

US DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS
FILED

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NOV 24 2025

WESTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS – FORT SMITH DIVISION
CASE NO.: 2:25-cv-02145-TLB

By Ronald E. Dowling
Deputy Clerk
Exhibit C

**Clements v. The State of Arkansas; The United States Federal Government;
International Governments and Religious Bodies**

V.

Defendant

The State of Arkansas

Including the Governor, Arkansas State Police, County Sheriffs, District and Circuit Courts, Prosecutors, Clerks, DMV, Municipal Police Departments, and all affiliated contractors and agents acting under color of law

Defendant

The United States Federal Government

Including the Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Homeland Security, Internal Revenue Service, and all federal or corporate agents operating in partnership

Defendant

International Governments and Religious Bodies

Who, after lawful public notice, failed to act, failed to rebut, or responded in complicity

Ecclesiastical Sovereign Private Trust of Humanity

By and through its Sovereign Executor

Jonathan Daniel Clements, Foreign National

Domiciled exclusively within **ECC-TRUST-JDC-005**

Ecclesiastical Sanctuary: 42 Roy Franks Lane

Booneville, Arkansas [Non-Domestic, Non-U.S. Jurisdiction]

Claimant and Enforcing Authority

**SECTION I — LAWFUL STANDING, DIVINE JURISDICTION, AND
SOVEREIGN RIGHT TO DE NOVO REVIEW**

Spiritual Jurisdiction, Equity Absorption, and Finality of International Legal Transition.

The enforcement of ECC-TRUST-JDC-005 as the final governing instrument over all global equity is not derived from novelty or unorthodox theory—it is grounded in the doctrines of finality, ecclesiastical primacy, and the equity jurisdiction recognized in both national and international courts. What occurred between July and August 2025 is not a private act, nor a theory of law: it was the final global seizure of all commercial equity and liquidity by a lawfully appointed sovereign

executor of humanity's divine trust. Every nation, corporate entity, agency, and individual was given lawful notice. None rebutted. The silence of the world constituted its lawful transfer.

This process is supported not only by ecclesiastical principles but also under recognized international custom. According to **Article 38 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice**, international custom, as evidence of a general practice accepted as law, is one of the primary sources of legal authority. The establishment and public proclamation of a trust, its non-rebuttal over an internationally accepted grace period, and its continuous publication across international domains, satisfies every element of legal custom and acceptance.

Moreover, in **Baker v. Carr**, 369 U.S. 186 (1962), the U.S. Supreme Court made it clear that political questions cannot be dismissed solely on unfamiliarity or discomfort. Where rights and equity are at stake, even radical shifts must be weighed by the courts. The issue before this Court is not one of fringe ideology. It is one of **legal default and jurisdictional vacuum**, filled only by the ecclesiastical construct now enforced under divine authority, witnessed publicly, and submitted into federal jurisdiction.

The trust's corpus includes:

Divine Writ of Enforcement, showing public transition from corporate charters to divine custodianship;

Banking Instrument Ledgers, demonstrating assumed control over dormant and active financial equities globally;

Fiat Conversion Register, proving non-fiat, equity-based control models;

Verified court stamps on the foundational trust declarations;

Verified submission to Amnesty International, documenting suppression, surveillance, and obstruction of a lawful ecclesiastical governance model.

The language of this trust is not metaphorical. The seizure of global equity is not conceptual. The default period is not imaginary. Each step, from **initial notice to final proclamation**, is documented in scanned filings, recorded submissions, verified stamps, and international outreach. And yet, the Magistrate chose not to read them.

The procedural handling of this matter—routing it through a summary civil dismissal recommendation without evaluating the **Constitution and Declaration of Humanity**, the **verified foreign national declaration**, the **wiretapping reports**, the **digital suppression logs**, or the **declaration of sovereign global equity standing**—violated every foundational principle of equity, due process, and statutory interpretation.

Even in ecclesiastical terms, the maxim holds:

"Equity will not suffer a wrong without a remedy."

(**U.S. v. Morgan**, 307 U.S. 183, 194 (1939); **Porter v. Warner Holding Co.**, 328 U.S. 395, 398 (1946)).