

Comes Now, Marc Anthony Bru (hereinafter “affiant”), whom reached over the age of majority, competent to state the facts herein under solemn pledge to divulge the truth within the penalties of perjury, and authorizing service of proof to the respondents for attempted murder, war crimes, terrorism for inciting against the affiant in the U.S. political system and to have the particulars addressed, and

James E. Boasberg, Joe Biden, Mike Pence, Merrick Garland, Democratic Party Chair (hereinafter “respondents”)

The affiant states that no office as to which serves a public record within any authority has the qualified immunity to violate human rights in disregard of peremptory norms. In count 1 and 2 of the indictment against the affiant it states that the affiant stormed the Capital Building as to which where the vice president was visiting and that the affiant did knowingly enter into a restricted building. The affiant states that the affiant observed the capitol police in the District of Columbia allow many civilian protesters just walk right through the doors of the Capitol Building and even had waiting times for allowing some to enter in an organized manner, and

The affiant states that the affiant did not see any visible signs noticing the affiant or anyone else of the building or area being restricted off and liable to trespass. The affiant states that it is confusing situation when the capitol police, whom are obligated to perform on the functions of security of the Capitol Building, were in fact encouraging people to enter the Capitol Building, and

Exhibit A: Law of Nations, Book 1, Chapter 4, Subsection 51,
But the nation may curb a tyrant and withdraw itself from his obedience. first paragraph, lines 12-17

As soon as a prince attacks the constitution of the state, he breaks the contract which bound the people to him; the people become free by the act of the sovereign, and can no longer view him but as an usurper who would load them with oppression. This truth is acknowledged by every sensible writer, whose pen is not enslaved by fear, or sold for hire.

Where is the bilateral social compact agreement by and between the United States Congress, it's House of Representatives and the Senate with the affiant as to which makes the affiant a party to United States Code?

Where is Mike Pence's letter of acceptance of office of vice president for the United States acknowledging all the obligations, duties and responsibilities to perform on that said office?

Where is the letter of acceptance of office for every United States House Representative and Senate member of the United States acknowledging all the obligations, duties and responsibilities to perform on that said office?

How can a private company whom standing has no procurement of a public government apparatus, be delegating in public affairs as to the functions of the seat of government is that in representation of the people on January 6th, 2021?

How is the affiant trespassing a restricted building when the Capitol Police whom are responsible for the security of the Capitol Building invited the affiant into the Capitol Building?

Plenty of video evidence of these facts that did occur and are circulating the internet. The intelligence behind the events that occurred on January 6th, 2021 have in fact been presented to the respondents as to which the respondents has condemned the protesters in the act of aiding and abetting the political witch trial and totalitarian courts against the affiant, and

Not once have any of the respondents come forward and condemned the political trials against the January 6th, 2021 capitol protesters, and the respondents after 2 years of certifying an election with many abnormalities where fraud and the evidence contributing it's exposure is having an impact as to the political opinions have swayed the courts in overzealous totalitarian communists fashion redefining the classification of terms to valuable expense to be sold and traded as a security where affiant is held as surety in a mortgage backed security where the affiant is held as collateral for the investment maturing for these agents of the Totalitarian Party to secure the political nature of securing power by deceit in a false claim of possessing higher moral ground, and

Exhibit B. Law of Nations Book 1, Chapter 11, Subsection 116
The nation may hence discover the intentions of its rulers.

§ 116. It is an incontestable truth, that the virtues of the citizens constitute the most happy dispositions that can be desired by a just and wise government. Here then is an infallible criterion, by which the nation may judge of the intentions of those who govern it. If they endeavour to render the great and the common people virtuous; their views are pure and upright; and you may rest assured that they solely aim at the great end of government, the happiness and glory of the nation. But if they corrupt the morals of the people, spread a taste for luxury, effeminacy, a rage for licentious pleasure-if they stimulate the higher orders to a ruinous pomp and extravagance-beware, citizens! beware of those corruptors! they only aim at purchasing slaves in order to exercise over them an arbitrary sway.

The affiant states that for a fact the affiant has observed in many cases the respondents push an agenda for homosexuality, sexual immorality, transgenderism, and have even pushed to organize the grooming of minor children to question the biological nature of sexes and have allowed drag-queen story time with children as young as three and four years old, and

The affiant states that the affiant is competent and stands on the grounds to claim that communism and totalitarianism creates an adhesion contract where the affiant is made the inferior party of this said adhesion contract where the respondents are subjecting the affiant into perpetual exile which is a form of statelessness placing the affiant as dead to rights, and

The affiant states that the respondents have not provided any sensible or logically sound organization to provide an instrument to redress a grievance on the subject matter for a highly contested election results which has grabbed the attention of many civilians suspecting too many abnormalities and fraud where the affiant and many of the other people the affiant have spoken to as to being politically charged the same as the affiant for the peaceful demonstration of protesting of the aforesaid election that occurred on January 6th, 2021 in the Capitol Building in the District of Columbia as well as being invited into the Capitol Building by Capitol Police, and

The respondents have been ridiculing the affiant on the claims the affiant has been claiming. Ridicule is defined as as the subjection of someone or something to dismissive and contemptuous language or behavior. According the definition, making fun of someone is just a form of ridicule, what the affiant is stating is that when a serious claim is made and is ignored thenceforth causing a suffering which is pain compliance and an act of torture in violation of peremptory norms which is an illegal act and a war crime, such as when the affiant asked respondent James E. Boasberg if respondent James E. Boasberg is a member of the Totalitarian Party, respondent James E. Boasberg, claiming to have judicial obligations in a contract as to which the affiant was forced into and did not accept it's terms and conditions, is obligated to answer every question to the affiant's satisfaction or therefor cannot fulfill the obligation of judicial nature as a court of record must address all particulars of the case otherwise are committing misprision, and

When has the United States ceded the 10 square miles district, known as the District of Columbia, to the US?

What is the difference between a United States Citizen and a US Citizen?

Where is the signed bilateral social compact agreement, signed and published by and between the US and the affiant, proving an irrefutable proof of evidence of a perfected claim proving consent?

Exhibit C: Law of Armed Conflict subsection 4.23.1, 466 4.23.2, 469 4.23.3

4.23.1 In general, members of law enforcement agencies have civilian status. 465 Furthermore, routine domestic law enforcement is part of the general protection of the civilian population and does not constitute “taking a direct part in hostilities” that would deprive police officers of their protection from being made the object of attack.

466 4.23.2 Police With a Military Role. Some States use police forces in a paramilitary capacity or use military forces in a police role. Members of the armed forces engaged in police roles are combatants. The extent to which police officers are treated as combatants largely depends on whether the State decides to use them in that capacity. States may decide to make law enforcement agencies part of their armed forces. 467 Members of these law enforcement agencies, like other members of those armed forces, receive combatant status by virtue of their membership in the armed forces. 468 In addition, States may authorize members of the law enforcement agencies to accompany their armed forces without incorporating them into their armed forces. These persons have the legal status of persons authorized to accompany the armed forces.

469 4.23.3 Police in Non-International Armed Conflict. Police officers may play a larger role in armed conflicts between States and insurgent or terrorist groups because in such conflicts the State may treat all enemy persons’ participation in hostilities as criminal.

A body forcing a political trial to persecute a civilian for an agenda creates a hostile environment making the body a hostility as to which in the Law of Armed Conflict defines as a hostility to be criminal and militant in distinction of a civilian. It is a war crime for a militant to attack a civilian for the purposes that a military's legal right to exist is that of protecting a civilian population. For hostilities carrying out political trials places the respondents as militants forcing the affiant, whom is a civilian into military court and military trial in totalitarian design, and

It is with the burden of proof with substantial recognition, to prove it was the affiant's intent to wake up the morning on January 6th, 2021, to enter a restricted building in order to obstruct the legal business of the United States Congress. The affiant was just following a crowd as to which got big and when the capitol police started allowing the people into the Capitol Building, the crowd became amass where it was overwhelmed and pushed the crowd further into the chambers and halls, and

Respondent Mike Pence condemned the protesters. Claiming the protesters were storming the building instead of the overwhelming crowd manufactured by the capitol police inviting the protesters into the building. As to which respondent Mike Pence has a direct key leading to the prosecution of the January 6th, 2021 Capitol protesters as a record that respondent Mike Pence attacks his own voters. Not once has respondent Mike Pence condemned the January 6th 2021 trials against the protesters, and

Affiant further sayeth naught

_____ date _____

In State of Washington}

}SS:

The United States of America)

On this _____, the affiant named above, personally appeared before me and acknowledged to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence that he or she executed the same in his or hers stated capacity, and that by his or hers signature on this affidavit is the person or entity upon behalf of which the person signed is a free and voluntary act and deed for the purposes and upon the terms and conditions hereinafter set forth.

Date: _____ By _____, Notary

Public

My Commission Expires: _____