

I, THE TREASURER OF THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY, DO HEREBY
CERTIFY THAT

MADISON MORRISON

THE OFFICER WHOSE NAME IS SUBSCRIBED TO THE
CERTIFICATE OF ACKNOWLEDGEMENT, PROOF OR AFFIDAVIT
ATTACHED TO THE ANNEXED INSTRUMENT, WAS AT THE TIME
OF TAKING SAID ACKNOWLEDGEMENT, PROOF OR AFFIDAVIT
A NOTARY PUBLIC, IN AND FOR THE STATE OF NEW
JERSEY, DULY COMMISSIONED AND SWORN AND WAS, AS
SUCH, AN OFFICER OF SAID STATE, DULY AUTHORIZED BY
THE LAWS THEREOF TO TAKE AND CERTIFY THE SAME, AS
WELL AS TO TAKE AND CERTIFY THE PROOF AND
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF DEEDS AND OTHER INSTRUMENTS IN
WRITING TO BE RECORDED IN SAID STATE, AND THAT FULL
FAITH AND CREDIT ARE AND OUGHT TO BE GIVE TO HIS
OFFICIAL FACTS.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I HAVE
HEREUNTO SET MY HAND AND AFFIXED
MY OFFICIAL SEAL AT TRENTON, THIS
9TH DAY OF JUNE 2025



Elizabeth Maher Muoio
State Treasurer

Certificate Number: 8512149588

Verify this certificate at
<https://www.njportal.com/DOR/businessrecords/Validate.aspx>

IN THE CENTRAL MUNICIPAL COURT OF ATLANTIC COUNTY

2 5905 Main Street, Mays Landing, New Jersey State, America, united States.

[Zone Improvement Plan: NJ-08330]

4 Case No. 24-18260

5 PARTIES

6 **Devon Tyler** of the Barber-Materio Family

7 (also known as Devon Tyler, acting in personal capacity and as a religious
8 office holder of Solis Holdings Inc., DBA Frontier Forever)

9 Petitioner

10 Township of Hamilton, Township of Hamilton Police Department, Officer

11 Boyd, et al.,

12 *Respondents*

**13 NOTICE OF DEMURRER, ABATEMENT, AND MOTION FOR WRIT OF QUO
14 WARRANTO, DECLARATORY RELIEF, AND EQUITABLE REMEDY**

15 TO THE HONORABLE JUDICIAL BRANCH AT THE CENTRAL

16 MUNICIPAL COURT FOR ATLANTIC COUNTY:

17 Please take notice that Devon Tyler, the petitioner herein, will present an
18 abatement followed by a motion to the Honorable Judicial Branch at the
19 Central Municipal Court of Atlantic County, located at 5905 Main Street, Mays
20 Landing, NJ 08330. The specific courtroom and time for this abatement and
21 subsequent motion will be designated upon the assignment of a judge.

22 **Nature of the Case:** This document outlines the procedural and
23 foundational inaccuracies of the case initiated by the respondents. It
24 challenges the jurisdiction of this court over Devon Tyler, a National Christian
25 man living by divine laws as codified within Christian Common Law, which
26 operates independently of the conventional statutory framework.

Abatement Justification: The initiation of proceedings against Devon
Tyler fails to meet the procedural standards set forth by Christian Common

29 Law, particularly concerning proper party identification and standing. These
30 failures warrant an abatement of the case.

31 **Jurisdictional Challenge:** As a man born naturally in New Jersey State
32 and living outside any federal zones, Devon Tyler asserts that his governance is
33 strictly under Christian Common Law. He is not subject to the jurisdiction of
34 this or any other secular court without explicit consent, which has not been
35 granted. This stance is supported by historical legal precedents that
36 differentiate between geographical jurisdictions and the rights therein.

37 **Faith-Based Legal Authority:** The authority of Christian faith imbues
38 Devon Tyler with a divine mandate, impacting legal engagement and exempting
39 him from secular legal processes that fail to recognize or infringe upon his
40 constitutionally and divinely guaranteed rights.

41 **Subsequent Motion:** This abatement precedes a motion that scrutinizes
42 the moral and legal foundations of the respondents' authority to enforce laws
43 upon Devon Tyler. It focuses particularly on violations of constitutional rights,
44 religious freedoms, and the principles of Christian Common Law, including but
45 not limited to those upheld by the Religious Freedom Restoration Act (RFRA).

46 **The motion raises critical questions regarding the following:**

- 47 - The legitimacy of the force used.
- 48 - Adherence to constitutional protections.
- 49 - Respect for religious beliefs.

50 **Relief Sought:** The petitioner seeks the following reliefs:

51 **1. Recognition of Abatement,**

52 **2. Writ of Quo Warranto,**

53 **3. Declaratory Relief,**

54 **4. Equitable Remedies:** As deemed just and necessary by a competent
55 Christian Common Law Tribunal.

56 The egregious breaches of constitutional rights and fundamental liberties
57 perpetrated by the respondents, highlighted by their disregard for the specific

58 legal status and rights of Devon Tyler as a Christian National, necessitate this
 59 abatement followed by judicial intervention. This intervention aims to correct
 60 these injustices and uphold the principles of liberty, justice, and personal
 61 sovereignty under Christian Common Law.

62 **Table of Contents**

Section	Description
I. Introduction	Substantiates the abatement and motion, emphasizing severe violations by Officer Boyd and historical legal precedents, calling for judicial intervention to uphold principles of liberty and justice.
II. Demurrer to Respondents' Anticipated Defenses	Challenges the legal basis of anticipated defenses, citing lack of probable cause and unconstitutional actions, with support from Supreme Court rulings.
III. Parties	Details on Devon Tyler, defending constitutional and divine rights, highlighting advocacy against overreach and constitutional mandates.
IV. Facts	Describes an unlawful stop and search incident, leading to excessive force and significant harm, emphasizing constitutional and religious rights violations.
V. Questions Presented	Examines the legality of Officer Boyd's actions under quo warranto principles, questioning the justification of the use of force and constitutional breaches.
VI. Supreme Court Jurisprudence Supporting the Motion	Utilizes major Supreme Court cases to challenge the legality of the force used and procedural conduct, arguing for judicial review and corrective action.
VII. Statement Section	Critically examines the actions of Officer Boyd, assessing the legality and constitutional appropriateness of detention and use of force.
VIII. Relief Sought	Seeks comprehensive remedies including equitable subrogation, declaratory judgments, and compensatory damages to rectify violations and prevent future misconduct.
IX. Conclusion	Synthesizes arguments, stressing the need for judicial oversight to correct constitutional violations and uphold civil liberties.
X. Certificate of Service	Confirms that all legal documents have been properly served to involved parties, ensuring procedural compliance.

XI. Exhibits	Detailed list of exhibits from A to I, each underscoring different aspects of the petitioner's positions supporting the motion's foundational themes.
XII. Case Law Citations	This section provides the foundational legal precedents supporting the arguments in this motion. The cited cases address crucial issues of excessive force, constitutional protections, procedural justice, and religious freedoms.

Exhibit
Exhibit A: Frontier Inn Sanctuary
Exhibit B: Divine Law & U.S. Constitution Sovereignty Insights
Exhibit C: Frontier Forever: Sustainable Homestead & Heirloom Seed Preservation
Exhibit D: Philosophical Insights
Exhibit E: The Timeless Message of Hope, Love, and Redemption
Exhibit F: Constitution for these United States in America(s)
Exhibit G: Government Integrity
Exhibit H: Power of Attorney, Status Declaration, and Copyright Trademark Assignment
Exhibit I: Documentation of Bodily Harm to Petitioner and Damage to Property

63 **SS/ss:** New Jersey State, Atlantic County

64 **AFFIDAVIT IN SUPPORT OF MOTION WITH PETITION FOR A WRIT OF**
65 **QUO WARRANTO, DECLARATORY RELIEF, AND OTHER EQUITABLE**
66 **REMEDIES**

67 I, Devon Tyler of the Barber-Materio Family, under SOLIS HOLDINGS
68 INC DBA Frontier Forever, residing at 325 East Jimmie Leeds Road, Suite 7,
69 Unit 333, Galloway Township, New Jersey State, being duly sworn, depose and
70 say:

71 **I. INTRODUCTION**

72 This affidavit underpins the motion for a writ of quo warranto,
73 declaratory relief, and other equitable remedies arising from the severe
74 violations committed by Officer Boyd and associated respondents, as detailed
75 herein. Rooted deeply in the jurisprudential heritage that "**once manumitted,**
76 **forever free,**" this petition draws upon the enduring wisdom of Sir Edward
77 Coke and the robust protections afforded by cases such as **Grosjean v.**
78 **American Press Co., Inc.**, 297 U.S. 233 (1936) and **People v. Croswell**, 3
79 Johns. Cas. 337 (N.Y. 1804). These precedents underscore the sanctity of free
80 expression and the press, which are foundational pillars of liberty and justice.

81 Grounded in the principles of justice highlighted by the landmark
82 decision in **Marbury v. Madison** (1803), which nullifies any actions
83 contravening the Constitution, this petition stands as an unwavering
84 denunciation of the flagrant abuses perpetrated by the respondents. Inspired
85 by Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.'s axiom that "**Injustice anywhere is a threat to**
86 **justice everywhere,**" the motion addresses the respondents' misuse of
87 authority, employing force without justification, and failing to adhere to the
88 dictates of diligent and lawful police work. Such actions not only breach civil
89 liberties but also challenge the foundational truths held by figures such as
90 James Madison and Dan Smoot regarding the preservation of a constitutional
91 republic against the distortions of pure democracy.

92 Further, this motion is driven by a commitment to the principles of
93 personal liberty and self-reliance, echoing the philosophies of Blackstone,
94 Burlamaqui, and the divine natural law that cherishes individual choice and
95 stewardship as sacrosanct. It seeks not merely to hold the respondents
96 accountable but to mandate that the judiciary acts as trustees and fiduciaries,
97 ensuring justice that is not only executed but manifestly observed, thus
98 affirming the court's role in safeguarding constitutional freedoms against any
99 form of tyranny.

100 In alignment with the leniency affirmed by **Haines v. Kerner** for pro se
101 pleadings, this petition emphasizes substance over procedural formality,
102 advocating for a legal system that respects and protects the rights of all
103 individuals, regardless of their proficiency in legal matters. This stance is
104 supported by further Supreme Court decisions such as **Erickson v. Pardus**
105 and **Estelle v. Gamble**, which underscore the court's duty to liberally construe
106 pro se filings to ensure justice is not compromised by procedural technicalities.
107 This petition is a call to action for judicial scrutiny that adheres to the just and
108 sacred principles endorsed by divine guidance, as articulated by President J.
109 Reuben Clark and other revered scholars. This approach seeks to restore the
110 petitioner's rights, address the injustices suffered, and reaffirm the
111 constitutional principles that anchor our nation's values, thus ensuring that
112 even those without legal representation receive a fair opportunity to have their
113 grievances addressed effectively within our judicial system.

114 **II. DEMURRER TO RESPONDENTS' ANTICIPATED DEFENSES**

115 **Basis for Demurrer**

116 **1. Absence of Probable Cause:**

117 **Case Reference:** **Terry v. Ohio**, 392 U.S. 1 (1968)

118 **Legal Principle:** Establishes that "stop and frisk" must be based on
119 reasonable suspicion of criminal activity.

120 **Application:** Officer Boyd lacked reasonable suspicion to detain me, making

121 the stop unconstitutional under **Terry** standards.

122 **2. Excessive Force and Physical Harm:**

123 **Case Reference:** **Graham v. Connor**, 490 U.S. 386 (1989)

124 **Legal Principle:** All claims of excessive force in the context of an arrest,
125 investigatory stop, or other "seizure" of a free citizen should be analyzed under
126 the Fourth Amendment's "objective reasonableness" standard.

127 **Application:** The force used was not objectively reasonable given the absence
128 of any threat or resistance on my part, rendering it excessive under **Graham v.**
129 **Connor.**

130 **3. Violation of Due Process and Religious Rights:**

131 **Case Reference:** **Employment Division v. Smith**, 494 U.S. 872 (1990)

132 **Legal Principle:** Government actions that are neutral and generally
133 applicable need not be justified by a compelling governmental interest even if
134 they have the incidental effect of burdening a particular religious practice.

135 **Application:** However, my account contrasts sharply with **Employment**
136 **Division v. Smith**, as the targeted and excessive nature of the police response
137 directly burdened my religious exercise without any justifiable law enforcement
138 objective, calling for strict scrutiny under RFRA.

139 **4. Inadequacy of Qualified Immunity Defense:**

140 **Case Reference:** **Harlow v. Fitzgerald**, 457 U.S. 800 (1982)

141 **Legal Principle:** Government officials performing discretionary functions are
142 shielded from liability for civil damages insofar as their conduct does not
143 violate clearly established statutory or constitutional rights of which a
144 reasonable person would have known.

145 **Application:** The rights violated in this case are clearly established; thus, the
146 respondents cannot reasonably claim ignorance of the law, negating their
147 qualified immunity defense.

148 **WHEREFORE, I respectfully request the Court to:**

149 1. Reject all defenses offered by the respondents as insufficient to

150 overcome the detailed and substantiated claims of egregious constitutional
151 violations presented in this petition;

152 **2.** Grant the relief sought in the petitioner's motion, including a writ of
153 quo warranto, declaratory relief, and other equitable remedies as deemed
154 appropriate and just by this Court.

155 **III. PARTIES**

156 **1. Petitioner:**

157 Devon Tyler of the Barber-Materio Family, a man alive within the
158 geographical boundaries of New Jersey State, outside of any federal zones. This
159 distinction is pivotal, as upheld by **Downes v. Bidwell**, 182 U.S. 244 (1901),
160 where the U.S. Supreme Court recognized differences between incorporated
161 and unincorporated territories under U.S. sovereignty, implying a specific
162 recognition of rights depending on geographical distinctions.

163 Devon Tyler acts both in his capacity and as a religious office holder of Solis
164 Holdings Inc., doing business as Frontier Forever. The petitioner is deeply
165 committed to defending the divine and constitutional rights afforded to State
166 citizens under the Tenth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution, which reserves
167 to the states or to the people the powers not delegated to the United States by
168 the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States. This commitment includes
169 advocacy for the community's rights to freedom of expression, freedom of
170 religion, and protection against unjust governmental intrusion, as guaranteed
171 under the First Amendment.

172 In his advocacy, the petitioner leverages **Murphy v. Ramsey**, 114 U.S.
173 15 (1885), which articulates the profound respect for the family as a unit under
174 constitutional protection, and **Reynolds v. United States**, 98 U.S. 145 (1878),
175 which supports individual religious freedoms against broad governmental
176 powers. Devon Tyler's standing is further emphasized by **Boyd v. United**
177 **States**, 116 U.S. 616 (1886), where the Supreme Court ruled on the sanctity of
178 one's home and possessions against unreasonable searches and seizures,

179 reflecting his defense against any overreach affecting personal sovereignty and
180 liberty.

181 The petitioner's efforts are fundamentally rooted in the principle that
182 natural-born citizens living within their state's boundaries are entitled to the
183 full protection of rights under the state's constitution and the broader
184 framework of the U.S. Constitution, independent of federal encroachments or
185 administrative overlays.

186 **2. Respondents:**

187 **Officer Boyd** and the **Township of Hamilton Police Department** are
188 identified as the primary respondents in this matter. The **Township of**
189 **Hamilton**, recognized by Dun & Bradstreet D-U-N-S® Number: 045506342,
190 operates as a municipal corporation. It is entrusted with public safety and
191 community governance under the provisions of the New Jersey State
192 Constitution and is expected to function within a legal framework that upholds
193 civil liberties and ensures public accountability.

194 This case also implicates broader judicial oversight, including the
195 Municipal Court system of Hamilton Township and the Judiciary Courts of the
196 **State of New Jersey**. These bodies are indicated to have systemic issues, as
197 evidenced by their failure to properly address ongoing misconduct and enforce
198 the constitutional limits required of their officers. The Judiciary Courts of the
199 **State of New Jersey**, designated with Dun & Bradstreet D-U-N-S® Number:
200 362288813, are particularly noted for their corporate standing which mandates
201 significant transparency and governance obligations.

202 These judicial entities, along with the **State of New Jersey** (D-U-N-S®
203 Number: 067373258), the **County of Atlantic** (D-U-N-S® Numbers:
204 079497897 and 930474452), and the **Hamilton Township Police Sub Station**
205 (D-U-N-S® Number: 787804546), are discussed not in terms of individual fault
206 but as part of a systemic failure. This failure is to uphold duties enshrined by
207 law, thereby potentially breaching the duty to protect the constitutional rights

208 of the people they serve. Such systemic failures question their operational
209 integrity as governance bodies and as business entities regulated under
210 commercial law.

211 Additionally, the **Government of The United States**, holding a Dun &
212 Bradstreet D-U-N-S® Number: 161906193, is highlighted for its overarching
213 constitutional responsibilities that should permeate local governance but
214 appear compromised in this instance.

215 **Request for Systemic Review and Correction**

216 Through this abatement and motion, there is a call for these entities to
217 re-evaluate and correct their practices. This is an opportunity for these bodies
218 to address and rectify the systemic discrepancies and failures in duty
219 highlighted by this case. All legal rights and equitable remedies are expressly
220 reserved, ensuring that the pursuit of correction and accountability is
221 conducted within the full scope of legal protections afforded to the petitioner,
222 underscoring a commitment to constitutional fidelity and public trust.

223 **IV. FACTS**

224 **Unlawful Detention and Search**

225 On May 7th, 2024, while I was lawfully walking on the sidewalk near the
226 Mays Landing Walmart Supercenter, deeply engaged in a critical phone call,
227 Officer Boyd, without warning and with emergency lights activated, unlawfully
228 stopped me. He interrupted my call, causing immediate distress, and stated,
229 "I'm not gonna give you any tickets," acknowledging the absence of any legal
230 basis for the stop. Despite this, he demanded my identification and threatened
231 arrest, violating my Fourth Amendment rights against unreasonable searches
232 and seizures.

233 **Excessive Force and Resulting Harm**

234 The encounter quickly escalated as I was forcibly taken to the ground by
235 Officer Boyd and approximately three to four additional officers. This excessive
236 use of force resulted in significant physical and psychological harm. My

237 personal property was damaged, and I sustained injuries to my shoulders,
238 hips, and wrists, with the latter bleeding from the metal shackles applied. As a
239 sufferer of PTSD, this incident exacerbated my symptoms, impairing my ability
240 to engage in subsequent legal processes. The disproportionate and unjustified
241 force used was not only inhumane but also failed to consider my specific
242 mental health challenges.

243 **Violation of Constitutional and Religious Rights**

244 Throughout the encounter, my constitutional rights to privacy and
245 freedom from unreasonable searches and seizures, as guaranteed by the
246 Fourth Amendment, were egregiously violated. Moreover, as a religious office
247 holder and practitioner at SOLIS HOLDINGS INC DBA Frontier Forever, my
248 right to personal sovereignty and dignity, rooted in my religious beliefs, was
249 severely infringed. The officers' actions not only breached my civil liberties but
250 also violated my religious freedoms as protected under the Religious Freedom
251 Restoration Act (RFRA). This profound disrespect for my fundamental human
252 and religious rights underscores the necessity for judicial intervention to
253 prevent future violations.

254 **V. QUESTIONS PRESENTED**

255 **Legal Authority and Quo Warranto Principles**

256 What legal basis or authority justified Officer Boyd and the
257 accompanying officers in detaining the petitioner, and how is the level of force
258 used during this incident defended? Under the principles of quo warranto,
259 which require public officers to demonstrate valid authority to hold and
260 execute their roles, does their conduct align with or conflict with their lawful
261 authority? This question aims to determine whether their actions contravene
262 statutory and constitutional mandates sufficiently to call into question the
263 propriety of their continued occupancy of office.

264 **Violation of Constitutional Rights**

265 Did the conduct of Officer Boyd and the other involved officers constitute

266 a violation of the petitioner's Fourth Amendment rights against unreasonable
267 search and seizure, and potentially the Sixth Amendment right to a fair trial?
268 Moreover, was there a violation of the Fourteenth Amendment's guarantees of
269 due process and equal protection under the law? These inquiries assess how
270 such actions might affect their legal standing and authority to enforce the law.

271 **Infringement of Religious Freedoms**

272 Given the petitioner's established religious beliefs and practices, did the
273 actions of the law enforcement officers conflict with the protections afforded by
274 the Religious Freedom Restoration Act (RFRA) and applicable state laws? Does
275 this conflict necessitate a reconsideration of their authority to operate within
276 their current capacities?

277 **Establishment of Precedent for Natural Inhabitants' Rights**

278 What judicial precedents should be established or reinforced to
279 safeguard the constitutional and religious rights of all natural inhabitants
280 against similar infringements in the future? In addressing these questions, how
281 should the court consider the role and suitability of the officers involved to
282 continue in their official capacities?

283 **VI. Supreme Court Jurisprudence Supporting the Motion**

284 **1. Graham v. Connor**, 490 U.S. 386 (1989)

285 **Legal Principle:** Establishes that all claims of excessive force in the
286 context of an arrest or other "seizure" should be analyzed under the Fourth
287 Amendment's "objective reasonableness" standard. **Application in Case:** This
288 standard will assess whether Officer Boyd's actions were objectively
289 reasonable, focusing solely on the facts available at the time of the incident.

290 **2. Tennessee v. Garner**, 471 U.S. 1 (1985)

291 **Legal Principle:** Holds that deadly force to prevent the escape of an
292 unarmed fleeing suspect is unreasonable unless the officer has probable cause
293 to believe the suspect poses a significant threat. **Application in Case:** The
294 necessity and proportionality of the force used by Officer Boyd will be

294 scrutinized, given the absence of any immediate threat posed by the petitioner.

295 **3. Kingsley v. Hendrickson**, 576 U.S. 389 (2015)

296 **Legal Principle:** For pretrial detainees, the standard for excessive force
297 claims is whether the force used was objectively unreasonable. **Application in**
298 **Case:** Applies the objective unreasonableness standard, taking into account
299 only the information known to Officer Boyd at the time.

300 **4. Brown v. Texas**, 443 U.S. 47 (1979)

301 **Legal Principle:** Establishes that stops and requests for identification
302 must be based on reasonable suspicion supported by specific, articulable facts
303 of an observed or suspected crime. **Application in Case:** Officer Boyd's
304 justification for the stop will be evaluated to determine if there was a legitimate
305 basis for suspicion.

306 **5. Hiibel v. Sixth Judicial District Court of Nevada**, 542 U.S. 177 (2004)

307 **Legal Principle:** Affirms that officers can request ID only when there is
308 reasonable suspicion that the person stopped is involved in criminal activity.
309 **Application in Case:** The lawfulness of Officer Boyd's demand for identification
310 will be assessed based on what he reasonably suspected at the time of the
311 stop.

312 **VII. STATEMENT SECTION**

313 **Legal Basis for Detention and Use of Force**

314 The legality of the petitioner's detention by Officer Boyd is called into
315 question, lacking clear justification under established legal standards.
316 According to **Graham v. Connor**, all police actions, including detention, must
317 meet the "objective reasonableness" standard, grounded in the Fourth
318 Amendment. This section examines whether Officer Boyd's actions, in the
319 context of the facts at the time, adhered to these criteria.

320 **Constitutional Violations**

321 The application of force during the petitioner's detention raises
322 significant constitutional concerns. Under the doctrine outlined in **Tennessee**

323 **v. Garner**, the use of force, particularly when no immediate threat is evident,
324 must be scrutinized for its necessity and proportionality. This section explores
325 how the force used may have violated the constitutional protections against
326 unreasonable seizures, emphasizing the lack of any probable cause to justify
327 such measures.

328 **Application of Pretrial Detainee Rights**

329 For pretrial detainees, the standard of treatment is distinctly outlined in
330 **Kingsley v. Hendrickson**, which focuses on whether the force applied was
331 objectively unreasonable without regard to the subjective intent of the officers
332 involved. This discussion extends beyond mere legality, assessing whether the
333 use of force was excessive and unnecessary, thus violating the petitioner's
334 rights under the Fourteenth Amendment's due process clause.

335 **VIII. RELIEF SOUGHT**

336 In light of the violations identified and corroborated by Supreme Court
337 precedents, the Petitioner respectfully requests that the Court grant the
338 following reliefs:

339 **Equitable Subrogation:** To correct any inequities and prevent unjust
340 enrichment at the Petitioner's expense, the Petitioner seeks equitable
341 subrogation to assert the rights originally belonging to the Petitioner in
342 connection with all associated bonds, accounts, and financial instruments.
343 This relief aims to place the Petitioner in the rightful position of entitlement to
344 all benefits derived as if the Petitioner had always retained direct control over
345 these assets.

346 **Reservation of Rights:** The Petitioner explicitly reserves all rights to all
347 associated bonds, accounts, interest, proceeds, and other financial benefits,
348 both currently known and to be discovered in the future. This reservation is
349 made nunc pro tunc, effective from the inception of each bond or account's
350 creation, to ensure the protection and restitution of the Petitioner's interests
351 without prejudice to the continuous exercise of these rights.

352 **Additional Equitable Remedies:** The Petitioner seeks any other equitable
353 remedies that the Court deems just and necessary under the circumstances to
354 fully address and rectify the matters presented in this motion.

355 **Declaratory Judgment:** Confirming the unconstitutionality of the actions
356 taken against the Petitioner.

357 **Compensatory and Punitive Damages:** For the physical, emotional, and
358 spiritual/psychological injuries caused by the Respondents.

359 **Injunctive Relief:** To prevent future misconduct and to mandate training on
360 constitutional rights for the involved parties. Additionally, it is asserted that
361 the Township of Hamilton, County of Atlantic, and the State of New Jersey are
362 all complicit in committing libel, having facilitated and disseminated false
363 accusations that have unjustly damaged the petitioner's reputation and
364 standing.

365 **Policy Reform and Oversight:** Including the establishment of oversight
366 mechanisms to ensure adherence to constitutional standards and protection of
367 civil liberties.

368 These reliefs are sought to ensure that justice is served, constitutional
369 rights are upheld, and future violations of a similar nature are prevented. Each
370 remedy is requested to restore the Petitioner's rights, correct injustices, and
371 provide adequate oversight and compensation for the harm suffered.

372 **IX. CONCLUSION**

373 The documented conduct of Officer Boyd and associated enforcement
374 personnel raises significant concerns that necessitate decisive legal scrutiny to
375 uphold and reinforce constitutional protections. The principles established in
376 landmark cases such as **Graham v. Connor**, **Tennessee v. Garner**, **Kingsley**
377 **v. Hendrickson**, **Brown v. Texas**, and **Hiibel v. Sixth Judicial District Court**
378 **of Nevada** provide a robust framework for evaluating this incident, yet the
379 issues at stake transcend these individual precedents. This case underscores
380 the imperative of rigorous enforcement of the rule of law and highlights the

381 critical need for the protection of individual rights as enshrined in the
382 Constitution. It is incumbent upon the judicial system to address violations of
383 constitutional rights effectively, ensuring justice is served to prevent recurrence
384 and thereby safeguarding the civil liberties of all citizens. This approach will
385 bolster public trust in the legal system and affirm a commitment to equitable
386 justice and respect for fundamental rights.

387 Therefore, the petitioner respectfully requests this court to recognize the
388 abatement due to the significant jurisdictional and procedural flaws, issue a
389 writ of quo warranto, grant declaratory relief, and provide other equitable
390 remedies as deemed just and necessary by a competent Christian Common
391 Law tribunal. By doing so, the court will help correct these injustices, uphold
392 the principles of liberty and justice, and ensure that similar violations of
393 constitutional and religious rights are prevented in the future. This
394 intervention is crucial for maintaining the integrity of the legal system and
395 protecting the fundamental rights of all citizens.

396 **X. CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE & NOTARY JURAT**

397 I, Devon Tyler of the Barber née Materio Family, affirm that all
398 statements contained in this document are true, so help me God. Executed in
399 _____ New Jersey State, this ____ day of May 2024, under God.

400 X_____

401 **Notary Jurat**

402 Subscribed and affirmed before me this ____ day of May 2024, by Devon Tyler
403 Barber, who is personally known to me or has produced
404 _____ as identification to verify their identity.

405 Notary Signature: _____

406 Notary's Printed Name: _____

407 Title: Notary Public. My Commission Expires: _____

408 **Certificate of Service**

409 I hereby certify that on this __ day of __, 2024, I served a copy of this motion
410 and its accompanying documents to the clerks listed below for further
411 handling, in accordance with the rules of this court. Service was performed via
412 United States Postal Service Certified Mail, with care and supervision facilitated
413 by the Court Clerk.

414 **Addresses for Service:**

415 - **Rita Martino**, Township **Clerk**, 6101 13th Street, Mays Landing, NJ 08330
416 - **Joseph J. Giraldo**, County **Clerk**, Historic Courthouse Complex, 5901 Main
417 Street, Mays Landing, NJ 08330-1701

418 **Additionally, a copy was sent to:**

419 - Officer Boyd, Township of Hamilton Police Department, 6101 13th Street,
420 Mays Landing, NJ 08330.

421 **XI. EXHIBITS**

422 **Exhibit A:** Frontier Inn Sanctuary | Illustrates our organization's mission to
423 foster biodiversity and celebrate divine creation through sustainable practices,
424 highlighting our commitment to spiritual and ecological stewardship. Link:
425 [Frontier Inn Sanctuary](<https://www.faithfrontier.org/pages/frontier-inn-sanctuary>)

427 **Exhibit B:** Divine Law & U.S. Constitution: Sovereignty Insights | Discusses
428 the divine and constitutional principles that underpin individual sovereignty,
429 emphasizing the sacred trust breached by fiduciary malpractice, reflective of
430 our foundational religious and legal tenets. Link: [Divine Law & U.S.
431 Constitution](<https://www.faithfrontier.org/pages/divinetrust>)

432 **Exhibit C:** Frontier Forever: Sustainable Homestead & Heirloom Seed
433 Preservation | Details our commitment to the divine guardianship of Earth's
434 bounty, linking sustainable agricultural practices with scriptural stewardship

433 to nourish both body and spirit. Link: [Frontier Forever]

434 (<https://www.faithfrontier.org/pages/heirlooms>)

435 **Exhibit D:** Philosophical Insights | Explores profound spiritual and moral
436 questions that shape our faith community's understanding of existential roles,
437 emphasizing the philosophical underpinnings of our religious practices. Link:
438 [Philosophical Insights](<https://www.faithfrontier.org/blogs/insights/wetiko-worldwide>)

440 **Exhibit E:** The Timeless Message of Hope, Love, and Redemption | Articulates
441 the transcendent messages of hope, love, and redemption shared across faiths,
442 resonating with our religious teachings and spiritual outreach efforts. Link:
443 [Timeless Message](<https://www.faithfrontier.org/blogs/unity/onelove>)

444 **Exhibit F:** Constitution for these United States in America(s) | Provides a
445 scriptural and constitutional analysis of governance, underscoring the divine
446 right and duty to uphold justice as enshrined in our nation's founding
447 documents. Link: [U.S. Constitution]

448 (<https://www.faithfrontier.org/pages/constitution>)

449 **Exhibit G:** Government Integrity | Addresses the spiritual imperative for truth
450 and integrity in governance, challenging systemic injustices and advocating for
451 a return to righteous and divine principles in public service. Link: [Government
452 Integrity](<https://www.faithfrontier.org/pages/journal>)

453 **Exhibit H:** Power of Attorney, Status Declaration, and Copyright Trademark
454 Assignment | Legally formalizes the petitioner's standing and directives,
455 reinforcing the legitimacy of his claims and intentions. Link: [Document Link]
456 (<https://drive.proton.me/urls/Q2FJ0V9MVG#aTcbbfPRKOTW>)

457 **Exhibit I:** Documentation of Bodily Harm to Petitioner and Property Damage |
458 Provides tangible proof of the harms suffered due to the actions challenged
459 within this motion.

460 **XIII. Case Law Citations**

- 461 **Graham v. Connor, 490 U.S. 386 (1989).**
462 **Tennessee v. Garner, 471 U.S. 1 (1985).**
463 **Kingsley v. Hendrickson, 576 U.S. 389 (2015).**
464 **Brown v. Texas, 443 U.S. 47 (1979).**
465 **Hiibel v. Sixth Judicial District Court of Nevada, 542 U.S. 177 (2004).**
466 **Terry v. Ohio, 392 U.S. 1 (1968).**
467 **Employment Division v. Smith, 494 U.S. 872 (1990).**
468 **Harlow v. Fitzgerald, 457 U.S. 800 (1982).**
469 **Downes v. Bidwell, 182 U.S. 244 (1901).**
470 **Murphy v. Ramsey, 114 U.S. 15 (1885).**
471 **Reynolds v. United States, 98 U.S. 145 (1878).**
472 **Boyd v. United States, 116 U.S. 616 (1886).**
473 **Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S. (1 Cranch) 137 (1803).**
474 **Grosjean v. American Press Co., Inc., 297 U.S. 233 (1936).**
475 **People v. Croswell, 3 Johns. Cas. 337 (N.Y. 1804).**
476 **Haines v. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519 (1972).**
477 **Erickson v. Pardus, 551 U.S. 89 (2007).**
478 **Estelle v. Gamble, 429 U.S. 97 (1976).**