

**IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES**

In Re:10-00131-01-CR-W-FJG

The People of Missouri  
Ex rel, Melinda Sue: Harrington, sui juris

**Petitioner,**

on behalf of

Denny Ray: Hardin, sui juris

non corporate entity

c/o 2450 Elmwood Avenue

Kansas City, Missouri [64127]

**Applicant**

**NO.**\_\_\_\_\_

VS

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, INC.

by and through it's Agents

President for the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, INC

Barack Hussein Obama II

The White House

1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW

Washington, DC. 20500

Attorney General for the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, INC.

Eric Holder

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW

Washington, DC. 20530-0001

Director for the U.S MARSHALS SERVICE

The parent corporation being : the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, INC.

John F. Clark

UNITED STATES MARSHALS SERVICE

600 Army-Navy Drive

Arlington, Virginia 22202

**RESPONDENTS**

**PETITION FOR  
GREAT WRIT OF  
HABEAS CORPUS  
IN ACCORDANCE WITH  
Article I, Section 9  
of the Constitution  
for the united States of America**

I, Melinda Sue:Harington,sui juris Petitioner / Relator, herein, state that I am a flesh and blood sentient being, not a corporation, not a Legal Entity, not a Commercial Entity, association, or any other fictitious entity, competent and being of the age of majority, asseverate that my “yes” be “yes” and “no” be “no” and that the following facts are true, certain, correct, complete, and not misleading, under the penalty of perjury law of bearing false witness so help me God, and, on or about May 10, 2010, Denny Ray:Hardin, sui juris hereinafter “Applicant”, was imprisoned by RESPONDENTS (or his predecessor), who, is a “CORPORATION for Profit”, holding a natural man, in the **LEAVENWORTH DETENTION CENTER** in Leavenworth, Kansas at 100 Highway Terrace, against his will, over his objection, and without his consent. Either the party for whose relief the Writ is intended, or any party for him, may present a petition to the proper authority for the purpose of obtaining relief. Applicant’s liberty is restrained by RESPONDENT(S). Restraint, and imprisonment is unlawful, and illegal, to wit; no criminal action in the state of Missouri or the united states of America, has been commenced against Applicant, by the filing of an Affidavit / Complaint, by a competent fact witness, alleging the necessary and essential facts sufficient to constitute the elements of a crime, that would invoke a Lawful

court's jurisdiction in the first instance, to issue mittimus papers. Petitioner and Applicant are unable to attach a copy of any bona fide mittimus, or committal papers as none are known by Petitioner to exist.

This court has appellate jurisdiction to hear this cause for violations of the 1<sup>st</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup>, 5<sup>th</sup>, 6<sup>th</sup>, 9<sup>th</sup>, 11<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> Amendments; which have become common practice to violate in both the US DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI and the US COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE 8<sup>TH</sup> CIRCUIT. These courts have aided and abetted agents for the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, INC. to commit heinous crimes against American Nationals in direct defiance of Congressional Mandates and United States Supreme Court Rulings.

This is not an isolated case in the Western District where corruption in the courts runs rampant and families are being destroyed everyday for the "Prisons for Profit". The People have become a mere inconvenience to the courts whose only goal is to obtain revenue; at all costs. The Great Justices of this Supreme Court have the discretionary power to stop this destruction of families and restore Justice to the courts. Adequate relief can not be obtained in any of the inferior courts because they believe they are above the law and the decisions of the great justices of this court.

Habeas corpus has been submitted to the US Court of Appeals for the 8<sup>th</sup> circuit which was denied ; judgment and mandate were received by Relator ,electronically signed by the clerk of the court. In effect suspending habeas corpus for Denny-Ray:Hardin in violation of Article I , Section 9 , The privilege of the Writ of Habeas Corpus shall not be suspended, unless when in Cases of Rebellion or Invasion the public Safety may require it. (See exhibit M, N, O,)

Habeas corpus has also been submitted to the US DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI; which to date has not been docketed to date (see exhibit K-2, K-3, V )

## Statement of Truth

I, Melinda-Sue:Harrington affirm under the penalty of perjury that the foregoing statements are true, correct and complete to the best of my abilities and knowledge without purpose to mislead. I reserve the right to amend this petition to retain accuracy in the record.

1. On November 4, 2008, US DISTRICT MAGISTRATE JUDGE Robert E. Larsen signed and authorized a search warrant without a signed statement of probable cause rendering the search and warrant illegal and unlawful and a violation of Denny-Ray:Hardin's 4<sup>th</sup> Amendment right to be secure in his home and person from all illegal searches. (See exhibit D-15, D-16)

The 4<sup>th</sup> Amendment state "The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no Warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by Oath or affirmations, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized. To date no signed statement of probable cause signed under the penalty of perjury has been produced to either Relator of Denny-Ray:Hardin.

A criminal complaint was filed by affidavit of Denny-Ray:Hardin with US Chief District Judge Fernando J. Gaitan of the US DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI. Judge Gaitan failed to prosecute this crime in clear "Obstruction of Justice" and "Misprison of felony" 18 USC 4. Three Affidavits have been filed and left unanswered to date in clear violation of Denny-Ray:Hardin's 1<sup>st</sup> Amendment right to "Petition for redress of grievances" and his 5<sup>th</sup> Amendment right to "Due process of law" (see exhibit D-18)

As per your own:

*Duncan v. Missouri, 152 U.S. 377, 382 (1894) Due process of law and the equal protection of the laws are secured if the laws operate on all alike, and do not subject the individual to an arbitrary exercise of the powers of government."*

Denny-Ray:Hardin has a natural, due process right, granted by the Creator, and as articulated in numerous historical documents including but not limited to, the original Constitutions for Missouri and / or the United States of America, Magna Charta, Northwest Ordinance, International Organization Immunities Act dated December 9, 1945, Charter Of The United Nations: June 26, 1945, The Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act, and numerous international

treaties, to Habeas Corpus relief for immediate release from unlawful imprisonment. All the above named Documents are incorporated herein, in their entirety, by reference.

2. On May 7, 2010 a “Motion to Dismiss” was filed by Denny-Ray:Hardin, sui juris. This motion was based upon his reservation of rights UCC1-308/1-207. (see exhibit C) The court had previously been noticed on Denny-Ray:Hardin’s “Reservation of Rights” (see exhibit A, B)

Rights can be reserved at anytime. See *Miranda v. Arizona* 384 U.S. 436 (1966)

Petitioner Denny-Ray:Hardin has made public record of his reservation of rights **UCC 1-308** and has done so for the court orally and in writing submitted into the record, (See case 09 CR 00448) Further he is a natural Citizen of the Republic of Missouri where he resides. Denny-Ray:Hardin is not a UNITED STATES citizen or a **14<sup>th</sup> amendment** citizen because he has claimed the remedy **15 United States Statute at large, 1868** also known as the expatriation statute. Wherefore he is not subject to UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI. However the court did not recognize and purposely ignored the remedy **UCC 1-308** as well as his Citizenship. The court in its actions against Stanley Street, a state Citizen, is in violation of

**Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act (FSIA) of 1976. See USC [TITLE 28](#) > [PART IV](#) > CHAPTER 97> [§ 1604](#), “Immunity of a foreign state from jurisdiction**

**Subject to existing international agreements to which the United States is a party at the time of enactment of this Act a foreign state shall be immune from the jurisdiction of the courts of the United States and of the States except as provided in sections [1605](#) to [1607](#) of this chapter.”**

3. On May 10, 2010 Denny-Ray:Hardin was “kidnapped” 18 USC 1201, without warrant, without complaint, without a signed statement of probable cause, and was forced to appear under threats of bodily harm in front of US Magistrate Robert E. Larsen to answer an “Indictment” obtained through “fraud” 18 USC 1001. In open court Denny-Ray:Hardin stated that he explicitly reserved all his rights UCC1-308-1-207 and demanded his remedy under the 15 Statutes at Large. Denny-Ray:Hardin informed Magistrate Larsen of his conflict of interest and Magistrate Larsen snickered and replied to Denny-Ray:Hardin “If your asking me to recuse myself, well that’s not gonna happen” (see exhibit V docket entry 7)

28 USC 455 (b)(1) clearly establishes that any judge who is biased and prejudicial “must” recuse himself. “Recusal under section 455 is self executing: a party need not file affidavits in support of recusal and the judge is obligated to recuse himself sua sponte under the stated circumstances.” Taylor V. O’Grady, 888 F. 2d 1189(7<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1989) “Should a judge not disqualify himself, then the judge is in violation of the Due Process Clause of the U.S. Constitution.” United States V. Sciuto, 521 F. 2d 842 (7<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1996) I witnessed as Magistrate Larsen denied to state for the record his jurisdiction to preside over Denny-Ray:Hardin. Clearly acting without jurisdiction.

*“Jurisdiction of court may be challenged at any stage of the proceeding, and also may be challenged after conviction and execution of judgment by way of writ of habeas corpus.”*

*[U.S. v. Anderson, 60 F.Supp. 649 (D.C.Wash. 1945)]*

*Ableman v. Booth, 21 Howard 506 (1859) "No judicial process, whatever form it may assume, can have any lawful authority outside of the limits of the jurisdiction of the court or judge by whom it is issued; and an attempt to enforce it beyond these boundaries is nothing less than lawless violence."*

4. On May 12<sup>th</sup>, 2010 Denny-Ray:Hardin filed a “Judicial Notice/ with 25 exhibits”

These 25 exhibits included the “search warrant” unlawfully signed by Magistrate Larsen ; unsupported by a signed complaint or a signed statement of probable cause signed under the penalty of perjury. Clearly establishing that Robert Larsen and Nathan VanSickle acted in clear “Conspiracy against rights” 18 USC 241 AND VIOLATED Denny-Ray:Hardins 4<sup>th</sup> Amendment right by conducting a illegal search without proper warrant supported by probable cause.(see exhibit D) copy of court date stamped motion. This document was taken out of the court record by Magistrate Larsen as clearly evidenced in court docket entries.(see exhibit V) This is clearly a criminal action of destruction of evidence in a criminal case establishing a felony crime. 18 USC 101 .

5. On May 13<sup>th</sup>, 2010 Denny-Ray:Hardin filed a “Response to Indictment” (see exhibit E)and “Defendants Response to Motion for Detention” (see exhibit F)the copies of court date stamped motions. These document were taken out of the court record by Magistrate Larsen as clearly evidenced in court docket entries.(see exhibit V) This is clearly a criminal action of destruction of evidence in a criminal case establishing a felony crime. 18 USC 101

In court on May 13, 2010 Magistrate Robert E. Larsen appointed Denny-Ray:Hardin a federal public defender; Anita Burns to act as “counsel” for the Defendant. Denny-Ray:Hardin demanded his 6<sup>th</sup> amendment right to the counsel of his choosing in open court. To which; Magistrate Larsen denied him and would not allow him to fire his appointed public defender. (see exhibit V docket entry 19)

The public defender was appointed by Magistrate Larsen without Denny-Ray:Hardin’s consent or knowledge. Denny-Ray:Hardin had already stated in open court he would proceed sui juris on May 10, 2010 and Magistrate Larsen said he would appoint stand by counsel. This clearly shows Magistrate Larsen is trying to deprive Denny-Ray:Hardin his God given rights under the color of law. 18 USC 242. Magistrate Larsen violated Denny-Ray:Hardin’s right to appear for himself rather than by counsel in violation of 28 USC 1654 that allows all people the right to represent one’s self. “While the Constitution guarantees to a defendant in a criminal case, the right to be heard by counsel, it also allows him to be heard “by himself” and where he elects to appear for himself rather than by an attorney, he can not be compelled to employ counsel or to accept services assigned by the court.” People V. Shapirio 188 MISC 363. Also see Johnson V. Zerbest 1938, Argersinger V. Hamlin 1972, and United States V. Lopez 2006

FEDERAL PUBLIC DEFENDER Anita Burns engaged in “fraud on the court” on May 13, 2010 (see exhibit V docket entry 15) by presenting “False” declarations before the court in violation of 18 USC 1623. Anita Burns claimed the “STATE OF MISSOURI” DECLARED Denny-Ray:Hardin delusional. The “STATE OF MISSOURI” is a corporation that can not speak, can not write and can certainly not state that a common man such as Denny-Ray:Hardin standing on God’s kingdom is delusional. Unless Anita Burns can produce the “STATE OF MISSOURI” in open court for cross examination lawfully allowed by 18 USC 4247(d) then “fraud on the court” is clearly established by Anita Burns. Because FEDERAL PUBLIC DEFENDER ,Anita Burns(see exhibit V docket entry 15) and the FEDERAL PROSECUTOR, Brian Casey(see exhibit V docket entry 13) both presented similar motions on the same day “Prosecutorial Misconduct” is evident.

6. On May 13, 2010 Magistrate Larsen closed court to Denny-Ray:Hardin to all motions except those filed by his appointed public defender in clear violation of 28 USC 452; that lawfully establishes that court is always open and by Magistrate Larsen only allowing an attorney to file has established that Magistrate Larsen has created a “Monopoly for Attorneys” in his court. The excuse that Denny-Ray:Hardin has appointed counsel so Magistrate Larsen will not address any of his motions is denying Denny-Ray”Hardin his 1<sup>st</sup> amendment right to petition for redress of grievances and his 5<sup>th</sup> amendment right to due process of law and because his appointed public defender has refused to file any motions on Denny-Ray:Hardin;s behalf rendering Denny-Ray:Hardin’s appointed counsel as ineffective assistance of counsel(see exhibit V docket entries 16,19,34,36) Because of these facts “Prosecutorial Misconduct” is clearly present and Denny-Ray:Hardin believes his appointed counsel is incompetent to defend him, or aide in his counsel; as evidenced in two seperate cases dated several months apart that where it is clear that PUBLIC DEFENDER Anita Burns is using a standardized formatted form to unjustly commit her clients. (see exhibit W and X) . These two motions show that this is common practice of the Anita Burns and she clearly can not keep her clients straight as evidenced in the text of the motion for Denny-Ray:Hardin. (see exhibit W)

7. On May 14, 2010 Magistrate Larsen “ordered” still without stating jurisdiction for the record that Denny-Ray:Hardin had to undergo a mental evaluation ; based upon motions of Anita Burns and Brian Casey.(see exhibitV docket 18)

As per your own:

*US v Will, 449 US 200,216, 101 S Ct, 471, 66 LEd2nd 392, 406 (1980) Cohens V Virginia, 19 US (6 Wheat) 264, 404, 5LEd 257 (1821)*

*“When a judge acts where he or she does not have jurisdiction to act, the judge is engaged in an act or acts of treason.”*

8. On May 21, 2010 Magistrate Robert E. Larsen was served documents establishing him as a “Fiduciary” of this cause of action. Clearly 28 USC 455(b)(4) states that a judge named as a fiduciary “must” disqualify himself. 28 USC 455 (e) clearly establishes this requirement cannot be waived. These documents were sent to the following persons:

Warden Rene G. Garcia- FCI Englewood, Littleton , CO.

Warden Shelton Richardson, CCA Leavenworth Detention Center, Leavenworth, KS  
Chief District Judge Fernando J. Gaitan, US District Court, Kansas City, MO  
CFO OF THE FEDERAL TREASURY Daniel Tangherlini, Washington, DC  
CFO OF THE DEPOSITORY TRUST COMPANY, New York, NY  
Magistrate Judge Robert E. Larsen, Kansas City, MO.  
CFO OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE, Washington, DC.  
(see exhibits G and H)

#### Public Servants have Fiduciary Responsibilities

:\* \*63C Am.Jur.2d, Public Officers and Employees, §247\* “As expressed otherwise, the powers delegated to a public officer are held in trust for the people and are to be exercised in behalf of the government or of all citizens who may need the intervention of the officer. [1] Furthermore, the view has been expressed that all public officers, within whatever branch and whatever level of government, and whatever be their private vocations, are trustees of the people, and accordingly labor under every disability and prohibition imposed by law upon trustees relative to the making of personal financial gain from a discharge of their trusts. [2] That is, a public officer occupies a fiduciary relationship to the political entity on whose behalf he or she serves. [3] and owes a fiduciary duty to the public. [4] It has been said that the fiduciary responsibilities of a public officer cannot be less than those of a private individual. [5] Furthermore, it has been stated that any enterprise undertaken by the public official who tends to weaken public confidence and undermine the sense of security for individual rights is against public policy. Fraud in its elementary common law sense of deceit-and this is one of the meanings that fraud bears [483 U.S. 372] in the statute. See *United States v. Dial*, 757 F.2d 163, 168 (7th Cir 1985) includes the deliberate concealment of material information in a setting of fiduciary obligation. A public official is a fiduciary toward the public, including, in the case of a judge, the litigants who appear before him and if he deliberately conceals material information from them, he is guilty of fraud. *McNally v United States* 483 U.S. 350 (1987)

8. On June 15, 2010 Relator filed a Judicial Complaint in regards to Magistrate Larsens outright disrespect of the Constitution for the united States of America and direct first hand personal knowledge of the violation of Denny-Ray:Hardin’s rights. (see exhibit I)

9. On June 24, 2010 Relator received a letter from the clerk of the court for the US Court of Appeals for the 8<sup>th</sup> Circuit acknowledging the complaint.(see exhibit J)

10. On June 28, 2010 Denny-Ray:Hardin mailed a habeas corpus to Chief Judge Fernando J. Gaitan of the US DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF

MISSOURI (see exhibit K-2) , and because the habeas corpus did not show up as docketed; I , the Relator and Denny-Ray:Hardin's Attorney-in-fact mailed a copy of the habeas corpus by United States Postal Service certified mail to the following:  
Fernando J. Gaitan #7009 0960 0000 9903 1896 delivered 7/19/2010

Clerk -US District Court for the Western District of Missouri

# 7009 0960 0000 9901 7937 delivered 7/19/2010

Warden Garcia-FCI Englewood #7009 0960 0000 9903 1889

To date this habeas corpus has not been docketed as evidenced in the record. (See exhibit K-3 and V); denying Denny-Ray:Hardin his 1<sup>st</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> amendment rights.

11. On July 16,2010 (see exhibit K)and July 23, 2010(see exhibit L) Relator mailed in Two follow up complaints to add to the original complaint of June 15, 2010

12. On July 31, 2010 Relator mailed by United States Postal Service a petition by certified mail # 7009 0960 0000 9903 1629 for the Great Writ of habeas corpus to the clerk of the court for the US COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE 8<sup>th</sup> Circuit signed by nine petitioners who have 1<sup>st</sup> hand personal knowledge of the facts in this cause of action.(see exhibit M) It was delivered on 8/2/2010. On 8/3/2010 Relator received a letter and the habeas corpus back from the court of the court stating it could not be filed because Relator was not a licensed attorney. (see exhibit N) This was done in violation of 28 USC 2242.

Application for a writ of habeas corpus shall be in writing signed and verified by the person for whose relief it is intended or by someone acting in his behalf. Since Relator is Denny-Ray:Hardin's attorney-in-fact Relator was acting on behalf of Denny-Ray:Hardin as an authorized representative. Relator mailed the habeas back to the court in which the clerk date stamped the petition and returned a copy with case no# 10-2830. On 8/26/2010 Michael E. Gans; clerk of the court, denied habeas corpus for Denny-Ray:Hardin thus violating Article I section 9 of the Constitution for the united States of America. (see exhibit O)

13. Denny-Ray:Hardin mailed Fernando J. Gaitan a Judicial Notice" Notice That" via United States Postal Service certified mail # 7009 0960 0000 9903 1476 which was

delivered on 10/1/2010. This was a second copy.(see exhibit Q-3 and Exhibit V docket entry 35)Also mailed was Judicial Notice”Constitution in crisis” certified # 7009 0960 0000 9901 7852 which was delivered 10/15/2010. Both Judicial Notices Magistrate Larsen put in orders stating he would not address the issue do to the fact Denny-Ray:Hardin was represented by counsel. Again, denying Denny-Ray:Hardin his right to redress of grievances and due process of law.

14. Denny-Ray:Hardin sent in two 28 USC 351(a) complaints to the US DISTRICT COURT FOR THE 8<sup>TH</sup> CIRCUIT with the following United States Postal Tracking numbers # 7009 0960 0000 9901 7845 and 7009 0960 0000 9901 7838 both of which were delivered 10/12/2010. (see exhibits Q and R) Denny-Ray:Hardin has received one letter from the clerk in regards to Magistrate Larsen(see exhibit S) but to date has not received any correspondence from the clerk in regards to the complaint filed against Chief Judge Fernando J. Gaitan. Relator has mailed a second complaint in regards to Magistrate Judge Larsen via United States Postal Service certified mail # 7007 0710 0001 7749 7407 and against Chief Judge Fernando J. Gaitan # 7007 0710 0001 7749 7414 which were both delivered on 10/22/2010 but to date there has been no correspondence form the clerk of the 8<sup>th</sup> circuit.

### **Conclusion**

The Petitioner Denny-Ray:Hardin has never given consent or entered into a contract with the court or the corporate UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, INC..  
See

"The state citizen is immune from any and all government attacks and procedure, absent contract." see, Dred Scott vs. Sanford, 60 U.S. (19 How.) 393 or as the Supreme Court has stated clearly, "...every man is independent of all laws, except those prescribed by nature. He is not bound by any institutions formed by his fellowmen without his consent."

CRUDEN vs. NEALE, 2 N.C. 338 2 S.E. 70

Alexander v. Bothsworth, 1915. "Party cannot be bound by contract that he has not made or authorized. Free consent is an indispensable element in making valid contracts."

As per you own:

Brady v. U.S., 397 U.S. 742, 748, (1970) "Waivers of Constitutional Rights, not only must they be voluntary, they must be knowingly intelligent acts done with sufficient awareness."

Further under Article I section 10 there can be no law impairing the obligation of a contract. And under 4 USC 1981 Denny-Ray:Hardin has the right to contract and the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, INC. cannot infringe on that right. Denny-Ray:Hardin has repeatedly challenged the courts jurisdiction; which has not been stated for the record to date. The US DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI had no authority in its actions, wherefore the judgment of the court against Denny-Ray:Hardin is void. As per your own:

*Elliot v. Piersol, 1 Pet. 328, 340, 26 U.S. 328, 340 (1828) "if a court is without authority, its judgments and orders are regarded as nullities. They are not voidable, but simply void, and form no bar to a recovery sought, even prior to a reversal in opposition to them. They constitute no justification and all persons concerned in executing such judgments or sentences are considered, in law, as trespassers."*

Petitioner, Denny-Ray:Hardin has been denied due process of law as per the **5<sup>th</sup> amendment**. And further being held not only as a captive but also as a contracted indentured servant by way of the **UCC** in violation of the **13<sup>th</sup> amendment** which abolished slavery. Magistrate Larsen, Chief judge Fernando J. Gaitan, Anita Burns, Brian Casey and Nathan Holmes VanSickle have all committed criminal acts in violation of the Constitution for the United States of America and the Republic of Missouri; to list a few but in no way is this a complete list as the violations are numerous :

Robert Larsen has committed :

"Treason" 18 USC 2381

"Seditious Conspiracy" 18 USC 2384

"Insurrection and Rebellion" 18 USC 2383

"kidnapping" 18 USC 1201

“Conspiracy against rights” 18 USC 241  
“Deprivation of rights under the color of law” 18 USC 242  
“Concealment, removal or mutilation generally” 18 USC 2071  
“Fraud” 18 USC 1001  
“Hostage Taking” 18 USC 1203  
“Interference with commerce by threat or force” 18 USC 1951  
“Unlawful conduct with respect to documents in furtherance of trafficking, peonage, slavery, involuntary servitude or forced labor” 18 USC 1592  
“Perjury” 18 USC 1621

Nathan Holmes Vansickle has committed:

“Bank Robbery” 18 USC 2113  
“Conspiracy against rights” 18 USC 241  
“kidnapping” 18 USC 1201  
“Deprivation of rights under the color of law” 18 USC 242  
“Interference with commerce by threat or force” 18 USC 1951  
“False declarations before the grand jury or court” 18 USC 1623  
“Fraud” 18 USC 1001  
“Perjury” 18 USC 1621

Brian Casey has committed:

“Seditious Conspiracy” 18 USC 2384  
“Conspiracy against rights” 18 USC 241  
“Deprivation of rights under the color of law” 18 USC 242  
“Interference with commerce by threat or force” 18 USC 1951  
“False declarations before the grand jury or court” 18 USC 1623  
“Fraud” 18 USC 1001  
“Perjury” 18 USC 1621

Anita Burns has committed:

“Seditious Conspiracy” 18 USC 2384  
“Fraud” 18 USC 1001  
“Conspiracy against rights” 18 USC 241  
“Deprivation of rights under the color of law” 18 USC 242  
“False declarations before the grand jury or court” 18 USC 1623  
“Unlawful conduct with respect to documents in furtherance of trafficking, peonage, slavery, involuntary servitude or forced labor” 18 USC 1592  
“Perjury” 18 USC 1621  
“Interference with commerce by threat or force” 18 USC 1951

Chief judge Fernando J. Gaitan has committed:

“Treason” 18 USC 2381  
“Seditious Conspiracy” 18 USC 2384

“Insurrection and Rebellion” 18 USC 2383  
“kidnapping” 18 USC 1201  
“Conspiracy against rights” 18 USC 241  
“Deprivation of rights under the color of law” 18 USC 242  
“Concealment, removal or mutilation generally” 18 USC 2071  
“Fraud” 18 USC 1001  
“Hostage Taking” 18 USC 1203  
“Interference with commerce by threat or force” 18 USC 1951  
“Unlawful conduct with respect to documents in furtherance of trafficking,  
peonage, slavery, involuntary servitude or forced labor” 18 USC 1592  
“Perjury” 18 USC 1621

It has become COMMON PRACTICE for the courts to appoint a public defender to keep the truth from being told. Fernando J. Gaitan and the US Court of Appeals for the 8<sup>th</sup> circuit have allowed their subordinates to violate the people without ever having to state their jurisdiction. Once jurisdiction has been challenged it can not summarily be dismissed and has to be proven. Denny-Ray:Hardin has been housed with adjudicated prisoners serving life sentences for murder. Denny-Ray:Hardin in fact has not been convicted of any crime as the exhibits and the record will reflect; but the courts have stalled, delayed and even altered the record so as to not have to prove their fraudulent accusations. The Inferior courts have in fact sentenced Denny-Ray:Hardin to death by detaining him under the guise of being mentally incompetant because he has a rigid belief system in the Constitution for the united States of America. Denny-Ray:Hardin is being persecuted for the same beliefs that the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, INC. made him swear an oath to when he served his country in the Navy. The courts have denied Denny-Ray:Hardin his right to cross examine his accusers in violation of the 6<sup>th</sup> amendment and the confrontation clause of that amendment; which quarantees the right to confront witnesses who are accusing him of these crimes. Denny-Ray-Hardin has a right to confront his accusers face to face. Our court systems have deemed us all guilty until proven innocent and will stop at no expense to the accused or his family to get a

conviction. To date the inferior courts have failed to state their jurisdiction for the record.

The United States district courts are not courts of general jurisdiction. They have no jurisdiction except as prescribed by Congress pursuant to Article III of the Constitution. [Graves v. Snead, 541 F.2d 159 (6th Cir. 1976)]

Since the inferior courts have failed to state their jurisdiction for the record all jurisdiction has ceased and the courts have become the modern day organized crime syndicate; raping and stealing the people and their families blind. Destroying this great nation from within.

*U.S. v. Tweel, 550 F. 2d. 297, 299, 300 (1977)*  
*Silence can only be equated with fraud when there is a legal and moral duty to speak or when an inquiry left unanswered would be intentionally misleading. We cannot condone this shocking conduct... If that is the case we hope our message is clear. This sort of deception will not be tolerated and if this is routine it should be corrected immediately.*

*Ableman v. Booth, 21 Howard 506 (1859)*  
*"No judicial process, whatever form it may assume, can have any lawful authority outside of the limits of the jurisdiction of the court or judge by whom it is issued; and an attempt to enforce it beyond these boundaries is nothing less than lawless violence."*

As per your own:

*Stump v. Sparkman, id., 435 U.S. 349* Some Defendants urge that any act "of a judicial nature" entitles the Judge to absolute judicial immunity. But in a jurisdictional vacuum (that is, absence of all jurisdiction) the second prong necessary to absolute judicial immunity is missing. A judge is not immune for tortious acts committed in a purely Administrative, non-judicial capacity.

### Relief Requested

The people of Missouri request that this great court and justices hold these public servants to the letter of the law, and prosecute their crimes in accordance with the written law and treaties of this great nation. Treasonous acts have been perpetrated on Denny-Ray:Hardin and his family and the courts have been left to abuse the people with no authority, no jurisdiction and no morals. Relator prays to God that this great court release Denny-Ray:Hardin immediately, and hold those accountable for their crimes against humanity and the people. Denny-Ray:Hardin has been his 6<sup>th</sup> amendment right to the counsel of his choosing. In fact Denny-Ray:Hardin cannot represent himself because he is himself, a sovereign authority and is not asking for the right to represent anybody. The court cannot refute the essential TRUTH of Protected Inherent Rights. If the inferior courts are allowed to continue this reign of terror where they take away the peoples rights to redress for their grievances and take away due process of law in favor of their lies and deceptions then the people of this great nation as a whole are doomed and have become nothing more than pawns for the courts and attorneys to torture and destroy the American way of life. To force a Natural Person to give up their rights in any court is TREASON, and these judges are to be held accountable BY THE PEOPLE. Denny-Ray:Hardin has a right to proceed sui juris, it is a fundamental right that is afforded highest degree of protection. DEVINE V INDIAN RIVER COUNTY SCHOOLBD.; 11<sup>TH</sup> Cir. 1997. The courts have treated Denny-Ray:Hardin as a criminal; but he HAS NOT been convicted of any crime. Refusal of the courts to state the jurisdiction for the record is “fraud”; where they believe they are above the law and will stop at committing crimes themselves to get a conviction whether that person is guilty of a crime or not. Our prisons are full of People waiting years for a trial; where it is up to the prosecution to prove the alleagations against them. The people are given diseal treatment in hopes that they will admit quilt so the courts can obtain a conviction without ever proving a crime was committed. Denny-Ray:Hardin again is not an isolated case but his case alone has been getting attention from foreign countries ,and they are appauld by the lack of humanity and justice in the courts of the UNITED STATES. As this is being written a German International film

director is in the process of compiling a documnetary about the “Life and Times of Denny-Ray:Hardin; An American Persecuted” and a International Attorney has expressed the want to take Denny-Ray:Hardin’s case to the World Court for the crimes and genocide against the American People. Denny-Ray:Hardin’s family heritage is enriched with great man that helped to form this nation. His great grandfather was the 22 Governor of Missouri (Charles Henry Hardin) and his great ancestor (Rufas King) was at the first Constitutional convention and one of the original signors of the Constitution for the united States of America. There have been Hardin family members in 12 Constitutional conventions. Denny-Ray;Hardin has injured no person, there are no signed complaints; and he is being held as a political prisoner for his beliefs that this great nation was founded on. The immediate release of Denny-Ray:Hardin is the only action to correct the wrongs perpetrated on him.

*Respectfully submitted,  
Without prejudice,*

Melinda-Sue:Harrington,  
Attorney-In-Fact  
*All rights reserved  
UCC1-308/1-207*

*Mailing Address:*  
Melinda-Sue:Harrington  
c/o 2450 Elmwood Ave  
Kansas City, MO. 64127

**IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES**

In Re:10-00131-01-CR-W-FJG

**PROOF OF SERVICE**

The People of Missouri  
Ex rel, Melinda Sue: Harrington, sui juris

**Petitioner,**

on behalf of

Denny Ray: Hardin, sui juris

non corporate entity

c/o 2450 Elmwood Avenue

Kansas City, Missouri [64127]

**Applicant**

NO. \_\_\_\_\_

VS

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, INC.  
by and through it's Agents

President for the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, INC  
Barack Hussein Obama II  
The White House  
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC. 20500

Attorney General for the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, INC.  
Eric Holder  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE  
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC. 20530-0001

Director for the U.S MARSHALS SERVICE  
The parent corporation being : the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, INC.  
John F. Clark  
UNITED STATES MARSHALS SERVICE  
600 Army-Navy Drive  
Arlington, Virginia 22202

## **RESPONDENTS**

I, Melinda-Sue:Harrington the Power of attorney for  
Denny-Ray:Hardin certify that I have mailed a copy of  
the **Petition for the great writ of habeas corpus in  
accordance with Article I section 9 of the Constitution  
for the united States of America.** on **November 9, 2010**  
to the counsel for the respondents as follows:

**Solicitor General of the United States**  
**Room 5614**  
**Department of Justice**  
**950 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.**  
**Wahshington, DC. 20530-0001**

Respectfully submitted,  
Withut prejudice,

Signed:

**Melinda-Sue:Harrington,** sui juris  
Attorney-In-Fact  
All rights reserved **UCC 1-308/1-207**