

# Proof of Delivery

Dear Customer,

This notice serves as proof of delivery for the shipment listed below.

**Tracking Number**

1ZWW0096D329962138

**Service**

UPS Worldwide Express

**Shipped / Billed On**

03/30/2026

**Additional Information**

Signature Required

**Delivered On**

03/31/2026 9:14 A.M.

**Delivered To**

WASHINGTON, DC, US

**Received By**

LEE

**Delivery Location**

Reception

Please print for your records as photo and details are only available for a limited time.

Sincerely,

UPS

Tracking results provided by UPS: 03/31/2026 10:09 A.M. EST



**Hello, your package has been delivered.**

**Delivery Date:** Tuesday, 03/31/2026

**Delivery Time:** 9:14 AM

**Left At:** RECEPTION

**Signed by:** LEE

## THE UPS STORE 573

<b>Tracking Number:</b>	<a href="#">1ZWW0096D329962138</a>
<b>Ship To:</b>	UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT 1 FIRST STREET NE WASHINGTON, DC 20543 US
<b>Number of Packages:</b>	1
<b>UPS Service:</b>	UPS Worldwide Express
<b>Package Weight:</b>	1.0 LBS
<b>Reference Number:</b>	054287
<b>Reference Number:</b>	MA04M0TK4PR91

### Discover more about UPS:

[Visit www.ups.com](http://www.ups.com)

[Sign Up For Additional E-Mail From UPS](#)

[Read Compass Online](#)

---

© 2026 United Parcel Service of America, Inc. UPS, the UPS brandmark, and the color brown are trademarks of United Parcel Service of America, Inc. All rights reserved.

All trademarks, trade names, or service marks that appear in connection with UPS's services are the property of their respective owners.

Please do not reply directly to this email. UPS will not receive any reply message.



Affidavit of Fact  
**Certificate of Service**

**Moorish National Republic Federal Government**  
Morocco Consular Court at Kanadario Republic Pursuantto Public Law 8 Stat. 484  
Competent Consular Jurisdiction and Venue Pursuant to Public Law 856, Chapter 807  
United States Department of Justice Moorish American Credential AA222141-TRUTH A-1

**International Document**

International Law Title 22 Chapter 2, Section 141-145  
International Court of Justice, decision the case France v. United States of American, "Case Concerning rights of nationals of the United States of America in Morocco, Judgment of August 27th, 1952: I.C.J.Reports 1952 p.176."

Supreme Court Case Law; "indeed no more than an affidavit is necessary to make the prima facie case".  
United States v. Kis, 658F. 2<sup>nd</sup>, 526, 536 (7<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1981; Cert. Denied, 50 U.S. L.W. 2169; S. Ct. March 22, 1982)

Notice to Agents is notice to principal; notice to principal is notice Agents  
For the record, and to be place on the record

**Re: PRESIDENT, Bertha 10 Martha Eaton Way, Unit 1903, Toronto, Ontario (the "Property") Mortgage No.: 840002765557; Statement of Claim, Judgment, etc... File No.: CV-24-00730325-0000, Writ of Possession- Notice to Vacate**

Consular Court Case No: 777-000000251  
Yashanti Bey v. Victor G. Dodig, Harry Culham, CIBC Bank (Inc), et al  
<https://moorishamericanconsulate.com/consular-court/> Docket 13

March 30, 2026

1. Affidavit of Fact – Writ of Injunction
2. Affidavit of Dispute Lawsuit, Yahshanti Bey, Ex relatione, Shaneen Alicia Oseghale and Sihon Alek Rowe- James v. Victor G. Dodig, Harry Culham, CIBC Bank (Inc), Eva Lake, Claire McMahon, et al.
3. Affidavit of Fact - Writ of Escheat Adverse Claim and Reversion of Estate
- 4.7 Moorish America State Proclamation Affirming Moors Aboriginal and Indigenous Full Faith and Credit
5. Yahshanti Bey Aboriginal Title to Allodium of EXHIBIT: B1 and Odesia President Bey Declaration of Trust
6. Treaty of peace and Friendship of 1787 and 1836 between the U.S. at North America and the Moroccan Empire

I **Yahshati Bey**, did served and enclosed the above documents round about March 30, 2026, Registered Mail and Email to the following recipients;

**Eva Lake, Milena Vinciguerra, Jocelyn Catenacci, Christopher. Staples, et al**  
Address: 5000 Yongc Street 10<sup>th</sup> Floor, Toronto, Ontario, Near [M2N 7E9], Phone: (416) 222-8888  
Email: [jocelync@chaitons.com](mailto:jocelync@chaitons.com)

**Claire McMahon, Khrytine McGowan, Home Alone Property Management Service Limited (Inc),**  
Address: 14, 1860 Appleby Line Suite 491, Burlington, ON, [L17 7H7], Phone: (905) 271-9922  
Email: [claire@homealone.ca](mailto:claire@homealone.ca)

CC: Moorish American Consulate, and Interesting Parties.

I **Yahshanti Bey**, declare and affirm that everything in this affidavit of Service to be right, truthful and correct to the best of our knowledge.

Executed this 30<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2026.

**United States Department of Justice Moorish American Credentials AA222141 – TRUTH A-1**

**Yahshanti Bey**  
AA222141 = A – Allodium + A – American – Title 22 Chapter 2 – Section 141–143 = Judicial Authority  
Authorized Representative, Natural Person, In Propria Persona:  
All Rights Reserve and Retained at all Points in Time  
U.C.C. 1-207/ 1-308; U.C.C. 1-103, Without Prejudice  
Non-Domestic, Non-Resident, Non-Subject, Not a Corporate Person or Entity  
Mailing Location: 89 Church Street, Blenheim, Ontario, [Zip Exempt]  
Email: [shaneenrowe@gmail.com](mailto:shaneenrowe@gmail.com)



**Affidavit of Fact**  
**Writ of Injunction**

**Moorish National Republic Federal Government**  
**Morocco Consular Court at Kanadario Republic Pursuant to Public Law 8 Stat. 484**  
**Competent Consular Jurisdiction and Venue Pursuant to Public Law 856, Chapter 807**  
**United States Department of Justice Moorish American Credential AA222141-TRUTH A-1**

**International Document**

**International Law Title 22 Chapter 2, Section 141-145**  
**International Court of Justice, decision the case France v. United States of American, "Case Concerning rights of nationals of the United States of America in Morocco, Judgment of August 27th, 1952: I.C.J. Reports 1952 p.176."**

**Supreme Court Case Law; "indeed no more than an affidavit is necessary to make the prima facie case". United States v. Kis, 658F. 2<sup>nd</sup>, 526, 536 (7<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1981; Cert. Denied, 50 U.S. L.W. 2169; S. Ct. March 22,1982)**

**MOOR.An officer in the Isle of Man, who summons the courts for the several sheadings. The office is similar to the English bailiff of a hundred. Black's Law Dictionary, 4<sup>th</sup> Edition, page 1159**

**Notice to Agents is notice to principal; notice to principal is notice Agents**  
**For the records, and to be place into the records**

Exhibit B

March 26, 2026

**A Mandatory and Permanent Injunction**

Yahshanti Bey, natural person in propria persona sui juris  
Ex Relation Shaneen Oseghale/Rowe, Shionn Alek Rowe James  
aboriginal and indigenous sovereign Moorish American National  
Authorized Representative at Kanadario republic  
Not a Corporate Person or Entity, Non - Subject  
All Rights Reserved and Retained, U.C.C. 1- 308; U.C.C. 1-103  
Mailing: 89 Church, Blenhelim, Ontario,  
Near [N0P 1A0]  
Email: [shaneenrowe@gmail.com](mailto:shaneenrowe@gmail.com)

**Plaintiff**

**VS**

Victor G. Dodig, Harry Culham, CIBC Bank, Acting as CEO, et al  
Address: 56 Commerce Court, West, Toronto,  
Toronto, Ontario, Near [M5L 1A2]  
Phone:(416) 980-7777  
Email: [victor.dodig@cibc.com](mailto:victor.dodig@cibc.com)

Eva Lake, Milena Vinciguerra, Jocelyn Catenacci, C. Staples, et al  
5000 Yonge Street 10<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Toronto, Ontario, Near [M2N 7E9]  
Phone: (416) 222-8888  
Email: [jocelync@chaitons.com](mailto:jocelync@chaitons.com)

David C. Sparkman, Lynne C. Leitch acting as Clerk and Justice  
Address: 80 Dundas Street London  
Ontario, Near [N6A 8K1]  
Phone: (519) 660-3000  
Email: [London.scj@ontario.ca](mailto:London.scj@ontario.ca)

Victor Mounivonh, acting as Sheriff, SHERIFF OFFICE  
Address: 80 Dundas Street London  
London Ontario, Near [N6A 8K1]  
Phone: (519) 660-3000  
Email: [London.scj@ontario.ca](mailto:London.scj@ontario.ca)

**Defendants**

Re: Consular Court Case No: 777-000000251

File No.: CV-25-00000725-0000  
in the foreign de facto  
ONTARIO SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE

Affidavit of Fact – Writ of Injunction  
International Document

International Law

Title 22 - Foreign Relations And Intercourse Ch 11  
Title 22 - Foreign Relations And Intercourse Ch 2,  
Sec 141 – 145, Consular Court and Judicial Authority  
Generally in all Cases to carry into full effect, Treaty  
Law, Embrace all Controversies with, Citizens, et al

Consular Jurisdiction and Venue

Pursuant to Public Law 856, Chapter 807, treaty  
law Article 20 and 21 of the Treaty of Peace Address:  
Friendship 1787/1836 between the United States  
of North America and the Moors Moroccan  
Empire per Article VI, clause 2, and per  
Article III section 2, clause 1 and 2 of  
the Continental United States Constitution  
For North America, Treaty Law  
Diversity of Citizenship/Nationality Case.

Affidavit of Fact  
**Writ of Injunction**  
International Document

Notice to Agents is notice to principal; notice to principal is notice Agents  
For the record, and to be place on the record

## A Mandatory and Permanent Injunction

Re: Yahshanti Bey, Ex relatione, Shaneen Alecia Oseghale and Sihon Alek Rowe-James, 89 Church Street, Blenheim Ontario (the "Property") Mortgage No.: 003517109; Judgment, etc... File No.: CV-25-00000725-0000, Writ of Possession - Notice to Vacate.

**Notice. A person has "notice" of a fact when; (a) he has actual knowledge of it; or (b) he has received a notice or notification of it; or (c) from all the facts and circumstances known to him at the time in question he has reason to know that it exists. A person "received" a notice or notification when: (a) it comes to his attention; or (b) it is duly delivered at the place for receipt of such communication. See Henry Campbell Black's Law Dictionary Abridged 5th Edition Page 550.**

### Introduction

"COMES NOW, plaintiff Yahshanti Bey, Ex relatione, Shaneen Alecia Oseghale and Sihon Alek Rowe-James request for an Injunction to settle the dispute. Law and justice are equated with truth and the rule of law. The Plaintiff Yahshanti Bey, Ex relatione, Shaneen Alecia Oseghale and Sihon Alek Rowe-James petitions this court for an Injunction. A mandatory and Permanent Injunction to move this court to enter an injunction against the Defendants who's names are listed above, and in support thereof states as follow:..."

- The defendants intend to cause irreparable harm upon the plaintiff by issuing a notice to vacate her home.
- The plaintiff disputed the claim(s) being made by the Defendants.
- This matter is before the court to settle the dispute

### Definition of Mandatory and Permanent injunction

**Mandatory injunction: One which (1) commands the defendant to do some positive act or particular thing; (2) prohibits him from refusing (or persisting in a refusal) to do or permit some act to which the plaintiff has a legal right; or (3) restrains the defendant from permitting his previous wrongful act to continue operative, thus virtually compelling him to undo it. Bailey v. Schnitzius, 43 N.J.Eq. 178, 16 A. 680. See Henry Campbell Black's Law Dictionary, 4<sup>th</sup> Edition, page 923**

**Permanent injunction: One intended to remain in force until the final termination of the particular suit. Riggins v. Thompson, 96 Tex.154, 71 S.W. 14. See Henry Campbell Black's Law Dictionary, 4<sup>th</sup> Edition, page 923**

1. **TAKE NOTICE** that I am in receipt of you Misrepresented Instrument Bill of Attainder /Foreign Bill of Exchange, Collusion, Collusive Action Title NOTICE TO VACATE Dated: February 27, 2026; File No.: CV-25-00000725-0000 in the foreign de facto ONTARIO SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE (Inc).

2. **TAKE FURTHER NOTICE** that a lawsuit has been filed against you (Listed Defendants). "No further action shall be taken by you in this Dispute." This is a Mandatory and Permanent Injunction.

3. **AND TAKE FURTHER NOTICE** that you are here served with an Injunction for the following reasons:

Furthermore, all Cases or Disputes involving a Moor / Moorish American and a Citizen of the UNITED STATES or CANADA "Must" be settled in a "Consular Court Venue", by "Competent Consular Authority", "Under Consular Jurisdiction." Pursuant to Article 20 and 21 of the Treaty of peace and Friendship of 1787 and 1836 between the United States at North America and the Moors Moroccan Empire, and per Article III section 2, clause 1 and 2, Diversity of Citizenship, and pursuant to Article VI, clause 2 of the Continental Constitution for the United States of North America Diversity of Citizenship and per Res Judicata World Court, I.C.J. The International Court of Justice decision "Case Concerning Rights of (Moorish American) Nationals of The United States of America In Morocco, Judgment Of August 27th, 1952 I.C. J. Reports 1952, P. 176.";

#### 214 JUDGMENT OF 27 VIII 52 (U.S. NATIONALS IN MOROCCO)

Judge Hsu Mo declares that, in his opinion, the jurisdictional rights of the United States of America in the French Zone of Morocco are limited to those provided in Articles 20 and 21 of its Treaty with Morocco of September 16th, 1836, and that the United States is not entitled to exercise consular jurisdiction in cases involving the application to United States citizens of those provisions of the Act of Algeciras of 1906 which, for their enforcement, carried certain sanctions. The Act of Algeciras, as far as the jurisdictional clauses are concerned, was concluded on the basis of a kind of consular jurisdiction as it existed at that time in its full form and in complete uniformity among the Powers in Morocco. The various provisions, in referring to "consular jurisdiction", "competent consular authority", "consular court of the defendant", etc., clearly meant that jurisdiction which was being uniformly exercised by foreign States over their respective nationals as defendants in all cases. They did not mean such limited jurisdiction as might be exercised by the United States consular courts, in accordance with Article 20 of the Moroccan-United States Treaty of 1836, in cases involving United States citizens or protégés only.

# Jurisdiction

4.

Morocco Consular Court has Jurisdiction, Pursuant International law Title 22 - Foreign Relations And Intercourse Chapter 2, Section 141 – 145, Consular Court and Judicial Authority Generally in all Cases to carry into full effect, Moroccan Treaties, Embrace all Controversies with Citizens of Canada and Moors or other pursuant to Public Law 856, Chapter 807. This Court has General Jurisdiction to carry out this writ;

§ 141. **Judicial authority generally. To carry into full effect the provisions of the treaties of the United States with certain foreign countries,** the ministers and consuls of the United States in China, Siam, Turkey, Morocco, Muscat, Abyssinia, Persia, and the territories formerly a part of the former Ottoman Empire including Egypt, duly appointed to reside therein, shall, in addition to other powers and duties imposed upon them, respectively, by the provisions of such treaties, respectively, be invested with judicial authority described in sections 141-143, 145-159, 163-174, 176- 181, 183, 211, 212, 218, 219, 251-258, and 1172 of this title, sections 701-704 of Title 28, and sections 21-24 of Title 50, which shall appertain to the office of minister and consul, and be a part of the duties belonging thereto, wherein, and so far as, the same is allowed by treaty, and in accordance with the usages of the countries in their intercourse with the Franks or other foreign Christian nations. (R. S. §§ 4083, 4125, 4126, 4127; June 14, 1878, ch. 193, 20 Stat. 131.)

§ 142. **General jurisdiction in criminal cases. The officers mentioned in section 141 of this title are fully empowered to arraign and try, in the manner provided in sections 141-143,** 145-159, 163-174, 176-181, 183, 211, 212, 218, 219, 251-258, and 1172 of this title, sections 701-704 of Title 28, and sections 21-24 of Title 50, all citizens of the United States charged with offenses against law, committed in such countries, respectively, and to sentence such offenders in the manner in such sections authorized; and each of them is authorized to issue all such processes as are suitable and necessary to carry this authority into execution. (R. S. § 4084.)

§ 143. **General jurisdiction in civil cases; venue. Such officers are also invested with all the judicial authority necessary to execute the provisions of such treaties, respectively, in regard to civil rights, whether of property or person;** and they shall entertain jurisdiction in matters of contract, at the port where, or nearest to which, the contract was made, or at the port at which, or nearest to which, it was to be executed, and in all other matters, at the port where, or nearest to which, the cause of controversy arose, or at the port where, or nearest to which, the damage complained of was sustained, provided such port be one of the ports at which the United States are represented by consuls. **Such jurisdiction shall embrace all controversies between citizens of the United States, or others, provided for by such treaties, respectively.** (R. S. § 4085.)

5. The Supreme Court stated that a "Lack of Federal Jurisdiction cannot be waived or overcome by agreement of parties". Griffin v. Matthews, 310 F supra 341, 342 (1969): and "Want of Jurisdiction may not be cured by consent of parties". Industrial Addition Association v. C.I.R., 323 US 310, 313.

6. All parties mention above are in violation of international law, The Continental Constitution, The Treaties of peacc and friendship of 1787 and 1836 between Morocco and the United States of North America. See the International Court of Justice Case regarding Jurisdiction;

INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE REPORTS OF JUDGMENTS, ADVISORY OPINIONS AND ORDERS CASE CONCERNING RIGHTS OF NATIONALS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA IN MOROCCO (FRANCE v. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA) JUDGMENT OF AUGUST 27th, 1952

188 JUDGMENT OF 27 VIII 52 (U.S. NATIONALS IN MOROCCO)

16

**The first point raised by the Submissions relates to the scope of the jurisdictional clauses of the Treaty of 1836,** which read as follows:

"Article 20.-If any of the citizens of the United States, or any persons under their protection, shall have any dispute with each other, **the Consul shall decide between the parties; and whenever the Consul shall require any aid, or assistance from Our government, to enforce his decisions, it shall be immediately granted to him. ~ -**

189 JUDGMENT OF 27 VIII 52 (U.S. NATIONALS IN MOROCCO)

Article 21.-If a citizen of the United States should kill or wound a Moor, or, on the contrary, if a Moor shall kill or wound a citizen of the United States, **the law of the country shall take place, and equal justice shall be rendered, the Consul assisting at the trial**; and if any delinquent shall make his escape, the Consul shall not be answerable for him in any manner whatever."

It is argued that Article 20 should be construed as giving consular Jurisdiction over all disputes, civil and criminal, between United States citizens and protégés. France, on the other hand, contends that the word "dispute" is limited to civil cases. It has been argued that this word in its ordinary and natural sense would be confined to civil disputes, and that crimes are offences against the State and not disputes between private individuals.

**The Treaty of 1836 replaced an earlier treaty between the United States and Morocco which was concluded in 1787. The two treaties were substantially identical in terms and Articles 20 and 21 are the same in both.**

Accordingly, in construing the provisions of Article 20 -and, in particular, the expression "shall have any dispute with each other"-it is necessary to take into account the meaning of the word "dispute at the times when the two treaties were concluded. For this purpose it is possible to look at -the way in which the word "dispute" or its French counterpart was used in the different treaties concluded by Morocco : e.g., with France in 1631 and 1682, with Great Britain in 1721, 1750, 1751, 1760 and 1801. It is clear that in these instances the word was used to cover both civil and criminal disputes.

**The Treaty of 1836 replaced an earlier treaty between the United States and Morocco which was concluded in 1787. The two treaties were substantially identical in terms and Articles 20 and 21 are the same in both.** Accordingly, in construing the provisions of Article 20 -and, in particular, the expression "shall have any

dispute with each other'-it is necessary to take into account the meaning of the word "dispute at the times when the two treaties were concluded. For this purpose it is possible to look at -the way in which the word "dispute" or its French counterpart was used in the different treaties concluded by Morocco : e.g., with France in 1631 and 1682, with Great Britain in 1721, 1750, 1751, 1760 and 1801. It is clear that in these instances the word was used to cover both civil and criminal disputes.

It is also necessary to take into account that, at the times of these two treaties, the clear-cut distinction between civil and criminal matters had not yet been developed in Morocco.

Accordingly, it is necessary to construe the word "dispute", as used in Article 20, as referring both to civil disputes and to criminal disputes, in so far as they relate to breaches of the criminal law committed by a United States citizen or protégé upon another United States citizen or protégé.

The second point arises out of the United States Submission that consular jurisdiction was acquired "in all cases in which an American citizen or protégé was defendant through the effect of the most favoured-nation clause and through custom and usage" and that such jurisdiction was not affected by the surrender by Great Britain in 1937 of its rights of jurisdiction in the French Zone and has never been renounced expressly or impliedly by the United States.

17

For these reasons,

#### **THE COURT,**

on the Submission of the Government of the French Republic,

unanimously,

**Rejects** its Submissions relating to the Decree of December 30th, 1948, issued by the Resident General of the French Republic in Morocco;

unanimously,

Finds that the United States of America is entitled, by virtue of the provisions of its Treaty with Morocco of September 16th, 1836, to exercise in the French Zone of Morocco consular jurisdiction in all disputes, civil or criminal, between citizens or protégés of the United States;

by ten votes to one,

Finds that the United States of America is also entitled, by virtue of the General Act of Algeciras of April 7th, 1906, to exercise in the French Zone of Morocco consular jurisdiction in all cases, civil or criminal, brought against citizens or protégés of the United States, to the extent required by the provisions of the Act relating to consular jurisdiction;

by six votes to five,

**Rejects**, except as aforesaid, the Submissions of the United States of America concerning consular jurisdiction;

40

213 JUDGMENT OF 27 VI11 52 (u.s. NATIONALS IN MOROCCO)

unanimously,

Finds that the United States of America is not entitled' to claim that the application to citizens of the United States of all laws and regulations in the French Zone of Morocco requires the assent of the Government of the United States, but that the consular courts of the United States may refuse to apply to United States citizens laws or regulations which have not been assented to by the Government of the United States;

on the Counter-Claim of the Government of the United States of America,

by six votes to five,

**Rejects** the Submissions of the United States of America relating to exemption from taxes;

by seven votes to four,

**Rejects** the Submissions of the United States of America relating to the consumption taxes imposed by the Shereefian Dahir of February 28th, 1948;

by six votes to five,

Finds that, in applying Article 95 of the General Act of Algeciras, the value of merchandise in the country of origin and its value in the local Moroccan market are both elements in the appraisal of its cash wholesale value delivered at the custom-house.

41

7.

## **Injury**

This dispute has cause so personal injury on the plaintiff. These injuries stems from ongoing harassment and threaten emails and mail. Which has cause severe stress and suffering. The Plaintiff sustain severe injuries due the negligence of the Defendants i.e., The ONTARIO SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE Clerks were rejecting and refusing to file her documents on the record. She was not given "due process of law". During the time of the dispute the plaintiff was in and out of the hospital. She was very sick and believe that some of the issue may have cause the stress and personal injuries.

This Injunction serves as a formal demand for a restrain against the Defendants. This dispute has cause physical and psychological ordeal endured by the plaintiff. Despite the extensive medical intervention this issue has cause. They have not been able to fully recover; and the consequences continue to impose emotional strain.

8.

## Closing And Warning

1. Any Violation of this Writ of Injunction Order of Restrain. Will Subject themselves to Liens and Levies, Land Fixture Filing Liens: and Federal Tax Liens. And shall face a minimum fine of five to fifteen (5-15) Million Dollars, and maximum of ten (10) years to life imprisonment or the death penalty.

2. A Lawsuit have been file against you (listed Defendants) above.

3.If there shall be a rebuttal to this Affidavit od Fact- Writ of Injunction, It shall be answered point by point and signed under the penalties of perjury or oath or affirmation by any interested person and filed in the records of this case withinten (10) days from the file date and receipt of this Affidavit, then it stands as prima facie evidence and conclusive proof in the records of the Morocco Consular Court Case number 777-000000251; et al.

9.

## Constitutional Violations

Title 18, Part 1, Chapter 13 §241 of United States Codes of Law:

*If two or more persons conspire to injure, oppress, threaten, or intimidate any person in any State, Territory, commonwealth, Possession, or district in the free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege secured to him by the Constitution or Laws of the United States, or because of his having so exercised the same;*

**They shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both;**

Title 18, Part 1, Chapter 13 §242 of United States Codes of Law:

*Whoever, under color of any law, statute, ordinance, regulation, or custom, willfully subjects any person in any State, Territory, Commonwealth, Possession, or District to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured or protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States, or to different punishments, pains, or penalties, on account of such person being an alien, or by reason of his color, or race, than are prescribed for the punishment of citizens, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.* "Where Rights secured by the Constitution are involved, there can be no rule - making or legislation, which would abrogate them." Miranda v. Arizona 384 US 436, 125

10. INJUNCTION. A prohibitive writ issued by a court of equity, at the suit of a party complainant, directed to a party defendant in the action, or to a party made a defendant for that purpose, forbidding the latter to do some act, or to permit his servants or agents to do some act, which he is threatening or attempting to commit, or restraining him in the continuance thereof, such act being unjust and inequitable, injurious to the plaintiff, and not such as can be adequately redressed by an action at law. Dupre v. Anderson, 45 La. Ann. 1134, 13 So. 743; City of Alma v. Loehr, 42 Kan. 368, 22 P. 424. A judicial process operating in personam, and requiring person to whom it is directed to do or refrain from doing a particular thing. Gainsburg v. Dodge, 193 Ark. 473, 101 S.W.2d 178, 180. See Henry Campbell Black's Law Dictionary, 4<sup>th</sup> Edition, page 923

11.

## Affidavit

I, Yahshanti Bey, declare and affirm by virtue of Divine Law, under the Zodiac Constitution; and upon the United States Republic Constitution; and upon the honor of my Foremother and Forefathers that everything in this foregoing Affidavit of Fact - Writ of Injunction to be right, truthful and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Executed this 26<sup>rd</sup> day of March, 2026.

Yahshanti Bey, de jure  
Authorized Representative, Natural Person, In Propria Persona:  
All Rights Reserve and Retained at all Points in Time  
U.C.C. 1-207/ 1-308; U.C.C. 1-103, Without Prejudice  
89 Church Street, Blenheim, Ontario, [Zip Exempt]  
Non-Domestic, Non-Resident, Non-Subject, Not a Corporate Person or Entity

In witness, I trustee jakim el bey, declare and affirm under the penalties of perjury that everything in this Affidavit of Fact - Writ of Injunction, to be right, truthful and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Autograph Trustee:  Date: March 26, 2026.

Executed this 26<sup>th</sup> day of March, 1448 M.C. Y. [2026 C.C.Y.] under Divine Law

**United States Department of Justice Moorish American Credentials AA222141 – TRUTH A-1**

Trustee: jakimel bey, Chief Consul / Judicial Officer / Registrar  
AA222141 = A – Allodium + A – American – Title 22 Chapter 2 – Section 141–143 = Judicial Authority  
Authorized Representative, Natural Person, In Propria Persona:  
Moorish American Consulate  
All Rights Reserve and Retained at all Points in Time  
U.C.C. 1-207/ 1-308; U.C.C. 1-103, Without Prejudice  
Non-Domestic, Non-Resident, Non-Subject, Not a Corporate Person or Entity  
Mailing Location: 1288 Ritson Road North, Suite #212, Oshawa, ON, [L1G 8B2]  
Email: [jakimelbey@gmail.com](mailto:jakimelbey@gmail.com)



**Affidavit of Fact**  
**Writ of Injunction**

**Moorish National Republic Federal Government**  
**Morocco Consular Court at Kanadario Republic Pursuant to Public Law 8 Stat. 484**  
**Competent Consular Jurisdiction and Venue Pursuant to Public Law 856, Chapter 807**  
**United States Department of Justice Moorish American Credential AA222141-TRUTH A-1**

**International Document**

**International Law Title 22 Chapter 2, Section 141-145**  
**International Court of Justice, decision the case France v. United States of American, "Case Concerning rights of nationals of the United States of America in Morocco, Judgment of August 27th, 1952: I.C.J. Reports 1952 p.176."**

**Supreme Court Case Law; "indeed no more than an affidavit is necessary to make the prima facie case".**  
**United States v. Kis, 658F. 2nd, 526, 536 (7th Cir. 1981; Cert. Denied, 50 U.S. L.W. 2169; S. Ct. March 22, 1982)**

**MOOR. An officer in the Isle of Man, who summons the courts for the several sherdings. The office is similar to the English bailiff of a hundred. Black's Law Dictionary, 4th Edition, page 1159**

**Notice to Agents is notice to principal; notice to principal is notice Agents**  
**For the records, and to be place into the records**

Exhibit B

March 26, 2026

**A Mandatory and Permanent Injunction**

Yahshanti Bey, natural person in propria persona sui juris  
Ex Relation Shaneen Alecia Oseghale, Shionn Alek Rowe James  
aboriginal and indigenous sovereign Moorish American National  
Authorized Representative at Kanadario republic  
Not a Corporate Person or Entity, Non - Subject  
All Rights Reserved and Retained, U.C.C. 1- 308; U.C.C. 1-103  
Mailing: 89 Church, Blenheim, Ontario,  
Near [NOP 1A0]  
Email: [shaneenrowe@gmail.com](mailto:shaneenrowe@gmail.com)

**Plaintiff**

**VS**

Victor G. Dodig, Harry Culham, CIBC Bank, Acting as CEO, et al  
Address: 56 Commerce Court, West, Toronto,  
Toronto, Ontario, Near [M5L 1A2]  
Phone: (416) 980-7777  
Email: [victor.dodig@cibc.com](mailto:victor.dodig@cibc.com)

Eva Lake, Milena Vinciguerra, Jocelyn Catenacci, C. Staples, et al  
Address: 5000 Yonge Street 10th Floor  
Toronto, Ontario, Near [M2N 7E9]  
Phone: (416) 222-8888  
Email: [jocelync@chaitons.com](mailto:jocelync@chaitons.com)

David C. Sparkman, Lynne C. Leitch acting as Clerk and Justice  
Address: 80 Dundas Street London  
London Ontario, Near [N6A 8K1]  
Phone: (519) 660-3000  
Email: [London.scj@ontario.ca](mailto:London.scj@ontario.ca)

Victor Mounivonh, acting as Sheriff, SHERIFF OFFICE  
Address: 80 Dundas Street London  
London Ontario, Near [N6A 8K1]  
Phone: (519) 660-3000  
Email: [London.scj@ontario.ca](mailto:London.scj@ontario.ca)

**Defendants**

Re: Consular Court Case No: 777-000000251

File No.: CV-25-00000725-0000  
in the foreign de facto  
ONTARIO SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE

Affidavit of Fact – Writ of Injunction  
International Document

International Law

Title 22 - Foreign Relations And Intercourse Ch 11  
Title 22 - Foreign Relations And Intercourse Ch 2,  
Sec 141 – 145, Consular Court and Judicial Authority  
Generally in all Cases to carry into full effect, Treaty  
Law, Embrace all Controversies with, Citizens, et al

Consular Jurisdiction and Venue

Pursuant to Public Law 856, Chapter 807, treaty  
law Article 20 and 21 of the Treaty of Peace  
Friendship 1787/1836 between the United States  
of North America and the Moors Moroccan  
Empire per Article VI, clause 2, and per  
Article III section 2, clause 1 and 2 of  
the Continental United States Constitution  
For North America, Treaty Law  
Diversity of Citizenship/Nationality Case.

## ORDER RESTRAIN

Upon the Writ of Possession, dated round about January 27, 2026, Notice to Vacate dated round about March 05, 2026. and by the affidavit conclusive evidence presented by the witness first-hand knowledge round about March 16, 2026, et al, at Morocco Consular Court, and hereto having been sworn to by oath of affirmation and under the penalties of perjury of the plaintiff Yahshanti Bey, Ex relatione, Shaneen Alecia Oseghale/Rowe and Sihon Alek Rowe-James, and base upon the facts asserted there in and the conclusive evidence presented before this Morocco Consular Court at kanadario republic.

This court has competent jurisdiction and judicial authority in all cases under international law Title 22 - Foreign Relations And Intercourse Chapter 2, Section 141 – 145, and pursuant to Public Law 859, Chapter 807 to issue this Order pursuant to Article 20 and 21 of the Treaty of Peace and Friendship 1787 and 1836 between the United States of North America and the Moors Moroccan Empire; and per Res Judicata World Court, I.C.J. International Court of Justice, decision, in the case France V. United States of America, Case Concerning rights of nationals, i.e., Moorish American Nationals of the United States of America in Morocco (the Empire), Judgment of August 27<sup>th</sup>, 1952: I.C.J. Reports 1952, p.176, and pursuant to Article VI clause 2 and Article III section 2 clause 1 and 2 of the Continental Constitution for United States of North America; and per the Supreme Court of Canada decision in Blencoe V. B.C. (Human Rights Commission), [2007] 2 S.C.R.307; and R, V. Hope, 2007; CANADA cannot violate International Law nor its International Human Rights Obligation, and pursuant to CANADA Bill C-15, United Nation Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People Act, Article 1-4, et al, assented June 21, 2021.

On this 26<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2026, it is hereby **ORDERED** that no further action shall be taken against the plaintiff Yahshanti Bey, Ex relatione, Shaneen Alecia Oseghale/Rowe and Sihon Alek Rowe-James and her home. Writ of Possession, dated round about January 27, 2026, Notice to Vacate dated round about March 05, 2026. and by the affidavit conclusive evidence presented by the witness first-hand knowledge round about March 16, 2026, et al, at the Morocco Consular Court, File No.: 777-00000025; be accepted as conclusive evidence, as a matter of fact, as a matter of law and as public policy; and pursuant to CANADA Bill C-15, United Nation Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People Act, Article 1-4, et al, assented June 21, 2021; and pursuant to Article 20 of the Treaty of Peace and Friendship 1787 and 1836 between the United States of North America and the Moors Moroccan Empire; World Court, I.C.J. International Court of Justice, decision, in the case France V. United States of America, Case Concerning rights of nationals, i.e., Moorish American Nationals of the United States of America in Morocco (the Empire), Judgment of August 27<sup>th</sup>, 1952: I.C.J. Reports 1952, p.176, and pursuant to Article VI clause 2 and Article III section 2 clause 1 and 2 of the Continental Constitution for United States of North America; and per the Supreme Court of Canada decision in Blencoe V. B.C.(Human Rights Commission), [2007] 2 S.C.R.307; and R, V. Hope, 2007; CANADA cannot violate International Law nor its International Human Rights Obligation.


It is further **ORDERED** that this Affidavit of fact – Writ of Injunction Mandatory and Permanent Junction be and the same is hereby entered against, Doug Littlewood, Badge #7288, Tetreault #7400, Victor G. Dodig, Harry Culham, CIBC Bank, CHAITONS LLP, Eva Lake, Milena Vinciguerra, Jocelyn Catenacci, Christopher Staples, Victor Mounivon, Claire McMahon, Khrytine McGowan, Home Alone Property Management Services Limited (Inc), and any other representative thereto, all Defendants, et al, David C. Sparkman, Lynne C. Leitch of THE ONTARIO SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE (Inc), and any other representative or joint principle agents thereto for “**Fraud and Errors and a lack of Jurisdiction**” pursuant to Article 20 of the Treaty of Peace and Friendship 1787 and 1836 between the United States of North America and the Moors Moroccan Empire; World Court, I.C.J. International Court of Justice, decision, in the case France V. United States of America, Case Concerning rights of nationals, i.e., Moorish American Nationals of the United States of America in Morocco (the Empire), Judgment of August 27<sup>th</sup>, 1952: I.C.J. Reports 1952, p.176, and pursuant to Article VI clause 2 and Article III section 2 clause 1 and 2 of the Continental Constitution for United States of North America, and per CANADA Bill C-15, United Nation Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People, Act, Article 1-4, et al, assented June 21, 2021; and per the Supreme Court of Canada decision in Blencoe V. B.C.(Human Rights Commission), [2007] 2 S.C.R.307; and R, V. Hope, 2007; CANADA cannot violate International Law nor its International Human Rights Obligation.

**This ORDER OF RESTRAIN is a Mandatory and Permanent Injunction.**

Autograph:  Date: March 26, 2026.

Executed this 26<sup>th</sup> day of March, 1448 M. C. Y. [2026 C.C.Y.] UNDER Divine Law

OFFICER OF COURT  

:  ~:  
Autograph of court officer or minister  
Morocco Consular Court at Kanadario republic

**SO ORDERED, sui juris**

**DONE AND ORDERED** at Kanadario Maghrib Aqsa, North – West Amexem / North America in Morocco

**United States Department of Justice Moorish American Credentials AA222141 – TRUTH A-1**

Trustee: jakim el bey, Chief Consul / Judicial Officer / Registrar  
AA222141 = A – Allodium + A – American – Title 22 Chapter 2 – Section 141–143 = Judicial Authority  
Authorized Representative, Natural Person, In Propria Persona:

Moorish American Consulate

All Rights Reserve and Retained at all Points in Time

U.C.C. 1-207/ 1-308; U.C.C. 1-103, Without Prejudice

Non-Domestic, Non-Resident, Non-Subject, Not a Corporate Person or Entity

Mailing Location: 1288 Ritson Road North, Suite #212, Oshawa, ON, [L1G 8B2]

Email: [jakimelbey@gmail.com](mailto:jakimelbey@gmail.com)

United States Library of Congress AA222141 = A-Allodium + A-American – Title 22 Chapter 2 – Section 141 – 145 = Judicial Authority.