

)

) .
)
)
)
)
IN RE:
THE STATE of Alabama, Alaska, Arizona,
Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut,
Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho,
Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky,
Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts,
Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri,
Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire,
New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North
Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma,
Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South
Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas,
Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West
Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming(The Federal
Trade Commission, The Bureau of Consumer
Protection, Bureau of Competition, Securities
and Exchange Commission) EX REL Sharon
Bridgewater (A.K.A. Sharon Abusalem, Sharon
Davis) Private Attorney General and Relator
PLAINTIFF AND/OR PETITIONER
“PLAINTIFFS AND/OR PETITIONERS”
(PROSECUTOR) on behalf of myself, James
S. Bridgewater(one or more of the following
companies, Specialty Investment Group
L.L.C., a Georgia Company, Specialty Global
Investments Inc., a Nevada Corporation, and
Bridgewater & Company Inc., a California
Corporation, The Coalition for
Empowerment(formerly Greater Lansing
Helping Hands)a 501C-3 non-profit
organization, a Michigan and/or Georgia non-
profit corporation, B & B Building
Maintenance INC. a Michigan Corporation,
forced out of business) and those similarly
situated

[Proposed] Class Plaintiff and/or Petitioner
Representative on behalf of Plaintiff and/or
Petitioner Class members

v.

Barak H. Obama in his official capacity as
United States President and individually et al
The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Ave. NW
Washington, DC 20500

AND

Loretta Lynch,
in her official as Attorney General of
the United States, and individually
United States Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C.20530-0001,

[Proposed] Class Defendant and/or Respondant
Representative Barak H. Obama in his official
capacity as United States President and
individually on behalf of Defendant and/or
Respondant Class members
and 1 thru 1,000,000,000 inclusive

Defendant and/or Respondants

NOTICE OF TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER AND PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION

THE STATE of Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming(The Federal Trade Commission, The Bureau of Consumer Protection, Bureau of Competition, Securities and Exchange Commission) EX REL Sharon Bridgewater (A.K.A.

Sharon Abusalem, Sharon Davis) Private Attorney General and Qui Tam QUI TAM RELATOR "PLAINTIFF AND/OR PETITIONER "PLAINTIFFS AND/OR PETITIONERS moves this court for a temporary restraining order and for a permanent injunction pursuant to 18 USC section 1963(d)(1)(a), restraining and enjoining Barak H. Obama individually _____ class Defendants, its agents, employees, successors, attorneys and all persons in active concert or participation with it, from taking any action that would render unavailable to the United States property, subject to forfeiture under 18 USC section 1962 as related to prohibited racketeering activities, pending hearing and determination of Plaintiffs motion for a preliminary. The property subject to forfeiture is more fully described as _____ -.

This motion is based on the assertion by THE STATE of Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming(The Federal Trade Commission, The Bureau of Consumer Protection, Bureau of Competition, Securities and Exchange Commission) EX REL Sharon Bridgewater (A.K.A. Sharon Abusalem, Sharon Davis) Private Attorney General and Qui Tam Relator on behalf of myself, James S. Bridgewater, one or more of the following[DISSOLVED] companies, Specialty Investment Group L.L.C., a Georgia Company, Specialty Global Investments Inc., a Nevada Corporation, and Bridgewater & Company Inc., a California Corporation, The Coalition for Empowerment(formerly Greater Lansing Helping Hands)a 501C-3 non-profit organization, a Michigan and/or Georgia non-profit corporation, B & B Building Maintenance INC. a Michigan Corporation, and those similarly situated PLAINTIFF AND/OR PETITIONER "PLAINTIFFS AND/OR PETITIONERS" (PROSECUTOR) that the property with respect to which the order is sought would in the event of conviction of Defendant for violation of 18 USC section 1962, be subject to forfeiture. Unless this motion is granted, the United States will suffer irreparable injury, loss, and damage if Defendant is permitted to dispose of, or other wise render unavailable, the property subject to forfeiture before a hearing can be had on Plaintiffs motion for a preliminary and/or permanent injunction, as more fully set forth in Plaintiffs complaint filed in this action and in the affidavit of Sharon Bridgewater ex rel or THE STATE of Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming(The Federal Trade Commission, The Bureau of Consumer Protection, Bureau of Competition, Securities and Exchange Commission) EX REL Sharon Bridgewater (A.K.A. Sharon Abusalem, Sharon Davis) Private Attorney General and Qui Tam Relator on behalf of myself, James S. Bridgewater, one or more of the following[DISSOLVED] companies, Specialty Investment Group L.L.C., a Georgia Company, Specialty Global Investments Inc., a Nevada Corporation, and Bridgewater & Company Inc., a California Corporation, The Coalition for Empowerment(formerly Greater Lansing Helping Hands)a 501C-3 non-profit organization, a Michigan and/or Georgia non-profit corporation, B & B Building Maintenance INC. a Michigan Corporation, and those similarly situated PLAINTIFF AND/OR PETITIONER "PLAINTIFFS AND/OR PETITIONERS" (PROSECUTOR) attached to this motion

II.

LEGAL STANDARD FOR GRANTING LIABILITY OF C RESTITUTIONAL CLAIMS AND/OR COMPENSATORY AND/OR PUNITIVE DAMAGES; AND ISSUES OF APPOINTMENT OF CLASS COUNSEL; APPOINTMENT OF SPECIAL PROSECUTOR AND/OR INDEPENDENT COUNSEL; Civil and/or Criminal

Contempt of Congress; CRIMINAL CAUSES OF ACTION; Writ of Mandamus ; Writ of Habeas; Writ of Quo Warranto; and other from the Other Causes of Action VIOLATION OF 18 U.S.C. SECTION 371, RICO, Malicious Prosecution; DECLARTARY JUDGMENT; JUDGMENT; STAY OF PROCEEDING ASSET FREEZE AND OTHER E. TABLE RELIEFWITH PERMANENT

INJUNCTION

Whenever there is cause to believe that the Defendants a person has engaged in or is engaging in RICO activities, a person may apply for and obtain, in an action in the appropriate district court of this state, a temporary restraining order or injunction, or both, pursuant to Federal and/or State Law, prohibiting such person from continuing such practices, or engaging therein, or doing any act in furtherance thereof. The court may make such orders or judgments as may be necessary to prevent the use or employment by such person which may be necessary to enjoin the Defendants from further overt RICO acts. Further when it appears, by the verified complaint, and/or affidavit, the plaintiffs is entitled to the relief demanded and such relief during the litigation, it appears that the defendant is doing, or threatens, or is about to do, or is procuring or suffering to be done, some act in violation of the plaintiff's rights it may, be granted and in any case where it is specially authorized by statute. Under Rule 65, and/or 66 when it clearly appears from specific facts shown by affidavit or by testimony that immediate and irreparable injury, loss, or damage the court can issue a TRO or an injunction, against Defendants imposing their ability to dissipate or dispose of any assets subject to a judgment in monetary judgment rendered in favor Plaintiff in order to preserve the status quo.

To obtain a temporary restraining order, appointment of Temporary Receiver, Asset Freeze, with expedited discovery, asset freeze, with expedited discovery, immediate access to Defendant's business premises, order to show cause criminal contempt of congress: 1) temporary restraining order or preliminary injunction the Plaintiff must show the following: (1) a substantial likelihood of success on the merits; (2) he/she is likely to suffer irreparable injury harm in the essence of preliminary relief; (3) the balance of ties tips in his/her favor; and (4) an injunction is in the public interest, also an injunction may also be appropriate where the plaintiff raises "serious question going to the merits and demonstrates that "the balance of hardships tips sharply in the Plaintiff's favor," and/or that damages are incidental and/or intertwined.

ARGUMENT

The egregious acts warrants an asset freeze

B. Likelihood of Success

The United States of America and/or Class Plaintiffs have both statutory and constitutional claims and the likelihood of success on the merits. *The United States of America ex rel Sharon Bridgewater* private attorney general affidavit allege this is a continuing scheme and conspiracy to defraud US Taxpayers, US Department, agencies and programs, etc. which makes the amount involved in the entire scheme or conspiracy forfeitable. The USA, ex rel have also proven via verified complaint and/or affidavit that the property subject to forfeiture was the proceeds of the drug activity, gun running, fraud, assisting the enemy, treason, etc. all had a express or implied agreement, and violated the VIOLATION OF 18 U.S.C. SECTION 371 and/or Rico Statues and are equally liable for damages in the amount of 100 Trillion Dollars.

1. Statutory authority –

First, Second, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, Eighth, thirteenth, Fourteenth Amendment violations of Class Plaintiffs

Further, the class plaintiffs have demonstrated in the affidavit and verified complaint constitutional violations of the Class Plaintiffs and the class Plaintiffs have been damaged and claims and interest in property via US President, US Attorney General, Congress, Legislators, Directors, Managers, etc. of Corporations alike is bound by and swears an oath to uphold the Constitution;" all of which violated their oath to uphold the Constitution, and violated the Class Plaintiff civil rights which re. res injunctive relief.

Defendants conspiracies to Defraud the the Plaintiffs and the damages are "incidental" to claim for injunctive or declaratory relief, because such damages as a matter of law, flow directly from a determination that injunctive or declaratory relief is warranted. The evidence presented show an entitlement to the claimed damages. Both money damages and e.table relief are sought, the controlling authority where a plaintiff, seeking e.table and legal relief, sue the defendant for claims such as, RICO and/or VIOLATION OF 18 U.S.C. SECTION 371 it authorizes injunctive relief in the form of a preliminary injunction pursuant to Fed. Rule Civil Procedure Rule 65 or 66 relief. appears that the defendant is doing, or threatens, or is about to do, or is procuring or suffering to be done, some act in violation of the plaintiff's rights respecting the subject of the action, it may be granted in any case where it is specially authorized by statute. Under Rule 65(b), and/or 66 when it clearly appears from specific facts shown by affidavit or by testimony that immediate and irreparable injury, loss, or damage will result before the adverse parties or their attorneys can be heard in opposition, the court can issue a TRO or an injunction, and appoint a temporary **LEGAL STANDARD FOR GRANTING EX-PARTE APPLICATION FOR**

PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION AND PERMANENT INJUNCTION WITH 64 and/or 65 and/or 66 ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

To obtain a permanent injunction THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA (with and/or without the United States) ex rel, *Sharon Bridgewater*, "Private Attorney General" must show the following: (1) a substantial likelihood of success on the merits; (2) he/she is likely to suffer irreparable injury harm in the easence of preliminary relief; (3) the balance of e. ties tips in his/her

favor; and (4) an injunction is in the public interest, also an injunction may also be appropriate where the plaintiff raises “serious question going to the merits demonstrates that “the balance of hardships tips sharply in the Plaintiff’s favor.”

Upon the United States showing of probable cause, in this case THE UNITED STATES (with and/or without the United States) ex rel, Sharon Bridgewater, “Private Attorney General” and on behalf of (Specialty Investment Group L.L.C.A dissolved Georgia Company), to obtain 1964(a) The Attorney General may institute proceedings under this section. Pending final determination thereof, the court may at any time enter such restraining order or prohibitions, or take such other actions, including the acceptance of satisfactory performance bonds, as it shall deem proper.

The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction to prevent and restrain violations of section 1962 of this chapter by issuing appropriate orders, including, but not limited to: ordering any person to divest himself of any interest, direct or indirect, in any enterprise; imposing reasonable restrictions on the future activities or investments of any person, including, but not limited to, prohibiting any person from engaging in the same type of endeavor as the enterprise engaged in, the activities of which affect interstate or foreign commerce; or ordering dissolution or reorganization of any enterprise, making due provision for the rights of innocent persons.

(b) The Attorney General in this case, The United States of America ex rel Sharon Bridgewater, may institute proceedings under this section. Pending final determination thereof, the court may at any time enter such restraining order or prohibitions, or take such other actions, including the acceptance of satisfactory performance bonds, as it shall deem proper.

III. ARGUMENT

The pattern and practices of the Defendant Eric Holder warrants a permanent injunction pursuant to class members and dissolution of this Organization.

18 USC Section 1964(a) vest district courts with powerful weapons to eliminate and prevent corruption in organizations, and accordingly authorized district courts to impose the full panoply of equitable relief, including, but not limited to, the intrusive remedies discussed below: “to prevent and restrain” violations of law under 18 U.S.C. § 1964(a).

The Supreme Court has repeatedly emphasized that courts are vested with extensive equitable powers to fashion appropriate remedies to redress unlawful conduct. He commits a RICO violation by establishing the same elements as in a criminal RICO case, except that criminal intent is not required; and (2) that there is a reasonable likelihood that the defendant will commit a violation. And a “coercive public interest remedy” whereby the “defendant is enjoined by a prohibitory injunction to refrain from doing specific acts or he is commanded by a mandatory injunction to carry out specified acts includes the equitable remedies of divestiture, dissolution and “reorganization of any enterprise.”

“[D]issolution’ refers to a . . . judgment which dissolves or terminates an illegal combination or association - putting it out of business, designed in the public interest to undo what could have been prevented had the defendants not outdistanced the government in their unlawful project.” Schine Chain Theaters v. United States, 334 U.S. 110, 128 (1948). Both dissolution and divestiture serve to put “an end to the [unlawful] combination or conspiracy” and to “deprive . . . defendants of the “Divestiture has been called the most important of antitrust remedies.” United States

Moreover, the Supreme Court has pointedly ruled that where “the public interest is involved. . . those equitable powers assume an even broader and more flexible character than when only a private controversy is at stake.” Porter v. Warner Holding, Co., 328 U.S. 395, 398 (1946). Accord Virginian Ry. Co. v. Sys. Fed’n. No. 40, 300 U.S. 515, 552 (1937) (“Courts of equity may, and frequently do, go much farther both to give and withhold relief in furtherance of the public interest than they are accustomed to go when only private interests are involved.”) (collecting cases); Golden State Bottling Co. v. NLRB, 414 U.S. 168, 179-80 (1973) (same).

HERE IN THIS CASE THE DEFENDANTS UPON INFORMATION AND BELIEF HAVE RETALIATED AGAINST FEDERAL WITNESS AND VICTIM OF CRIME OF THE US GOVERNMENT AND IN MY CASE ILLEGALLY UNLAWFULLY UPSURRATION OF BUSINESS, NAME, IDENTITY THEFT, OPPRESSION, ETC.

In accordance with these principles, courts have imposed a wide variety of highly intrusive equitable remedies in institutional reform litigation to remedy constitutional violations and to foster paramount public interests, including various structural reforms.¹³ Typically in such cases, the equitable relief afforded exceeds an injunction enjoining the proscribed conduct, and also encompasses compelled changes in practices, structural changes and prolonged court-supervision over implementation of the equitable relief. See generally, DOBBS, Vol. Two at 348-353. Broad Equitable Powers To Remedy Unlawful Conduct, Including Ordering Intrusive, Structural Changes in Wrongdoers’ Entities and Practices

Moreover, the Supreme Court has pointedly ruled that where “the public interest is involved. . . those e.table powers assume an even broader and more flexible character than when only a private controversy is at stake.” *Porter v. Warner Holding, Co.*, 328 U.S. 395, 398 (1946). Accord *Virginian Ry. Co. v. Sys. Fed’n. No. 40*, 300 U.S. 515, 552 (1937) (“Courts of e.ty may, and frequently do, go much farther both to give and withhold relief in furtherance of the public interest than they are accustomed to go when only private interests are involved.”) (collecting cases); *Golden State Bottling Co. v. NLRB*, 414 U.S. 168, 179-80 (1973) (same).¹²

In accordance with these principles, courts have imposed a wide variety of highly intrusive e.table remedies in institutional reform litigation to remedy constitutional violations and to foster paramount public interests, including various structural reforms.¹³ Typically in such cases, the e.table relief afforded exceeds an injunction enjoining the proscribed conduct, and also encompasses compelled changes in practices, structural changes and prolonged court-supervision over implementation of the e.table relief. See generally, *DOBBS*, Vol. Two at 348-353. The egregious facts of this case and Defendants’ pattern of RICO activities warrants permanent injunction, asset freeze and/or appointment pre-judgment writ of attachment, including injunctive relief, reasonable restrictions on defendants’ future activities, disgorgement of unlawful proceeds, divestiture, dissolution, reorganization, removal from positions in an entity, and appointment of court officers to administer and supervise the affairs and operations of defendants’ entities and to assist courts in monitoring compliance with courts’ orders and in imposing sanctions for violations of courts’ orders

In a civil RICO 1964(a) it authorizes district courts to impose intrusive, structural reforms including, but not limited to, divestiture, Adissolution or reorganization of any enterprise, @ Areasonable restrictions on the future activities or investments of **any person**” and Aprohibiting **any person** from engaging in RICO, 18 U.S.C. ' 1961(3), provides that “ 18 ‘person’ includes any individual or entity capable of holding a legal or beneficial interest in property,” which includes a corporation, union, partnership and a sole proprietorship.individual, partnership, corporation, association, or other legal entity, and any union or group of individuals associated in fact although not a legal entity.” the same type of endeavor as the enterprise engaged in.”(emphasis added).

In determining this a District Court/Judge (1) the nature and seriousness of the predicate racketeering offenses; (2) whether the predicate racketeering offenses were committed over a substantial period of time, and/or pose a threat of continuing unlawful activity; (3) whether an organized crime group participated in any of the predicate racketeering offenses or exercised corrupt influence over any proposed enterprise, defendant or related entity; (4) whether there is a reasonable likelihood that the defendant will commit unlawful activity in the future; (5) the pervasiveness of wrongdoing within a collective entity that is a proposed defendant, including the complicity in, or condonation of, the wrongdoing by the collective entity’s officers and management; (6) the defendant’s history of similar unlawful conduct, including prior criminal, civil or regulatory enforcement actions against it;(7) whether the defendant has derived unlawful proceeds from his RICO violation that are subject to disgorgement; (8) the defendant’s timely and voluntary disclosure of wrongdoing and his/her or its willingness to cooperate with the

authorities to eliminate corruption involving the defendant or related entities; (9) the existence and adequacy of a collective entity's compliance program and other remedial actions; (10) collateral consequences, including harm, if any, to innocent third parties, including a collective entity's shareholders, employees, or union members; (11) whether and to what extent the sought remedies are likely to be effective; and (12) the availability and adequacy of other remedies, and must be considered under the totality of the circumstances.

Nature of emergency/irreparable injury:

a. Each day without a receivership or asset freeze, there is a substantial at: imminent danger to the United States Treasury, the Plaintiffs and/or Petitioners will continue to cause injury to the United States Treasury, defraud consumers, US Taxpayers, deprive taxpayers the intangle right to honest services, dissipate his/her assets or continue to defraud the Defendants and/or Respondants, assets freeze is necessary to satisfy a judgment in this case either by conspiring to engage in money laundering(wire fraud) in, paying-off substantial gambling debts that are currently owed, withdrawing large sums of cash that cannot easily be traced, or transferring properties, cash, art work or vehicles to third parties.

b. A receivership or asset freeze, is necessary to prevent Defendants from wrongfully disposing of, encumbering or causing damage to the real property of the "UNITED STATES OF AMERICA" and/or the Class Defendants and/or Respondant during the pendency

THE ASSET FREEZE, REPARTRIATION AND PASSPORT TURNOVER PROVISION ARE ESSENTIAL TO GUARANTEE FUNDS FOR EFFECTIVE FINAL RELIEF

United States' Laws Governing U.. Efforts to Confiscate and Recover Foreign Assets United States prosecutors have authority to file either domestic civil or criminal forfeiture actions against property abroad. Under 28 U..C. § 1355(b), a civil forfeiture action may be filed against any foreign property which is subject to civil forfeiture under U.. law. Case law has established that, in order to provide the U.. district court with jurisdiction, the U.. government must be able to demonstrate that the foreign government will cooperate in recognizing the forfeiture or in allowing the asset to be transferred to the United States. Under 21 U..C. § 853(l) and 18 U..C. § 982(b)(1), a U.. district court can enter any criminal forfeiture order "without regard to the location of any property" which may be subject to forfeiture. Also, in a criminal forfeiture proceeding, a U.. court may order a defendant, under 21 U..C. § 853(e)(4) to repatriate any foreign assets to the United States. Such repatriation should occur only if permitted by the foreign government and if not in violation of any restraining order which the foreign government has enforced on behalf of the U.. Further, if a criminal defendant agrees to plead guilty pursuant to an agreement, the agreement will contain a provision by which the defendant agrees to repatriate the foreign-based property back to the U.. for forfeiture. The plea agreement may also contain a provision by which the defendant agrees to the appointment of a representative in the foreign country to assist in the confiscation and liquidation of the property. Also, the United States will often add to an Extradition Treaty request a request that any valuable property which is found on or near the defendant when he or she is arrested be returned to the United States with the person. The Asset Freeze, Repatriation, and

Passport Turnover Provisions Are Essential to Guarantee Funds for Effective Final Relief. The Eleventh Circuit has repeatedly upheld the authority of district courts to order asset freezes, appoint receivers, and re.re immediate access to business premises and records where, as here, corporate defendants and their officers deceive consumers, and it is likely that, in the absence of this relief, assets will be subject to waste and records will be destroyed. See, e.g., Gem Merch., 87 F.3d at 469 ("district court may order preliminary relief, including an asset freeze, that may be needed to make permanent relief possible"); US. Oil & Gas, 748 F.2d at 1433-34 (affirming district court's ruling granting ancillary relief freezing assets and appointing receiver); McGregor v. Chierico, 206 F.3d 1378, 1381 (11th Cir. 2000) (citing trial court's ex parte order for asset freeze and appointment of receiver, along with other e.table relief, pending resolution of contempt proceedings); see also USABevs., 2005 WL 5654219 at *8 (appointing a receiver is essential to ensure compliance with the [court's order], and to prevent deposited there, they have considerable incentive not to repatriate these funds and, potentially, even to flee this Court's jurisdiction and rejoin their funds. The TRO should therefore re.re the Individual Defendants to tum over their passports, whether U.. or foreign, subject to their repatriating the millions of dollars that they have already transfened abroad. Courts have ordered this relief in cases where there is compelling evidence that a Defendant has substantial foreign assets. SEC v. Resource Development Int 'l LLC, 160 Fed. App' x. 368, 369 (5th Cir. 2005) (granting ex parte TRO re.iing repahiation of assets and sunender of passports in scheme to defraud investors); SEC v. Universal Consulting Resources LLC, 2010 WL 4873733 at* 2 (D. Colo. Nov. 23, 2010) (ordering surrender of passport and repatriation of assets because defendants "have interests in or ownership of assets outside the United States"); SEC v. Private E.ty Mgmt. G1p. LLC, 2009 WL 1310984 at *7 (C.D. Cal. Apr. 27, 2009) (ordering sunender ofpassports and repatriation of assets); SECv. Stanford Int 'l BankLtd., 2009 WL 9123278 at *1 , 5 (N.D. Tex. Feb. 17, 2009) (ordering surrender of passports because of flight risk and repatriation of assets because "some assets are located abroad."). 5 (N.D. Tex. Feb. 17, 2009) (ordering surrender of passports because of flight risk and repatriation of assets because "some assets are located abroad."). EVEN FURTHER

RICO EXPRESSELY AUTHORIZES THE "UNITED STATES EX REL SHARON BRIDGEWATER PRIVATE ATTORNEY GENERAL" to seek pre-trial restraining orders in civil actions, and 18 USC section 1964(a) provides that district courts "shall have jurisdiction to prevent and restrain violations of section 1962 of RICO, and further enter orders of "prohibitions, or take such other actions, including the acceptance of satisfactory performance bond.

ARGUMENT

A. The erigous acts warrants an asset freeze

B. Likelihood of Success

The United States of America and/or Class Plaintiffs have both statutory and constitutional claims and the likelihood of success on the merits. *The United States of America ex rel Sharon Bridgewater* private attorney general affidavit allege this is a continuing scheme and conspiracy to defraud US Taxpayers, US Department, agencies and programs, etc. which makes the amount involved in the entire scheme or conspiracy forfeitable. The USA, ex rel have also proven via verified complaint and/or affidavit that the property subject to forfeiture was the proceeds of the drug activity, gun running, fraud, assisting the enemy, treason, etc. all had a express or implied agreement, and violated the VIOLATION OF 18 U.S.C. SECTION 371 and/or Rico Statues and are equally liable for damages in the amount of 100 Trillion Dollars.

1. Statutory authority –

First, Second, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, Eighth, thirteenth, Fourteenth Amendment violations of Class Plaintiffs

Further, the class plaintiffs have demonstrated in the affidavit and verified complaint constitutional violations of the Class Plaintiffs and the class Plaintiffs have been damaged and claims and interest in property via US President, US Attorney General, Congress, Legislators, Directors, Managers, etc. of Corporations alike is bound by and swears an oath to uphold the Constitution;" all of which violated their oath to uphold the Constitution, and violated the Class Plaintiff civil rights which re.res injunctive relief.

Defendants conspiracies to Defraud the the Plaintiffs and the damages are "incidental" to claim for injunctive or declaratory relief, because such damages as a matter of law, flow directly from a determination that injunctive or declaratory relief is warranted. The evidence presented show an entitlement to the claimed damages. Both money damages and e.table relief are sought, the controlling authority where a plaintiff, seeking e.table and legal relief, sue the defendant for claims such as, RICO and/or VIOLATION OF 18 U.S.C. SECTION 371 it authorizes injunctive relief in the form of a preliminary injunction pursuant to Fed. Rule Civil Procedure Rule 65 or 66 relief. appears that the defendant is doing, or threatens, or is about to do, or is procuring or suffering to be done, some act in violation of the plaintiff's rights respecting the subject of the action, it may be granted in any case where it is specially authorized by statute. Under Rule 65(b), and/or 66 when it clearly appears from specific facts shown by affidavit or by testimony that immediate and irreparable injury, loss, or damage will result before the adverse parties or their attorneys can be heard in opposition, the court can issue a TRO or an injunction, and appoint a temporary receiver without notice to the adverse party.

That hereafter any committee of the Senate is hereby authorized to bring suit on behalf
(continued...)

Congress's Contempt Power and the Enforcement of Congressional Subpoenas
Congressional Research Service 25

Without affecting the right of the Senate to institute criminal contempt proceedings or to try an individual for contempt at the bar of the Senate,¹⁸⁰ this procedure gives the Senate the option of a civil action to enforce a subpoena.¹⁸¹ Civil enforcement might be employed when the Senate is more concerned with securing compliance with the subpoena or with clarifying legal issues than with punishing the contemnor. Unlike criminal contempt, in a civil enforcement, sanctions (imprisonment and/or a fine) can be imposed until the subpoenaed party agrees to comply thereby creating an incentive for compliance; namely, the termination of punishment.¹⁸² Since the statute's enactment in 1979, the Senate has authorized the Office of Senate Legal Counsel to seek civil enforcement of a subpoena for documents or testimony at least 6 times, the last in 1995. None has been against executive branch officials.

The civil enforcement process is arguably more expeditious than a criminal proceeding, where a court may more closely scrutinize congressional procedures and give greater weight to the defendant's constitutional rights. The civil enforcement procedure also provides an element of flexibility, allowing the subpoenaed party to raise possible constitutional and other defenses (e.g., the privilege against self-incrimination, lack of compliance with congressional procedures, or an inability to comply with the subpoena)¹⁸³ without risking a criminal prosecution.

(...continued) of and in the name of the United States
in any court of competent jurisdiction if the committee is of the opinion that the suit is
necessary to the adequate performance of the powers vested in it or the duties imposed upon
it by the Constitution, resolution of the Senate, or other law. Such suit may be brought and
prosecuted to final determination irrespective of whether or not the Senate is in session at the
time the suit is brought or thereafter. The committee may be represented in the suit either by
such attorneys as it may designate or by such officers of the Department of Justice as the
Attorney General may designate upon the request of the committee. No expenditures shall be
made in connection with any such suit in excess of the amount of funds available to the said
committee. As used in this resolution, the term "committee" means any standing or special
committee of the Senate, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, or the Senate
members of any joint committee. conduct of the executive branch official giving rise to the
contempt citation was not endorsed by the President, for example where an official
disregards a congressional subpoena to protect personal rather than institutional interests, the
criminal contempt provision may remain an effective avenue for punishing executive
officials. 28 U..C. §1365(a) (2012). The statutory exception was explained in the Senate's
Report as follows: This jurisdictional statute applies to a subpoena directed to any natural
person or employee of the US Government entity acting under color of state or local
authority and person acting outside of scope of authority in their prive persons . By the
specific terms of the jurisdictional statute, it does not apply to a subpoena directed to an
officer or employee of the Federal Government

GLOBAL ASSET FREEZE

Bilateral Mutual Legal Assistance Treaties (MLATs)

The most common formal procedure used by the United States to request or provide legal assistance in criminal matters is through a formal bilateral MLAT. An MLAT is a formal agreement, generally negotiated and approved by the ministries of justice and foreign ministries of both countries, which provides for the gathering of information in connection with the enforcement of the criminal laws of both countries. The United States currently has bilateral mutual legal assistance treaties with over 70 other countries and one with the European Union. Most of these MLAT agreements have provisions governing mutual legal assistance in confiscation or forfeiture matters as included in the enforcement of criminal laws. These provisions obligate parties to provide to each other formal assistance in the nature of restraint of property which is subject to confiscation, and to assist in the eventual confiscation of the property. Generally, an MLAT agreement will re.re a form of dual criminality, sometimes called dual forfeitability, for assistance to be available – in other words, that the conduct underlying the confiscation in Country A also subject the property located in Country B to forfeiture had the conduct occurred in Country B.2 MLAT's are often used to obtain financial records and to obtain search and seizure warrants or orders in a foreign country.

2. United Nations Conventions and Other Multilateral Treaties

For foreign partners with whom we do not have an MLAT, the U.S. will use the appropriate United Nations Convention, or, if preferred by the other country, a multilateral treaty such as the Inter-American Convention on Mutual Assistance in Criminal Matters, which has been in effect since 1992. Depending upon the relationship and the willingness of the other country, these Conventions may provide results as satisfactory as an MLAT.³

3. Informal Channels of Assistance

Often, near the beginning of an investigation, coercive powers are not yet needed, and some form of “informal assistance” may suffice to provide information helpful to the investigation. This term is generally used for assistance through channels outside of the formal MLA channels, often through direct communications between counterparts such as financial intelligence units (“FIU’s”), police, prosecutors or investigating magistrates sharing intelligence or data which is legally available to that agency through domestic databases.

The Camden Assets Recovery Inter-Agency Network (“CARIN”) is one such example of “an informal network of contacts and a co-operative group in all aspects of tackling the proceeds of crime.” See http://www.europol.europa.eu/publications/Camden_Assets_Recovery_Inter-Agency_Network/CARIN_Europol.pdf. CARIN’s membership consists of law enforcement and judicial authorities from the European Union and invited jurisdictions, and observer status is granted to several others. This organization began in October 2002 with a conference of the Criminal Assets Bureau of Ireland and Europol held at the Camden Court Hotel in Dublin, Ireland. CARIN has become an effective law enforcement tool used among member countries for the expedient sharing of information and use of multiple tools available for each jurisdiction to trace, freeze or seize, and confiscate the assets of international criminal organizations.

Such informal assistance can be exceedingly helpful to the process of asset recovery, particularly in the initial identification of other names used by the criminal targets, associates, and properties in the names of these individuals. Less formal contacts can often be the starting point for later formal requests. Informal assistance creates a dialogue which can produce invaluable information, but formal MLA will likely be needed to obtain documents and witness statement to be used in court as evidence. Following the informal assistance, if permitted, a draft of the formal MLA request can be sent to the other country to insure that the prre.sites are met. This practice can hopefully avoid time-consuming delays resulting from rejections of the request for failure to comply with treaty re.rements.

Vienna Convention (1988)

The UN Convention Against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances (“Vienna

Convention”) was adopted in 1988, and provides the basis for mutual assistance in drug trafficking cases. The Convention has been ratified by at least 175 countries, and most countries which provide mutual legal assistance have little difficulty providing assistance in drug cases. Article 5 of the Vienna Convention requires each State Party to enact domestic confiscation and freezing provisions for proceeds, instrumentalities and intended instrumentalities of drug offences, and to provide international assistance in these areas. The same article requires that financial records pertaining to such offenses be available to domestic and foreign investigators despite bank secrecy provisions.

Finally, Article 5(a) provides that “proceeds or property confiscated by a Party . . . shall be disposed of by that Party according to its domestic law and administrative procedures,” and Article 5(b)(ii) encourages the sharing of such confiscated assets with other Parties “on a regular or case-by-case basis” in accordance with domestic law or any applicable bilateral or multilateral agreements. Thus, although the Vienna Convention requires the provision of legal assistance such as evidence to other countries, and requires each State Party to provide for the confiscation of drug-related assets, it does not require that those assets be shared with other countries.⁷

3. UN Convention against Transnational Organized Crime (1999)

The UN Convention against Transnational Organized Crime (“UNTOC”) was signed in Palermo, Italy, in December 2000, and provides for a global response to combat serious international criminal activity, such as the trafficking in persons, arms and ammunition, and money laundering. This Convention, which has been ratified by at least 147 countries, also obligates States Parties to adopt domestic regimes to confiscate the proceeds, instrumentalities, and intended instrumentalities of offences covered by the Convention. These offences include certain specified crimes such as an organized criminal group, money laundering, corruption, obstruction of justice, and “serious crimes” which are transnational and punishable by imprisonment of over four years. The Convention also requires States Parties to criminalize the laundering of the proceeds of certain listed predicate crimes.

Article 13 of UNTOC governs the obligations of States Parties to each other in confiscation matters. It requires that the requested country “take measures to identify, trace and freeze or seize proceeds of crime” as well as instrumentalities “for the purpose of eventual confiscation to be ordered either by the requesting State Party or . . . by the requested State Party.” Such procedures must not prejudice the rights of “bona fide third parties.” Like the Vienna Convention, Article 14 provides that confiscated assets be disposed of under domestic law, but that “if so requested” a State Party should “give priority consideration to returning the confiscated proceeds of crime or property to the requesting State Party so that it can give compensation to the victims of the crime or return such proceeds of crime or property to their legitimate owners.” Sharing is encouraged, as well as contributions to intergovernmental bodies specializing in the fight against organized crime. Thus, under UNTOC, use of confiscated assets as restitution to victims of crime is a priority.

4. UN Convention against Corruption (2005)

The UN Convention against Corruption (“UNCAC”), signed in Merida, Mexico, in December 2003, provides an entirely different, and mandatory, scheme for the recovery and return of corruption proceeds. In further discussing the G8 and global initiative against grand corruption, this paper will cover these provisions in greater detail in a subsequent section. The UNCAC took effect in 2005, and has been ratified by over 137 States Parties.

United States’ Laws Governing U.S. Efforts to Confiscate and Recover Foreign Assets

United States prosecutors have authority to file either domestic civil or criminal forfeiture actions against property abroad. Under 28 U.S.C. § 1335(b), a civil forfeiture action may be filed against any foreign property which is subject to civil forfeiture under U.S. law. Case law has established that, in order to provide the U.S. district court with jurisdiction, the U.S. government must be able to demonstrate that the foreign government will cooperate in recognizing the forfeiture or in allowing the asset to be transferred to the United States. Under 21 U.S.C. § 853(l) and 18 U.S.C. § 982(b)(1), a U.S. district court can enter any criminal forfeiture order “without regard to the location of any property” which may be subject to forfeiture. Also, in a criminal forfeiture proceeding, a U.S. court may order a defendant, under 21 U.S.C. § 853(e)(4) to repatriate any foreign assets to the United States. Such repatriation should occur only if permitted by the foreign government and if not in violation of any restraining order which the foreign government has enforced on behalf of the U.S. Further, if a criminal defendant agrees to plead guilty pursuant to an agreement, the agreement will contain a provision by which the defendant agrees to repatriate the foreign-based property back to the U.S. for forfeiture. The plea agreement may also contain a provision by which the defendant agrees to the appointment of a representative in the foreign country to assist in the confiscation and litigation of the

property. Also, the United States will often add to an Extradition Treaty request a request that any valuable property which is found on or near the defendant when he or she is arrested be returned to the United States with the person.

Dated:

Respectfully Submitted

I certify and/or Declare and/or state under penalty and perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed 21th day of May 2015 in New York, New York.

By: (Specialty Investment Group L.L.C., a Georgia Company,
It's Managing Member and/or Founder)
By: (Specialty Global Investments Inc., a Nevada Corporation,
Its President and/or Chief Executive Office (C.E.O.) and/or Founder)
By: (Bridgewater & Company Inc. a California Corporation [James S. Bridgewater – C.E.O. and/or President and Director son of Sharon Bridgewater])
Its Secretary and/or Treasurer
By: (B & B Building Maintenance INC. a Michigan Corporation)
Its President and/or Chief Executive Office (C.E.O.) and/or Founder
By: (The Coalition for Empowerment [formerly Greater Lansing Helping Hands] a 501-C-3 Non-profit Organization Its Founder and Executive Director)
By:

Name: Sharon Bridgewater
Title: President and/or Chief Executive Officer (C.E.O.) and/or Founder
And/or Managing Member and/or Officer and/or Executive Director and/or Treasurer and/or Secretary
Counsel for one or more of the above[DISSOLVED] companies
Plaintiff and/or Petitioner
12070 W. Outer Drive
Detroit, MI 48223
Sbridge11@yahoo.com

Sharon Bridgewater individually
PLAINTIFF AND/OR PETITIONER
Class Representative and/or Counsel– Pro Se

12070 W. Outer Drive
Detroit, MI 48223
1-313-375-0351
Sbridge11@yahoo.com

UNITED STATES EX REL SHARON BRIDGEWATER
PRIVATE ATTORNEY GENERAL AND QUI TAM
RELATOR Counsel for “UNITED STATES-50
STATES(PEOPLE OF THE 50 STATES” AND THOSE
SIMILARLY SITUTATED)- PLAINTIFFS AND/OR
PETITIONERS
12070 W. Outer Drive
Detroit, MI 48223
Sbridge11@yahoo.com

MEM AND POINTS

CONSTITUTION RULES OVER STATUTES

“The constitution is intended for the observance of the judiciary as well as other departments of government and the judges and all public official including the US President and US Attorney General are sworn to support its provisions, the courts are not at liberty to overlook or disregard its commands or counteract evasions thereof, it is their duty in authorized proceedings to give full effect to the existing constitution and to obey all constitutional provisions irrespective of their opinion as to the wisdom or the desirability of such provisions and irrespective of the consequences, thus it is said that the courts should be in our alert to enforce the provisions of the United States Constitution and guard against their infringement by legislative fiat or otherwise in accordance with these basic principles, the rule is 90 fixed that the duty in the proper case to declare a law unconstitutional cannot be declined and must be performed in accordance with the delivered judgment of the tribunal before which the validity of the enactment it is directly drawn into question. If the Constitution prescribes one rule and the statute the another in a different rule, it is the duty of the courts to declare that the Constitution and not the statute governs in cases before them for judgment.” **[16Am Jur 2d., 95 Sec. 155:, emphasis added]**

III - SUPREMACY CLAUSE

“The Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every state shall be bound thereby, anything in the

100 Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.” [US Constitution] “... Thus, the particular phraseology of the constitution of the United States confirms and strengthens the principle, supposed to be essential to all written constitutions, that a law repugnant to the constitution is void, and that courts, as well as other departments, are bound by that instrument.” after more than 200 years this decision still stands [Marbury v. Madison 5 U.S. 137 (1803)]

IV - COMMON LAW IS STILL LAW OF THE LAND

All cases which have cited Marbury v. Madison case, to the Supreme Court has not ever been over turned. [See Shephard's Citation of Marbury v. Madison.] The constitution was ordained and established by the people “for” the United States of America aka government. The government was created by an act of the people therefore the creation cannot trump the creator. *“If any statement, within any law, which is passed, § unconstitutional, the whole law is unconstitutional.”* [Marbury v. Madison: 5 US 137 (1803):] Therefore no legislation ... that statutes which would deprive a citizen of the rights of person or property without a regular trial, according to the course and usage of common law, would not be the law of the land. [Hoke vs. Henderson, 15, N.C.15,25 AM Dec 677]. "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]

V - INTERPRETATION IN FAVOR OF THE PEOPLE

Any constitutional provision intended to confer a benefit should be liberally construed in favor in the clearly intended and expressly designated beneficiary. *“Then a constitution should receive a literal interpretation in favor of the Citizen, is especially true, with respect to those provisions which were designed to safeguard the liberty and security of the Citizen in regard to person and property.”* [16Am Jur 2d: 16Am Jur 2d., Sec. 97; Bary v. United States - 273 US 128]

VII - CONSTITUTIONS MUST BE CONSTRUED TO REFERENCE THE COMMON LAW - SUMMARY PROCEEDINGS ARE NULL AND VOID

“As to the construction, with reference to Common Law, an important canon of construction is that constitutions must be construed to reference to the Common Law.” The Common Law, so permitted destruction of the abatement of nuisances by summary proceedings^{s6} and is was never supposed that a constitutional provision was intended to interfere with this established principle 145 and although there is no common

VIII - SHALL NOT INFRINGE

"Various facts of circumstances extrinsic to the constitution are often resorted to, by the courts, to aid them and determining its meaning, as previously noted however, such extrinsic aids may not be resorted to where the provision in the question is clear and unambiguous in such a case 155 the courts must apply the terms of the constitution as written and they are not at liberty to search for meanings beyond the instrument." [16Am Jur 2d., Sec. 117:]

X - SUPREME LAW IS THE BASES OF ALL LAW - ALL FICTION OF LAW IS NULL

Nisi prius courts relies on statutes, which is fiction of law, that seeks to control⁷ the behavior of the sovereign⁸ people⁹ of New York, who are under common law, not statutes, 170 and who ordained and established¹⁰ the law, therefore legislators cannot legislate the behavior of the people. "No provision of the Constitution is designed to be without effect," "Anything that is in conflict is null and void of law", "Clearly, for a secondary law to come in conflict with the supreme Law was illogical, for certainly, the supreme Law would prevail over all other laws and certainly our forefathers had intended that the supreme Law would be the bases of all law and for any law to law, no courts are bound to uphold it, and no Citizens are bound to obey it. It operates as a near nullity or a fiction of law." "All codes, rules, and regulations are for government authorities only, not human/Creators in accordance come in conflict would be null and void of law, it would bare no power to enforce, in 180 would bare no obligation to obey, it would purport to settle as if it had never existed, for unconstitutionality would date from the enactment of such a law, not from the date so branded in an open court of with God's laws. All codes, rules, and regulations are unconstitutional and lacking due process..." [Rodriques v. Ray Donavan]

XI - NO ONE IS BOUND TO OBEY AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL LAW NO COURTS ARE BOUND¹⁹⁰ TO ENFORCE IT

"The general rule is that a unconstitutional statute, whether Federal or State, though having the form and name of law as in reality no law, but is wholly void and ineffective for any purpose since unconstitutionality dates from the enactment and not merrily from the date of the decision so braining it. An unconstitutional law in legal contemplation is as inoperative as if it never had 195 been passed. Such a statute lives a question that is purports to settle just as it would be had the

statute not ever been enacted. No repeal of an enactment is necessary, since an unconstitutional law is void. The general principles follows that it imposes no duty, converse no rights, creates no office, bestows no power of authority on anyone, affords no protection and justifies no acts performed under it. A contract which rests on a unconstitutional statute creates no obligation to 200 be impaired by subsequent legislation. No one is bound to obey an unconstitutional law. No courts are bound to enforce it. Persons convicted and fined under a statute subsequently held

unconstitutional may recover the fines paid. A void act cannot be legally inconsistent with a valid one and an unconstitutional law cannot operate to supersede an existing valid law. Indeed, in so far as a statute runs counter to the fundamental law of the land, it is superseded thereby. 205 *Since an unconstitutional statute cannot repeal, or in anyway effect an existing one, if a repealing statute is unconstitutional, the statute which it attempts to repeal, remains in full force and effect and where a statute in which it attempts to repeal remains in full force and effect and where a clause repealing a prior law is inserted in the act, which act is unconstitutional and void, the provision of the repeal of the prior law will usually fall with it and will not be permitted 210 to operate as repealing such prior law. The general principle stated above applied to the constitution as well as the laws of the several states insofar as they are repugnant to the constitution and laws of the United States."* [16Am Jur 2d., Sec. 256:]

XII - CONGRESS CANNOT ALTER RIGHT

Congress cannot by authorization or ratification give the slightest effect to a state law or constitution which is in conflict with the Constitution of the United States." [16Am Jur 2d., Sec. 258]

LYNCH ACTS OR OMISSIONS(ACTS OR REFUSE TO ACT)

XIII – ALL NOMINATION, APPOINTMENTS, CONFIRMATION

MUST _____