

=====

=====

=====

RIDGEWAY
SUPPLEMENT

=====

=====

1

=====

=====

=====

=====

RIDGEWAY SUPPLEMENT

Volume 1 R. Supp.

*Cases Argued and Determined
in the*

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF RIDGEWAY



**Printed by the Supreme Court of the State of Ridgeway
Office of the Reporter of Decisions**

This volume is property of the Superior Court of the State of Ridgeway.

**JUDGES AND RETIRED JUDGES
OF THE
SUPERIOR COURT OF THE
STATE OF RIDGEWAY**

With Date of Appointment

JUDGES

zac2524, Chief Judge	08-25-21
insertfailure	08-25-21
Dannlabs	12-19-21

TABLE OF CASES REPORTED

Lx1nas v. State.....1

Lx1nas v. State.....1

Lx1nas v. State.....3

LX1NAS, Plaintiff,

v.

**STATE of Ridgeway,
Defendant.**

No. RSC-CV-270

Superior Court of Ridgeway

Decided April 14, 2022

APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL:

AZAD9L and Mytrius, Mytrius and Associates, RW, for plaintiff.

Clifford2, Solicitor General, Ridgeway Department of Justice, Palmer, RW, for defendant.

Dannlabs, Superior Court Judge:

***RULING ON MOTION TO DISMISS BY
THE HONORABLE JUDGE DANNLABS***

On motion from the Defense to dismiss this case, I will deny this motion.

**[1] STATE IS CORRECTLY NAMED AS
THE DEFENDANT**

Despite claims by the defence that the state should not be named in this case, the state had produced the first set of laws and acts, of which the wildlife act falls under and is being challenged by the plaintiff.

**[2] PLAINTIFF IS NOT SEEKING PRE-
ENFORCEMENT CHALLENGE**

The plaintiff had correctly asserted that Lx1nas had in fact been persecuted by members of the Ridgeway Parks Service (RPS) under the provisions of the Wildlife Conservation Act; subsequently being arrested for unlawful possession of a firearm, therefore making this a post-enforcement case.

**[3] PLAINTIFF IS ENTITLED TO FILE
SUIT & SEEK RELIEF**

The plaintiff is undeniably human, albeit with poor fashion taste. I have no idea why the defence would try and class the plaintiff as an “animal” despite said animals being fully capable of

operating a motor vehicle, firearm, and communicating in English. This also raises the notation of a constitutional issue in the plaintiff's response, referencing the fact that all citizens of the state of ridgeway are entitled to find recourse and remedy for any laws, injuries and wrongs committed against them.

CONCLUSION

Therefore, the court denies the State's motion to dismiss.



LX1NAS, Plaintiff,

v.

**STATE of Ridgeway,
Defendant.**

No. RSC-CV-270

Superior Court of Ridgeway

Decided April 20, 2022

APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL:

AZAD9L, HolyRomanRyan, and Mytrius, Mytrius and Associates, RW, for plaintiff.

Clifford2, Solicitor General, Ridgeway Department of Justice, Palmer, RW, for defendant.

See also 1 R. Supp. 3 (2022).

Dannlabs, Superior Court Judge:

RULING ON THE MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT BY THE HONORABLE JUDGE DANNLABS

On motion from the defense for summary judgment, I will grant this motion in favor of the plaintiff.

[1] INTERPRETING *EX PARTE* YOUNG

As pointed out to me by re-reading the case and Justice Jackson's concurrence in the denial of certiorari in *State v. Laxinas*, ___ Rid. ___, No. 22-01 (Apr. 18, 2022), *Ex parte Young*, 209 U.S. 123 (1908), is a case specifically centered around a state's immunity in a federal court; of which this court is not. Furthermore, *Ex parte Young* applies specifically to constitutional issues, and would otherwise be valid if the question at hand was not presented by a state statute.

[2] STATE IS NOT ENTITLED SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY AS IT HAS CONSENTED

It is claimed by the defence that "a state may not be sued in its own courts without its consent." *Railroad Co. v. Tennessee*, 101 U.S. 337, 339 (1880). However, in this case, the government has consented through statutory means, as the original Civil Complaint's cause of action, sections 3 & 4, points out the law is a contravention to the state constitution and U.S. Constitution, wherein creating an explicit liability against the state, opening it to a suit under Civil Claims Act 2.2(b), which I shall expand upon more in the next section.

[3] PLAINTIFF HAS STANDING TO FILE SUIT

Through the interpretation of 2.2(b) of the Civil Claims Act, "The government is exempt from all suits in this section, except for later laws in which liability is explicitly created," however due to the law contravening with the state constitutions right to freedom, and the plaintiff being arrested due to a unconstitutional law, the plaintiff has the grounds and standing to file suit.

[4] PLAINTIFF HAS STANDING TO FILE SUIT

The Civil Claims Act section 2.1 provides that "Any policy, order, procedure, or directive that infringes upon an individual's rights, immunities or privileges as secured by law shall be sub-

ject to injunctive relief." With regards to concerns about the *in personam* holdings of *Nken v. Holder*, 556 U.S. 418 (2009), the effect of the injunction would operate *in personam* by preventing agents of the State from justifying arrests under the Wildlife Conservation Act.

[5] PLAINTIFF HAS STANDING TO FILE SUIT

The defense claims that the 2nd cause of action in the plaintiff's civil complaint does not carry merit because the clause should not be read to allege a right, however in the defense's own motion, they quote the clause as "every member of society hath a right to be protected in the enjoyment of life, liberty and property". Their reasoning for this is that the clause should not be read alone, and that it is rather an exchange between the government and its citizens for their contribution to society. I however refute this claim, as even with the additional context, it does not remove this right from any citizen or rather, member of society, from its protections. The government must do its due diligence with regards to the rights of its citizens, regardless of their beliefs.

RELIEF GRANTED

The following forms of relief shall be granted pursuant to the plaintiff's original CC, plus more pursuant to necessity.

1. It shall be hereby declared that the Wildlife Conservation act Section 3(b) Be deemed unconstitutional.
2. Furthermore, Section 3 of the Wildlife Conservation Act shall be similarly enjoined, and "hunting licenses" shall be revoked with immediate effect.
3. The State of Ridgeway as a whole; and by proxy its actors, agents and otherwise enforcement officers shall be prohibited from enforcing this act through an injunction.
4. The plaintiff's criminal records gained from the events sparking this lawsuit shall be expunged, that being the count of unlawful possession.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

LX1NAS, Plaintiff,

v.

**STATE of Ridgeway,
Defendant.**

No. RSC-CV-270

Superior Court of Ridgeway

Decided April 20, 2022

APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL:

AZAD9L, HolyRomanRyan, and Mytrius,
Mytrius and Associates, RW, for plaintiff.

Clifford2, Solicitor General, Ridgeway De-
partment of Justice, Palmer, RW, for defend-
ant.

See also 1 R. Supp. 1 (2022).

Dannlabs, Superior Court Judge:

INJUNCTION

Following a summary judgement on the case
of *Lx1nas v. State*, 1 R. Supp. 1 (2022), in favor
of the plaintiff, I hereby issue the following in-
junctions, orders, and other memorandums to
be followed as required by law.

ORDERS

The following forms of relief shall be granted
pursuant to the plaintiff's original CC, plus
more pursuant to necessity.

4. The plaintiffs records obtained on March
21st, for unlawful possession, shall be ex-
punged.
1. It shall be hereby declared that the Wild-
life Conservation Act Section 3(b) is un-
constitutional, and herein unenforcea-
ble. Persons wearing cat ears, tails, or
other similar products shall no longer be
labeled as wildlife.
 2. The rest of Section 3 shall also be en-
joined due to its lack of purpose for
“hunting wildlife”, and all hunting li-
censes shall be revoked with immediate
effect.
 3. The state as a whole, and by proxy all of
its actors, agents and otherwise enforce-
ment officers are prevented to arrest
any person for possessing a weapon as
“wildlife”. The state is further encour-
aged to amend the law as soon as possi-
ble.

IT IS SO ORDERED.