Case number 241901068

I am (name), (address), (phone number). I am (name), (address), (phone number). I submit this complaint having listened to the court audio recording of this court regarding the following dates:

November 20, 2024: Judge Hall agreed to appointment as fiduciary

April 2, 2025: Judge Hall agreed to conduct trial by jury

On November 20, 2024 after Devante Cartwright appointed Judge Hall as his fiduciary, Judge Hall continued the court proceeding without objecting to the appointment. This constitutes acceptance of the appointment. By standard court proceeding, Judge Hall accepted the appointment as fiduciary of Devante Cartwright.

On April 2, 2025, Devante Cartwright clearly told Judge Hall that he desired a trial by jury, to which Judge Hall responded, "That's fine." Judge Hall thus agreed to a TRIAL BY JURY, but then signed an order two days afterwards on April 4, 2025 requiring a JURY TRIAL, which is NOT a TRIAL BY JURY. Judge Hall now stands in contempt of his own statement in which he agreed to a TRIAL BY JURY but then signed an order for a JURY TRIAL, and this act constitutes JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT. I demand investigation of this proceeding as well as a declaration of MISTRIAL.

As it stands, these charges are based on hearsay and this case is riddled with lack of evidence, lack of service, and especially lack of affidavit.

Furthermore, the living man DeVante Cartwright does not meet the court's definition of "person," so legally, this court does not have jurisdiction over him.

This case violates DeVante's Constitutional rights as follows:

1. There is no direct evidence that DeVante sent the TikTok videos (violates In re Winship, 397 U.S. 358). In reality, he did not send the videos, and his multiple affidavits overwhelmingly confirm such contrary evidence. The prosecutor and this court both pursue a legal absurdity by continuing to prosecute such baseless charges.

2. These charges are based on hearsay upon hearsay (body cam of phone, officer narrating), which violates Crawford v. Washington, 541 U.S. 36.

3. This case is void for vagueness: the prosecuting attorney's attempt to apply the statute to punish speculative conduct violates U.S. Const. Amend. XIV & Utah Const. Art. I §

4. This court must dismiss this case because this judge has committed judicial misconduct by altering the trial terms after agreeing on record, i.e., the judge ordered a "jury trial" instead of "trial by jury," which he agreed to on audio recording. This judicial misconduct now activates the Constitution's Supremacy Clause (U.S. Const. Art. VI) which must move the case to a federal due process because of state misuse. Authorities: New Hampshire v. Maine; U.S. Const. Amend. VI.

Due Process

The state cannot be its own witness because the reporting agent, “officer,” lacks personal knowledge and the alleged “victim” did not produce an affidavit as evidence (Linda R.S. v. Richard D., 410 U.S. 614).

The officer involved has no credibility as he is no longer employed, and his police department refuses to provide his oath of office by GRAMA (void act: Norton v. Shelby County, 118 U.S. 425).

The history of this ongoing case is riddled with entrapment because the accuser repeatedly lured DeVante into violations (Jacobson v. U.S., 503 U.S. 540; Utah Code § 76-2-303).

Agents of this case also coerced DeVante into making prior pleas, therefore this case is invalid under Boykin v. Alabama, 395 U.S. 238.

I demand judicial estoppel because the judge reversed his on-record agreement about trial procedure, reference clip 2 that was taken from the court’s own recording of the proceeding (New Hampshire v. Maine, 532 U.S. 742).

Jurisdiction

The living man DeVante Cartwright entered this matter via Special Appearance, not as pro se. He is a living man and NOT in the jurisdiction of this corporate administrative court. He admits to NO JURISDICTION of this court. DeVante Cartwright is an American State National, not a “person” by any definition. The court’s misidentification of DeVante as a “person”is a jurisdictional defect and constitutes fraud. Authorities: U.S. Const. Amend. X; Yick Wo v. Hopkins, 118 U.S. 356.

Courts lack standing without an injured party (Utah Const. Art. I § 11), and DeVante’s evidence shows that he did not send the videos in question. This court must exonerate DeVante and recognize that this complaint is VOID.

This court must dismiss this matter WITH PREJUDICE because of Failure to State a Claim, i.e., there is no evidence that DeVante sent any “videos” to the account inquisition, as well as the fact that the accuser admitted to no injury. Authorities: U.S. Const. Amend. V & XIV; Utah Const. Art. I § 7; Winship, Utah Const. Art. I § 11; Linda R.S. v. Richard D.; Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife..

The “police officer” that made a statement is no longer employed by the “department” and he had no personal knowledge of the event in question, so his statement is VOID. Authorities: Utah R. Evid. 602, 801; Fed. R. Evid. 602, 802; Norton v. Shelby County.

The “body cam” footage is based on hearsay upon hearsay which also makes the police agent’s statement VOID. Authorities: Crawford v. Washington; Utah R. Evid. 801–803.

This court must exclude prior convictions because DeVante was coerced into making pleas under unclear circumstances, as well as numerous other complicating factors. Authorities: Boykin v. Alabama; Utah Const. Art. I § 12.

 Your name, living man or woman
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