

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



A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Elizabeth Maher Muoio".

Elizabeth Maher Muoio  
State Treasurer

Certificate Number: 8512149588

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

1                   **IN THE CENTRAL MUNICIPAL COURT OF ATLANTIC COUNTY**

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

3                               [**Z**one **I**mprovement **P**lan: 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.

27               **Abatement Justification:** The initiation of proceedings against Devon  
28      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
<b>I. Introduction</b>	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.
<b>II. Demurrer to Respondents’ Anticipated Defenses</b>	Challenges the legal basis of anticipated defenses, citing lack of probable cause and unconstitutional actions, with support from Supreme Court rulings.
<b>III. Parties</b>	Details on Devon Tyler, defending constitutional and divine rights, highlighting advocacy against overreach and constitutional mandates.
<b>IV. Facts</b>	Describes an unlawful stop and search incident, leading to excessive force and significant harm, emphasizing constitutional and religious rights violations.
<b>V. Questions Presented</b>	Examines the legality of Officer Boyd's actions under quo warranto principles, questioning the justification of the use of force and constitutional breaches.
<b>VI. Supreme Court Jurisprudence Supporting the Motion</b>	Utilizes major Supreme Court cases to challenge the legality of the force used and procedural conduct, arguing for judicial review and corrective action.
<b>VII. Statement Section</b>	Critically examines the actions of Officer Boyd, assessing the legality and constitutional appropriateness of detention and use of force.
<b>VIII. Relief Sought</b>	Seeks comprehensive remedies including equitable subrogation, declaratory judgments, and compensatory damages to rectify violations and prevent future misconduct.
<b>IX. Conclusion</b>	Synthesizes arguments, stressing the need for judicial oversight to correct constitutional violations and uphold civil liberties.
<b>X. Certificate of Service</b>	Confirms that all legal documents have been properly served to involved parties, ensuring procedural compliance.

<b>XI. Exhibits</b>	Detailed list of exhibits from A to I, each underscoring different aspects of the petitioner's positions supporting the motion's foundational themes.
<b>XII. Case Law Citations</b>	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
<b>Exhibit A:</b> Frontier Inn Sanctuary
<b>Exhibit B:</b> Divine Law & U.S. Constitution Sovereignty Insights
<b>Exhibit C:</b> Frontier Forever: Sustainable Homestead & Heirloom Seed Preservation
<b>Exhibit D:</b> Philosophical Insights
<b>Exhibit E:</b> The Timeless Message of Hope, Love, and Redemption
<b>Exhibit F:</b> Constitution for these United States in America(s)
<b>Exhibit G:</b> Government Integrity
<b>Exhibit H:</b> Power of Attorney, Status Declaration, and Copyright Trademark Assignment
<b>Exhibit I:</b> 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.



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

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

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

### **Basis for Demurrer**

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

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

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

**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



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

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

### **III. PARTIES**

#### **1. Petitioner:**

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

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

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

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

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

#### **Request for Systemic Review and Correction**

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

### **IV. FACTS**

#### **Unlawful Detention and Search**

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

#### **Excessive Force and Resulting Harm**

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

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

### **Violation of Constitutional and Religious Rights**

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

## **V. QUESTIONS PRESENTED**

### **Legal Authority and Quo Warranto Principles**

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

### **Violation of Constitutional Rights**

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

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

### **Infringement of Religious Freedoms**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Legal Principle:** Holds that deadly force to prevent the escape of an unarmed fleeing suspect is unreasonable unless the officer has probable cause to believe the suspect poses a significant threat. **Application in Case:** The 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**



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

#### **Application of Pretrial Detainee Rights**

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

#### **VIII. RELIEF SOUGHT**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## **IX. CONCLUSION**

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

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

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

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

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

X\_\_\_\_\_

**Notary Jurat**

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

Notary Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Notary's Printed Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Title: Notary Public. My Commission Expires:\_\_\_\_\_

**Certificate of Service**

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

**Addresses for Service:**

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

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

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

**XI. EXHIBITS**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Exhibit I:** Documentation of Bodily Harm to Petitioner and Property Damage | Provides tangible proof of the harms suffered due to the actions challenged 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).**