

charlemagne-binyamin: sandford-el
c/o 2018 Gladeview Parkway
stone mountain, georgia, RFD [30083]
Tele: 000-000-0000

charlemagne-binyamin: sandford-el, Appears Specially: Pro Per

NEWARK DISTRICT COURT

CHARLEMAGNE BINYAMIN:
SANDFORD-EL,
Plaintiff,

vs.

CHRIS CANNON, GEORGE PILESKEY, C.
CALABRO, C. BONAGURA, B. FLYNN,
FRANK MONGALIERI, JAMES IANDOLI,
PTL CELOSKI, WARREN MUNICIPALITY,
PROSPECT PARK MUNICIPALITY,
BLOOMINGDALE MUNICIPALITY,
MIDDLESEX MUNICIPALITY, SOUTH
BRUNSWICK MUNICIPALITY, HALEDON
MUNICIPALITY et al.

Defendant

) Docket No.: 3:19-cv-08776-FLW-DEA
)
)
) AMMENDED PETITION FOR REDRESS
) OF GRIEVANCES
)

14
) Date: 13th Day of December, 2019

I, charlemagne-binyamin: sandford-el (charles-benjamin: sandford), hereafter referred to as the "Affiant," having firsthand knowledge of the facts stated herein, and being competent in mind and body to testify, declare and affirm that the facts stated herein are true, correct, and complete in all material fact, not misrepresented and made under the penalties of perjury of the laws of the united States of America (28 U.S.C § 1746 (1)).

GROUND

Conspiracy to deprive rights guaranteed by State and Federal Constitutions.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

1. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 & §1343 the district courts shall have jurisdiction of all civil actions arising under the Constitution, laws, or treaties of the United States and to redress the deprivation under color of any State law, statute, ordinance, regulation custom or usage, of any right, privilege or immunity secured by the Constitution for the united States of America. Pursuant to Article VI §3 paragraph 2 of the New Jersey Constitution, the Superior Court shall have original general jurisdiction throughout the state for all causes. Pursuant to Article 3 § 2 of the Constitution for the united States of America, when a State is a party the Supreme Court shall have original jurisdiction.

PARTIES

2. The Plaintiff, charlemagne-binyamin: sandford-el (charles benjamin: sandford) is of the age of majority, and is the only party personally injured and aggrieved; a New Jerseyan.
3. The Defendants, Frank Mongalieri and SOUTH BRUNSWICK MUNICIPALITY, can be served at P.O. Box 190 540 Ridge Road, Monmouth Junction, New Jersey, 08852.
4. The Defendants, B. Flynn and HAWTHORNE MUNICIPALITY can be served at 445 Lafayette Ave, Hawthorne, New Jersey, 07506.
5. The Defendants C. Bonagura and Prospect Park Municipality can be served at 106 Brown Ave, Prospect Park New Jersey, 07508.
6. The Defendants James Iandoli, Ptl. Celoski, and HALEDON MUNICIPALITY can be served at 510 Belmont Ave, Haledon New Jersey, 07508.
7. The Defendants Chris Cannon and WARREN MUNICIPALITY can be served at 44 Mountain Blvd., Warren New Jersey, 07059
8. The Defendants George Pilesky and MIDDLESEX MUNICIPALITY can be served at 1200 Mountain Ave, Middlesex New Jersey 08846.
9. The Defendants C. Calabro and BLOOMINGDALE MUNICIPALITY can be served at 101 Hamburg Turnpike, Bloomingdale New Jersey, 07403.

10. All other Municipalities as can be ascertained by charges against Charles Sandford in the records of the Department of Motor Vehicles.
11. At all times relevant to this petition, all defendants acted in concert and conspiracy and were jointly and severally responsible for the harms caused to the Affiant.
12. At all times relevant to this petition, all defendants acted under color of law, repugnantly misapplying statutes related to the regulation of vehicles on the highway for gain. (Stephenson v. Binford No. 326 287 U.S. 251)
13. At all times relevant to this petition, all defendants acted with deliberate and willful indifference to the Supreme Law of the Land and their oaths of office.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

14. I charlemagne-binyamin: sandford-el have changed my name by way of assumption from the name I was before called Charles Benjamin Sandford.
15. From the time I became of the age of majority and began to exercise my right to movement by use of noncommercial truck, I have been denied my fundamental rights to liberty and due process by public servants repugnantly misapplying statutes related to regulating vehicles on the highway for gain. (Kent v. Dulles 357 U.S. 116 (1958) Dianna Sanchez v. Department of Human Services Gundaker v. Gassert 127 A.2d 566 (1956)).
16. From the time I began using the public ways to travel, I have always felt that it was inherently wrong how the police power was used, but did not have the words and know-how to express it effectively in a "court" setting.
17. Beginning sometime in 2015 I dedicated myself to learning the law and my civil rights and obtained my first victory in HALEDON MUNICIPAL COURT case 15-03029 in which charges for driving while suspended, no insurance or registration, and brakelight infractions, were dismissed with prejudice. (Valesquez v Franz 589 A.2d 143 (1991))
18. Although many of my early litigation documents were rather crude, I have never failed to mention the fact that I was not on the public ways for commercial purposes.
19. The parties in HALEDON MUNICIPAL COURT case 15-03029 were THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY V. CHARLES SANDFORD.
20. Every subsequent traffic infraction I have gotten from 2016 up until 2018 has the same caption of THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY V. CHARLES SANDFORD.

21. Every subsequent traffic infraction after my initial victory in 2016 case 15-03029, was started in the same manner, a public servant turning on his emergency lights when no emergency existed, depriving me of my liberty by custodial arrest, without due process of law, and a additional violation of my due process rights by penalizing me for what the law clearly states I can do. (U.S. v. Goodwin 457 U.S. 368 (1982) Delaware v. Prouse 440 U.S. 648 (1979)).
22. The last overt acts of this conspiracy were committed sometime after June of 2018 by MIDDLESEX MUNICIPAL COURT, SOUTH BRUNSWICK MUNICIPAL COURT, HAWTHORNE MUNICIPAL COURT, AND PROSPECT PARK MUNICIPAL COURT, by issuing warrants in violation of R.7:2-4(b). (Berger v. Paterson Veterans Taxi Serv., 244 N.J. Super. 200, 204 (App. Div. 1990) (quoting Driscoll v. Burlington Bristol Bridge Co., 8 N.J. 433, 493 (1952))).
23. Despite giving notice to the Municipalities mentioned in point 22 of the ineffective service of process only SOUTH BRUNSWICK MUNICIPAL COURT removed the void warrants as of 4/28/2019.
24. In the beginning of January 2016, I was arbitrarily deprived of my liberty by James Iandoli by custodial arrest. James informed me that he pulled me over because of the loud muffler noise of my non-commercial truck and that a brake light was out.
25. I gave James my license and the insurance and registration to the car, somehow the insurance and registration got back into the automobile and the automobile towed.
26. I was penalized for exercising my right to movement by the three bills of pains and penalties mentioned in point 17.
27. On January 19, 2016 I made a first appearance in HALEDON MUNICIPAL COURT and challenged the jurisdiction of the court. Judge John Sergeto assumed jurisdiction and I was arrested for constantly objecting to Judge John Sergeto attempting to move on to trial absent any jurisdictional facts on and for the record. (Abbot v. Beth Israel Cemetery Association of New Jersey; Bradley v Fisher 80 U.S. 335 13 Wall 335)
28. I was charged with a disorderly persons by PTL Celoski, who made a statement under penalty of perjury, that he had first hand knowledge of the offense I was charged with, only later to admit to me that he wasn't even in the court room at the time I was arrested.

29. I, charlemagne-binyamin: sandford-el, was exercising my federally protected elementary right of travel when deprived of my rights to liberty and due process by Frank Mongalieri acting under color of law on 03/30/2016.
30. I was in complete control and did not put the general public in danger by travelling in a automobile. Frank Mongalieri with deliberate indifference, applied statutes in a manner repugnant to my fundamental right to movement/migration/travel in order penalize that right.
31. After depriving me my right to liberty by custodial arrest, Frank Mongalieri demanded that the Affiant provide a license, seeking to override my private preferred use of the public ways for travel; which is a natural right. (Murdock v. Pennsylvania, 319 U.S. 105 (1943) No. 480)
32. I did not give Frank Mongalieri a license but did offer him my common law copyright positively identifying myself (UNITED STATES V STEWART No. 2258-64); and the registration and insurance for the automobile.
33. I was then assaulted by unlawful arrest.
34. On first appearance I gave notice to the South Brunswick municipal prosecutor that HALEDON MUNICIPAL COURT case 15-03029 bars the claims asserted, the prosecutor deceptively gave a good common sense "theory" as to why he was not barred from prosecuting the repugnant claim of Frank Mongalieri; however it was not based in law and a lie. (State v Frost 727 A.2d 1 (1999))
35. Despite challenging jurisdiction several times (State v Osborn, 32 N.J. 117 (1960) 160 A.2d 42), and providing the court with the disposition of the case barring their claims, the Affiant was falsely convicted and sentenced to 12 days imprisonment and fined \$1,267.00.
36. Judge Spero Kalambakas is bound by oath (U.S. Const. Article 6 §2) to uphold the supreme law of land, but it doesn't appear that he has in these factual allegations. It appears that Judge Spero Kalambakas is deliberately indifferent to the supreme law of the land. I feel like I lacked a fair opportunity to be heard or present my defense, even if SOUTH BRUNSWICK MUNICIPAL COURT had jurisdiction to adjudicate the controversy contained herein, which it clearly did not and does not, and if HALEDON MUNICIPAL COURT case 15-03029 didn't bar the claims repugantly asserted, which the Affiant believes does; the prosecutor and Judge Kalambakas were given notice that I was exercising my right to travel at the time of the cause of action against me; nor was

there any commercial activity involved in flexing my rights. (HOWLETT v. ROSE, (1990) No. 89-5383) My constant protest to the courts subject-matter jurisdiction should have been considered sua sponte in the interest of justice. I am not aware of any jurisdictional facts for the record, or any evidence of jurisdiction to the best of my recollection. (Marbury v. Madison)

37. Even after enduring all of the above, I was still harassed by SOUTH BRUNSWICK MUNICIPAL COURT on a couple of instances by issuing warrants contrary to my due process rights and R. 7:2-4(b).
38. An instance of the fact mentioned above in point 36, is I was defending myself from the second half of HLEDON MUNICIPAL COURT case 15-03029, which had been split and sent to different courts. While similarly challenging jurisdiction in case 15-03029 I was charged in retaliation with a false disorderly persons charge. The false repugnant traffic charges were sent to Totowa and the disorderly persons charge sent to Bergen County. While I was attempting to defend himself in Bergen County the prosecutor of the same county conspired with SOUTH BRUNSWICK MUNICIPAL COURT to deprive the me of my right to be heard concerning the disorderly persons charge, by assaulting me by unlawful arrest and taking me against my consent to SOUTH BRUNSWICK MUNICIPAL COURT on a warrant issued in violation of R. 7:2-4(b). The traffic violations that were sent to Totowa were dismissed with prejudice, and the disorderly persons charge was also dismissed
39. The Prosecutors actions constitute an impermissible collateral attack on a final judgement; his impermissible collateral attack produced my wrongful conviction and false imprisonment.
40. The Prosecutor was grossly negligent in denying my due process right of a final judgement and relief as stipulated by Valesquez v Franz, violated RPC 1.1.
41. The Prosecutor assisted Frank Mongalieri to testify falsely under the unproven presumption that I was on the road for the extraordinary purposes of gain, violating RPC 3.4
42. The Prosecutor did not refrain from prosecuting Frank Mongalieri's claims against me, which represented a violation of my liberty and due process rights pursuant to Kent v Dulles.
43. I am not the person legislature intended to regulate on the public ways pursuant to Stephenson v Binford, therefor Frank Mongalieri lacked probable cause to deprive me of my liberty rights. Frank Mongalieri issuing me tickets represents a due process violation

pursuant to U.S. v Goodwin and the Prosecutor still chose to persecute me violating RPC 3.8(a).

44. I have sustained severe emotional distress due to the factual allegations stated above, and have developed a post traumatic stress when dealing with police officers and municipal courts. I am not insured and can not seek any counseling because I can not afford it. I have also developed claustrophobia due to the constant unlawful arrests. I have also lost employment, and employment opportunities because of the penalization of my right to travel, and unlawful arrests. But that is not the end of it.
45. On 5/23/17 I was deprived my liberty by custodial arrest, by PTLM Pilesky, without probable cause pursuant to his oath of office.
46. The Defendant PTLM George Pilesky pulled up behind me on private property and turned on his emergency lights. I had already arrived home, taken the keys out of the ignition of the non-commercial truck and was outside of it when approached by PTLM George Pilesky and demanded to stay against my will and consent. I wanted to remain silent and demanded to be read my Miranda rights since I was now under custodial arrest. The Defendant refused to read my rights and escalated the situation without cause.
47. George Pilesky then handcuffed me against my will and consent, and searched me. George Pilesky touched my genitals several times and made me very uncomfortable. I was in fear for my life and well- being.
48. PTLM George Pilesky, then transported me against my will and consent to Middlesex Police Station and obtained my information under duress.
49. I informed George Pilesky, and co-conspirators that the use of the my registered service mark would cost \$150,000.00 one hundred and fifty thousand per use per occurrence, as well as stipulated in CR-111719868042.
50. The Defendants have become unauthorized users pursuant to CR-111719868042
51. PTLM George Pilesky also used the information obtained from me under duress to search for warrants. The Defendant found a void warrant issued by Middlesex Municipal Court for failure to appear in violation of R.7:2-4(b).
52. I had the case transferred due to a conflict of interest to New Brunswick. On the day scheduled for court I appeared. Judge Hoebich refused to allow me a reasonable

opportunity to be heard because I was wearing a basketball jersey with no sleeves. I affirm that the weather that day was in the 90's give or take a few degrees. I affirm that the "judge" in New Brunswick did not seem impartial, and the court record should be discoverable.

53. I affirm that the facts concerning the warrant and charges 1211 S 2017 000140 and 1211 E17 002305-002310 have been misrepresented. When the "judge" from New Brunswick adjourned my case, 14 days had expired and the case should have been dismissed due to lack of persecution. 2C:1-2(d) states nothing contained in this code shall limit the right of a defendant and, subject only to the Federal and State constitutions. The Defendant, PTLM George Pilesky, refused to acknowledge my rights according the New Jersey Constitution and deprived me of the rights of due process, self-incrimination, property rights, and the right to worship the Lord Almighty in a manner agreeable with the dictates of my consciousness. I have stated in the Ammendment to SA#-111719868042-CBS 1 Corinthians 3:16-17 Know ye not that ye are the temple of God and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you? If any man defile the temple of God, him shall God destroy. George Pilesky has defiled my temple and took it by force against my consent as all other defendants in this action.
54. On or around 2/14/17 I was stopped by the Defendant, Chris Cannon, without probable cause pursuant to his oath of office.
55. I demanded to see Chris Cannons' superiors because I did not recognize Chris Cannons' probable cause or jurisdiction. I also spoke with Chris Cannons' superiors and they also did not provide me with probable cause or an emergency that would justify the arbitrary search and seizure.
56. I was then assaulted by unlawful arrest and transported against my consent to a jail so that Chris Cannon and his superiors could profit off of my oppression.
57. I was never given a reasonable opportunity to be heard in Chris Cannon's repugnant claims against me yet the charges for the violations appear in my surcharges.
58. The above mentioned Haledon case bars Chris Cannon's repugnant claims against me.

59. I, charlemagne-binyamin: sandford-el, was flexing my elementary, federally protected right to travel, which is well established by law, on 5/25/18 when unlawfully seized in violation of my 4th and 14th amendment immunity, by public servant C. Bonagura.
60. C. Bonagura is barred from the claim he was repugnantly seeking to enforce by HALEDON BORO MUNICIPAL COURT case 15-03029.
61. C. Bonagura called his supervisor to the scene after depriving me of my right to liberty, and I also informed her that I was not on the public ways for the purposes of commerce.
62. I did not commit any crime so I did not feel compelled to identify myself.
63. I was told by C. Bonagura's superior that if I did not identify/incriminate myself, that she would arrest me.
64. The law did not require me to identify myself under the facts of this experience so I refused and was assaulted by unlawful arrest and deprived of my rights to liberty and due process. (Brown v. Texas 443 U.S. 47 (1979))
65. Shortly after being assaulted by the above mentioned officers, I was further deprived of my rights by way of a void warrant pursuant to R.7:2-4(b) from HAWTHORNE MUNICIPAL COURT.
66. HAWTHORNE MUNICIPAL COURT was in session at the time I was deprived of my rights to liberty and against unreasonable search and seizures, and I was further deprived of my rights to due process because I was not allowed by PROSPECT PARK police officers to see the magistrate.
67. CITY WIDE TOWING also conspired to deprive me of my rights by stealing trust res and extorting me.
68. I, charlemagne-binyamin: sandford-el [real party of interest, man of full life, New Jerseyian, Mississippian, Georgian, was exercising my elementary right of travel along ancestral lands at about 12:30 a.m. when I was deprived of my right to liberty by PTL. B. FLYNN
69. After being deprived of my right to liberty by PTL. Flynn I was also deprived of my due process rights when PTL. FLYNN issued several bills of pains and penalties on the repugnant misapplication of statutes relating to vehicles on the public ways for the

purposes of gain; and the false assumption that I was operating trust res for commercial purposes.

70. The actions taken by PTL. FLYNN happened on Goffle Rd. a borderline between Paterson and Hawthorne. To the best of my knowledge and belief the deprivation of my liberty was racially motivated by stereotypes and the unwritten belief and culture of modern police offices that Moorish Americans are criminals. I consented to an additional search for weapons under threat, duress, and coercion because I did not want to escalate the situation; as is also an unwritten culture of modern police officers when Moorish Americans assert their rights.
71. At the time of the stop, I did not possess a drivers' license, which to the best of my knowledge is a important nexus in traffic cases that may bind a defendant; furthermore my right to travel is clearly established law.
72. The court has further deprived me of my due process rights by issuing a warrant contrary to R. 7:2-4(b).
73. HALEDON BORO MUNICIPAL COURT case 15-03029 also bars PTL. FLYNN and HAWTHORNE MUNICIPAL COURT from pursuing its false and repugnant claims.
74. I was exercising my elementary right of travel along ancestral lands on 03/31/18 when I noticed a public servant parked at a gas station, shortly after I passed the public servant pulled out a car behind me. Because I was in a predominantly white area and painfully aware of how much police officers in New Jersey target Moorish Americans at a much higher rate the whites; I quickly turned into a 7Eleven and purchased a few things. I then continued on my way and shortly after that same public servant had turned on his emergency lights as soon as he could get behind me. I then pulled over my private conveyance under the assumption that there was a fire or some other emergency, in order to make room for the public servant to pass on. To my dismay the public servant, PTL A CALABRO(BLOOMINGDALE MUNICIPAL COURT), pulled over behind me, exited his vehicle and began to approach my conveyance. PTL A CALABRO then presumed that I was for hire or doing business and demanded a driver's license registration and

insurance. Bewildered, I told PTL A CALABRO I do not have a license I am not for hire, under his jurisdiction or a U.S. Citizen (28 U.S.C. § 3002 (15)(A)(B)(C)). I then gave PTL A CALABRO my common law identification and the insurance and registration of the trust res. The public servant then continued to harass me and trespass on my elementary right to free movement and trust res without nexum or probable cause of a crime. The public servant, PTL A CALABRO then called for a co-conspirator and then unlawfully searched and found some of my left over food (Genesis 1:29 P.L 97-280). After the public servant finished trespassing on trust res, he then assaulted the affiant by unlawful arrest. While kidnapped and handcuffed in the public servants place of business, I was forced to self incriminate as PTL A CALABRO and co conspirators violated my temple (Ammendment to SA-#111719868042-CBS) by scanning my fingerprints through a electrical device in order to fabricate a charge. Before my temple was violated the public servants had no way of forcing their corporate bills of attainder on me.

After PTL A CALABRO and co-conspirators got what information they needed they proceeded to deliberate for a lengthy time as to what was the best bill of attainders to use to enforce business upon me. The stress of the altercation caused me to experience chess pains and had to taken to a hospital. After being treated at the hospital I was then taken to Passaic County Jail. I was held kidnapped at Passaic County Jail for two days before seeing a judge. At the hearing I told the judge I do not want a public defender to represent me, I am capable of handling my own affairs and that it was a conflict of interest for public defender to represent me because THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY was prosecuting me and THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY would now be defending me. I challenged jurisdiction but was ignored and denied release from Passaic County Jail on a motion that was not presented to me until 10 minutes before the hearing, nor did I have a opportunity to rebut/answer the motion. I was denied due process and held an additional four days before my next appearance before a judge. By this time the Affiant was under extreme duress and was now becoming more concerned about previous trade agreements and livelihood. The affiant has never been employed in a federal sense and has never worked for THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY or THE UNITED STATES INC. (28 U.S.C. § 3002 (15)(A)(B)(C) 29 U.S.C § 152 (3)).

75. The cases as stated from point 58 and upward of this complaint is the reason I was denied release on my own recognizance from Passaic County Correctional Facility.
76. I have been arrested multiple times on void warrants pursuant to R. 7:2-4(b)

18 U.S.C §242 §241 Conspiracy to Deprive Rights

77. For the reasons stipulated in points 12, 13, and 15-76 the defendants participated in a conspiracy to continually and willfully deprive me of my fundamental rights and to oppress me. The human defendants went on the public ways posing as officers who took an oath to protect and uphold the Constitutions, but their actions apparently don't mirror that oath. Police officers use fear tactics and always escalate a situation if a person asserts their rights. They completely disregard the fundamentals of their official duties and encroach on the most basic liberties guaranteed to we the people. The Municipalities are liable for failure to train their officers on right to travel jurisprudence and upholding their first duty which is to protect and uphold the Constitutions as faithful stewards of the public trust; as well as the unconstitutional unwritten custom to mistreat those whom they deem "sovereign citizens".

42 U.S.C 1983 Conspiracy to Deprive Rights

78. For the reasons stipulated in point 77 the Defendants are liable under 42 U.S.C § 1983.

14TH Amendment Violations

79. The named Municipalities are liable under the 14th amendment for trespassing on my due process rights, and my liberty rights. The municipal courts lack the subject matter jurisdiction to adjudicate constitutional controversies. The municipal courts never prove a person was using the public ways for an extraordinary purpose, they always presume it. I have no knowledge of any facts on the record of any of the aforementioned cases; that I was using the public ways for the extraordinary purpose of gain.

Assault

80. Every unlawful arrest from 2016-2018 constitutes a separate charge of assault.

Double Jeopardy

81. The unlawful conviction and imprisonment in the South Brunswick Municipal Case was an impermissible collateral attack on a final judgement. The multiple other charges are exactly the reason why res judicata and double jeopardy are apart of American jurisprudence. THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY has become a vexatious litigant, Municipal Corporations repeatedly expose me to the gauntlet when the dismissal with prejudice in the Haledon case should have been the final adjudication. If THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY wanted to collateral attack that judgement the proper course of action would have been an appeal.

Due Process Violations

82. Every arbitrary arrest under the false presumption that I was using the public ways for an extraordinary purpose equals a violation of my due process rights pursuant to Kent v. Dulles.
83. Every time I was ticketed and penalized for exercising my right to movement is a due process violation pursuant to U.S. v. Goodwin.

False Arrest

84. For the reasons stated in the Factual Allegations every traffic stop was a false arrest

Kidnapping

85. To the best of my knowledge transportation laws more accurately apply to the public servants who appear to be in a agency relation with the Department of Motor Vehicles.
86. Public servants more accurately use the public ways for extraordinary purposes since they regulate interstate commerce.
87. Every time I was arrested on a void warrant pursuant to R. 7: 2-4(b) I was taken without my consent and transported to another location and public servants are paid to do this.

Prayer for Relief

88. I pray for a preliminary injunction against THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY from pursuing any claims against me because I flex my right to movement. If a public servant does not see any advertisements on my non commercial truck, then they have no reason to interact with me. If I am not a risk to the public safety I should be left alone and allowed my privacy.
89. I pray that the case started by Ptl A. Calabro be declared void and the records expunged.
90. I pray for compensatory and punitive relief in the amount of ten million dollars, preferably a negotiable instrument payable on demand immediately after judgement without delay.
91. Determination of unauthorized user fees.

Respectfully presented,
charlemagne-binyamin: sandford-el (charles-benjamin: sandford),
Petitioner

Charles Sandford
ISI charlemagne binyamin sandford-el
WITHOUT PREJUDICE

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Georgia STATE)
) Scilicet
County of Dekalb)

SUBSCRIBED TO AND SWORN before me a Notary, this ^{14th} ~~13th~~ day of December, A.D. 2019,

that, charlemagne-binyamin: sandford-el(charles-benjamin: sandford) personally appeared and known to me to be the man whose name subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to be the same.

Seal;

Notary Public in and for said State

My Commission expires;

September 22, 2023

C. Hardwick

