Howard-Berton: Son of Adams

"a son of The Most High God", sui juris, sovereign living man Office of "the people"

Inhabitant of the land of Florida Leave to file GRANTED

November 21, 2022

RE:

NOTICE TO THE COURT

Case Number: 1:21-cr-00358-BAH UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Date /2/13/2022 Beryl A. Howell

Chief Judge

United States District Court

Beryl A. Howell acting as JUDGE BERYL A. HOWELL To:

Dear Judge Beryl A. Howell

THE PLAINTIFF IS BANKRUPT

It is now common knowledge that The UNITED STATES Inc. (Dunn & Bradstreet #096226982) is a BANKRUPT corporation that has lost it's charter!

Every franchised State of State, and STATE OF STATE, and HOWARD B. ADAMS are all bankrupt entities.

A bankrupt entity attempting to seize assets form a bankrupt franchise entity

is BANKRUPTCY FRAUD!

The UNITED STATES, Inc. and it's trustees are operating without legal or lawful authority.

When in bankruptcy a corporation cannot function as a business entity in BANKRUPTCY.

The UNITED STATES, Inc. is in receivership and has no authority to conduct business.

Your corporate charter has been revoked.

It is the Plaintiff's responsibility to provide proof that these allegations are incorrect to prove good faith



Page 1 of 2 Notice to the Court

Case 1:21-cr-00358-BAH Document 52 Filed 12/13/22 Page 2 of 6

and competency in this matter.

These statements are true and accurate to the best of my knowledge.

All of which is submitted under penalty of perjury to 28 U.S.C. 1746(1) without the UNITED STATES.

Dated this 22^{th} day of November in the year of our Lord Two Thousand Twenty Two.

By: Howard Berton Adams, Jr. 9 sui juris

"a son of the Most High God" sovereign living man Inhabitant of the land of Florida

Nichole, Buckmaster & Ellzey

From:

DCD_ECFNotice@dcd.uscourts.gov

Sent:

Thursday, November 17, 2022 3:05 PM

To:

DCD_ECFNotice@dcd.uscourts.gov

Subject:

Activity in Case 1:21-cr-00358-BAH USA v. ADAMS Motion Hearing

This is an automatic e-mail message generated by the CM/ECF system. Please DO NOT RESPOND to this e-mail because the mail box is unattended.

NOTE TO PUBLIC ACCESS USERS Judicial Conference of the United States policy permits attorneys of record and parties in a case (including pro se litigants) to receive one free electronic copy of all documents filed electronically, if receipt is required by law or directed by the filer PACER access fees apply to all other users. To avoid later charges, Notice of Electronic Filing

The following transaction of November in the year as Sovereign District Case Name:

ase No. MEND STATES OF AMERICA, IRC. download a copy of each document during this first viewing. However, if the referenced document is a transcript, the U.S. District Court hat the corpo

Notice of Electronic Filing

The following transaction was entered on 11/17/2022 at 3:05 PM EDT and filed on 11/17/2022

Case Name: USA v: ADAMS

The following transaction was entered on 11/17/2022 at 3:05 PM EDT and filed on 11/17/2022

Case Name: USA v. ADAMS

Case Number: 1,21-cr 00358-BAN

Filer:

Document Number No document attached

Docket Text:

Minute Entry for proceedings held before Chief Judge Beryl A. Howell: Motions/Hearing as to HOWARD S. ADAMS held on 11/17/2022 Referedant failed to appear Oral Metron by the HOWARD S. ADAMS held on 11/17/2022. Defendant failed to appear. Oral Motion by the government for the issuance of an Arrest Warrant, GRANTED, Arrest Warrant issued over the objection of standby defense counsel, Mr. Gregory Smith, Defendent's [47] MOTION for Miscellaneous Reflet fllet by HOWARD B: ADAMS, DENIED (Order entered by the Court); [33] Unopposed MOTION to Withdrawas Aftorney by Jeremy J. Buckmaster GRANTED. Bond Status of Defendant: Fugitive Present: Defense Attorneys: Brian A. Camrell, Jeremy J. Buckmaster, and Charles R. Haskell; US Attorney: Michael C. Liebman; Standby Attorney: Gregory Smith; Pretrial Officer: Christine Schuck. (ztg)

1:21-cr-00358-BAH-1 Notice has been electronically mailed to:

Michael Charles Liebman michael.liebman@usdoj.gov

Charles R. Haskell charles@charleshaskell.com

Jeremy J. Buckmaster eservice@buckmasterellzey.com, Brian@Buckmasterellzey.com, Jeremy@BuckmasterEllzey.com, Laney@Buckmasterellzey.com, nichole@buckmasterellzey.com

Brian Adam Cantrell eservice@buckmasterellzey.com, Brian@Buckmasterellzey.com, laney@buckmasterellzey.com, nichole@buckmasterellzey.com

Nichole, Buckmaster & Elizey

From:

DCD_ECFNotice@dcd.uscourts.gov

Sent:

Thursday, November 17, 2022 12:01 PM DCD_ECFNotice@dcd.uscourts.gov '

To: Subject:

Activity in Case 1:21-cr-00358-BAH USA v. ADAMS Order on Motion to Dishiss Case

This is an automatic e-mail message generated by the CM/ECF system. Please DO NOT **RESPOND** to this e-mail because the mail box is unattended.

NOTE TO PUBLIC ACCESS USERS Judicial Conference of the United States policy permits attorneys of record and parties in a case (including pro se litigants) to receive one free electronic copy of all documents filed electronically, if receipt is required by law or directed by the filer. PACER access fees apply to all other users. To avoid later charges, download a copy of each document during this first viewing. However, if the referenced document is a transcript, the

U.S. District Court

U.S. Dist BUS.C. 1746(1) without the United STATES. Case Number: 1:22 Cr 80358 BAH

Filer: Document Number: No document attached

Docket Text: MINUTE ORDER (paperless), as to HOWARD B. ADAMS, DENYING defendant \$ [34] letter to the Court which is constrained as a Metion of Diagram of Diag reasons already stated in the Minute Order issued on November 1, 2022 denying defendant's [47] Motion for Miscellaricous Relief Detendant's motion makes a series of difficult-to-follow claims. He contends that he does not consent to be governed by the United States," and does "not stand under statutes of the United States" which he walls "The UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, INC. Def.'s Mot at 1. The motion asserts that the U.S. government is a "for profit corporation," based on a flawed reading of a few cherry-picked cases, making the U.S. statutes defendant is accused of violating mere "corporate bylaws," that he is not subject to, as a "living man." Id. at 12. The motion includes a document titled "Declaration of Political Status," id. at 56, seeming to declare his political status as a "Georgian," and his reply brief includes: (1) a "Mandatory Notice" seeming to claim sovereign immunity, [37] Reply at 7, (2) a document titled "Elements of a Contract," with portions indicating the role of consent in the formation of a contract highlighted, id. at 8, (3) a document titled "Revocation of Signature," which alleges that defendant was "completely embarrassed and belittled" by his appearance before a federal court in Orlando related to this case, against his consent, id. at 11-12, and (4) a "Notice for the Record" repeating the same claims that defendant is not a U.S. citizen and not subject to "United States Corporate Law." Id. at 13-14. Defendant further contends that he has "trespassed no man" and "done no harm." Def.'s Mot. at 12.

Defendant's motion is entirely frivolous. The [26] Superseding Indictment charges defendant with violating provisions of Titles 18 and 40 of the United States Code. "'[T]here can be no

doubt that Article III permits Congress to assign federal criminal prosecutions to federal courts,' [and] the mere fact that the defendant was within the territory of the United States at the time of the alleged criminal action is 'the beginning and the end of the jurisdictional inquiry." United States v. Brown, Case No. 22-cr-170 (CKK) 2022 WL 2828996, *4 (D.D.C. July 20, 2022) (quoting United States v. Underwood, 726 F. Appx 945, 948 (4th Cir. 2018)). Defendant seems to think that he is not subject to the United States' criminal laws as a fait accompli because he does not believe himself to be a U.S. citizen. The key to personal jurisdiction, however, is not a defendant's citizenship, but where he was during the alleged commission of the crime. Defendant does not dispute that he was in the United States-in fact. in the Nation's Capital city, Washington, D.C. Finally, as to defendant's contention that he has "trespassed no man" and "done no harm," Def.'s Mot, at 12, defendant may raise this argument at trial. Dismissal under Fed. R. Crim. P. 12(b) is granted in only "unusual circumstances." United States v. Ballestas, 795 F.3d 138, 148 (D.C. Cir. 2015). That is because, "[w]hen considering a motion to dismiss an indictment, a court assumes the truth of the indictment's] factual allegations (Ballestas, 795 F.3d at 149. The superseding indictment alleges that defendant has in fact done harm-that he participated in a riot at the U.S. Capitol Jeremy J. Buckmaster S eservice@buckmasterellzey.com, Brian@Buckmasterellzey.com, June Buckmasterellzey.com, Laney@Buckmasterellzey.com, Brian@Buckmasterellzey.com

21-cr-00358-BAH, 1 Notice will be deligated. with the intent to obstruct the official proceedings of Congress At this stage, this Court must

Dated this 22st day of Movember in the Year of o By Howard Berton Adams, It of Films He Most High Loor sovereign in

Florida by my republic stat All of which is submitted under Pe Criminal codes witho I require that you prov with color out

HOWARD B. ADAMS YOU GOL

2

