

Paul-Kenneth: Cromar.™

- Executor of the name ©“PAUL KENNETH CROMAR”, and,
Barbara-Ann: Cromar.™

- Executrix of the name © “BARBARA ANN CROMAR”™
c/o 9870 N. Meadow Drive / Cedar Hills, Utah-State: usA [84062]

IN THE FOURTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT
UTAH COUNTY, PROVO, STATE OF UTAH

STATE OF UTAH
EIN #87-6000545 & DUNS #009094301

Plaintiff

vs.

PAUL KENNETH CROMAR – VESSEL,
BARBARA ANN CROMAR – VESSEL.
Sole Executors and Heirs of the Estates
by the same trademarked names

Res Defendants

**DECLARATION [*Affidavit*]:
NOTICE of unlawful denial of
Faretta Declaration right of self-defense,
unlawful “requirement”
of judicial impossibilities
- with Criminal Referral to
the Utah Attorney General
for Treason in this court**

cases #201402860 & #201402868
Christine S. Johnson
Trustee in dishonor – Recusal required
#2014-02860 - CUSIP #4812CA652

USPS Certified: # 7020 0410 0002 9777 7627

#

#

***“For the Lord is our judge; the Lord is our lawgiver;
the Lord is our king; he will save us.***

(BIBLE - Isaiah 33:22 – see SECOND JUDICIAL NOTICE: Exhibit A – God’s Word)

**DECLARATION [*Affidavit*]:
NOTICE of unlawful denial of Faretta Declaration right of self-defense,
unlawful “requirement” of judicial impossibilities,
- with Criminal Referral to the Utah Attorney General
for Treason in this court**

We, Paul-Kenneth: Cromar and Barbara-Ann: Cromar, a man and woman, hereafter “Barbie and Ken” declared by a jury of our peers “found to be living”, of age, of sound mind and body, a son and daughter of God, of Divine inheritance, anointed to be a king and queen unto the Most High God, and have been determined to be competent to manage the affairs of the Paul-Kenneth: of the House of Cromar Estate, and the Barbara-Ann: of the House of Cromar Estate; and do so *sui juris* with Constitutional Counsel of choice Eugene Paul Richardson heretofore unlawfully denied by this court, standing on the land (described under our signatures at end) *in propria persona*, state nationals of Utah known as Utahns, under the flag of the *Original Jurisdiction* as per **Public Notice, Declarations, Mandates, and Lawful Protest – The Law does not permit impossibilities** (un-rebutted jurisdiction challenge filed with the court on October 1, 2020), respectfully and *in honor* do hereby file this **DECLARATION [*Affidavit*]: NOTICE of denial of Faretta Declaration right of self-defense, unlawful “requirement” of judicial impossibilities, - with Criminal Referral to the Utah Attorney General for Treason in this court**, in the pursuit of justice, as follows:

We, Paul-Kenneth: and Barbara-Ann: House of Cromar, a living man and woman on the land, **do NOT understand these proceedings, nor do we consent to these proceedings.** And hence reject and rescind offers to contract that would draw us into foreign jurisdictions to places unknown, without full disclosure, knowingly, willingly or voluntarily. We are not in your

declared jurisdiction, have now proven it yet again at the June 2, 2022 hearing wherein we declared that we don't, haven't and never will allow this court to move us into the jurisdiction described in **USC Title 18 § 4108**. We Do Not consent to our being transferred to the jurisdiction of the United States. This law requires us to willingly, knowingly, and voluntarily to authorize such action – which we have not done, nor do we ever intend to do.

“There is a Federal Code Title 18 USC Section 4108 called Verification and Consent of Offender to Transfer to the United States Corporation. We have not ever nor will we ever allow as required by law to be in your jurisdiction, your corporate jurisdiction. And the Court and prosecutors might be interested, officers of the Court, in familiarizing themselves with that law.”

(see June 2, 2022 Pretrial Hearing Transcript – page 23, starting at line 20)

We've hereby notice the court that we do not authorize our being transferred to the United States, and hence are not within the jurisdiction of this court. Therefore, this case is VOID of authority. The continued prosecution and trial must be considered criminal judicial malfeasance in Malicious Prosecution as DECLARED in our June 7, 2022 filing, which was also blocked with a “not received” by this court.

Our challenge to this court's declared jurisdiction was challenged from the first day, with our very first filing. On October 1, 2020, we, Barbie and Ken, provided a detailed, explicit challenge with a **Public Notice, Declarations, Mandates and Lawful Protest** (which we affectionately call the “Checkmate” – see Exhibit “A”) has on it's first page this statement of fact that,

"The Law does not permit impossibilities."

However, not only has this jurisdictional challenge never been substantively and directly addressed during the next 21-months to date been addressed by the prosecution, court, Christine S. Johnson nor any other party, but this court has proceeded regardless of law, fact and challenges, but also with our warning on the record, that “we're not in this jurisdiction, but we're present only to gather additional evidence for multiple felony violation this court seems hell-bent

on committing against us. Additionally, as clearly stipulated in the Checkmate agreement, if not answered within 30-days (which can vary) then a non-response is a response that is in agreement. This court often implements this approach with the public, and is equally vulnerable to the process. Notices of default and INVOICES regarding the Checkmate documents have been lawfully served to Christine S. Johnson, Jared Perkins and David O. Leavitt, their non-responses accepted as agreement, INVOICED as stipulated, faulted, and then defaulted, creating judgments that are now lawfully collectable. We intend to collect. And again, Johnson and Perkins have been asked numerous times to **recuse** due to their financial conflict of interest, and have declined in violation of our rights to fair and impartial proceedings!

Therefore this court and all other connected and similarly served parties remain in *Checkmate*, indeed the game is over for Malicious Prosecution by a jurisdiction foreign to us, and hereby made officially so with this Criminal Referral to the Utah Attorney General for Malicious Prosecution identified in the June 7, 2020 Declaration [Affidavit] NOTICE of Malicious Prosecution, along with various other criminal violations explained therein, and now for **Treason** for violation of Constitutional oaths of office.

More Impossibilities Unlawfully “Required” by this Court

In the June 2, 2022 hearing, Madam Johnson “required” us to immediately provide a “witness list”. Maintaining ourselves *in honor* with the court, we filed a Declaration with the “witness list”, doing so as a man and woman, without the burden and legal liabilities of BAR attorney assistance, and as noticed in our June 7, 2022 filing. However, the court again notified us that it was “not received” for our not being “state-licensed BAR attorneys”, though we have been acting under a dejure Faretta Declaration (we only recently learned of the term “Faretta”), making Christine Johnson's refusal to accept our filings in **direct contradiction to the Constitution, SCOTUS rulings, Federal laws and statutes, and the Rules of Professional Conduct**. As cited numerous times but ignored as part of our defense as *In Propria Persona* pleadings, our filings are to be considered without regard to technicalities, as we are not professional attorneys or BAR club members. The Supreme Court of the United States has weighed in here:

"Pleadings in this case are being filed by Plaintiff In Propria Persona, wherein pleadings are to be considered without regard to technicalities. Propria pleadings are not to be held to the same high standards of perfection as practicing lawyers. (See Haines v. Kerner 92 Sct 594).

"The Federal Rules rejects the approach that pleading is a game of skill in which one misstep by counsel may be decisive to the outcome and accept the principle that the purpose of pleading is to facilitate a proper decision on the merits." According to Rule 8(f) FRCP and the State Court rule which holds that all pleadings shall be construed to do substantial justice."

It appears Christine S. Johnson is unwilling, unable to fulfill her responsibilities on the bench (nor David O. Leavitt "Prosecutor" or Jared Perkins within the Utah judicial system), they may be in need of a judicial competency hearings to determine if they can effectively apply the Supreme Law of the Land from the bench and as officers of the court, when she doesn't seem to understand that **this Utah district court is inferior** to the Supreme Court of the United States of America, which is subservient to the Constitutions (US and Utah), which they swore to protect and defend against all enemies foreign and domestic. If they deceitfully swore an oath to some other Constitutions, declare so on the record in full disclosure now.

"Therefore, I, the Lord, justify you, ... in befriending that law which is the constitutional law of the land;

"And as pertaining to law of man, whatsoever is more or less than this, cometh of evil.

(Doctrine & Covenants 98: 6-7)

If found that Christine S. Johnson, David O. Leavitt and Jared Perkins cannot keep their oath of office, shouldn't they resign? If Christine S. Johnson cannot honorably function in "good Behavior" (Constitution Article III Section 1.2.1.1) then in the interest of Justice **she must be removed from the bench** and similarly Leavitt and Perkins as officers of the court, and hence this Criminal Referral is respectfully NOTICED upon the Utah State Attorney General (Sean Reyes), with request for immediate Recusals, Stays and Delays to be Ordered and enforced in

this instant case, or better yet **in the interest of justice that has been heretofore denied, must receive Dismissal with extreme prejudice.**

The Common Law is the Law of the Land

“...But that in the body of the Constitution does not include a petty offense like the present. It must be read in the light of the common law. "That," said Mr. Justice Bradley, in Moore v. United States, 91 U.S. 270, 274, referring to the common law, "is **the system from which our judicial ideas and legal definitions are derived.** The language of the Constitution and of many acts of Congress **could not be understood without reference to the common law.**" Again in Smith v. Alabama, 124 U.S. 465, 478, is this declaration by Mr. Justice Matthews: "The interpretation of **the Constitution of the United States is necessarily influenced by the fact that its provisions are framed in the language of the English common law,** and are to be read in the light of its history." In United States v. Wong Kim Ark, 169 U.S. 649, 654, Mr. Justice Gray used this language:

"In this, as in other respects, it **must be interpreted in the light of the common law,** the principles and history of which were familiarly known to the framers of the Constitution. Minor v. Happersett, 21 Wall. 162; Ex parte Wilson, 114 U.S. 417, 422; Boyd v. United States, 116 U.S. 616, 624, 625; Smith v. Alabama, 124 U.S. 465." See also Kepner v. United States, post, 100; 1 Kent, Com. 336.

List of Impossibilities "Required" by this court, but not permitted by Law

– VOIDS this case and makes a case for accusations of TREASON

While it is true that, "The Law does not permit impossibilities," this court has repeatedly attempted to impose "requirements" upon the res Defendants Barbie and Ken, it hypocritically does so. For example:

#

1.) The court requires our counsel to be “state-licensed BAR attorneys”, when no such thing exists. We’ve asked to be shown their “state issued licenses”, but they have not done so. Why? Because they do not exist. The BAR is an association or club. The BAR does not issue licenses, but rather membership cards. A BAR card is not a license to practice law provided by Utah state. The Utah State legislature has not enacted statute that issues an authorized and issued license to practice law that we are aware of. This court requiring one of us or our counsel is **an impossibility which the Law does NOT permit.**

2.) The law requires a “speedy trial”, but this case has languished now for 21-months. During the last 12+ months we have been denied access to the court record and filings because our counsel of choice with whom we have a private contract, Eugene Paul Richardson, has been un-Constitutionally denied the right to help us in our defense creating **an impossibility which the Law does NOT permit.**

3.) Mr. Perkins announces at the June 2, 2022 pretrial hearing that he made an error in not noticing the Rule 16 update, which allows for our original requests for evidence to now be fulfilled, and yet chastises us in an email for our objections to his clever strategy and requirements when, even now the exculpatory evidence we asked for of the interior of our home, especially our posting on our doors, remains withheld in violation of Rule 16 provisions. Why was our request for evidence denied originally if justice is the objective?

Rule 16 (a) (2) - Timing of mandatory disclosures.

The prosecutor’s duty to disclose under paragraph (a)(1) is a continuing duty as the material or information becomes known to the prosecutor.

An email from Mr. Perkins declares there may more evidence to come in a “timely” manner. It appears that Obstruction of Justice was and remains the objective of Mr. David O. Leavitt’s prosecution of Barbie and Ken. Why has the prosecution waited until June 2, 2022 to disingenuously state, “in the abundance of caution” (June 2, 2022 Court Transcription page 4, line 7) the offering of NEW evidence over the next few days, but as of this moment has not

provided all of what absolutely needed and requested as far back as October of 2020, **creating an impossibility which the Law does NOT permit.**

4.) In a May 27, 2022 response by Adam Beck, was made to our May 13, 2022 GRAMA request to the Utah County Attorneys office. The following response was recorded in Beck's email:

GRAMA REQUEST – please provide: “Media records of Paul Kenneth and Barbara Ann Cromar being read their Miranda rights at time of arrests or any time thereafter.”

Adam Beck: “Upon review of our records, Utah County has not identified document that fit within the scope of your request.”

This GRAMA request response, independently confirms that we already knew which was that Ken was NOT read his Miranda rights on the 24th of September, 2020, nor was he read his Miranda rights two days later when falsely arrested a second time by AFPD, **creating another impossibility which the Law does NOT permit.**

5.) During the November 4, 2021 hearing, in an act akin to “leading the witness”, prosecutor Perkins appeared to “lead the judge”:

MR. CROMAR: “... [Johnson and] Prosecutor Jared Perkins have been asked and refused to, numerous times, to recuse for their conflicts of interest in denial of our right to request such.

THE COURT: Okay, Mr. Cromar--

MR. CROMAR: I'm not done. This Court, by exceeding its jurisdiction has lost its juris...”

THE COURT: Nancy, will you please mute Mr. Cromar. (see Court Transcript of Nov. 4, 2021 – page 5, line 16)

With res defendants Barbie and Ken's microphone cut off, the following occurred without their consent or participation.

MR. PERKINS: Yes, Your Honor. I think at this point the defendants need to enter their pleas, which I expect will be not guilty,... (Court Transcript of Nov. 4, 2021 – page 6, line 9)

THE COURT: All right, I'll receive **not guilty** pleas on the charges on behalf of, for the Cromars. And just so the record is clear, the Cromars have elected to represent themselves in court. (Ibid – page 6, line 15)

“Not guilty” pleas were not offered by us, the Cromars, for her to “receive”. Our **objection** to the court entering “not guilty” pleas was not able to be heard by the court because our microphone was off in a denial of *due process* and meaningful participation.

THE COURT: Okay. Nancy, we can go ahead and unmute the Cromars so that we can get this scheduled for a pretrial. (Ibid – page 8, line 16)

Our microphone was turned off for exactly 3 pages of record from page 5, line 16 through to page 8, line 16. We objected then and the pleas of “not guilty” entered in our behalf were not ours willingly, knowingly and voluntarily, and as such, were then and remain a fraud upon the court record. We, Barbie and Ken, as the sole heirs and Executors of our Estates by the same name, have never entered a plea of “guilty” or “not guilty”, because as declared in the first hearing in October of 2020, that we were and remain “innocent” of all charges, and Object to any declaration, assumption or presumption to the contrary. Therefore, when Christine S. Johnson entered a plea of “not guilty” she committed fraud upon the court, **creating an impossibility which the Law does NOT permit.**

6.) False declarations of “Frivolous”, “vexatious”, “scandalous” were also used as pretense to block honest declarations of truth on the record, MOTION TO COMPEL PLAINTIFF TO PRODUCE DISCOVERY of approximately March 3, 2022. (see forthcoming SEVENTH JUDICIAL NOTICE affidavit regarding this action in dishonor) The filing should have been esteemed to “do justice”, and despite the numerous documented commitments on the record to provide the Warrant in question Mr. Perkins ultimately claimed he didn’t have to do so, and we finally approached the Deseret News reporter to ask him for the mystery Warrant which a 20+ year court clerk veteran, and a now former employee of Christine S. Johnson, said they could not find on the docket, but when pressed, said they found it in a “side file”. This embarrassing MOTION TO COMPEL PLAINTIFF TO PRODUCE DISCOVERY was instead stricken from

the record, presumably because of undeniable, embarrassing bifurcations by Mr. Perkins on the official court record in multiple hearing transcripts over a period of approximately 8 months, and because they were prejudicially, maliciously, “scandalously” and stricken from the record, **creating an impossibility which the Law does NOT permit.**

6.) Now that our witness list and 17 exhibits have been accepted by the prosecution, the time needed to secure our witnesses with our constitutional right to compel via Subpoena, has been compromised. The Sixth Amendment to the Constitution reads:

In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a **speedy and public trial**, by an **impartial jury** of the state and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; **to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor**, and to have the assistance of counsel for his defense

7.) We have contacted virtually all 30 of our witness via email (see Exhibit “B”) – as quickly as possible but have maybe approximately 20% response, and now we’ve drifted into a 14-day window that is not fair to the witness’ schedule, is not likely to secure the testimonies of witness we require, leaving us judicially compromised. This may challenge our ability to “obtain witnesses in our favor”, and still allow us time to make proper preparations for a trial we’ve been waiting for 21 months. In reality we’ve been fighting for over 54-months and battle through 15 cases, in the quest to finally get our day in court to prove that we are INNOCENT of all charges. And now the 54+ month long-awaited opportunity for our “day in court” is compromised by denied access to the court, *but which* is required, *but which* is impossible to participate with the court, *but which* is artificially denied by fabricated, unlawful “requirements”, *all of which* appears to us, to be designed to insure a predetermined, agenda driven outcome of injustice of us in prison, **creating an impossibility with the Law does NOT permit.**

8.) **We do not understand, or stand under, or comprehend these proceedings.** And we **certainly do not consent to these proceedings**, which don’t even pretend to have “the required appearance of fairness”, **creating an impossibility with the Law does NOT permit.**

9.) We informed the court in the June 2, 2022 pretrial hearing of Declarations of Nationality filed in Evidence Exhibit #201 and #202, which clearly demonstrate that we do not fall under this court's jurisdiction as proven by our introduction of USC Title 18 § 4108 - WE Do NOT consent to the transfer to the United States which was compromised by our oft muted microphone denying us meaningful defense, **creating yet another impossibility with the Law does NOT permit**, which in and of itself voids this entire case.

There are actually numerous additional violations of law that have systematically denied our access to even the County Recorders office, under the claim that this court and a federal court judge denied the ability to "file on demand" documents, even under "misc", without the filing being done by a BAR attorney and/or reviewed by a Utah County Attorney. Three separate times we attempted to exercise our rights under Utah Code 57-3-104. The Utah County Recorder, under advice from County Attorney David O. Leavitts office that the Recorder has the right to decide if something can be filed when this title clearly stipulates a filer of a certified copy recorded in one county, is entitled to be filed in any other counties in Utah, when it reads, "**Certified copies entitled to record in another county...**" refers to the filer and not the county recorder and hence is NOT in her discretion – and thus violates our right of access to the Public Record. (Exhibit "C" – proof of Deputy theft of 3 filings from the Public Record)

Three different days we attempted to lawfully file our documents on demand but were denied. We called for Utah County Sheriff Deputies to arrest the County Recorder or Clerks for breaking the law. Three times the Deputies refused to make the arrests in what may qualify for misprision of felony violations on their part. We have witnesses along with video and audio recordings of the three events. Video evidence has been secured via GRAMA, which shows the three Certified document stacks, with \$40 on each, stolen by deputies who later informed us of "abandoned property" in secreting the public record and destruction of the public record. Provisions in the law exist to allow charges for unlawfully filed documents, which we were in the wrong could have been proved. This evidence will be provided to assist the Utah Attorney General's investigation of this Criminal Referral and prosecution of multiple violations of law.

The history of this court, which should be the People's court, suffers a history of repeated injuries and usurpations by David O. Leavitt, Jared Perkins, and Christine S. Johnson who has claimed various times it is "my court", each having in direct object the establishment of an absolute Tyranny of trespass of the defendant Barbie and Ken's God-given, unalienable, Constitutionally guaranteed rights, life, liberty, and property in a jurisdiction that is applicable to a man and woman on the land. They have combined with others to subject us, Barbie and Ken, to a jurisdiction foreign to our constitutions (see original jurisdictions as described on page 3 in the Checkmate Exhibit "A"), and unacknowledged by common law; giving them Assent to their Acts of pretended Legislation and order in undisclosed assumptions and presumptions (see forthcoming SEVENTH JUDICIAL NOTICE), apparently unlawfully imposed by secret, unauthorized use of our Power of Attorney, which is forgery and fraud, and which we **reject and rescind en toto**, while having **never understood nor ever knowingly, willingly nor voluntarily consented to these proceedings**. To prove this, let the Facts presented herein be submitted to a candid world.

Notice this Court of Violation of Rights to Judicial "Faretta" Self-defense

We hereby Notice this court of violation of rights to judicial self-defense (otherwise known as Faretta motion) feel that this filing of NOTICE needs to be done in order to save this court from making a fatal criminal error described herein.

David O. Leavitt, Christine Johnson and Prosecutor Perkins have collectively worked together to deny our filings and or to accept documents presented in our defense, and indeed striking honorable filings in defense, including the Court documents wherein the IRS acknowledged errors (found in the Fourth Judicial Notice and Sixth Judicial Notice, where in the Commissioner of Internal Revenue has admitted no lawful claim through the required Notices of Deficiency any claim against the Defendant Cromars from 1990 through 2020), thus making all related court case claims, orders, and judgment VOID as "fruit of the poison tree". (see forthcoming SEVENTH JUDICIAL NOTICE and EIGHTH JUDICIAL NOTICE.)

ADDITIONALLY Barbie and Ken have been denied the benefit of the Amicus Curiae (Friend of the Court Brief) filing “in behalf of the defense”, which points out the apparent flaws and injustices against the Defendant Cromars. – This court’s behavior reminds the quip, "Don't bother me with the facts, my mind is already made up!"

This situation is a legal impossibility! The court's denial of our filings and refusal to accept our documents without going through a state licensed attorney, at this stage (within 2 weeks) of the trial, make fair presentation of the facts an IMPOSSIBILITY. Statements by Prosecutor Perkins just continue to show how much the claims against the Cromars, in a kangaroo court, are nothing more than a show and game of smoke and mirrors through BAR “professional gamesmanship”.

The state’s Criminal justice system has been rigged against Barbie & Ken. It appears this court created an A FAIR and impartial TRIAL and IMPOSSIBILITY. – Therefore our only option left is for us to not lend our honor to proceedings we have repeatedly declared we do not understand and to which we do not consent, through any further participation.

There is no greater evidence to this fact than the statements made to the court by the court appointed, but unaccepted, public defender Ms. Estrada who openly told the court, “I believe there are some serious problems with moving forward with this case.” (June 2, 2022 Court Transcript - page 6 line 2)

Ms. Estrada warns the court of where this trial is headed and essentially tells them to stop this approach and pursuit of the Cromars. Ms. Estrada even warns the court, "One of the motions the state has filed is a motion to prevent re-litigation of ... the foreclosure process.” (Ibid, page 6 line 20) Ms. Estrada explained, "I'm concerned that that’s possibly going to be the major defense of the Cromars." (Ibid page 7 line 1)

Ms. Estrada's statement infers clear understanding by the court of the unspeakable truth, that they all know about the IRS Rulings in US Tax Court Washington DC, wherein the Chief Judge Maurice B. Foley rules acknowledgment of no lawful IRS claim over the Cromars exists from 1990 through 2020, but refuse to take notice, or accept Judicial Notices (Fourth and Sixth), thus making this case VOID, but the court, continuing forward in judicial malfeasance, reckless pursuit of Barbie & Ken through a clearly Malicious Prosecution.

Again Ms. Estrada declares, "This trial is not going to be a fair one" (Ibid page 7, line 15) and then goes as far to say, "I just wanted to put that on record, your Honor, because I am very concerned for them. That they are facing a second-degree felony is the highest charge and that's 1 to 15 years in prison. And from what I've seen this trial is going to be a disaster." (Ibid page 19, line 6-10)

Yes, Christine Johnson, Prosecutors Jared Perkins, David Leavitt and all of the other participants in this judicial farce against Barbie & Ken have full knowledge of our innocence and the intentional destruction of our lives, liberty and the pursuit of our happiness. Reading the June 2, 2022 Court Transcript demonstrates that there is not even the required "appearance of justice and fairness". It's time to end this mockery of justice. We can no longer be misunderstood and falsely declared participating when we are simply staying in honor and gathering evidence for criminal violations of law, so we can properly calculate damages and collect for multiple violations that include but are not limited to Obstruction of Justice, misprision of felony, and aiding and abetting criminal trespass and theft through felony 2 "burglary of a dwelling" (ours) and felony 3 "false appropriation" of our home the IRS now admits they had no lawful claim as required in notices of deficiency from 1990 through 2020, making for the kidnapping, assault and various other damages to the Cromars VOID for fraud and swindle in dishonor *ab initio*. This court could do so. It hasn't. Now, the officers of this court are hereby referred to the Utah Attorney General for Treason in violation of the Oath of Office, and for denial of God-given, unalienable rights of Barbie and Ken, and hence, denial of justice that harms all the people of Utah and this nation.

Therefore, as the sole heirs and lawful Executors of our Estates by the same names, this court is put on notice that this court's actions taken under the color of law in violation of Title 18 sec 242, have made VOID all of the claims against Barbie & Ken (a living and breathing man and woman) and that this corporate, for-profit court with corporate identifications (EIN #87-6000545 & DUNS #009094301) that prove they are a sub-corporation to the foreign corporation of USA Inc. (and various similarly named corporate shell designations, including White House corp, etc.), all of which are foreign to the Cromars (see Exhibit 201 and 201 presented as

evidence), and hence has no jurisdiction over them – in is now therefore declared in a criminal conspiracy in violation of our rights under the color of law (Title 18 section 242).

So the documents to be filed is the Faretta Motion with reference back to the first filing and notice that "The Law does not allow impossibilities," because that is what they have created. AND of course the same documents need to be sent, as a criminal referral to the Utah State Bar Association, the State of Utah General Attorney and upward through the military for PROSECUTION FOR TREASON and VIOLATION OF THEIR OATHS OF OFFICE TO PROTECT AND DEFEND THE CONSTITUTION.

Faretta v. California proves Court has prejudicially denied Cromars' rights

Months ago we, Paul-Kenneth: Cromar, and Barbara-Ann: Cromar engaged Eugene Paul Richardson in a contract of mutual benefit to act as our counsel. However, this court continues to chose to deny Our Constitutionally guaranteed right to counsel, because he is not a "state licensed BAR attorney", and then summarily block us in our right to self-defense (including res defendants' own court filings) as allowed by the Supreme Court of the United States in **Faretta v. California**, 422 U.S. 806 (1975) – and hence simultaneously "secreted the public record", by denying our filings on the court via unlawful "striking" or "ruling" in violation of **USC 18 §2071:**

Whoever willfully and unlawfully conceals, removes, mutilates, obliterates, or destroys, or attempts to do so, documents filed or deposited with any clerk or officer of any court, shall be fined or imprisoned not more than three years, or both.

This court and it's officers have so muddied the waters of justice with un-Constitutional fabrications that we, Barbie and Ken, must agree with Ms. Estrada on one point, "from what I've seen this trial is going to be a disaster.

No one is above the law, especially those entrusted with upholding it as our servants. And, no one, not David O. Leavitt, not Christine S. Johnson, nor Jared Perkins, has the authority to make rules or "requirements", "Where rights secured by the Constitution are involved, there can be no

rule making or legislation which would abrogate them" -- Miranda v. Arizona, 384 U.S. 436, 491]

BE IT SO EXECUTED, and by this execution, be made to appear, in-deed, enacted, decreed, this the 13th day of the 6th month, anno Domini, two thousand and twenty-two, Amen.

Notice to Principal is notice to Agent. Notice to Agent is notice to Principal.

We reserve the right to make any amendments or corrections at our pleasure.

FOR THE DECLARATION [AFFIDAVIT]: NOTICE OF DEJURE FARETTA MOTION AND CRIMINAL REFERAL, IS OF THE TRUE:

FOR THE sole Heirs /Executors ARE FOR THE AFFIRMATION
OF THE DECLARATION OF THE
TRUE BY THE FIRSTHAND KNOWLEDGE OF THE FACTS:

Respectfully and In Honor,

Utah County)
)
Utah Republic)
united States of America)

Asseveration

L.S.

Paul Kenneth Cromar



Signed only in correct public capacity
As Heir and Executor within the
Original Republic Jurisdiction.
:Paul-Kenneth: Cromar.
c/o 9870 N. Meadow Drive
Cedar Hills, Utah state [84062-9998]

LAND PATENT #392 part and parcel thereof;



Asseveration

L.S. by: Barbara-Ann: Cromar USA - 4:55 P.M.

Signed only in correct public capacity
As Heiress and Executrix within the
Original Republic Jurisdiction.
:Barbara-Ann: Cromar.
c/o 9870 N. Meadow Drive
Cedar Hills, Utah state [84062-9998]

LAND PATENT #392 part and parcel thereof;

Standing on our Metes and Bounds, having never abandoned them, which are as follows:

Beginning at the Northeast corner of Lot 3, Plat "C", Amended North Meadow Estates Subdivision, said point being S89°28'48"W 1129.68 feet along the Quarter Section line, and S0°00'00"W 773.49 feet from the East 1/4 corner of Section 6, Township 5 South, Range 2 East of the Salt Lake Base and Meridian, and running thence along said Lot 3 boundary line the following five (5) course: (1) S0°18'49"W 96.09 feet; (2) S89°59'43"W 149.21 feet; (3) along a curve to the right 23.50 feet through a central angle of 89°46'16" having a radius of 15.00 feet and a chord that bears N45°07'09"W 21.17 feet; (4) N0°14'01"W 80.49 feet; (5) N89°45'59"E 165.06 feet to the point of beginning, containing 0.361 acres.

[for LOT "C", AMENDED NORTH MEADOW ESTATES SUBDIVISION within the SE ¼ of SEC. 6, T.5 S.,R.2 E. SLBM – 0.361 acres]

Exhibit "A"

2020 10 01 - PUBLIC NOTICE - Judge Johnson filed on court CHECKMATE



COPY

**DEED OF SECONDARY CONVEYANCE OF INCORPOREAL HEREDITAMENTS
AN AUTHENTICATED FOREIGN DOCUMENT - HAGUE CONVENTION, 5 OCTOBER 1961**

**PUBLIC NOTICE, DECLARATIONS,
MANDATES, AND
LAWFUL PROTEST**

FILED
OCT 01 2020
CLERK OF DISTRICT
COURT
STATE OF UTAH
UTAH COUNTY

THE LAW DOES NOT PERMIT IMPOSSIBILITIES

Utah County)
)
Utah Republic)
)
United States of America)

Asseveration

L.S.

By: Paul-Kenneth C
Signed only in correct public capacity
As beneficiary to the Original Jurisdiction.

NOTICE. The term "Original Jurisdiction" herein and in all other documents issued by **Paul-Kenneth: and Barbara-Ann: Cromar**, means the constitution for the United States of America, anno Domini 1787, and articles of amendment anno Domini 1791 and other original parent agreements as indexed in Paragraph Number 12 below.

Let Right Be Done, Though The Heavens Should Fall

I, **Paul-Kenneth: Cromar: a/k/a Paul-Kenneth: and Barbara-Ann: Cromar: , a/k/a Barbara-Ann:**, both of the family **:Cromar**, in public capacity as beneficiary to the Original Jurisdiction, being of majority in age, competent to testify, a self-realized entity, a free, living and breathing Man upon the free soil, an American citizen of the American Republic, My yeas being yeas, My nays being nays, do hereby state that the truths and facts herein are of first hand personal research, true, correct, complete, certain, and not misleading, so help me GOD.

PUBLIC NOTICE

THIS DOCUMENT GIVES NOTICE TO all Public Officials by and through the Office of the Secretary of State, the United States of America a/k/a UNITED STATES a/k/a U. S. a/k/a UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, and the Office of the Secretary of State, the State of Utah a/k/a Utah a/k/a STATE OF UTAH a/k/a UT a/k/a "this State" and to all whom it may concern, of the DECLARATIONS, LAWFUL PROTESTS and other matters contained herein.

**NOTICE OF FOREIGN JURISDICTION
TO: ALL U.S. AND STATE AGENTS & OFFICERS**

When this notice is affixed to a premises, all property therein and attached thereto is under the custody and control of the above-noted foreign official and not subject to intrusion or seizure. The bearer of this Notice has been duly notified to the Department of State pursuant to international law and enjoys immunity from criminal and civil jurisdiction, arrest and detention. Under international convention, the bearer should be treated with respect and all steps should be taken to prevent attack on the bearer's freedom, mobility, interests and property.

Law enforcement inquiries may be made to the U.S. Department of State Authentications Office, (202) 647-4000.
Legalization inquiries may be made to the U.S. Delegation for the Hague Convention. (202) 776-8342

DECLARATIONS

APPELLATION, STATUS, AND FACTS

1. **KNOW ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS, Paul-Kenneth: Cromar, a/k/a Paul-Kenneth of the family: and Barbara-Ann: Cromar do hereby state, assert and aver all of the following:**

2. **Paul-Kenneth: and Barbara-Ann: Cromar, are a living, breathing free Man and Woman upon the free soil, an American citizen of the American Republic, also known as a declared Utah state national, beneficiary to the Original Jurisdiction.**

3. **Paul-Kenneth: and Barbara-Ann: Cromar, are not a United States Citizen, subject, vessel or "person" as defined in Title 26 United States Code, Section 7701 or elsewhere, or any other *ens legis* artificial person, individual, entity, fiction of law, procedural phantom or juristic personality, notwithstanding the reproduction of any such fictions in any media, computer, record or instrument, written or electronic.**

4. **Paul-Kenneth: and Barbara-Ann: Cromar, are foreign to the United States and retains official authority within his chosen jurisdiction. As beneficiary to the Original Jurisdiction, he is not subject to nor does He volunteer to submit to or contract with any *ens legis* artificial or corporate jurisdiction to which a United States person may be subject.**

5. **Paul-Kenneth: and Barbara-Ann: Cromar, reserves all Rights, Remedies and Defenses granted to them by God and memorialized by Paul-Kenneth: and Barbara-Ann: Cromar's correct public capacity as beneficiary to the Original Jurisdiction.**

6. **Paul-Kenneth: and Barbara-Ann: Cromar, waive no Rights, Remedies or Defenses nor yields imprescriptible Rights including, without limitation, the Right to movement and travel without restriction, permission or license in any conveyance of His choosing on any public roadway in America, and the right to bear arms for the protection of His family, friends and neighbors without restriction, unless such waiver is specifically done so lawfully in writing.**

7. **Paul-Kenneth: and Barbara-Ann: Cromar, did not, does not, nor does they ever intend to volunteer, consent or contract to being identified as, of, or connected by any nexus to, any institutional, bifurcated, public *cestui que* trust or other fictional construction of law or *ens legis* entity of a political state or subdivision thereof, in any capacity including, without limitation, as trustee, co-trustee, surety, co-surety, officer co-officer, fiduciary or co-fiduciary.**

8. **Paul-Kenneth: and Barbara-Ann: Cromar, reserves the nature and character of their exact and proper designation as:**

Paul-Kenneth: Cromar AND Barbara-Ann: Cromar

or in the alternative.

Paul-Kenneth: AND Barbara-Ann: of the family, :Cromar.

...which shall be spelled written, formatted, printed, engraved and inscribed now and in perpetuity in all media exactly and precisely as just above-written with a first and second given name separated from, and joined to, a family name by a mark of punctuation or the words "of the family"; with the first letter of each given and family name being capitalized and all other letters being written in lower case fully in accord with the Rules of English Grammar.

9. **Trade Mark notice.** The name **Paul-Kenneth: and Barbara-Ann: Cromar** by common law is Trade Marked TM and all trade names and derivatives thereof, whether or not registered, are Trade Marked TM by and property of **Paul-Kenneth: and Barbara-Ann: Cromar**, to whom all rights are reserved. The use thereof without the express written permission of **Paul-Kenneth: and Barbara-Ann: Cromar**, creates a voluntary and informed consensual contract obligating the unauthorized user to the payment of a Trade Mark infringement fee as follows:

A Trade Mark infringement fee in the sum certain of two-hundred fifty-thousand dollars (\$250,000.00) lawful specie, gold, or silver, American mint, or certified bullion, Lawful coin money at current spot market price pursuant to the Constitution for the united States of America, 1787 anno Domini, amended anno Domini 1791, Article 1, Section 10, Clause 1, shall apply to each unauthorized use of the designation **Paul-Kenneth: and Barbara-Ann: Cromar**, and to each attempt or event of conversion, alteration, distortion and/or misnomer whether by improper spelling, abbreviation, capitalization, initializing, reversal of parts, or conversion to a fiction of law or other juristic personality or artificial being.

10. Clause 1, shall apply to each unauthorized use of the designation **Paul-Kenneth: and Barbara-Ann: Cromar**, and to each attempt or event of conversion, alteration, distortion and/or misnomer whether by improper spelling, abbreviation, capitalization, initializing, reversal of parts, or conversion to a fiction of law or other juristic personality or artificial being.

11. **The legal doctrine of *idem sonans* is inapposite to Paul-Kenneth: and Barbara-Ann: Cromar**, whether oral or written; all such improper usages and misnomers comprising infringement on the above-noticed copyright.

12. **Paul-Kenneth: and Barbara-Ann: Cromar, does hereby accept the Original Jurisdiction, to wit:**

- A. **Constitution for the united States of America, anno Domini 1787, Articles of Amendment anno Domini 1791;**
- B. **National Bill of Rights, anno Domini 1776;**
- C. **The Northwest Ordinance, anno Domini 1787**
- D. **Constitution of Utah, anno Domini 1896;**
- E. **Bill of Rights for Utah, anno Domini 1896;**

13. **Paul-Kenneth: and Barbara-Ann: Cromar**, does hereby further state, assert and aver the following facts:

- a. It is well established the Hague Regulations and Geneva Convention IV specifically protect the original jurisdiction from encroachment upon internationally protected people.

b. Furthermore, it is well established under public policy that citations, legislations, prescriptions and other comprise a cloak to disguise collateral undertaking in U.S. Funds. All such offers want for authority under original organic State Constitutions pursuant to which they are forbidden and can never be duly enacted.

c. The U.S. a/k/a the United States is defined as a federal corporation at Title 28 USC 3002(15).

d. The United States is bankrupt pursuant to Perry v. United States, 294 US 330-381 (1935); 79 L. Ed 912.

e. United States is an obligor/grantor to the Federal Reserve Bank pursuant to the Federal Reserve Bank Act of December 23, 1913, 38 Stat 265, Ch. 6.

f. The said Federal Reserve Bank Act comprises a contractual granting by Congress to the Federal Reserve Bank of a paramount and enduring (ex-warrant 1913-1933) lien on the assets of the United States and all parties who would use bank notes issued by the Federal Reserve Bank pursuant to 38 Stat 265, Ch. 6 p266-267.

g. The Congress of the United States, by authority of the Gold Bullion Coin Act of 1985, PL 99-185, December 17, 1985, 99 Stat 1177 has decreed its intention that all Americans can no longer be forced into an obligor/grantor status in relation to said Federal Reserve Bank Notes.

h. The Constitution for the united States of America, 1787, Article 1, Section 4, Clause 2 (1856) states that Congress shall assemble at least once in every year, which shall be the first Monday of December. Notwithstanding, Amendment XX, Section 2 (1933) states: "The Congress shall assemble at least once in every year, and that such meeting shall begin at noon on the third day of January, unless they by law appoint a different day."

14. The Constitution cannot be in conflict with itself. The *de jure* legislature of the united States of America identified as "Congress" in the aforementioned Article 1, Section 4, Clause 2 (1856) adjourned "*sine die*" in 1861. Evidence of its reconvening in the absence of a congressional quorum has not been exhibited by the United States. The national legislative body discernible in Amendment XX, Section 2 first appeared in 1863 by executive resolution as a department of the Executive Branch of government pursuant to "Emergency War Powers." This *de facto* "Congress" was conceived and continues to sit at the pleasure of the president of the corporate *ens legis* UNITED STATES.

15. The *de jure* private people who, by their inherent character *in rerum natura*, are foreign to and wholly without the corporate *ens legis* United States are not subject to the actions, acts and whims of the *ens legis* Congress of the corporate UNITED STATES. Accordingly, living Men *in rerum natura* are not subject to the Federal Reserve Bank Act of December 23, 1913 which wants for force and effect of law in the Original Jurisdiction.

16. Disclosure of the facts and frauds stated herein has been denied to Paul-Kenneth: and Barbara-Ann: Cromar, in his rightful capacity as beneficiary of the Original Jurisdiction by an extraordinary and persistent policy of covin, conspiracy, and collusion constructed and condoned

by the UNITED STATES Congress, Amendment XX, the Federal Reserve Bank/System, and contractors, agents, assigns, successors, heirs, representatives, obligors and grantors thereof.

17. It is well settled in law that "no right, by ratification or other means, can arise out of fraud." Fraud vitiates everything it touches. There exists no lawful statute of limitation on fraud.

18. By this PUBLIC NOTICE, DECLARATIONS AND LAWFUL PROTEST, the following addendum is attached by reference herein in its entirety to any and all Federal Reserve Notes, public policy instruments, and documents regardless of kind arising from or relating to the Federal Reserve Bank/System which are held, received or used by **Paul-Kenneth: and Barbara-Ann: Cromar**, now and in perpetuity:

"The use of this instrument/conveyance by Paul-Kenneth: and Barbara-Ann: Cromar, is of necessity only and under Lawful Protest, *nunc pro tunc* to December 23, 1913, in the absence of a reasonable alternative."

19. The labor of **Paul-Kenneth: and Barbara-Ann: Cromar**, is measured and valued *quantum meruit* exclusively in gold and silver coin. As the value of such labor is tangible, it cannot be measured by any instrument which serves as evidence of debt, notwithstanding that the operational currency of the corporate UNITED STATES consists exclusively of instruments noted thereon to be evidence of liability.

20. **Paul-Kenneth: and Barbara-Ann: Cromar**, hereby expressly states his intention to pay, extinguish and satisfy all of His obligations and make all parties whole. Accordingly, **Paul-Kenneth: and Barbara-Ann: Cromar**, specifically disavows the use of "discharge" as a fraudulent transaction which implies payment but serves to covertly transfer the debts of **Paul-Kenneth: and Barbara-Ann: Cromar**, to other parties contrary to **Paul-Kenneth: and Barbara-Ann: Cromar**, deeply held Scriptural beliefs under God regarding theft and deceit.

21. **Paul-Kenneth: and Barbara-Ann: Cromar**, is not now and has never been a United States Citizen under the Fourteenth and Sixteenth Amendments of the *ens legis* Constitution for the corporate UNITED STATES, notwithstanding any failures to properly pass the said amendments into law.

22. **Paul-Kenneth: and Barbara-Ann: Cromar**, has the absolute unalienable Divine right to keep and bear arms of any kind for protection of Self, family, and neighbors, by his own will and this DECLARATION.

23. **Paul-Kenneth: and Barbara-Ann: Cromar**, has the absolute unalienable Divine right to move and travel upon all public roadways in America, of whatever kind and nature, in whatever mode or carriage of transportation He may choose, without license or permission or any other infringement of that right, by His own will and this DECLARATION.

24. In addition to all of the above, **Paul-Kenneth: and Barbara-Ann: Cromar**, retains all of the Rights as enumerated and protected by the constitutions, bills of rights, and ordinance pursuant to the Original Jurisdiction.

LAWFUL PROTEST

As it is a crime to conceal a crime and conceal a fraud, Paul-Kenneth: and Barbara-Ann: Cromar, makes Lawful Protest against, abjures, denounces, refuses, takes exception and does not assent to:

1. The formation of any institutional, bifurcated, public, *cestui que* trust in violation of the copyright of **Paul-Kenneth: and Barbara-Ann: Cromar**, previously declared herein.
2. Any allegation or presumption that **Paul-Kenneth: and Barbara-Ann: Cromar**, have consented expressly or tacitly to being a Citizen pursuant to the Fourteenth and/or Sixteenth Amendment of the *ens legis* Constitution of the UNITED STATES.
3. Any pledge, mortgage, lien or encumbrance by the Council of State Governors, March 6, 1933 which would identify **Paul-Kenneth: and Barbara-Ann: Cromar**, as security, surety, co-surety or collateral for any part or portion of the public debt which has been hypothecated by the use of counterfeited Federal Reserve securities.
4. The forced involuntary use of U.S. funds such as Federal Reserve Bank/System notes, commercial liability instruments and electronic liability transactions as part of a scheme to compel the principals to impart artificial commodity value to the liability evidenced thereon, on the authority of *MacLeod v. Hoover*, (June 22, 1925) No. 26395, S. Ct. Louisiana; 105 S. Rep. 305, that court citing *U.S. Bank v. Bank of Georgia*, 23 U.S. 333, 10 Wheat, 333, 6 L. Ed. 34.
5. Any presumption that **Paul-Kenneth: and Barbara-Ann: Cromar**, have volunteered to be a debtor in possession of Federal Reserve Notes with expectation of a quid pro quo; a guarantor/surety/co-surety on the lien created by the Federal Reserve Bank Act of December 23, 1913; a party to any confidence game, scheme, forced or *cestui que* use whereby paper wanting inherent value is placed into circulation by the Federal Reserve Banks in lieu of Constitutionally required gold or silver; a party to the failure of public officials and Federal Reserve principals to provide full disclosure of the liabilities and perils of using private scrip, instruments of debt, corporate U. S. obligations, and Federal Reserve Notes as inauthentic replacements for lawful money.
6. Any presumption that **Paul-Kenneth: and Barbara-Ann: Cromar**, have at any time expressed or implied a promise to guarantee the debt hypothecated by the said Federal Reserve Act, the private debt of the corporate UNITED STATES, or any obligations of the Federal Reserve Banks, agents, contractors, assigns, successors, heirs and grantors thereof, now and in *perpetuity*.
7. Any presumption that **Paul-Kenneth: and Barbara-Ann: Cromar**, have at any time volunteered expressly or tacitly to join as a co-conspirator in any fraud, conspiracy, covin, collusion, confederation or joint business venture operated by the *de facto* STATE OF UTAH and the corporate *ens legis* UNITED STATES as a surety, co surety, guarantor or other obligor.
8. Any attempt to induce **Paul-Kenneth: and Barbara-Ann: Cromar**, to act as a tortfeasor to the Constitution for the united States of America, anno Domini 1787, where at Article 1, Section 10, it states **"No State shall . . . emit bills of credit; make anything but Gold and Silver Coin a tender in payment of debts," all such offers being refused for fraud.**

9. Pursuant to the Original Grant of Depositum for Bailment via the 1896 Constitution of UTAH, **Paul-Kenneth: and Barbara-Ann: Cromar**, make Lawful Protest against, abjures, denounces, refuses, takes exception and does not assent to the calculated use of legal fictions to undermine and convert the political Will of the People on the free soil of the organic country known as Utah into a legislative democracy that transforms the free People into subjects of the municipal law of foreigners within the geographical exterior boundary of Utah and contrary to the Northwest Ordinance and the original Grant of the People, September 17, 1787, anno Domini, as amended 1791, anno Domini.

MANDATES

IT IS HEREBY EXPRESSLY MANDATED TO IMMEDIATELY:

1. **RETURN THE DEPOSITUM FOR BAILMENT to Paul-Kenneth: and Barbara-Ann: Cromar**, in his capacity as descendent by blood of the original Bailor/Grantor/Settlor and his endowment to warrant same by Almighty God, pursuant to the terms, conditions, stipulations, exceptions and reservations contained within the Original Grant.
2. **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT, RECOGNITION AND RETURN BY THE BAILEE OF THE SAID DEPOSITUM OF BAILMENT to Paul-Kenneth: and Barbara-Ann: Cromar**, as repository trustee for the Original public Trust.
3. **EXHIBIT THE AUTHORITY** whereby **Paul-Kenneth: and Barbara-Ann: Cromar**, can be compelled, forced or enticed to falsely act as a tortfeasor to Article 1, Section 10, Clause 1 of the Original Grant against his will by using the aforementioned fictional bank notes within a scheme of discharge disguised as payment. Failure to so exhibit within ten (10) days of PUBLIC NOTICE comprises stipulation that no such authority exists.
4. **EXHIBIT THE AUTHORITY** whereby **Paul-Kenneth: and Barbara-Ann: Cromar**, can be compelled, forced or enticed to falsely present himself as a United States Citizen/person in violation of the Fourteenth and Sixteenth Amendments prohibition against slavery and involuntary servitude. Failure to so exhibit within ten (10) days of PUBLIC NOTICE comprises stipulation that no such authority exists.
5. **ADMIT OR DENY** that all actions of the UNITED STATES, the STATE OF Utah and all political subdivisions thereof whether judicial, administrative, municipal, county or otherwise are by their nature actions *indebitatus assumpsit*. Failure to respond within ten (10) days of PUBLIC NOTICE comprises admission of an ongoing Fraud against the beneficiaries of the Original Jurisdiction.

“Suits as well as transfers may be the protective coverings of fraud,” *Steelman v. All Continent Corp.*, 301 US 278, 81 L. Ed 1085; *Shapiro v. Wilgus*, 287 U.S. 348, 355, 53 S. Ct. 142, 144, 85 A.L.R. 128. “The fact that the means employed to effect the fraudulent conveyance was the judgment of a court and not a voluntary transfer does not remove the taint of illegality,” *First National Bank v. Flershem*, 290 US 504, 78 L. Ed. 465. “... it is obvious that the fraud did not occur in open court nor in that sense enter into the decrees under attack, hence the fraud of which we complain was not susceptible to insulation. In the language of *Shapiro v Wilgus*, 287 US 348, 77 L. Ed 355. It was part and parcel to a scheme whereby the form of a judicial remedy was to supply a protective

cover for a fraudulent design.” Also, Steelman, supra Flersham, supra, Braun, supra., “That in the absence of an adversary trial or decision the distinction between extrinsic and intrinsic fraud becomes immaterial and made clear by the following from the Throckmorton opinion,” 98 US 61, 65, Braun, supra.

6. **EXHIBIT VERIFIED EVIDENCE** proving the time, place and nature of full disclosure of the benefits, risks and perils by which Paul-Kenneth: and Barbara-Ann: Cromar, could knowingly volunteer to submit to the Federal Reserve Bank Act of 1913. Failure to so exhibit within ten (10) days of PUBLIC NOTICE comprises stipulation that no such disclosure was made.

7. **ADMIT OR DENY that Paul-Kenneth: and Barbara-Ann: Cromar, did in fact knowingly and voluntarily ratify the *cestui que* trust created by the UNITED STATES through the Federal Reserve Bank Act of 1913 which resulted in the use of grammatical derivations of Paul-Kenneth: and Barbara-Ann: Cromar’s name in a scheme of intentional misnomer for profit and gain. Failure to respond within ten (10) days of PUBLIC NOTICE comprises denial that the *cestui que* trust created by the UNITED STATES through the Federal Reserve Bank Act of 1913 was ever duly and lawfully ratified by and any assumption of such ratification is false.**

8. **EXHIBIT VERIFIED EVIDENCE** proving the knowledgeable and voluntary ratification and acceptance by Paul-Kenneth: and Barbara-Ann: Cromar, of the aforesaid *cestui que* trust. Failure to so exhibit within ten (10) days of PUBLIC NOTICE comprises stipulation that the said *cestui que* trust was never ratified by Paul-Kenneth: and Barbara-Ann: Cromar, and any assumption of such ratification is false.

9. **EXHIBIT VERIFIED EVIDENCE** proving the granting of a copyright license by Paul-Kenneth: and Barbara-Ann: Cromar, expressly conveying to the licensee the authority to use grammatical derivations of the proper name belonging to Paul-Kenneth: and Barbara-Ann: Cromar, in a scheme of intentional misnomer for profit and gain through an unauthorized *cestui que* trust. Failure to respond within ten (10) days of PUBLIC NOTICE comprises stipulation that all such misnomers and uses of the aforesaid *cestui que* trust comprise intentional copyright infringement.

10. WE, Paul-Kenneth: and Barbara-Ann: Cromar, do hereby deny having received disclosure of the existenc, benefits, risks and perils of a *cestui que* trust named derivatively at any time, or having been asked to ratify the said trust. Consequently, I do hereby deny, denounce, adjure and disavow having ever ratified any such trust.

11. WE, Paul-Kenneth: and Barbara-Ann: Cromar, Beneficiary of the *cestui que* trust, rejects and never accepted Offer to contract, and did not and does not consent to any proceedings, and REBUKES all officials herein named for their dishonorable part in aiding and abetting the DENIAL to the Cromar family their unalienable DUE PROCESS, HEARING and TRIAL BY JURY, and the irreparable harm to our Life, Liberty and Pursuit of Happiness and property in any way related to the UTAH FOURTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT Civil Case No. 201402860 and/or 201402868.

12. WE, Paul-Kenneth: and Barbara-Ann: Cromar, beneficiary of *cestui que* trust mandate ALL claims against Paul-Kenneth: and Barbara-Ann: Cromar, AND Barbara-Ann: Cromar, by Flesh-and-Blood MS. CHRISTINE JOHNSON and/or his

client(s) be released and/or restored, immediately voided, all liens and notices of lien voided, and all claims on land, property, improvements, or any pursuit of happiness at a place commonly known as 9870 North Meadow Drive in a neighborhood known as Cedar Hills in Utah state, be returned to **Paul-Kenneth: Cromar, AND Barbara-Ann: Cromar, with a DECLARATION OF APOLOGY for aiding and abetting the denying Constitutional rights to due process, hearing, trial by jury and justice, be drafted and signed by you, notarized, then be recorded on the property through the Utah County Recorder, with the original being mailed to the address below via NEXT DAY USPS mail. If this mandate is not met, a penalty of ten thousand (\$10,000.00) dollars a day will be enforced until such time the debt is paid in full, County record corrected, apology filed thereon, and if necessary, the house is returned with a \$660,000 terrorism and threat of endangerment personal distress fee, plus \$1000 per day penalty until fee is paid in full.**

13. WE, **Paul-Kenneth: and Barbara-Ann: Cromar**, beneficiary of *cestui que* trust do hereby instruct, Flesh-and-Blood MS. CHRISTINE JOHNSON being an officer of the CORPORATION cannot use the name of Paul KENNETH CROMAR, in any form, except as per written instructions, it is a **felony** in the **Utah State**.

14. WE, **Paul-Kenneth: and Barbara-Ann: Cromar**, beneficiary of the *cestui que* trust, do not have a contract with any court of the UNITED STATES. If threatened in any manner, I **Paul-Kenneth: and Barbara-Ann: Cromar**, in the Body of Flesh-and-Blood by MR. JOHN W. HUBER, MR. ROBERT J SHELBY, MR. ADAM POMEROY, MS. LYNN W. DAVIS, MS. CECILIA M. ROMERO, MS. ANTHONY HOWELL, MR. RYAN S. WATSON, MR. RICHARD E. ZUCKERMAN, MS. WANDA I. MANLEY, ANDREA VENTURA, MR. "GARY CHAPMAN" (alias - ID # 10000324786), MR. ROBERT E. MANSFIELD, MR. NATHAN S. DORIUS, MR. ANDREW V. COLLINS, MR. DAVID O. LEAVITT, MR. MIKE SMITH, MR. DALE EYRE, MR. JEFFERY SMITH, MR. KRAIG J. POWELL, MR. GARY HERBERT, MR. SEAN D. REYES, MS. HEATHER J. CHESNUT, any Corporate employee, or any other suspected criminals not named here, charge for such fraud Seventy-Five Thousand (\$75,000.00) DOLLARS per officer, official or living individual. If any perceived threats are manifest, all the people/persons above may be exposed to investigation and prosecution for possible RICO violations, and violations under Title 18 sec 241 & 242, and all the fines, penalties and possible life imprisonment or death penalty there under.

15. WE, **Paul-Kenneth: and Barbara-Ann: Cromar**, beneficiary of *cestui que* trust mandate that MS. CHRISTINE JOHNSON show that the corporate regulations have authority over the BODY of Flesh-and Blood of **Paul-Kenneth: and Barbara-Ann: Cromar**. And since corporations, including the corporation of the UNITED STATES, has no authority over the Body of Flesh-and Blood, now fraud and swindle in dishonor, and extortion charges, do now apply since trying to bring me into contract with the corporation of the UNITED STATES, a penalty of ONE HUNDRED FIFTY THOUSAND DOLLARS (\$150,000.00) now applies to the Corporation of the OFFICE of ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS a subsidiary of the UNITED STATES Corporation for the distress that has been incurred to me in the Body of Flesh-and Blood.

16. WE, **Paul-Kenneth: and Barbara-Ann: Cromar**, beneficiary of *cestui que* trust mandate that MS. CHRISTINE JOHNSON provide a certified copies signed under the pains and penalty of perjury, of his **Oath of Office, his Subscribed Oath, his Anti-Bribery Statement, his Foreign Agents Registration Act disclosure (see FARA.gov), copies of any and all oaths including BAR guild, and his bond number and bonding company name, address, phone and agent contact**, sent via USPS in c/o the mailing address below.

17. WE, **Paul-Kenneth: and Barbara-Ann: Cromar**, beneficiary of *cestui que* trust mandate that MS. CHRISTINE JOHNSON provide certified true and complete copy of all records, communications, filings, etc. in any way related to UTAH FOURTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT (Provo) civil cases #190400494, #200400972, #201402860 & #201402868, – and sent via NEXT DAY USPS mail, c/o our official court mailing address below.

18. WE, **Paul-Kenneth: and Barbara-Ann: Cromar**, beneficiary of *cestui que* trust mandate that MS. CHRISTINE JOHNSON to pay me \$5,000 in via cashiers check, for each and every day from the date of receipt of this service (*including day of receipt*), until you NOTIFY me in writing of your DISMISSAL of the UTAH FOURTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT (Provo) civil cases #190400494, #200400972, #201402860 & #201402868, – and sent via NEXT DAY USPS mail, c/o our official court mailing address below. (Note Related cases in U.S. DISTRICT COURT (SLC) 2:09-cv-1102, 2:17-cv-01223-RJS-EJF, 2:19-cv-0255-TDD, 2:20-cv-224, 2:20-cv-625)

19. WE, **Paul-Kenneth: and Barbara-Ann: Cromar**, Beneficiary of the *cestui que trust*, do hereby instruct MR. GARY R. HERBERT acting as the GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF UTAH **corporation**, and responsible for all corporate employees for the STATE OF UTAH and hence any collusion or conspiracy to defraud the Cromars, to hereby enforce all above mandates. If these mandates are not met within ten (10) days from the date of receipt of this **PUBLIC NOTICE, DECLARATIONS, MANDATES AND LAWFUL PROTEST**, all individual names mentioned in this document will be submitted to the US Marshals and/or the Utah County Sheriff for action.

CAVEAT LAW – SUPREME COURT CASES

1. All public officials, Officers of government bodies politic, in all branches/departments, Executive, Legislative, or Judicial, being of Oath of Office, bonded to fidelity, are under ministerial duty, Supervisors v. United States ex rel. 71 U.S. 435, 4 Wall 435, U.S. v. Thomas, 15 Wall 337, U.S. v Lee, 106, US 196, 1 S. Ct 240, fiduciary/trustees, U.S. v Carter, 217 US 286, 30 S. Ct 515. “The implication of a trust is the implication of every duty proper to a trust... Whoever is a fiduciary or in conscience chargeable as a fiduciary is expected to live up to them.” Buffum v Peter Barceloux Co. 289 US 227, 237; 77 L. Ed 1140, 1146, cited Braun v. Hansen, 103 F.2d 685 (1939), wherein it further states “Being fiduciaries, the ordinary rules of evidence are reversed”, must obey the law, Butz v. Economou, (US) 98 S Ct. 2895, Davis v Passman (1979, US) 442 US 226, 99 S. Ct. 2264.

2. "The law will protect an individual who, in the prosecution of a right does everything which the law requires him to do but fails to obtain his right by the misconduct or neglect of a public officer." Lyle v Arkansas, 9 Howe 314, 13 L. Ed 153, Duluth & Iron Range Co. v Roy, 173 US 587, 19 S. Ct 549, 43 L. Ed 820. "It is a maxim of the law, admitting few if any exceptions, that every duty laid upon a public officer for the benefit of a private person, is enforceable by judicial process". Butterworth v U.S. ex rel. Hoe, 112 US 50, 5 S. Ct 25, 28 L. Ed 656.

3. "A ministerial officer is liable for an injury done, where his acts are clearly against the law." Tracy v. Swartwout, 10 Pet. 80, 9 L Ed 354. "The judicially fashioned doctrine of official immunity of judicial, legislative or executive officers does not reach so far as to immunize criminal conduct prescribed by an Act of Congress." O'Shea v. Littleton, 414 US 488, 94 S Ct. 669, "in equity there are certain rules prohibiting parties bearing certain relations to each other from contracting between themselves; and if parties bearing such relations enter into contracts with each other, courts of equity presume them to be fraudulent, and convert the fraudulent party into a trustee." Perry on Trusts (7th Ed) Sec. 194, in Braun v Hansen (1939) 103 F 2d 685. Under the doctrines of *res gestae*, *res ipsa loquitur*, *respondeat superior*, as now having prior knowledge, authority, power, opportunity to prevent or aid in preventing injury, damage, having been or about to be committed. Title 42 USCS Section 1986, as applies to public officials, Officers, by the existence of an agreement between two or more persons, acting in a private conspiracy, McNalley v Pulitzer Pub. Co. (1976) 532 F 2d 69, 429 US 855, 50 L Ed 2d 131, to conspire, through said conspiracy, to impede or hinder, or obstruct or defeat the due course of justice in a State or Territory, with the purposeful intent to deny the equal protection of the law, under color of State law or authority, or other, Griffin v. Breckinridge (1971) 403 US 88, 91 S Ct. 1790, depriving of having or exercising a Right, Federal Conspiracy to Obstruct Justice Act (Title 42 USCS Section 1985(2), deprivation of due process, even by federal officials, Williams v. Wright (1976) 432 F Supp 732, Founding Church of Scientology v Director, FBI (1978) 459 F Supp 748, 98 L Ed 2d 150, 108 S Ct 199, even District Attorneys, Rouselle v Perez (1968) 293 F Supp 298, places upon you the badges of fraud, prior knowledge, superior knowledge of the law, will of intent, perjury of Oath of Office, constructive treason, bad faith, breach of fiduciary/trustee responsibility, whereupon "Being fiduciaries, the ordinary rules of evidence are reversed," (1939) 103 F 2d 685. Further, being advised, as in Ex Parte v Young, 209 US 123 (1908), "The attempt of a State Officer to enforce an unconstitutional statute is a proceeding without authority of and does not effect, the State in its sovereign or governmental capacity, and is an illegal act, and the officer is stripped of his official character and is subject in his person to the consequences of his individual conduct. The State has no power to impart to its officer immunity from responsibility to the supreme authority of the United States." (Emphasis added.)

Support NOTES from lower courts: From Perry on Trusts, (7th ed), Sec. 851 "... in order that the release, confirmation, waiver, or acquiescence may have any effect The cestui que trust must also know the Law, and what his rights are, and how they would be dealt with by the court." The Supreme Court of Arizona in Garrett v Reid Cashion Land, 34 Ariz 245, 270 P. 3044 at page 1052 quotes thus from Adair v Brimmer, 74 NY 539 "Confirmation and ratification imply to legal minds, knowledge of a defect in the act to be confirmed, and the right to reject or ratify it. The cestui que trust must therefore not only have been acquainted with the facts, but apprised by the law, of how these facts would be dealt with by a court of equity, All that is implied in the act of ratification, when set up in equity by a trustee against his cestui que trust, must be proved, and will not be assumed. The maxim 'ignorantis legis excusat neminem' cannot be invoked in such a

case. **The cestui que trust must be shown to have been apprised of his legal rights.**" (Emphasis added.) Also from *Ungrich v Ungrich*, 115 NYS 413, 417, "The rule (is) that to fasten ratification upon a cestui que trust he must not only have been acquainted with all the facts, but apprised also in the law, and how such facts would be dealt with by a court of equity." Likewise, *Thaw v Thaw*, 27 Fed 2d 729, *US v Carter*, 217 US 286, 54 L Ed 769, *Wendt v Fisher* (Cardozo, J.) 234 NY 439, 154 N.E. 303, *Leach v Leach*, 65 Wis. 284, 26 NW 754.

4. The delay in discovery of the Frauds stated herein pursuant to Amendment XX provides no defense to the remedy, laches or otherwise. *Michoud v Girod*, 4 How 503, @ 561, 11 L Ed 1076, *Pomeroy's Equity*, Sec. 847, *Wiget v Rockwood* 69 F @d 326, et seq., and from *Texas & Pacific Ry, v Pottorff*, 291 US 245, 78 L Ed 777, in *Braun, supra*, "the doctrine is thus affirmed. It is the settled doctrine of this court that no rights arise on an ultra vires contract, even though the contract has been performed; and this conclusion cannot be circumvented by erecting and estoppel which would prevent challenging the legality of a power exercised." And from *US v Grossmayer*, 9 Wall 72, 19 L Ed 6 27, "A transaction originally unlawful cannot be made any better by being ratified." And, further, following *Braun, supra*, "It is held axiomatic that no right, by ratification or other means, can arise out of fraud." 13 C.J. 492, Sec. 440, 6 R.C. L., p 698, the following is quoted in *Thompson on Corporations*, 3rd Ed Sec. 2828, from *Central Transportation Co. v Pullman Palace Car Co.*, 139 US 24, as established doctrine of the Supreme Court, "No performance of either side can give the unlawful contract any validity, or be the foundation of any right of action upon it." As said long ago by the great Justice Story in *Prevost v Gratz*, 6 Wheat 481, 497; 5 L Ed 311, 315, "It is currently true that length of time is no bar to a trust clearly established; and in a case where fraud is imputed and proved, length of time ought not, upon principles of eternal justice, to be admitted to repel relief. On the contrary, it would seem that the length of time during which the fraud has been successfully concealed and practiced, is rather an aggravation of the offense, and calls more loudly upon a court of equity to grant ample and decisive relief." (Emphasis added.)

5. It is a maxim of law that **peonage and involuntary servitude are forbidden, and immunity is denied to any party, real or imagined, person or public official who would or conspire to traffic in slaves or participate in aiding or abetting.** *Clyatt v US*, 197 US 207 (1905), *Plessy v Ferguson*, 163 US 537, 542, "Whoever [Title 18 U.S.C. Sec.1581] holds or returns any person to a condition of peonage, or arrests any person with the intent of placing him in or returning him to a condition of peonage, shall be fined not more than \$5,000.00 or imprisoned not more than five years."

6. **All public officials in receipt of this notice are required by their Oath of Office to answer.** Notification of legal responsibility is "the first essential of due process of law" *Connally v. General Construction Co.*, 269 U.S. 385,391. "Silence can only be equated with fraud where there is a legal or moral duty to speak or when an inquiry left unanswered would be intentionally misleading." *U.S. V. Tweel*, 550 F.2d.297. It is the ministerial fiduciary/trustee duty of each and every government official, officer, agent, contractor and assign of the UNITED STATES, the STATE OF UTAH, the Federal Reserve Banks/System, the International Monetary Fund, the International Finance Corporation, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the Inter-American Development Bank, the World Bank, the Commission of the European Communities, the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, the United Nations and any and all other obligors/grantors who view this notice ("Respondents") to timely and fully answer, *Federal Crop Insurance v Merrill* (1947) 332 US 380., 92 L Ed 10, 68 S Ct 1, 175 ALR 1075.

7. **The period for Respondents to respond to this notice is ten (10) days.** Any party or public official wishing to answer, respond, refute, rebut, deny, object or protest any statement, term, declaration, denial or provision in this presentment must do so by Lawful Protest within ten (10) days of the date of issuance or forever lose all rights, titles, interests, and the opportunity to plead. All such responses must be verified and have exhibitions and factual evidence in support annexed thereto.

8. **Respondents may agree with all statements, terms, declarations, denials and provisions herein by remaining silent.** Failure to timely respond to all such terms and provisions with which Respondents disagree comprises Respondents' stipulation and confession jointly and severally to acceptance of all statements, terms, declarations, denials and provisions herein as facts, the whole truth, correct and fully binding on all parties.

9. **This document serves as Notice of Fault in the event Respondents fail to timely respond.**

10. **Notice of Default shall be issued no sooner than three (3) days after Notice of Fault.** Default is final three (3) days after Notice of Fault is issued. Default comprises Respondents consent jointly and severally to be named as defendant(s) in various actions, administrative and judicial.

11. **Upon Default, all matters are settled *res judicata* and *stare decisis*.**

12. **Default comprises an estoppel of all actions, administrative and judicial, by Respondents against Paul-Kenneth and Barbara-Ann: Cromar, 3J. Pomeroy, Equity Jurisprudence Section 805, p. 192, Restatement 2d of Torts Section 894(1) (1979), and now reasonably relied on, Wilbur National Bank v US 294 US 120, 124-125 (1935), due to misconduct by Government agents Heckler v Community Health Services, 467 US 51, at 59, 60, Federal Crop Ins., *supra*. "It [the doctrine of Estoppel by Silence] arises where a person is under duty to another to speak or failure to speak is inconsistent with honest dealings." In Re McArdules Estate, 140 Misc. 257, et seq., and Silence, to work estoppel, must amount to bad faith. Wise v USDC Ky., 38 F Supp 130, 134, where duty and opportunity to speak, Codd v Westchester Fire Ins. Co. 14 Wash. 2d 600, 128 P 2d 968, 151 ALR 316, creating ignorance of facts, Cushing v US Mas s, 18 F Supp 83, inducing person claiming estoppel to alter his position, Braunch v Freking, 219 Iowa 556, 258 NW 892, knowledge of facts and of rights by person estopped, Harvey v Richard, 200 La. 97, 7 So. 2d 674, willful or culpable silence, Lencomi v Fidelity Trust & Savings Bank of Fresno, 96 Cal. App. 490, 273 P. 103 et seq., "Silence" implies knowledge, and an opportunity to act upon it, Pence v Langdon, 99 US 578 @ 581, et seq.**

13. **Under the Clearfield Doctrine, derived from the 1943 Supreme Court Decision in Clearfield Trust, et al. vs. United States, (328 U.S. 363, 318), the court ruled, in essence, that when a government reduces itself to a corporate status, it becomes merely another corporation, having no more nor less standing than all other corporations.**

14. **The UNITED STATES Supreme court in 2000 ruled, Bond vs. UNITED STATES 529 US 334-2000, held that the people are in fact Sovereign and not the STATES or government. The court went on to define that local, STATE and FEDERAL law enforcement officers are committing unlawful actions against the Sovereign people by the enforcement of laws and are personally liable for their actions.**

DISCLAIMER

THE QUOTATION OF THE PRIVATELY COPYRIGHTED STATUTORY LEGISLATIVELY CREATED CASE LAW AND STATE AND FEDERAL STATUTES PURSUANT TO PL 88-244, DECEMBER 30, 1963, IS DONE WITHOUT INTENT TO CREATE A "USE", VIOLATE ANY PRIVATE COPYRIGHT, OR GIVE LEGAL ADVISE TO ANYONE, AND STANDS SO UNLESS LAWFULLY PROTESTED BY ANY CONCERNED PARTY(IES)

Notice to the principal is notice to all agents. Notice to an agent is notice to all principals. By this Public Notice, Declarations, Mandates and Lawful Protests the world is now informed.

BE IT SO EXECUTED, and by this execution, be made to appear, in-deed, enacted, decreed, This the 1st day of the 10th month, anno Domini, two thousand and 20, Amen.

L.S. by: Paul-Kenneth Cromar {SEAL}
Signed only in correct public capacity as
Beneficiary of the Original Jurisdiction

Paul-Kenneth: Cromar.
c/o 9870 north meadow drive.
Cedar Hills
Utah [84062]

L.S. by: Barbara-Ann Cromar {SEAL}
Signed only in correct public capacity as
Beneficiary of the Original Jurisdiction

Barbara-Ann: Cromar.
c/o 9870 north meadow drive.
Cedar Hills
Utah [84062]

CC: MR. WILLIAM P. BARR acting as Attorney General
MIKE SMITH acting as Utah County Sheriff
GARY R. HERBERT as Governor of the Utah state
US MARSHAL OFFICE - SLC

EXHIBIT "B"

SAMPLE of letters to Witnesses for the res Defendants

"Barbie and Ken"

From: Ken Cromar
Subject: NOTICE: You are on our Witness List for our defense at a Trial by Jury the week of June 27, 2022 - RESPONSE REQUIRED
Date: June 12, 2022 at 8:58:47 PM MDT
To: Ron Gibson
Cc: Barbara Cromar

Sunday, June 12, 2022

Dear Ron Gibson,

I'm hoping you remember us? Kate Dalley out of St. George, Utah and David Straight are mutual friends. You allowed me to use your Memorandum on Land Patents in a Judicial Notice. Please look at the two links under my signature for info that may refresh your memory. We could talk on the phone later if you like.

We, Barbara and I are being put on trial the week of June 27, 2022, in the Utah Fourth District Court in (Provo, Utah) in **STATE OF UTAH vs PAUL KENNETH CROMAR, and BARBARA ANN CROMAR** in Criminal cases 201402860 & 68, and you are being contacted to act as an Official Witness in our case as we mount a defense against two felony charges including "burglary of a dwelling" and face 1-15 years in prison if convicted.

- Jury selection is Monday the 27th.
- Prosecution is to make their case the 28th & 29th.
- If we understand correctly, our two days of witnesses is Thursday & Friday June 30 & July 1.

The Sixth Amendment to the Constitution reads:

In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a **speedy and public trial**, by an **impartial jury** of the state and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; **to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor**, and to have the assistance of counsel for his defense.

As you can see above, we have rights to a **compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor**. We As you can see, we have the means to compel your availability. However, we prefer this friendly means of writing to ask if you if you would **willingly accept our invitation** to serve as a witness, on either June 30 and/or July 1. Or, would you prefer that we SUBPOENA you? We've heard that a Subpoena helps secure time off from work, etc. We're happy to help you in whatever way we can to secure your availability.

Please confirm your preferences ASAP, today or tomorrow if possible, with preferred method of contact (proper name, address, phone, email, etc.) so we can secure lawful Subpoenas through the court immediately?

Almost all our witnesses are being contacted with this exact same letter. Please note a couple of court forms below that we've been advised may come into play with the subpoena approach. More definitive details will follow after your response to this Barbara & Ken's request for you as a Witness for the Defense.

We're kind of new to this whole process, and have been un-Constitutionally denied our choice of counsel because he is not a "state-licensed BAR attorney". We are handling our own defense *sui juris*, and so your patience with us is appreciated as we work our way through this summoning of Witnesses process.

Thank You,

Ken & Barbara Cromar

Paul-Kenneth: & Barbara-Ann: of House of Cromar
c/o 9870 N. Meadow Drive
Cedar Hills, UT 84062-9998
801-400-5900

- or -

PO Box 942
Pleasant Grove, Utah 84062-9998

CedarHillsCitizens.org

www.MiraclesInGodWeTrust.com/BarbieandKenvGoliathIRS/

NOTICE: This email message is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message.

EXHIBIT "C"

Proof of 3 stolen filings from Utah County Records Office

With 3 x \$40 = \$120



UTAH COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE

SHERIFF

MICHAEL L. SMITH

Date: 4/4/2022

Case Number: 22UC03748

Name: PAUL CROMAR

Address: 9870 N MEADOW DR

Cedar Hills, UT 84062

This letter is to inform you that the Utah County Sheriffs Office has possession of the following described property:

PAPERWORK, *Cash*

Our records indicate that you are the owner of the above described property. You may reclaim the property by contacting the Utah County Sheriffs Evidence office at 801-851-4014, between 8:00 am and 4:30 pm, Monday through Friday, to make inquiries about property or to schedule an appointment to pick up property.

You must show a Government issued Photo ID when you come to claim your property at 3200 North 256 West, Spanish Fork, UT 84660. You must have an appointment to pick up claimed property.

YOU HAVE 90 DAYS FROM THE DATE OF THIS LETTER TO RECLAIM THE PROPERTY. Should you fail to reclaim the property within this time period, the property will be disposed of pursuant to Title 77, Chapters 24 and 24a, Utah Code Annotated, 1953 as amended. An appointment is required to pick up any reclaimed items.

Sincerely,

Douglas Squire
Evidence Custodian

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

FOR THE VERIFICATION IS FOR THE TRUE AND CORRECT-COPY OF THE ORIGINAL OF THE:

“DECLARATION ‘[*AFFIDAVIT*]: NOTICE OF DEJURE FARETTA MOTION AND CRIMINAL REFERAL TO UTAH ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR TREASON”

AS INDICATED BELOW.


David O. Leavitt – the man (*recusal required*)
Utah County Attorney
JARED PERKINS (*recusal required*)
Deputy Utah County Attorney
- Criminal Division
100 East Center Street, Suite 2100
Provo Utah 84606

USPS Certified Mail: # 7020 0410 0002 9777 7634

Sean D. Reyes – the man
c/o UTAH ATTORNEY GENERAL OFFICE
Utah State Capitol Complex
350 North State Street, Suite 230
Salt Lake City, UT 84114-2320

USPS Certified Mail: # 7020 0410 0002 9777 7641

Respectfully,


:Paul-Kenneth: Cromar - EXECUTOR
c/o 9870 N. Meadows Dr.
Utah County
Cedar Hills,
Utah state [84062]



Standing on Land Patent #392
– part and parcel thereof

June 13th, 2022

Notary Public as JURAT CERTIFICATE

Utah State

Utah County

United States of America

On this June 13, 2022 before me,

a Notary Public, personally appeared Paul-Kenneth: Cromar. & Barbara-Ann: Cromar who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the living man / woman whose Name is subscribed to the within attached instrument and acknowledged to Me that he /she executed the same in his authorized capacity, And that by his/her autograph(s) on the instrument the man/woman executed, the instrument known as

“NOTICE OF DEJURE FARETTA MOTION AND CRIMINAL REFERAL TO UTAH ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR TREASON”

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the lawful laws of

Utah state that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

Signature

Cheryl Lynne Davis

of Notary / Jurat



seal

Notice to agents is notice to principal, Notice to principal is notice to agent.