

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

ORIGINAL

ANDRE MOORE

Plaintiff,

AMON, CH.J.

COMPLAINT

-against-

LIUETENANT CAINE,
LALCHAN SINGH,

Defendants,

BLOOM, M. **CV 15**

2062

RECEIVED
IN CLERK'S OFFICE
U.S. DISTRICT COURT E.D.N.Y.

★ APR 10 2015 ★

LONG ISLAND OFFICE

I. Parties:

Plaintiff ANDRE MOORE, resides at 580 Sutter avenue #6B Brooklyn New York

Defendant LIUETENANT CAINE, resides at 1000 Sutter Avenue Brooklyn New York 11208

Defendant LALCHAN SINGH, resides at 1000 Sutter Avenue Brooklyn New York 11208

II. **ALL PARTIES** are hereby advised that the Federal District Court has original "subject matter" jurisdiction where Federal Questions and/or Diversity of Citizenship are at issue. The primary issue is the constitutional deprivation of the Sovereign's [Secured Party/Holder in Due Course] Rights, pursuant to **42 U.S.C. 1983** and **18 U.S.C. 241 & 242**. The Respondents/Defendants are reminded of their Oaths of Performance of which are secured by their Official Bond/Surety; and therefore, government selected/appointed officials have a duty to take the appropriate action [**42 U.S.C. 1986**]. This Complaint for Damages is enforceable.

III. **Statement of Claim.**

On December 11, 2014 defendants assaulted and battered your deponent with a false arrest for exercising a fundamental right guaranteed by the 5th amendment of both the corporate and the organic constitutions. I was approached at an intersection by officer LALCHAN SINGH wearing a ski mask for allegedly having my windows of the automobile I was operating appearing to be too dark by a knock on my window.

He asked for a driver's license and registration in order for him to write me a presentment for payment. I informed him that the "5th amendment protects me from self-incrimination in any matter against me and the fourth amendment protects me in my person, places, home, automobile and etcetera... from unreasonable searches and seizures and I am not operating in a commercial capacity to be sanctioned for a crime against my legal entity ANDRE MOORE who I am the sole proprietor of and in furtherance I do not consent to color of law jurisdiction and I invoke my

constitutional rights which you swore to support and defend and if you do not honor my request you will be committing a crime because you are under oath, and if you want you can call a supervisor to see if he is willing to be responsible for your actions because ignorance of the law is not an excuse and the law is readily available to anyone who chooses to learn it.

Minutes later defendant LIUTENANT CAINE arrived and I explained my rights to him as aforementioned to defendant LALCHAN SINGH and how he can be responsible for LALCHANS actions under title 42 USC 1983 he disregarded this and ordered LALCHAN SINGH to "lock this guy up" as LALCHAN executed the demand as he hand cuffed me under duress, searched and confiscated the automobile I was operating and I was transported to the 75th PRECINCT in Brooklyn where I was booked and processed under protest, duress and coercion due to the Kidnapping , assault and battery I was subjected to by the defendants. The automobile was released approximately six hours to my sibling .

Subsequently after arrest the matter was dismissed in the criminal court on February 6th , 2015 at 120 Schermerhorn street in part AP 5.

CIVIL RIGHTS

SANDERS v. ENGLISH, 950 F2d 1036 (6th Cir. 1992) False arrest, illegal detention (false imprisonment), and malicious prosecution are recognized as causes of action under **Title 42 Section 1983.** (•• and TORT!)

IV. Remedy.

42 U.S.C. 1983 [AGAINST STATE, COUNTY, OR MUNICIPAL DEFENDANTS]

Against Defendants in their official capacity as . . .

Provides that every person who, under color of any statute, ordinance, Regulation, custom, or usage, of any State or Territory or the District of Columbia, subjects, or causes to be subjected, any citizen of the United States or other person within the jurisdiction thereof to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws, shall be liable to the party injured in an action at law, suit in equity, or other proper proceeding for redress.

42 U.S.C.1985 [CONSPIRACY TO INTERFERE WITH CIVIL RIGHTS]

(2) Obstructing justice; intimidating party . . .

If two or more persons in any State . . . conspire to deter, by force, intimidation, or threat, any party . . . or to injure such party . . . in his person or property . . . for the purpose of impeding, hindering, obstructing, or defeating, in any manner, the due course of justice in any State equal protection of the laws, or to injure him or his property for . . . attempting to enforce, the right of any person, or class of persons, to the equal protection of the laws;

(3) Depriving persons of rights or privileges

If two or more persons in any State . . . conspire . . . for the purpose of depriving, either directly or indirectly, any person or class of persons of the equal protection of the laws, or of equal privileges and immunities under the laws; or for the purpose of preventing or hindering the constituted authorities of any State . . . from giving or securing to all persons within such State . . . the equal protection of the laws; . . . in any case of conspiracy set forth in this section, if one or more persons engaged therein do, or cause to be done, any act in furtherance of the object of such conspiracy, whereby another is injured in his person or property, or deprived of having and exercising any right or privilege of a citizen of the United States, the party so injured or deprived may have an action for the recovery of damages occasioned by such injury or deprivation, against any one or more of the conspirators.

42 U.S.C. 1988(a)(b)(c) [PROCEEDINGS IN VINDICATION OF CIVIL RIGHTS]

18 U.S.C. 241 [AGAINST STATE, COUNTY, OR MUNICIPAL DEFENDANTS]

Against Defendants in their official capacity as . . .

Provides that 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 . . . shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

The implementation of codes, rules, regulations and statutes are nothing more than ex post facto law absolutely forbidden by the united states constitution and the state constitutions to which the defendants swore oaths to uphold and it is the defendants sole obligation to monitor their own action's and to operate in compliance to the oath they took for employment. It has long been held that "No state shall convert a liberty [Right To Travel] into a privilege, license it, and attach a fee to it." **Murdock v Peon, 319 US 105 1943** the defendants have an obligation to know that "If the state converts a liberty [Right To Travel] into a privilege the citizen can engage in the right with impunity" **Shuttlesworth v Birmingham, 373 US 262 1963** because "The Constitution of these United States is the supreme law of the land. Any law that is repugnant to the constitution is null and void of law."

Marbury v Madison, 5 US 137 1803 which is the same constitution the defendants swore an oath to and "Qualified immunity defense fails if public officer violates clearly established right because a reasonably competent official should know the law governing his conduct"

Jones vs Counce 7-F3d-1359-8th Cir 1993; Benitez v Wolff 985-F3d 662 2nd Cir 1993

"The Fifth Amendment provides that no person shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself. The Amendment not only protects the individual against being involuntarily called as a witness against himself in a criminal prosecution but also privileges him not to answer official questions put to him in any other proceeding, civil or criminal, formal or informal, where the answers might incriminate him in future criminal proceedings."

Lefkowitz v. Turley, 94 S.Ct. 316, 414 U.S. 70 (1973)

"Where an individual is detained, without a warrant and without having committed a crime (traffic infractions are not crimes), the detention is a false arrest and false imprisonment."

Damages Awarded: **Trezevant v. City of Tampa, 741 F2d. 336 (11th CIR 1984)**

Motorist illegally held for 23 minutes in a traffic charge was awarded \$25,000 in damages

The above case sets the foundation for \$75,000 dollars per hour, or \$1,800,000 dollars per day

And both defendants are reprehensible for the ascribed aforementioned actions against the flesh and blood man in PROPRIA PERSONA, in sui juris and alieni jura and holder in due course the sentient being Andre-Troy born to the Moore family. In final analysis the defendants are both accountable for their action and their official bond apply as surety for the damages and the government selected/ appointed officials have a duty to take appropriate actions for the one million and eight hundred thousand dollars (1,800,000.00) per each defendant totaling to three million and six hundred thousand (3,600,000.00) in functional currency .

Andre-Troy: Moore

DATED: February 25, 2015

Andre-Troy: Moore, In Propria Persona, "sui juris" and "alieni jura"
Secured Party and Holder-In-Due-Course
uccfiling # 201306120331401

In-Care-Of: 580 Sutter Avenue
Brooklyn New York republic
PRO PER, Signature, Without Recourse: UCC 1-207, UCC 1-103.6
Accordance With 28CFR 16.41(d); 28USC1746(1)

Andre
