



The Government of The United States of America
General Post Master Council
Rural Free Delivery Route 1, Box #5
The United States of America
Global Postal Code-NAC: 850H2 MR7C8
Office hours: 9:00 - 9:00 UTC Monday - Friday
Phone: (405) 458-0553
Website: <http://generalpostmastercouncil.com/>
Email: gpmcouncil@generalpostoffice.international



Judicial Review

In the Matter of Glenn Joseph DeRusha v U.S. Department of Justice and Loretta Lynch

Before the General Post Master Council (hereinafter "Court") is an Affidavit submitted by Glenn Joseph DeRusha (hereinafter "Petitioner") which communicates a disturbing series of events that stem from prejudicial and discriminatory attitudes and behaviors displayed by federal and state law enforcement authorities as well as state judicial officers. These actions include violations of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) as well as constitutional violations.

It is well-established that Executive Order #13107, "The Implementation of Human Rights Treaties", signed December 10, 1998 by U.S. President William Jefferson Clinton, makes the United States a party to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Also undeniable is the implementation of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man, under The Bar Treaty of 1947, to which, all members of the American Bar Association and its subsidiaries are subject.

Cognizant of these indisputable facts, and mindful that "Member States have pledged themselves to achieve, in co-operation with the United Nations, the promotion of universal respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms"¹, this Court has prepared the following review of events based upon Petitioner's affidavit.

¹ Preamble, The Universal Declaration of Human Rights



Summary of Events

Briefly, the Petitioner was engaged in the defense of his home against a forced eviction (foreclosure) in Scott County District Court. In mid-2014, the judge for the case, Diane Hanson, issued a memorandum in support of summary judgment stating the court “declines to conduct an extensive analysis of Defendant’s argument...” and provided as reasoning for ignoring Petitioner’s arguments that they are “often expressed by individuals who are aligned with the Posse Comitatus movement.”

Article 6

Everyone has the right to recognition everywhere as a person before the law.

Article 7

All are equal before the law and are entitled without any discrimination to equal protection of the law. All are entitled to equal protection against any discrimination in violation of this Declaration and against any incitement to such discrimination.

Article 17

- (1) Everyone has the right to own property alone as well as in association with others.
- (2) No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his property.

During a traffic stop in late 2015, a Falcon Heights Police Officer, Kiel Rushton, declared the Petitioner to be “one of those sovereign citizens” and ordered the Petitioner to exit the automobile under threat of being “shot” with a stun gun. Petitioner reports Petitioner was informed the arrest was for lack of identification.

Article 5

No one shall be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.

Article 7

All are equal before the law and are entitled without any discrimination to equal protection of the law. All are entitled to equal protection against any discrimination in violation of this Declaration and against any incitement to such discrimination.

During the processing and detainment for the traffic incident the Petitioner reports three unnamed deputies referred to Petitioner as a “sovereign citizen”.

Article 5

No one shall be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.



Article 7

All are equal before the law and are entitled without any discrimination to equal protection of the law. All are entitled to equal protection against any discrimination in violation of this Declaration and against any incitement to such discrimination.

Court papers arrived informing Petitioner of a mid-March 2016 arraignment and Petitioner reports the Court Register of Actions stated Petitioner to be a “sovereign citizen”.

Article 12

No one shall be subjected to arbitrary interference with his privacy, family, home or correspondence, nor to attacks upon his honour and reputation. Everyone has the right to the protection of the law against such interference or attacks.

Perceiving a pattern of overly aggressive behaviors and accusatory and discriminatory language, thus fearing for his safety, Petitioner did not appear at the arraignment.

Article 20

(2) No one may be compelled to belong to an association.

Also during March, an agent for the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), Mark Kempe, filed three felony arrest warrants stating on each request that Petitioner was a “sovereign citizen”.

Article 9

No one shall be subjected to arbitrary arrest, detention or exile.

This led to FBI agents visiting the home of the father of Petitioner, stating to the father that Petitioner was being investigated as a “very dangerous sovereign citizen” that may have been involved with a group that shot at Sheriff Deputies in Wisconsin.

Article 11

(1) Everyone charged with a penal offence has the right to be presumed innocent until proved guilty according to law in a public trial at which he has had all the guarantees necessary for his defence.

(2) No one shall be held guilty of any penal offence on account of any act or omission which did not constitute a penal offence, under national or international law, at the time when it was committed. Nor shall a heavier penalty be imposed than the one that was applicable at the time the penal offence was committed.

Violation of Due Process

This Court is compelled to ask: why, during the defense of his home, was Petitioner’s arguments denied “extensive analysis”? The provided rationale was that these arguments



stem from a “posse comitatus movement”. Is that not a decision addressing the Petitioner’s political beliefs and not the law? Can a judge dismiss legal arguments because a litigant is a republican? Or a member of the Green Party? Due process demands that one may use existing law for one’s defense. Quite obviously, all persons cannot be equal before the law if some persons are denied the ability to use that law.

The essential elements of due process of law are notice and opportunity to defend. In determining whether such rights were denied we are governed by the substance of things, and not by mere form. (Simon v. Craft, 182 U.S. 427 (1901))

Prudence would dictate a hearing conducted at Scott County District Court with Petitioner in attendance for accurate determination of the alleged “posse comitatus” status.

Further, this Court is concerned that the continued promulgation of the inflammatory term “sovereign citizen” and the anti-government slander associated with that term will lead to more outrageous due process violations as enforcement officers on the street are encouraged to serve as judge, jury and, in the case of a killing of an accused, executioner. This Court knows of no allowance within the UDHR made for street-litigation conducted by private membership associations.

Article 10

Everyone is entitled in full equality to a fair and public hearing by an independent and impartial tribunal, in the determination of his rights and obligations and of any criminal charge against him.

Mortgage fraud is now well documented. As such, it seems obvious to this Court that the Petitioner would act against such fraud to protect his family and equity. Just as obvious to this Court would be the expectation by the Petitioner of an unbiased court system.

Article 25

(1) Everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and of his family, including food, clothing, housing and medical care and necessary social services, and the right to security in the event of unemployment, sickness, disability, widowhood, old age or other lack of livelihood in circumstances beyond his control.

Failure to Register the Instrument with the Treasury of the United States

With regards to the initial action—that of the foreclosure of the Petitioner’s home—the instrument (a mortgage note) was not registered with the Treasury of the United States as an asset, but rather, the note was bundled with other instruments and diverted to Wall Street and the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission. The failure to register the mortgage note reveals an organized scheme to withhold assets from the Treasury of the United States.



Treason – Cooperating with a Foreign Government

Thus, it seems that the Department of Justice (DOJ), a law enforcement agency in United States, is knowingly cooperating with Manhattan Island, a foreign country under the Netherlands charter of the Patroons and with the Bank of New York Mellon founded in 1784.

This is in direct contradiction to the mission statement of the DOJ, which, in part, reads:

To enforce the law and defend the interests of the United States according to the law; to ensure public safety against threats foreign and domestic²

How does the DOJ rationalize it is in the interest of United States or the Public-at-Large to allow a foreign country or foreign banks and other entities to withhold assets from the Treasury of the United States?

This Court also questions why the DOJ is protecting illegal activity of the Bank of New York Mellon by allowing agencies under its authority to demonize mortgage fraud whistle-blowers and the Public-at-Large with slanderous labels like “sovereign citizen” when it is the DOJ and its subordinate agencies that are charged with the responsibility to correct wrongdoings to protect United States and the Public-at-Large. Is it the assertion of the DOJ that the Petitioner, seeking to defend a home against a forced eviction, is a more serious threat to United States than a foreign country or foreign banks withholding trillions in assets from the Treasury of the United States?

As the DOJ has recently applauded efforts of the Southern Poverty Law Center (SPLC), a notorious propaganda machine and human rights violator, it seems clear the DOJ is more interested in murdering whistle-blowers than assisting them. Any attempt by the DOJ to minimize anti-government rhetoric against whistle-blowers is unknown to this Court. Indeed, an argument can be made that the anti-government and hate group rhetoric spewed by the SPLC is condoned and promoted within the enforcement agencies under DOJ, to slowly convert unknowing and trusting enforcement officers into “murder squads” to protect the illegal activities of Manhattan Island and the Bank of New York Mellon against whistle-blowers.

Freedom of Expression

There is a difference between freedom of expression and inciting.

The Petitioner is entitled to his beliefs and freedom of opinion and expression, as are all persons. Contrastingly, the unsubstantiated “hate group” and “anti-government sovereign citizen” accusations and labelling used by SPLC does not fall under freedom of expression as

² U.S. Department of Justice, Our Mission Statement <https://www.justice.gov/about> (6/19/2016)



it is nothing more than slanderous rhetoric designed to limit political rights and incite violence between law enforcement and the group or person(s) targeted.

The SPLC, through its inflammatory and biased training and media materials is inciting violence and murder against whistle-blowers on behalf of the DOJ and the U.S. Attorney General Loretta Lynch.

Article 19

Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.

Article 3

Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of person.

Breach of Contract

As there was no intent to register the mortgage note with the Treasury of the United States, there was never intent to fulfill the purchase nor deliver the goods stipulated within the purchase contract — in this case the subject property. A party to a contract that never intends to fulfill the terms and conditions of the contract commits breach of that contract and, with a note involved, that party also commits theft of labor — slavery.

As such, the DOJ is assisting a foreign country and foreign banks with slave trading.

Article 4

No one shall be held in slavery or servitude; slavery and the slave trade shall be prohibited in all their forms.

Failure to Register Court Case with the Treasury of the United States

Statutory courts also have an obligation, within the scope of their creation, to register cases they settle with the Treasury of the United States. Failure to register court cases is a violation of Article 21, section 1 of UDHR. Therefore, the violation of the intangible property right to honest services is revealed by the dishonesty of presenting the appearance of due process to the Public at Large during the process of foreclosures.

The Overthrow of the United States

It is the duty of the courts and officers of the courts to provide honest services. As such, the courts and its officers are aware of the obligation to register cases as assets with the Treasury of the United States. As a consequence of failing to register court cases, courts and their officers have intentionally withheld assets from the Treasury of the United States,



thereby engaging in dishonest services to the Public at Large and the United States. The courts and their officers, then, are participating in a conspiracy to over-throw the United States by withholding assets which would allow a National Currency to be issued to the Citizens of the United States. The people have a right to a Nationality in Article 15 of UDHR. The violation of Article 15 of UDHR reveals to the International Community the violation of the intangible property right to honest services.

Conclusion

Based on the foregoing, it is the opinion of this Court that the DOJ, its agencies and the SPLC have, through the on-going and unrelenting use of inflammatory rhetoric, created an antagonistic atmosphere designed to incite violence between law enforcement officers and whistle-blowers and the Public-at-Large. Glenn Joseph DeRusha is entitled to believe he is in immediate danger of loss of life or limb.

Autographed this 93rd day in the year of Yahweh, 6018 (June 20, 2016)



Chief Judge, General Post Master Council



Judge, General Post Master Council



Judge, General Post Master Council

