorial Misconduct" by Preston Dean and Charlene Wright to deny Movant his right to due process of law in violation of the 5th Amendment as the record of this court clearly shows in the transcript.

9. Pre-trial Hearings:

In the first pre-trial hearing the imposter judge John M. Torrence fraudulently claimed Movant was in a "Corporate Court" where he would determine the facts, law and evidence. The transcript of this proceeding is not available from the Court Reporter who claims she was absent that day. The "foreign agents" Byron Woehlecke and Jordon Stanley fraudulently entered their appearance on behalf of the "STATE OF MISSOURI" replacing Charlene Wright. Upon their motion, John M. Torrence quashed the subpoenas lawfully issued for the second time, denying Movant defense witnesses for the second violation of the 6th Amendment. During this process, John M. Torrence kept telling the Movant "You need a lawyer", which Movant refused because all members of the [BAR] are incompetent in the field of law. This conduct of John M. Torrence and the "foreign agents" clearly shows denial of due process of law required of all courts within the United States of America by the 5th Amendment. Since no transcript is available Movant can produce atleast 10 witnesses present that day that will confirm the unlawful conduct of John M. Torrence.

In the second pre trial hearing John M. Torrence granted the foreign agents' third motion to quash subpoenas lawfully served for defense witnesses. John M. Torrence made it appear to be a lawful process by forcing Movant to explain why he wanted each and every witness subpoenaed. Then he quashed all except those the prosecution planned to call as witnesses. The Constitution of Missouri Article V, Section 5 prohibits any Rule that impairs the examination of witnesses. By John M. Torrence deny the Movant his defense with defense witnesses, he denied the jury the ability to determine all facts of the case. By John M. Torrence determining what facts were allowed and what facts were suppressed he was the trier of fact and Movant was denied trial by jury in violation of the 6th Amendment of the Constitution for the United States of America. It is common knowledge the jury is the trier of all facts, to suppress facts because they expose corruption of the "Corporate Court" is clear denial of due process of law required by the 5th Amendment. The transcripts clearly show evidence of this "conspiracy against rights" by John M. Torrence and the foreign agents who worked in concert to deny Movants his Constitutional rights before the jury trial was scheduled. The record of the court clearly confirms these violations.

10. Trial without rights, without defense or due process:

Throughout the trial of Movant, the foreign agents were allowed, by John M. Torrence, to threaten Movant with 15 years in prison for a "C" felony. The foreign agents were allowed to present the jury with fraud that Movant was a violent criminal who had been previously been charged with assault and rape. Movant has not been charged with either. All objections were heard ex parte, and without any authority of law the foreign agents were given the advantage every time. No witness of the prosecutor claimed any injury, no damage to property was proved. John M.

Torrence led this "Conspiracy to convict" without due process of law required by the 5th Amendment. The "STATE OF MISSOURI" with this bogus trial converted the 1st Amendment right to "Freedom of Speech" into the crime of "Tampering with judicial process" RSMo 575.260. Movant's supposed crime was saying, "I will abolish this Court" an absolute right. The Constitution of Missouri Article I, Section 3 gives the people the sole, inherent and exclusive right to abolish government. Therefore, this right has been converted to a crime by the "Corporate Court". The United States Supreme Court prohibits this conduct of all inferior courts within the United States of America with their determination, "The claim and exercise of a Constitutional right cannot be converted into a crime." Miller v. U.S. 230 F 486 at 489. This bogus trial, by a "Corporate Court", is now lawfully challenged as follows:

a. Plaintiff:

The "Plaintiff" of this cause of action, is the "foreign state", as defined in 22 USC 611, of the "STATE OF MISSOURI". All prosecutions by foreign states are prohibited by the 11th Amendment of the Constitution for the United States of America. By allowing this "fictitious entity" to act as "Plaintiff", Movant was clearly denied his right to cross examination of his accuser within Article I, Section 18a of the Constitution of Missouri, that requires the defendant be allowed face to face cross examination of his accuser. This is clear denial of due process of law, required of all inferior courts of the United States of America, by the 5th Amendment of the "Constitution for the United States of America. The record of the court clearly establishes this "Fact".

b. Prosecutors:

Charlene Wright, Byron Woehlecke and Jordon Stanley are "foreign agents" of the "British Atoned Registry" (AKA "BAR") who have fraudulently claimed to represent the "STATE OF MISSOURI" in this criminal prosecution. The "STATE OF MISSOURI", is a "Corporation" that can not speak, can not write, can not contract and can not be represented by any foreign agent acting against any "American Citizen". These "foreign agents" have acted in clear "Conspiracy against rights" 18 USC 241 to deny Movant his 1st Amendment right to "freedom of speech" & "right to petition", his 6th Amendment right to "Compulsory process for witnesses" & "right to trial by jury" and his 5th Amendment right to due process of law. Without injury to person or damage to property, these "foreign agents" have conspired to take, and in fact have taken, the liberty of MOVant without due process of law in violation of the 5th Amendment. These "foreign agents" have committed "perjury" to obtain a conviction of a felony crime, this is a class "B" felony within RSMO 575.040(7)(2).

c. Witnesses for the Prosecution:

Like the prosecutors, every witness against me, is a foreign agent of the "British Atoned Registry" or employed by a foreign state. The transcript of the trial clearly shows, upon cross examination no witness could declare "injured party status", because no injury to person or damage to property was proved. All these witnesses worked in concert, as foreign agents, to give the jury the impression a crime had been committed. Of course this is false and clear misrepresentation of facts. The "indictment", is required by Rule 23.02 (f) to have "intent to injury, cheat or defraud", none of which was present in this cause of action. No criminal intent to injure was established, therefore the Indictment was not proved. Movant was convicted of an "imposter crime" without injury, without damage to property, without malice or intent to injure. The Clerk of the Court to whom the statement was made was the only witness present, all other gave testimony in "Hearsay" to convince the jury of Movant's guilt. This clearly establishes "Perjury" to obtain a conviction of a felony crime, by all other witnesses not present, this is clear evidence of a felony crime a class "B" felony within RSMO 575.040(7)(2). The transcripts present in the record of this court supports this claim.

d. Judge John M. Torrence, sentencing authority:

John M. Torrence is a "foreign agent", as defined in 22 USC 611, and unlawfully holding the "Public Office" of "Judge" in violation of the "Original 13th Amendment" that strictly prohibits any foreign agent from holding any office of trust or profit within the United States of America. John M. Torrence led this "Conspiracy against rights" 18 USC 241 to deny Movant all due process of law in clear violation of the 5th Amendment. He repeatedly refused to provide "Findings of facts and conclusions of law" required of all inferior courts within the United States of America by 5 USC 557(c)(3)(A)&(B). These are also lawfully required of all judges of Missouri by RSMO 536.090 John M. Torrence refused to establish his "jurisdiction", though repeatedly challenged, as established by the record of the court, no statement of "jurisdiction" is present. Movant repeatedly sought due process of law and John M. Torrence without rebuttle, without authority of law, without jurisdiction refused all due process to the Movant in clear violation of the 5th Amendment. Some of these are as follows:

- * Motion for New Trial (Denied)
- * Motion to Set Aside Judgment (Denied)
- * Motion to Void Judgment (Denied)
- * Petition for Habeas Corpus (Denied)
- * Motion for Judgment of Acquittal (Denied)

All the above were simply denied, without any due process allowed without any argument, without any rebuttle, without jurisdiction without authority of law. These and many others, all denied.

The record of the court provides over whelming evidence of conspiracy to convict without authority of law. Every American is entitled to equal rights under the law within 42 USC 1981. Every right Movant petitioned the Court for was "Denied", not once was the law presented challenged by the prosecutor, it was just "Denied". This was done by John M. Torrence to keep Movant in "involuntary servitude", in clear violation of 18 USC 7102(5). Every Motion was lawfully required to be heard, argued and lawfully determined by the law presented. Every denial by John M. Torrence, by his "order" is "documented evidence", of his unlawful acts to keep Movant in "Slavery" to the "STATE OF MISSOURI", in clear criminal conduct as prohibited by 18 USC 1592. By "Obstruction of Justice" 18 USC 1512, through the denial of due process of law, John M. Torrence was trafficking Movant in slavery, involuntary servitude and forced labor as defined in 18 USC 1590. John M. Torrence sold Movant into "involuntary servitude" in violation of the current 13th Amendment and 18 USC 1584 that prohibits this conduct within the United States of America. John M. Torrence through his false impersonation of a lawful "Judge" RSMo 575.120(1)(a)&(b), enticed Movant into slavery a criminal act under 18 USC 1583. The Sentencing/Judgment is clear evidence John M. Torrence imposed "Forced Labor" on Movant in violation of 18 USC 1589. Based upon the Sentencing/Judgment, Movants liberty was unlawfully seized by the "Missouri Department of Probation and Parole" where he was forced to serve 2 years, 11 months, and 27 days, for a total of 1083 days, of "involuntary servitude" in violation of 18 USC 1585. The record of the court clearly establishes the foregoing criminal acts of John M. Torrence to take Movant's liberty without due process of law in violation of the 5th Amendment and without authority of law required by RSMo 1.210. This lawfully binding law requires every judge of the State of Missouri to provide the authority of law they claim allows them to restrain or detain an American Citizen. Because "findings of facts and conclusions of law" do not exist in this cause of action there can be no lawful reason for Movant's involuntary servitude, restrain or detainment. The record of the court clearly reflects these truths.

11. Judge W. Stephen Nixon Unlawful Imprisonment/Peonage:

In furtherance of the foregoing "conspiracy to convict" W. Stephen Nixon refused Movant his 6th Amendment right to witnesses for his defense of a probation violation. W. Stephen Nixon refused Movant his right of trial by jury in violation of the 6th Amendment. On August 12th 2009 W. Stephen Nixon, working in concert with Bryon Woehlecke, conducted a mock trial devoid of all law, for the fraudulent claim Movant violated Condiction #10 of John M. Torrence's slavery documentation. The transcript clearly shows W. Stephen Nixon unlawfully determined Movant filed a document in court that violated his probation. W. Stephen Nixon refused Rule 20.04g that defines filing with the court. Refused direct testimony of Melinda Sue Harrington who stated under oath she filed the document in the Ray County Circuit Court. W. Stephen Nixon refused to provide "findings of facts and conclusions of law". W. Stephen Nixon revoked the probation of Movant due to end in three days and sentenced him to 5 years in

peonage without authority of law required by RSMo 1.210. W. Stephen Nixon and Byron Woehlecke worked in clear "Prosecutorial Misconduct" to imprison Movant without authority of law, without lawful jurisdiction and without justification to cause Movant personal injuries with malice, intent and knowledge of criminal conduct of "Conspiracy against rights" 18 USC 241. The constant presence of Byron Woehlecke, throughout all these proceedings shows he alone has petitioned the courts to injure Movant without authority of law. However, W. Stephen Nixon denied due process of law required by the 5th Amendment and took Movant's liberty without authority of law. He alone is responsible for the unlawful imprisonment of Movant and must now state his jurisdiction and authority of law to justify his conduct. Like John M. Torrence, W. Stephen Nixon is impersonating a "Judge" in the "Corpoarte Court" of no authority or juristicition.

12. Evidence of Conspiracy against rights:

In the "Corporate Court" no due process of law has been allowed, all has been denied without authority of law. Movant filed "Notice of Appeal" on August 14th 2009 and has been refused "Appeal Bond" lawfully required by Rule 30.16, to all prisoners except those sentenced to life in prison or the death penalty. Movant's Appeal was not filed in the Missouri Supreme Court until late Novemeber clearly showing "Obstruction of Justice" by denial of an "Appeal" to a higher court. This is clear obstruction of the enforcement of slavery laws a crime under 18 USC 1581. In this "Corporate Court" there is no law capable of obtaining justice or vendicating a person the "foreign agents" want in prison. Movant has petitioned the Court for 1083 days of credit for Probation time served within RSMo 559.100. If the court had granted this time, Movant would be out of prison. Either, Bond or time credit would release Movant from prison, refusal shows clear conspiracy to unlawfully keep Movant in prison. The fact these standard practices have not been granted provides clear evidence of the "Conspiracy against rights" to keep Movant in prison without authority of law. Movant believes the reason he is in prison is because he refuses to stop protecting his friends against the unlawful conduct of foreign agents. Any one of the above violations requires the Court to void its judgment, Movant setting in prison based upon all these violations, shows clear conspiracy to confine without authority of law or jurisdiction. It is common knowledge once due process of law is violated all jurisdiction ceases.

13. Summation of Facts, Law and Evidence:

This case is being utilized to create a "Public Record" of the corruption of the "Corpoarte Court" known as "IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF JACKSON COUNTY, MISSOURI AT KANSAS CITY". This "Public Record" clearly shows all due process of law, required by the 5th Amendment, has been denied in this "Corporate Court". This "Corporate Court" has no jurisdiction or authority of law to conduct any "Judicial Process". This imposter court is an "Organized Crime Operation" of "foreign agents" of the "British

Atoned Registry" who utilize the prestige of the "Judicial System of Missouri" to steal property under fraudulent pretences of lawful actions, extort large defense fees against imposter crimes and takes the American Peoples' liberty without due process of law. Petition has been unlawfully imprisoned for over 120 days now in violation of the 5th Amendment after his rights under the 1st, 4th, 5th, 6th, 9th, 11th, and 14th Amendments were clearly violated. This "Corporate Court" has no authority or jurisdiction to deny any American Citizen any right, privilege or immunity secured to the American People by the Constitution for the United States of America. It is the "duty" of every lawful judge to protect these; clearly the judges of this case have failed in their judicial obligations.

The attached clearly shows the efforts being made to stop the corruption of this "Corporate Court" and others like it. "Corporate Courts" operated by "foreign agents" have become the common practice of [BAR] Associations all over the United States of America. Soon the President of the United States of America and the Governor of Missouri will have to answer for the criminal acts of these "Corporate Courts" to the "International Court of Justice". As long as, Movant is unlawfully in prison, he has the right to seek "Habeas Corpus" under Article I, Section 9 of the Constitution for the United States of America. These are being presented to courts all over this land and to the American People who are starting to wonder why they are not being granted. Movant is claiming "foreign agents" have over-thrown every Constitutional court of this land, these courts' refusal to support Constitutional law are proving Movant's claims true.

On the day Movant was sentenced to prison, he prayed with his family and friends, on the courthouse steps. Movant asked God to let the truth be known. Movant believes God is answering his prayers, because this case has given Movant the ability to put the corruption of this "Corporate Court" before every court of this land. Soon this "Corporate Court" will be brought before the World Court and those entrusted with the power to govern will be required to answer for its conduct. Movant believes God's will, will be done.

14. Relief Demanded:

- a. Movant demands "findings of facts and conclusions of law" to support the determination of this Court within Rule 29.15(j). The requirement of rules "are not mere formality". *Crews v. STATE* 7 S.W. 3d 563, 567 (Mo. App. 1999)
- b. Movant demands his immediate release from the MOBERLY CORRECTIONAL CENTER where he is unlawfully imprisoned. Rule 91.06 requires every judge who has knowledge a person is unlawfully imprisoned to release that person.
- c. Movant demands the exspingement of his record.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Denny Ray Hardin, do hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing was mailed by Certified Mail on this _____ day of December, 2009 to the following:

Byron Woehlecke,
C/O Jackson County Prosecuting Attorney
415 East 12th Street
Kansas City, Missouri 64106

For Investigation:

Attorney General Chris Koster
Supreme Court Building,
P.O. Box 889,
Jefferson City, Missouri 65102

U.S. Attorney General Eric H. Holder, Jr.
5137 Robert F. Kennedy BLDG.,
10th St. Constitution Ave.
NW - Washington DC 20530

Denny R. Hardin

Denny Ray Hardin's Fight for freedom and Justice

GOVERNMENT INFORMED OF CORRUPTION
OF JACKSON COUNTY, MISSOURI

Habeas Corpus
International Court
of Justice
Pending

President For the United States
Governor of Missouri
FBI
JAG
State Department
Homeland Security
U.S. Attorney

Habeas Corpus
Superior Court
Washington DC
Denied/Refiled/Show
Cause/Answered
Pending

Appealed 8th Circuit Court
of appeals (Dismissed)

Habeas Corpus
U.S. Supreme Court
Pending

Complaint "Conspiracy against rights"
U.S. District Western District of MO.
Dismissed

Habeas Corpus
U.S. District Court
Delaware
Denied/Refiled/
Pending

Motion for Tranfer to
Missouri Supreme Court
Denied Clerk of Court

Habeas Corpus
Missouri Supreme Court
Filed/Refused by Clerk
Filed/Refused by Clerk

Appealed Missouri Court of Appeals
Western District
Dismissed

Appeal
Missouri Supreme Court
Pending

Appealed after Probation

Appeal after Incarceration

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF JACKSON COUNTY, MISSOURI AT KANSAS CITY

None of the above have supported the Constitutions to date.