

JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT

This court have universal jurisdiction which allow the “50 States” ex rel Sharon Bridgewater Private Attorney General to prosecute individuals(Foreign Heads of State and their co-conspirators) for their conspiracy with Kamala Harris in her Official Capacity as San Francisco District Attorney General and/or Successive Capacities and for serious international crimes, committed outside their territory, such as genocide, war crimes, and crimes against humanity, which have affected and continues to affect the international community as a whole, and thus “50 States” ex rel Sharon Bridgewater Private Attorney General have a duty to prosecute or extradite all perpetrators. Kamala Harris in her “defacto” official capacity as Vice President(previous capacity Sa Joe Biden Donald Trump in his official capacity as President in his official capacity et al at all times herein mentioned, is an Corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Virginia and/or Delaware and/or Maryland with principle offices located at 1600 Pennsylvania Ave. NW, Washington, DC in the County of Fairfax. Biden, Harris, and/or Trump are a citizen of Virginia, Maryland and/or Delaware and his directors, subsidiaries, affiliates, agents, servants, employees, successors, attorneys, and assigns, and any other persons or entities under his control, and each of them, and all persons and entities in active concert of participation with Trump, including but not limited to Jeff Sessions in his official capacity as United States Attorney General, John Kelly in his official capacity as Director of Homeland Security, Thomas E. Brandon in his official capacity as Acting Director of the United States Bureau of the Alcohol, Tobacco and FireArms and Explosives(ATF), his directors, subsidiaries, affiliates, agents, servants, employees, successors, attorneys, and assigns, and any other persons or entities under his control, and each of them, and all persons and entities in active concert of participation with Trump are citizens of the state of Virginia and/or Maryland and/or Delaware. Sharon Bridgewater and James Shannon Bridgewater are citizens of the State of Michigan. There is an complete diverse in federal citizenship. Sharon Bridgewater further allege that the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000.00, exclusive of costs, expenses, interests, and fees, for purposes of invoking and establishing federal diversity of citizenship subject matter jurisdiction under Title 28 United States Code §§ 1332(a)(1),(2), and 1332(b). This court further have jurisdiction pursuant to one or more 42 U.S.C. Sections 1983, 1985, 1986, 1988, the 5th, 9th, 10th, and/or 14th, 42 USC Section 2000 a-1,2 and/or 3, 42 USC Section 2000e and/or 42 USC section 2000e, 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and/or 2202. Allege admiralty and maritime claim, exterritorial jurisdiction AND/OR jurisdiction over the subject matter of this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1331. This Court has one or more personal jurisdiction over the defendants because that section authorizes nationwide service of process and because all the defendants have at least minimum contacts with the United States, and can be found in, reside, or transact or have transacted, business in the District of Columbia. This court has “further,” jurisdiction in personam over Kamala Harris in her official capacity as San Francisco District Attorney for California(and successive capacities) and has authority to issue a Writ of Quo Warranto against Kamala Harris in her official capacity as San Francisco District Attorney for California(and successive capacities)for her exercising her executive powers contrary to the “50 States Constitution,” and/or the United States Constitution, and all writs necessary to the complete

exercise of its jurisdiction” 1651 “All Writs;” that are (1) arbitrary, capricious, and/or is an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law and contrary to the United States Constitution. constitutional right, power, privileges, or immunity; (3) in excess of statutory jurisdiction and to de novo review Statutory interpretation of contracts (breach of contracts) premised to be within the admiralty and maritime jurisdiction of this United States District Court of Columbia; and this court has jurisdiction in personam jurisdiction to de novo review Statutory interpretation of contracts (breach of contracts) and actions of Kamala Harris and/or Biden, Barry Soerthos (Barak H. Obama), Trump, Bush, and Clinton. All Writs Statute at 28 U.S.C. § 1651. One or more 28 USC sections 1333 to 1364. Defendants transact business and can be found within this district, and that is a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claims occurred, or a substantial part of property that is the subject matter is situated within, this district. Plaintiffs allege that the nature of the controversy arising between The RICO plaintiffs and the RICO defendants is a controversy between parties Completely diverse in federal citizenship, inasmuch as plaintiffs are citizens of the State of Michigan and defendant Kamala Harris, Merrick Garland, Trump and/or Barak H. Obama [AKA Barry Soerthos] are citizens of the states of Delaware and/or Maryland and/or Virginia and Plaintiffs further allege that the amount in controversy exceeds \$ 5,000,000,000, million 75,000.00, exclusive of costs, expenses, interests, and fees, for purposes of invoking and establishing federal diversity of citizenship subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to Title 28 United States Code §§ 1332(a)(1),(2), and 1332(b). via torts committed in violation of one or more treaties of the United States and jurisdiction to protect trade and commerce against restraints and monopolies, unfair competition, unfair business practices, admiralty and maritime claim within the meaning of 9(h) Special Maritime Jurisdiction, Extra-territorial Jurisdiction., one or more: 42 USC Section 2000a-1, 42 USC Section 2000 a-2 , 42 USC Section 2000 a-3, 42 USC Section 2000 e-2 42 USC section 2000d , 42 USC section 2000b, 42 USC Section 2000h-1, 2000h-2, 42 USC section 2000h-2, 42 USC section 2000e-2, 1651 “All Writs,” Habeas one or more 2241, 2254 or 2255, and/or 42 U.S.C. Sections 1983, 1985, 1986, 1988, 28 USC section 2403(a), and/or the Constitution of the United States of America, as well as the First, Second, Fourth, Fifth, sixth, eighth, thirteenth and Fourteenth Amendments This is an admiralty and maritime claim within the meaning of 9(h), and further to enjoin “directors, agent, etc., acting under the Direction under the Direction of Barak Obama relating to national and/or international banks. This District of Columbia also have jurisdiction pursuant to D.C.Code § 16-3501 and/or Under § 16-3502, and/or under D.C.Code § 16-3503, to issue writs of Quo Warranto-Against Officers of the United States from this District Court for the District of Columbia in the name of the United States against Kamala Harris and other co-conspirators Loretta E. Lynch et al a person who within the District of Columbia usurps, intrudes into, or unlawfully holds or exercises, a franchise conferred by the United States or a public office of the United States, civil or military. Venue in this district is proper under 1965(a) and/or 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391. The Plaintiff is informed and believes and therefore alleges that none of the officers of the Defendant is now within this District and that the Defendant does not maintain an office within this district but that there are now or will be during the pending of this action certain goods, chattels, credits and effects belong to or claimed by the Defendant within this District, to with; tangible and/or in tangible property, and during all times mentioned herein, Defendant ,Kamala Harris Barak H. Obama in his official capacity as United States President, were and now are corporations existing under and by virtue of the laws of the United States Constitution and in some manner as yet unascertained and are being sued herein by fictitious

names their true name being unknown to the Plaintiff. Further, this is a special maritime time and/or admiralty jurisdiction and to review by mandamus and/or by common law certiorari the administrative decision and/or actions of Loretta Lynch in her official capacity as United States Attorney General. (4) dismissal of complaint by the Petitioners/Appellant/Claimant/Plaintiff; (5) contempt of court via “this court orders;” and/or other courts thru out the United States; (6) and to declare the rights, duties and liabilities of parties. Merrick Garland in his official Capacity as United States Attorney General United States of United States Department of Justice, 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C.20530-0001, “class representative,” is a citizen of Delaware and/or Virginia and/or Maryland and at all times herein mentioned has been a public entity and an incorporated and/or duly authorized and existing as such in and under the laws of the United States Constitution.(is sovereign) with her principle place of business and/or office located at 950 Penn Sylvania Street, Washington, DC is found, resides and/or conduct resides and/or conduct business in this District of Columbia. Sharon Bridgewater is a citizen of Detroit, MI, address is 18592 Dale Street, Detroit, Michigan. There is complete diversity of Citizenship between Lynch and Bridgewater and subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to Title 28 United States Code §§ 1332(a)(1),(2), and 1332(b) the amounts in controversy exceeds \$75,000.000. Further jurisdiction is invoked pursuant to 42 U.S.C. Sections 1983, 1985, 1986, 1988, D.C.Code § 16–3501 and/or Under § 16–3502, and/or under D.C.Code § 16–3503, to issue Writs of Quo Warranto, against Merrick Garland who usurps, intrudes into, or unlawfully holds or exercises the Office of the United States Attorney General; one or more: 42 USC Section 2000a-1, 42 USC Section 2000 a-2 , 42 USC Section 2000 a-3, 42 USC section 2000d; one or more 2241, 2254 or 2255, Habeas Corpus Jurisdiction, and further jurisdiction is invoked pursuant to one or more 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 28 USC sections 1333 to 1364; the second ninth, tenth, and fourteenth amendments thereto. This Court has authority to issue a declaratory judgment and order other relief that is just and proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202. Defendant Merrick Garland and/or Kamala Harris is “not within,” the District of Eastern Michigan (the District in which the Petitioner/Plaintiff/Claimant resides), but there are now or will be during the pending of this action certain goods, chattels, credits and effects be longingly to or claimed by the Defendant within this District to wit and further has venue as follows: The United States Government has paid Loretta Lynch in this District to perform duties as required of the United States Attorney General. Via employment thru the Government; and for services to be conducted in good faith. As required under the controlling terms of the contract Lynch has failed to do her legal duties and further have violated the Petitioners civil rights. Lynch is liable the Plaintiff in the same manner and to the same extent, and other actions and because part of the transaction out of which this claim arises took part in this District Court of Columbia; and further Jurisdiction of this Court is invoked pursuant to: (i) 28 U.S.C. §1331, (ii) 28 U.S.C. and further, §1343(a), and (iii) D.C. Code, Division II, Title 16, Chapter 35. Complete Diversity of Citizen exist between Barak H. Obama and/or Loretta Lynch and This court has jurisdiction pursuant to 1291(Final orders and judgment of the State Court, or final decision which ends the litigation on the merits and with “leave nothing for the court to do but execute Judgment. “and Anti-injunction Act USC section 22831 section 28 USC section 1651(a) all Writs (Writ

1 (the following exceptions- to issue injunction to stay proceedings in a state court expressly authorized by Act of Congress, or where necessary in aid of its jurisdiction or to protect of effectuate its judgments; 2) to prevent State courts form continuing to hear matters which have

of Quo Warranto, Writs of Habeas), Anti-injunction act, and the declare the rights and duties of the parties Merrick Garland and Bridgewater (Class Representatives) “The 50 United States” ex rel Sharon Bridgewater Private Attorney General and/or Qui Tam Relator, The amount in controversy exceeds 5,000,000,000 million dollars. And even further, this court have jurisdiction under the Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) pursuant to FRCP rule 23 which is brought by 1 or more representative persons(Sharon Bridgewater), on behalf of herself and others similarly situated. The class exceeds 2,000,000 members. The amount in controversy exceeds the sum or value of \$5,000,000 and the parties are minimally diverse pursuant to §1332(d) (2): DC CODE. This court has jurisdiction pursuant to the Federal Declaratory Judgment Act(38 USC section 2201), in a case of actual controversy between the Plaintiff “The United States ex rel Sharon Bridgewater Private Attorney General and/or Qui Tam Relator(Claimant et al)”and this is an admiralty and/or maritime complaint e meaning o of Rule 9(h) with respect to one or more of the following remedies: Maritime time attachment and garnishment. Actions in rem. Habeas Corpus Jurisdiction, and all writs!

Extraterritorial Jurisdiction

The court has extraterritorial jurisdiction to exercise authority beyond it normal boundries for crimes or overt acts committed by Foreign Officials in their official capacity and individually in respect of things that they did outside that country.

been removed to federal court and to enjoin state suits in cases of real property dispute where a federal claim is filed first or to prevent parties who have lost in federal litigation from seeking hearing of their cases in state court or the Civil rights Act(42 USC section 1983 and/or 42 USC section 1985(3)).