CASE________________________________

IN THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

2003 TERM

CIV. APP. O2-2275

ROYAL DEMOCRATIC STATES OF CONTINENTAL AFRICA GOVERNMENT;
KING WILLIAM LORD PUNCHARD;
(EDMOUND RIGHT ROYAL CONSUL;
MICHEL CONTRERES ROYAL CONSUL)
Plaintiff-Petitionre,

V,

THE STATE OF NEW MEXICO;
GOVERNOR GARRY JOHNSON;
THE 2ND JUDICIAL DISTRICT JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF NEW MEXICO; THE NEW MEXICO CORRECTION CENTER OF NEW MEXICO; 12TH JUDICIAL CITY MAGISTRATE,
Defendant-Appellee.

<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>

Petition for ORIGINAL Jurisdiction to the United States Supreme. From the 10th Circuit Appeals Court.

PETITION for a ORIGINAL JURISDICTION ;With A Writ of CERTIORARI; With Writ of HABEAS CORPUS

DEFENDANT'S COUNSEL <>DEFENDANT COUNSEL
PEGGIE JEFFERS WIKLE <> Tony F. Ortiz, Jr.
P.O. Box 1508 <> P.O. BOX 1339 .
SANTA FE, New Mexico <>Los Alamos, New Mexico
87504 <> 87544

RECEIVED
APR 29 2003
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

Plaintiff Counsel Pro Se
William Lord Punchard
Royal Continental Africa
GOVERNMENT EMBASSY #15
702 West First Street
Deming, New Mexico 88030 u.s.a

04-25-03

CASE 03-34

IN THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

2003 TERM

**ROYAL DEMOCRATIC STATES OF CONTINENTAL AFRICA GOVERNMENT ;
KING WILLIAM LORD PUNCHARD;
(EDMOUND RIGHT ROYAL CONSUL;
MICHEL CONTRERES ROYAL CONSUL)**

PETITIONERS,

V,

**THE STATE OF NEW MEXICO;
(GOVERNOR GARRY JOHNSON;
THE 2ND JUDICIAL DISTRICT
JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF
NEW MEXICO; THE NEW MEXICO
CORRECTION CENTER OF
NEW MEXICO; 12TH JUDICIAL
CITY MAGISTRATE)**

RESPONDENTS.

<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>

Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus to the United States Supreme. From the 10th Circuit Appeals Court.

<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>

PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>

Plaintiff –Counsel Pro Se
WILLIAM LORD PUNCHARD;
Royal Continental Africa Government Embassy #15
702 West First Street
Deming, New Mexico 88030 U.S.A.,
(505) 546- 9473

RECEIVED
JUL - 1 2003
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

QUESTIONS PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

U.S. District Court made a disposition ,dening

deral Jurisdiction TO Foreign agents for a Writ of Habeas

rpus , in direct conflict with the Exclusive Doctrine

d by U.S. Constitution, Article III., Section 2., Paragraph

oreign Ministers , and State Conflicts),and Supreme

ourt RULE 10 (C) (....BUT SHOULD BE).

QUESTION

Will the Court Reverse the DC"s final Disposition

gainst Writ of Habeas Corpus,Pursuant to the Doctrine

f none delegation (no Final Jurisdictional Statutes in

oreign Diplomatic and State Conflicts) ?

<>

2. The Defendant Appellee Refuse to Release Foreign

Government Agents having diversity citizenship, in 10

years, make no Timely Federal Court File of a Diplomatic

Conflict where State is a Part ,it Circumventing Federal

Constitution, Article III., Section 2., Paragraph 2.(Doctrine

of Exclusive Jurisdiction by the U.S. Supreme Court).

QUESTIONS PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

QUESTION

2. Will the Court Grant the Writ of Habeas Co

QUESTION

2 (B) Will Court denie State Claims of 11 Amendm
Rights to Circumvent over U.S. Court's Exclusive
Jurisdiction given under Constitutional Article III,?

<>

3. Defendant –Appellee(City court) continues hurassment, abuse Power and discretion with act of State Terrorism against Plaintiff-Appellant's Government Embassy Staff and Property, In spite of Diplomatic Statutes and Diversity of Citizenship Notices.

QUESTION

4. Will the Court Order the Defendant-Appellee to stop his Actions against the Plaintiff-Appellant and his Foreign Government ?

QUESTION

4(A). Will the original requested amount ($)of Compensation ($)be Granted the Plaintiff-Appellant ?

QUESTIONS PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

5. The U.S. State Department Letter to the Plaintiff Appellant is about the latest correspondence concerning international affairs. This Letter about Peace talks in the Sudan region is offered to show that their is a Citizenship diversity that Plaintiff-Appellant and his Government Agents, Have; and a Foreign Government interest of the Plaintiff-Appellant , that is recognized by the U.S. State Department.

QUESTION

5. Will the Honorable Court accept this EXHIBIT D) (App-4., and APP 7)as Presented Evidence Support for The Federal Rules of Evidence, RULE 902 3.(B) (Self-Authentication) Diversity Citizenship and Sovereignty Statutes?

<>

QUESTION

6. Will the Court order the release of Plaintiff Appellant's Government Agent with out any more Delay?

LIST OF PARTIES

PETITIONORS, ROYAL DEMOCRATIC STATES OF CONTINENTAL AFRICA GOVERNMENT;
HIS MAJESTIE WILLIAM LORD PUNCHARD
(COUNSUL AGENT EDMOUND WRIGHT;
CONSUL AGENT MICHEL CONTRERES).
ROYAL CONTINENTAL AFRICA EMBASSY #15
702 WEST FIRST STREET
DEMING, NEW MEXICO 88030 u.s.a.
(505) 546-9473

<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>

RESPONDENTS, GOVERNOR GARRY JOHNSON
TONY F. ORTIZ, JR
CASTILLE LAW FIRM
P.O. BOX 1339
Los Alamos, New Mexico 87544

<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>

THE STATE OF NEW MEXICO
PEGGIE JEFFERS WIKLE
Assistance attorney General
P.O. Drawer1508
SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO 87504
(505) 827-6000

==================#####==================

Appellet History

This Plaintiff-Government has never been before the U.S. U.S. Supreme Court in this combination of a Complaint, in it's Government's Political Name with this Matter. However' there has been Subjects and Members of the Government before the Supreme Court with this Matter.

District Court dismiss on........Sept.,3,2002...BB/KBM
Appeals Court dismiss on 01/27/2003........

<>

JURISDICTHONAL STATEMENT

This court has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to Constitutional, Article III, Section 2., Paragraph 2.; Federal Neutrality Act; the constitutional , Article VII , 14 th Amendment ; 6th amendment ; the 13th Amendment Bill of Rights; the Federal Code 28 U.S.C. Sect. And 28 U.S.C 1983, 1332 (a); the Federal Rule of Evidence , RULE 902. (3.b), and RULE 901(7) , this Court has exclusive Jurisdiction herein.

PRECEDURAL HISTORY

pursuant to RULE 4.) The Plaintiff –Petitioner Diversity of Citizenship Jurisdiction quilify him to Request for a Writ of Habeas Corpus Pursuant to the U.S. Superme Court RULE 10 (C).

(B) Plaintiff-Petitioner and Embassy Staff Live on the Foreign Government Embassy owned Property , and Jurisdiction, and have so for 19 .8 Years. Pursuant to U.S. Federal Rules of Evidence, RULE 901 (7) (Public Record).

(C) Plaintiff-Petitioner's Motioned the U.S. District Court for a Protective Court Order against the Defendant-Appellee (Beaes ,City Court). The U.S. District Court again made **Folly** of the request for a Protective Order. Active Arrogant State Terrorism is no joke, and dangerous to this Government So' this Plaintiffs Petition the American U.S. Supreme Court

STATEMENTS OF THE CASE

1. Attempted Jurisdiction take over Plaintiff-Petitioner's Foreign Government, was a violation of the Federal Neutrality Act. The Plaintiff being harmed by the Defendant (State) Terrorism (False-Imprisonment) Actions, and Due Process (Protection), and Relief for the Plaintiff is over Due.

<>

2. U.S. District Court, and U.S. Court of Appeals Failed to notice the Complaint"s Captions (Political) qulifily Federal Jurisdiction, and removes The Doctrine of Disposition from the U.S. District Court.

<>

3. Is the Federal District Court, and the U.S. Appeals Court Suffering from the Doctrine of None-Delegation : No Jurisdiction to Make any Political Foreign Policy for Constitutional , Article III., Section 2., Paragraph 2. Litigation qualifications.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

4. Defendant-appellee claim the 11 Amendment **Right**, and Jurisdiction over the Case. The **Rooker-Feldman** Doctrine that Bars a Losing Party from Seeking review in U.S. District Court, **but'**is Bared' by the Constitutional , Article III., Section 2., Paragraph 2.(Foreign Ministers), (Exclusive Jurisdiction of the U.S. Supreme Court).

PLEASE SEE: Kiowa Indian Tribe of Okla. V, Hoover, 150 F .3d 1163, 1169 (10thCir.1998)

<>

5. District Court aboused his discretion by attempted to make a Political, and Medical Disposition. Pursuant to Constitution, Article III, Section 2., Paragraph 2. The District Court's Disposition to Denie Jurisdiction should be stricken down. Only the Supreme Court has that Exclusive(Medical or Political) Disposition Rights Nationally. **PLEASE SEE: (EXHIBIT E), Constitution.**

<>

6. The Plaintiff-Petitioner being a Foreign Government

STATEMENTS OF THE CASE

Agent , and living in a Publicly Posted Foreign Government Embassy, and has a deferent Diversity of Citizenship from Defendant-appellees.. Satifying the RRooker-Feldman Doctrine .....*1. The State of New MexMexico Jurisdiction do not extend in to this Foreign Embassy Jt Jurisdiction. *2. Defendant-Appellee(Johnson) lives in the same Jurisdiction as Defendant-Appellee(state).**PLEASE SEE: Newman-Green ,Inc. V, Alfonzo-Larrain** 490 U.S. 826, 828.**(1989).**

<>

7. The U.S. Federal Code 28 U.S.C. 1332(A) acknowledge that Subject of a Foreign State as Diversity. Federal Rules of Evidence, RULE 902, (3.B) POINTS OUT THAT Foreign Embassy Staff Identification of Agents is applicable. **PLEASE SEE: (EXHIBIT B).**

<>

8. U.S. District Court Blocked Petitioner's Subpoenaing of the Defendant-Appellee's State Court Record Proper(DC Rule 81.1) from being showing to the U.S. Supreme Court.,

ARGUEMENTS FOR GRANTING

1. Pursuant to Federal Code 28 U.S. C. 1332(a) Diversity of Jurisdiction Statutes may be employed because the Plaintiff-Petitioners qualify here in as a *1. A Foreign State...and is a Plaintiff. *2. Subject of a Foreign State. This can be viewed on the first Page of the Federal District Court Complaint. Plaintiff has the Diversity Statutes neede for Federal Jurisdiction. **Please See: Federal Code 28 U.S.C. 1332(A).**

<>

2. The U.S. District Court Errored in its Discretion to Attempt to remove Federal Jurisdiction Because ' he suffers from the Doctrine of None-Delegation (No Jurisdiction to make **final** Political (Federal) Disposition). Concerning a discrepancy between a State, and Plaintiff-Petitioner Minister of a Foreign State (Constitutional, Article III., Section 2., Paragraph 2. (Foreign Ministers). The Supreme Court Should Grant the Writ of Habeas Corpus . **Please See: (EXHIBIT E)**

ARGUEMENTS FOR GRANTING

3. The Plaintiff-Petitioner lives in a Foreign Government Embassy Jurisdiction that is Publicly Displayed and the Embassy Property is Recorded So . Plaintiff-Petitioner Political Statutes don't allow him to loose in a Foreign Political State Court. Therefor ' the Defendant-Appellee Claim to the 11 Amendment , and Jurisdiction over this Case is Moot, and can not be Employed against Constitutional Article III. District Court should be reversed. **Please See: Kiowa Indian Tribe of Okla. V, Hoover,** 150F #d 1163, 1169 (10th Cir. (1998)

<>

4. The Defendant-Appellee's unreasonable , and untimely delay in making a Application to a Federal Jurisdiction in a Constitutional ,**Article III Class Discrepancy** with the Plaintiff-Petitioner's Consul Agents Constitute *1. Failure to grant a Speedy Trial, *2. Violations of the Doctrine of involuntary servitude; **Please See: (EXHIBIT E).**

ARGUEMENTS FOR GRANTING

5. The U.S. District Court assessment of Plaintiff Petitioner's complaint (as to intent) is not held in the same light with in the International Community (International Court of Justice) in which the Plaintiff –Petitioner herein is a Charged Office . U.S. District Court attempted Disposition Comments failed to Address the Legal Process of the Complaint; therefore' Courts Disposition should be viewed **Malpractice (Lack of Due Process)** by his Owen words, and **Reversed** for lack of Exhibits to Support his Conclusions. **Please See: (EXHIBIT A)**

<>

6. State Court don't have a Federal Jurisdiction to appoint defense Counsel that is paid by the State Court in a foreign Political State, v, State Case. Failure to allow a Federal Jurisdiction to a Foreign Government Consul Agent is a Violation of the Federal Neutrality Act. and violating Code 28 U.S.C. 1332(A).Diversity Doctrine, with State Terrorism. It's Timely to Grant the **Writ of Habeas Corpus.**

CONCLUSIONS

Other than Acting Judicially Unprofessional with his descriptions, and folly at the person of the Plaintiff-Petitioner, the U.S. District Court abused the Court discretion. He knew and had reason to know that the Petitioner has Diversity Citizen Statutes. The constitutional Article III, do not require the U.S. District Judge to regulate, nor Final Disposition , nor Screen partys having intent to comply with obviously the U.S. Supreme Court , RULE 10(c). The State Defendant and U.S. Appeal Court Suffers from the Doctrine of None-Delagation(no Jurisdiction to Politically Disposition). Granting the Writ of Habeas Corpus relief of the two Consul Agents is the Proper thing to do. Diversity Statutes held by the Plaintiff-Petition should have accessibility to the U.S. Supreme Courts less the American Constitution deprivation sat in for the lack of Rule of law . Pursuant to Federal Rules of Evidence, RULE 902 (3.B) All of the Plaintiffs-Petitioner Consul Agent have Diversity

CONCLUSIONS

Jurisdiction. The District Court Blocked the transfering o the State Court Record Proper. (DC 81.1). this was a obstruction of Justice by the District Court attempting to deprive the Counsul Agents of Due Process of LAW. The Writ relief was due with in the First Minute the Defendant-Appellee (State) received a Notice of Political Agency from the Plaintiff-Petitioner's Government Embassy. Pursuant to Federal Rules of Evidence , Rule 902 (3.B) each Defendant-Appellee had a Notice of Diversity Statutes delivered to them Pursuant to DC Rule 4. Service. Terms of time (40 Years) of False Imprisonment of Government Diplomats is Out Ragious Conduct Expressed as a State Terrorism. This will be the Second time the Plaintiff has attempted to gain the Freedom of it's Diplomats. This Matter is begaining to lay heavy on International Friendly Relations. We want relief.

. The Granting of the Writ of Habeas Corpus is Consistant with National Justice , and Right, and will not Prejudice the Defendant-Appellee in any way,

04/22/2003 William Lord Punchard

WILLIAM LORD PUNCHARD,PRO SA CONSEL

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW MEXICO

KING WILLIAM LORD PUNCHARD, Royal Democratic States Of Continental Africa Government,(Edmound Right , royal consul: Micheal contreres, Royal consul).

Plaintiff,

Vs, No. CIV 02-780 bb/KBM

State of New Mexico ,Governor Gary Johnson;(2nd Judicial District court of new Mexico ; 12nd Judicial District Court of New Mexico ;New Mexico State Corrections Department); the Deming City Magistrate Ray Baesa,

Defendants.

ORDER DISMISSING CASE

This matter came before the Court on motions to dismiss filed by several Defendants (docs.16.,18). Plaintiff has filed an initial pleading "Petition for arrest of Judgment and Writ of Habeas Corpus", which has been treated as a Complaint. In the Petition, Plaintiff claims to be the head of State of a Non-existent country, the Royal Continental Africa Government. Plaintiff also claim that two Individuals incarcerated in New Mexico Prisons are Diplomats employed by this Non-Existent Country. And are entitled to diplomatic immunity. He therefore request habeas corpus relief on behalf of those individuals. In addition, Plaintiff requests relief from "harassment " by the Deming"City Magistrate Court". Which is allegedly mailing "Hurassing Court Summjons" To the Royal Embassy." These Summons apparently concern a Citationand $167 fine assessed upon Plaintiff by the Deming Municipal Judge, for maintaining unsanitary Permises(Classic Car Collection). Exh. B,Plf. Motion for directed Verdict).

Dismissal of this case is warranted for a number of reasons. As to the Habeas Corpus aspect for the Petition, seeking reliease of the two Inmatees who are allegedly Consul or Diplomats of Plaintiff,s non-existent country , the allegations of the petition are fanciful and delusional , and this court may dismiss on that basis *See,eg,Dekoven v, bell.2001* W l 1450702 (6th Cir.)(complaint alleging that plaintiff was the true messiah was

United states

Washington ,D.C. 20520,

Dear Mr, Punchard:

The White House has asked me to respo
letter to President Bush about Sudan.

The administration shares your concerns
people of Sudan who have suffered aerial bombi
raiding, forced displacement, and religious persec
result of the 20-year conflict. We believe the opp
end these human tragedies is possible by securing
lasting peace.

We are encouraged by the peace negotiation
Kenya between the warring parties: the Government
Sudan and the Sudan People's Liberation Movement
(SPLM;/A). Both parties signed an agreement in Oct
2002 to cease hostilities and allow unimpeded human
access to all areas of Sudan. As a result, aerial bomba
has ceased, fighting has been reduced, and some previ
unreachable areas are now receiving food aid.

Sudan's president omer Hassan Ahmed El-Bas
and SPLM/A leader John Garang met April 2,2003, in
and affirmed their commitment to a peace agreement an
expressed their hope for the conclusion of an agreement
June 2003. Negotiations are ongoing. Building upon th
critical July 20, 2002 Peace Protocol that resolved the ro
religion and the State and the South's right of self-
determination, We will continue to work diligently with
regional partners to help both sides conclude a just and
comprehensive peace agreement.

Mr. William Lord Punchard, 702 West First street,
Deming, NM 88030

(APP 7)

upport
Protection Monitoring Team (CPTM) to investigate
n Civilians. The CPMT is helping the peace process
ighting atrocities, keeping both sides accountable
word, and recommending concrete action both sides
ke to avoid further attacks.

The president signed the Sudan Peace Act into Law
October 21, and the Administration is actively engaged in
lizing its goal, a just and lasting peace of all the people of
dan. Consistent with the Sudan Peace Act, the President
ade a determination on April 21 . 2003, that the parties to
e conflict were negotiating in good faith and that the
egotiations should continue . For further information on
his determination, We refer you to the Sudan Page on the
Department of State/s Web Site : (www. State. gov)

Sincerely,

Ambassador Michael
Ranneberger
Special Advisor for Sudan
Bureau of African Affairs

(APP 8)