

The Charter of the City of New York and Its Agencies are Actively Engaged in Usurpations of Both State and Federal Constitutions and the Tenets of the Founding Fathers as Set Forth in the Oath Act of 1789.

New York City is currently operating under an **outlaw oath** that is in direct invasion of both the United States Constitution and the New York State Constitution, fundamentally undermining the foundational legal framework established by the Oath Act of 1789—the first law enacted by the first Congress, signed by none other than George Washington.

This egregious misalignment not only contravenes the oaths sworn by public officials but also distorts the very principles of democracy within a city that once served as the nation’s capital. Despite being situated mere blocks from historical landmarks of governance, such as City Hall, the practices of the Charter of the City of New York disregard the supremacy of state and federal law, effectively subverting the constitutional tenets that are meant to uphold public service and integrity. Such actions highlight a systemic betrayal of trust and a dangerous precedent for democracy itself, as city officials perpetuate an unconstitutional framework that contradicts their sworn duties.

Statement on Corrective Actions

The corrective actions required to address the constitutional violations and governance inversion in New York City would include the pursuit of a Writ of Mandamus and a Writ of Quo Warranto.

A Writ of Mandamus would compel public officials and agencies to fulfill their mandated duties under the law, ensuring adherence to constitutional requirements.

A Writ of Quo Warranto would challenge the authority of those who currently hold public office under a potentially unconstitutional framework, questioning their legitimacy and the lawfulness of their actions.

Together, these legal remedies serve as crucial mechanisms to restore accountability and uphold the integrity of governance in the City of New York.

Statement of Constitutional Invasion and Governance of Inversion

New York City operates under an outlaw oath that directly contravenes the U.S. Constitution and the New York State Constitution, fundamentally undermining the legal framework established by the Oath Act of 1789—the first law enacted by Congress, signed by George Washington.

The Charter's assertion of democracy promotes group rights, which conflicts with the constitutional mandate requiring a republican form of government, as stated in Article IV, Section 4 of the U.S. Constitution. This republican framework safeguards individual rights, ensuring that governance prioritizes the liberties of each citizen rather than the collective will of the majority.

This inversion of constitutional principles represents a significant threat to the intentions of the Founding Fathers and an invasion of individual rights. The Supreme Court's affirmation in **Chisholm v. Georgia (1793)** underscores that any claim of group rights under the Charter—especially those justified through equity—stands in **direct opposition to the common law principles demanded by the Constitutions**. This situation represents a systemic betrayal of the very foundation of American governance, eroding the rights of individual citizens in favor of an unconstitutional framework that disregards both legal and democratic integrity.

The Charter of the City of New York is subject to the supremacy of state laws, this inverted inconsistency poses significant questions about the validity of oaths taken by city officials.

The Charter of the City of New York: Conflict with State Law

Public Officers Law Section 30:

“No person shall be entitled to enter upon the discharge of any duties of his office until he shall have taken and filed the oath required by law. Such oath shall be taken and filed within thirty days after the commencement of his term.”

Charter of the City of New York Provision

Section 12-117:

"Every person elected or appointed to any office in any agency of the city shall take and file an oath or affirmation to support the Constitution of the United States and the Constitution of the State of New York before entering upon the discharge of duties."

This indicates that the Charter requires adherence to both the U.S. and New York State constitutions.

Key Issues Highlighted

The Charter mandates a 5-day timeframe for filing the oath, while the Public Officers Law provides a 30-day timeframe.

Legal Primacy: Since the **Charter of the City of New York** is subject to state laws, this inconsistency poses significant questions about the validity of oaths taken by city officials.

Statement on Usurpations of Constitutional Mandates

The Charter of the City of New York and Its Agencies are Actively Engaged in Usurpations of Both State and Federal Constitutions and the Tenets of the Founding Fathers as Set Forth in the Oath Act of 1789. This foundational commitment to constitutional integrity carries significant weight, as affirmed by the New York State Court of Appeals in *Matter of Sloat v. Board of Examiners*, 274 N.Y. 367:

"Statutes and administrative orders, alike, must conform to the mandate of the Constitution. They cannot authorize a procedure which would disregard or nullify that mandate. A person aggrieved by an order or determination of an administrative board or officer which has such result may, in proper case, appeal for redress to the courts. Upon such appeal, the courts are not to be satisfied by lip service. Disobedience or evasion of a constitutional mandate may not be tolerated even though such disobedience might, perhaps, at least temporarily, promote in some respects the best interests of the public."

This ruling affirms that constitutional mandates cannot be overlooked or altered through administrative means and underscores the necessity for

compliance with the core principles laid out by the Founding Fathers. The decision emphasizes that administrative actions are subject to judicial review, especially when they contravene constitutional principles, reinforcing the imperatives for legal accountability and adherence to foundational tenets in governance.

This context highlights the urgency of correcting unconstitutional practices within New York City, as the systemic disregard for these mandates constitutes a profound threat to both individual rights and the integrity of democratic governance.

Statement on Usurpations of Constitutional Mandates

The Charter of the City of New York and the Agencies created under it are Actively Engaged in Usurpations of Both State and Federal Constitutions and the Tenets of the Founding Fathers as Set Forth in the Oath Act of 1789.

As affirmed by the New York State Court of Appeals in *Matter of Sloat v. Board of Examiners*, 274 N.Y. 367:

"Statutes and administrative orders, alike, must conform to the mandate of the Constitution. They cannot authorize a procedure which would disregard or nullify that mandate. A person aggrieved by an order or determination of an administrative board or officer which has such result may, in proper case, appeal for redress to the courts. Upon such appeal, the courts are not to be satisfied by lip service.

Disobedience or evasion of a constitutional mandate may not be tolerated even though such disobedience might, perhaps, at least temporarily, promote in some respects the best interests of the public."

Kevin I think below can be use in whole or in part or not at all but I believe it's relevant it's from, *The Constitutional History of NY 1905* — Pages 37 & 38

LAW OF THE LAND. **The phrase "law of the land" is synonymous with the**

words "due process of law," and has the same legal import and effect. It does not mean merely an act of the legislature, for that would abrogate all restraints upon legislative authority. The clause means that the statute which deprives a citizen of the rights of person or property without a regular trial according to the course and usage of the common law would not be the law of the land in the sense of the Constitution. *People v. Toynbee* (1855) 20 Barb. 194, affirmed *m* (1856) 13 N. Y. 378.

The rights and privileges secured to citizens include the formalities and the safeguards recognized as due process of law, or the orderly application of the law of the land. *People ex rel. Frank v. Davis* (1903) 80 App. Div. 448, 457. The words "by the law of the land" do not mean a statute passed for the purpose of working a wrong. Rights and privileges cannot be taken away unless the matter is adjudged upon trial had according to the course of the common law. "It must be ascertained judicially that he has forfeited his privileges, or that someone else has a superior title to the property he possesses, before either of them can be taken from him. It cannot be done by mere legislation." *Taylor v. Porter* (1843) 4 Hill, 140, 40 Am. Dec. 274; also *White v. White* (1849) 5 Barb. 474, in which the married woman's act of 1848, chap. 200, was held unconstitutional. *Wynehamer v. People* (1856) 13 N. Y. 392.

As to below I will provide the certified oaths in a evidence area of this complaint

The body politic of New York City is often seen as a stepping stone to higher office, exemplified by figures like Andrew Cuomo, Eric Adams, Letitia James, Alvin Bragg, Jack Smith and various judges and attorneys who seek positions of higher office as District Attorney, council member, or senator. The sheer number of individuals who have passed through this fictitious oath is astounding, considering that city agencies employ roughly 330,000 personnel. For instance, Kathy Hochul took a similar oath upon her appointment and subsequent election as county clerk in Erie County; however, evidence shows that this oath is not the constitutional oath required.

Under New York City Charter Section 1116 Fraud, Neglect of Duty, and Willful Violation of Law Relative to Office:

a. Any council member or other officer or employee of the city who shall wilfully violate or evade any provision of law relating to such officer's office or employment, or commit any fraud upon the city, or convert any of the public property to such officer's own use, or knowingly permit any other person so to convert it or by gross or culpable neglect of duty allow the same to be lost to the city, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and in addition to the penalties imposed by law and on conviction shall forfeit such office or employment, and be excluded forever after from receiving or holding any office or employment under the city government

b. Any officer or employee of the city or of any city agency who shall knowingly make a false or deceptive report or statement in the course of duty shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction, forfeit such office or employment.

The implications of these violations are staggering, as they not only threaten the integrity of governance but also expose a long-standing pattern of misconduct that has persisted for decades. As a patriot and USAF veteran, it is my right and duty to enforce the "Black Letter of the Law," demanding accountability from those who occupy positions of power within our city. Addressing this systemic betrayal is essential to safeguard individual rights and restore the principles of our founding documents.