



DECLARATION OF ENTITY CORRUPTION AND DEMAND FOR REDRESS

1. Assembly Declaration

We, the undersigned living souls, do hereby establish and constitute the “Shield of Souls” (the “Assembly”), standing firmly upon natural and divine law.

Foundational Authority:

This Assembly is founded under the authority of the Supreme Creator and the inherent rights endowed to each living soul, recognizing that legitimate governance originates from divine/natural law rather than from statutes of any temporal government.

Independence from Statutory Jurisdiction:

The Assembly explicitly operates outside of statutory or legislative authority and does not acquiesce to assumptions that it is bound by or subject to any corporate, municipal, state, or federal jurisdiction or code. This disclaimer of statutory authority is a fundamental element of our governance.

Peaceful Assembly & Association:

In accordance with our natural right to peaceably gather and associate, each member of the Assembly affirms these principles:

Lawful, peaceful assembly without intent to injure or defraud.

Respect for members’ sovereignty and dignity, striving to do no harm.

Responsibility to resolve disputes through non-statutorily governed processes.

Purpose & Principles:

a) To uphold and defend the sacred covenant among our members under divine/natural law.

b) To maintain an environment that ensures transparency, mutual support, and private dispute resolution.

c) To foster cooperation and trust within this Assembly and with any other assemblies or organizations that honor natural law principles.

“Chief Lead,” “Founder” _____

Date: _____



2. Evidence Against the Party:

A. Exhibit 1 (FBI 2010):

“Some or all of the following may provide an indication of sovereign activity. However, it is important to note these activities may also be indicative of lawful, innocent conduct and in some instances may constitute the exercise of rights guaranteed by the United States Constitution. For these reasons, these indicators should be considered in the context of other suspicious behavior and the totality of the circumstances in which they are observed or reported.”

— FBI, 2010 Sovereign Citizen Guide

B. Exhibit 2 (FBI 2015):

“It is not illegal to advocate sovereign citizen beliefs. Individual indicators of sovereign citizen activity may comprise lawful conduct or non-sovereign citizen criminal activity. No single indicator should be the sole basis for a determination of sovereign citizen activity.”

— FBI, 2015 Courtroom Security Guide

These establish the legal and ethical standard:

1. Not all so-called “sovereign citizen” actions are criminal.
2. Law enforcement and agencies must assess context and intent, and avoid blanket assumptions.
3. There is an explicit call for protections of lawful conduct and constitutional rights.

C. Exhibit 5’s Omission (2021 Law Review Article)

In Exhibit 5 (“2021 Law Review Article - Sovereign Citizens.pdf”), a full review and search reveal there is no acknowledgement that sovereign citizen tactics may be lawful when done correctly.

The article presents a narrative treating “sovereign citizen” activity as inherently problematic, with no mention that context or intent could distinguish between lawful and unlawful conduct.

“Chief Lead,” “Founder” _____

Date: _____



The omission of this nuance directly contradicts the more measured, constitutional approach in Exhibits 3 and 4.

By not offering the qualifying statements found in FBI materials, the academic article provides a misleading and overbroad characterization of “sovereign citizen” actions as always unlawful or fraudulent.

D. Implications for Agencies: Fraud, Removal of Truth, and Liability

When an agency, policymaker, or officer relies on guidance that ignores or omits the standards established in Exhibits 3 and 4—and instead treats all “sovereign citizen” actions as inherently fraudulent or criminal (as seen in Exhibit 5)—the following concrete risks materialize:

E. Fraud Through Omission or Misrepresentation

Definition of Fraud:

Fraud can consist not only of active misstatements, but also of “material omissions”—leaving out relevant qualifying information so as to create a misleading or deceptive impression.

Removal of Truth:

By failing to inform officers, courts, or the public that many legal filings and tactics (like UCC forms or self-representation) are lawful when used appropriately, the agency is effectively misrepresenting the law—a form of institutional fraud. This is especially potent since the FBI’s own guidance (Exhibits 3 and 4) specifically warns against such blanket assumptions.

F. Legal Liability (Lawsuits and Civil Rights Actions)

Due Process and Civil Rights:

If action—such as arrest, prosecution, or administrative sanction—is taken against someone for using a legal process that is not inherently fraudulent, and the officer/agency ignored the clear standards in Exhibits 3 and 4, this can constitute a violation of due process and constitutional rights (e.g., First Amendment, right to self-representation, right to petition the government).

“Chief Lead,” “Founder” _____

Date: _____



G. Basis for Lawsuit:

Agencies/individual officers could face claims for:

False arrest or malicious prosecution

Civil rights deprivation under 42 U.S.C. § 1983

Possibly, official misconduct or violation of state/federal tort laws

H. Specific Officer and Agency Risks

Qualified Immunity Erosion:

Qualified immunity for government actors hinges on whether they acted in light of “clearly established law.” Exhibits 3 and 4, being from the FBI, constitute authoritative and widely disseminated standards; ignoring them can erode this legal shield and result in personal liability for officers and supervisors.

Pattern or Practice:

If an agency adopts Exhibit 5’s broad, undifferentiated view and this is shown to be a “pattern or practice,” the agency may face institutional or class-action litigation.

I. In conclusion:

Any officer or agency that does not recognize, apply, or communicate the distinction between lawful and unlawful uses of legal processes—with intent or context considered, as demanded by Exhibits 3 and 4—places itself at risk for being found liable for fraud by omission and for violating the constitutional rights of affected individuals. Such practices, if systematized, provide grounds for both individual lawsuits and large-scale remedial actions against the agency.

J. Supreme Court & Administrative Framework

Supreme Court precedent (e.g., *Boddie v. Connecticut*, *Armstrong v. Manzo*, *Mathews v. Eldridge*, *Goldberg v. Kelly*) requires that before rights are affected or deprived there must be meaningful notice and an opportunity to be heard. Pro se and assembly-based filings, particularly those grounded in natural law, are to be held to “less stringent standards” by the judiciary (*Haines v. Kerner*, *Faretta v. California*). Agencies that ignore good faith assertions of right and standing—and fail to respond within a clear and reasonable notice period—may become estopped from contesting those claims or facts (see administrative estoppel principles).

“Chief Lead,” “Founder” _____

Date: _____





K. If the FBI Fails to Publicly Clarify Within 30 Days

Per your administrative process:

Notice of status/standing has already been given and/or is being given;

Notice of specific rights violations has been or will be issued, with evidence and reference to harm;

Opportunity to Cure: The FBI (or relevant agency) is given 30 calendar days to make a public statement clarifying the distinction recognized in their own guidance: "Not all behaviors or legal acts described as 'sovereign citizen' are fraudulent, and protected rights/activities must not be miscategorized as criminal or extremist" .

Failure to provide this clarification constitutes tacit acquiescence, default, and a breach of duty, exposing the agency to administrative and judicial remedies.

L. Right to Recourse & Settlement Proposal

Remedy for Members' Rights Violations: The assembly will act to secure recourse for damages suffered by its members as a direct consequence of this mischaracterization and resulting violations. This includes, but is not limited to:

Emotional harm, reputational injury, lost income (using detailed affidavits and documented costs);

Assembly resources diverted to defending against unlawful prosecutions or actions .

Settlement Path: The matter may be privately resolved ("settled") between the FBI and the Assembly, with a good faith compensation paid to the Assembly's designated trust (in accordance with trust vs. assembly doctrine) .

M. Compensation Amount & Calculation

A. Calculation Principles (drawn from trust v assembly doctrine and administrative law):

Compensation is based on a combination of direct damages, quantifiable economic losses, emotional/mental distress, punitive factors, and costs incurred by the Assembly and its members as a result of the violations.

Assembly claims are aggregated when harm is suffered by multiple members, with amounts calculated both per capita and collectively, and are paid into the Assembly Trust for communal benefit (see trust v assembly, §§79–81).

B. Per Person Damages

Base damages: \$10,000 per affected member is established as the minimum fair compensation (combining lost time, legal expenses, reputational, and personal distress), per affidavit and community practice.

This figure can be increased with documentation (for example, for lost wages or actual injury).

"Chief Lead," "Founder" _____

Date: _____



C. Aggregate Compensation

Assembly-wide claim: For administrative clarity and efficiency, a fixed lump-sum settlement of \$250,000 is demanded, which will be distributed or retained as per the Assembly's common law trust protocols.

This amount is not a cap: If there are more than 25 identified members, the per-person or detailed losses may be demonstrated, and the compensation recalculated accordingly.

D. Settlement Option

The recipient agency may resolve this matter by:

Paying \$250,000 as a settlement to the Assembly Trust,

Acknowledging the agency's prior error (failure to clarify rights on the "sovereign citizen" matter), and

Making a public correction within 30 days.

Acceptance of this settlement closes all related claims.

Failure or refusal to settle within 30 days of notice constitutes default, at which point the Assembly will:

Initiate commercial liens or bond claims,

Pursue §1983 federal rights litigation,

Seek both individual and institutional liability, and

Potentially escalate with public or class actions for injunctive and further compensatory relief.

E. Supporting Citations from Assembly Documents

Administrative demand and group redress models: trust v assembly, §§42–44, 79–81.

Example language for compensation and settlement process: Section 80, trust v assembly.

Basis for punitive/additional multipliers: comparable civil rights settlements and Assembly historical claims.

Sample Demand (can be individualized based on affected members and documentation):

Base damages: \$10,000 per affected member x [insert count].

Aggregate Assembly/Trust Compensation: \$250,000 (lump sum to the Assembly Coffers)

Settlement Option: Payment of \$250,000, acknowledgement of error, and a public correction closes the matter.

Absent response or cure within 30 days, Assembly will proceed with liens, bond claims, §1983 federal rights claims, and possibly public action for further redress.

N. Path Forward

Formal Notice will set the 30-day clock;

Failure to Act/Respond = default, triggering administrative and judicial remedies;

Private Settlement preferred—public escalation and litigation only if required.

"Chief Lead," "Founder" _____

Date: _____



UNCLASSIFIED//LAW ENFORCEMENT SENSITIVE

POSSIBLE INDICATORS OF SOVEREIGN CITIZEN ACTIVITY

Some or all of the following may provide an indication of sovereign activity. However it is important to note these activities may also be indicative of lawful, innocent conduct and in some instances may constitute the exercise of rights guaranteed by the United States Constitution. For these reasons, these indicators should be considered in the context of other suspicious behavior and the totality of the circumstances in which they are observed or reported.

- Documentation may be mailed and addressed to the Secretary of the Treasury Department or the Depository Trust Company
- Documentation includes an "Apostille Number"
- Documents contain the phrase "Accepted for Value"
- Documents are notarized, even if not required
- International postage rates is applied even for domestic mailings
 - o All paperwork will be mailed using registered mail
 - o Stamps will be affixed near the signature line or at the bottom corner of the page
- Name written in all capital letters
 - o Example: JOHN SMITH
- Name will be written last name : first name
 - o Example: Smith: John or Smith: Family of John
- Zip codes enclosed in brackets
 - o Example: [11233]
- Presence of thumbprints on documents,
 - o Typically in red or blue ink
 - o Typically on or near a signature or seal
- "SLS" may follow signature
 - o "SLS" stands for "Sovereign Living Soul"

Indicators of Sovereign Activity Observed by Local Law Enforcement

Sovereign citizens often carry fraudulent identification documents. During a traffic stop or arrest, they may produce documents indicating law enforcement does not have the authority to stop their vehicle. Sovereign citizens may also write the term "No Liability Accepted" above their signature on a driver's license to indicate they do not accept it as a legitimate identification document. sovereign citizens may also create and display fraudulent license plates.

"Chief Lead," "Founder" _____

Date: _____



UNCLASSIFIED//FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

(U) PART I: IDEOLOGY AND COMMON CLAIMS

(U) Introduction

(U) Sovereign citizen ideology is a belief system that leads adherents to reject their US citizenship and government authority. The ideology is based upon a conspiracy-laden view of the past and interpretation of historical documents fundamental to American history such as the Declaration of Independence, US Constitution, Bill of Rights, Articles of Confederation, various treaties and Supreme Court decisions. This primer identifies basic ideological beliefs and common claims made by sovereign citizens, understanding these differ by individual and change over time. Sovereign citizen claims thus often appear nonsensical, incomplete, and at times, contradictory.

(U) Many assertions made by sovereign citizens today are adopted from the Sheriff's Posse Comitatus, a militant anti-government, anti-tax group active in the 1970s and 1980s, primarily in the west and mid-west sections of the country. Sovereign citizens claim to possess secret "truths" about the US financial system, hidden conspiracies, or knowledge about supposed government-suppressed technologies. They purport special understanding about legal procedure, common law, and the Uniform Commercial Code (UCC). Others may convene special courts, which purport to operate under common law, or file legal documents that appear legitimate. Some claims are drawn from white supremacy, anti-government, or separatist extremist ideologies.

(U) It is not illegal to advocate sovereign citizen beliefs. Individual indicators of sovereign citizen activity may comprise lawful conduct or non-sovereign citizen criminal activity. No single indicator should be the sole basis for a determination of sovereign citizen activity. The FBI is concerned, however, about individuals who commit crimes in furtherance of the ideology, specifically:

- (U//FOUO) Sovereign citizen **extremists**, who seek to advance their views through force or violence; and
- (U//FOUO) Sovereign citizen **criminals**, who seek to advance their views through non-violent criminal activity.

(U) Declaring Sovereignty

(U) Sovereign citizen ideology fundamentally rejects the concept of US citizenship. Consequently

(U) What is a sovereign citizen?

(U) The term "sovereign citizen" is used mainly by law enforcement; adherents tend to self-identify as sovereign, freemen, flesh-and-blood persons, diplomats, indigenous Americans, living beings, etc. Sovereign citizens make up a diverse, nationwide movement, as opposed to comprising a single organized, homogenous group. Because it is not illegal to advocate sovereign beliefs, the FBI does not maintain a count of sovereign citizens. The movement, which has its origins in the United States, has appeared in Canada, the UK, Ireland, Australia, New Zealand, and mainland Europe.



(U) Fraudulent law enforcement badge.

"Chief Lead," "Founder" _____

Date: _____



END EVIDENCE---

“Chief Lead,” “Founder” _____

Name: Ethan Allen UST Date: _____

