

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

v.

MARC BRU,

Defendant.

No. 21-cr-352 (JEB)

**Motion to Dismiss for Lack of Due
Process and the Liability of Libel**

COMES NOW, Marc Anthony Bru, Defendant, having reached the age of majority, competent to state the facts forthwith, and pledges to correct the international record under solemn affirmation under the penalties of perjury, to have the particulars addressed with right to the truth, with the Defendant's obligation of asking for the facts of the case, which the answers must satisfy to the Defendant by the fiduciary obligation of the court with no right to remain silent or refuse to answer, on the grounds to motion to dismiss for lack of due process and the plaintiff's parties liability of libel, and many other crimes such as pain compliance against the Defendant which is classified as torture under international law, and

This is in rebuttal to the following accusations made against the Defendant, by the charges listed by United States Code which is copyrighted intellectual property as to which the Defendant is not a party to, nor does the Defendant have rights in using, and therefor cannot be legally charges by it, otherwise the plaintiff's would be looking at violating the Defendant's rights by and through Title 18 U.S.C § 241 & 242, and

The listed complaint of the accusation listing the charges here so forth: 18 U.S.C § 1752(a)(1)- Knowingly Entering or Remaining in any Restricted Building or Grounds Without Lawful Authority, 18 U.S.C § 1752(a)(2)- Knowingly Engaging in Disorderly or Disruptive Conduct in any Restricted Building or Grounds, 40 U.S.C § 5104(e)(2)(D), and (e)(2)(G)- Violent Entry and Disorderly Conduct on Capitol Grounds, 18 U.S.C § 231(a)(3)- Obstruction of Law Enforcement During Civil Disorder, 18 U.S.C § 1512(c)(2)- Obstruction of Justice/Congress, and

The Defendant, by the rule of law, have the right to face every accuser, therefor an unsealed indictment by a private club, not of the Defendant's peers, not by compact, cannot have any legal standing unless each and every individual member of the jury who signed the said indictment is willing to come forward, sign a bilateral social compact with the Defendant giving the jury the right to indict the Defendant, and wherein the Defendant having the right to address the members of peers of the jury in court, and

The Defendant's security of persons is being violated by being inserted into this joint civil case against the Proud Boys, L.L.C. Marc Bru is not a member of the Proud Boys, L.L.C. Having Proud Boys gear such as neck guitar, shirt, hoodie and helmet does not make the Defendant a member of Proud Boys, L.L.C, and

The Defendant is being sued in civil court within the United States District Court of the District of Columbia followed with Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The Defendant's security of person is being violated by violation of Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Rule 17, Subsection B3(a) wherein the Defendants name and person, an unincorporated association, and as exhibit A and B, herein defined as a private membership association that the United States District Court is not a party to and which is foreign to by international boundaries, wherein the Defendant is being sued where legally cannot be sued, and

The fact that the Defendant cannot be sued in its common name under a civil court in federal trial rules for this case to be dismissed because if there cannot be a conviction in civil court for an assessment in damages to equity or injury to persons for an injunction than the evidence does not exist to substantiate to try a case for a criminal intent and therefor the parties not being in compact with the Defendant and cannot try the Defendant, and

In the complaint listed against the Defendant claimed that the Metropolitan Capitol Police only have access to restricted areas to enforce security. The the Defendant asks, why was the Metropolitan Capitol Police escorted members of the assembly of that day on January 6th, 2021 into the Capitol Building and into many restricted areas? It at that moment the entry became an invitation by the Metropolitan Capitol Police and is by lawful authority no longer restricted area and considered trespassing, which makes this case entrapment into political trial existing on hearsay and totalitarianism by using communist tactics such as ridicule, and

The Defendant has not at any time, in any situation from the events that took place on January 6th, 2021 at the District of Columbia, incited any insurrection or rebellion, did not damage any property, wasw not violent towards any human being, and did not injure any person and what happened by the actions of other persons is not of liability or responsibility of the Defendant's, and

The Defendant followed the rest of the assembly of the crowd whom where being escorted by the Metropolitan Capitol Police, the defendant did not directly walk into sealed off areas as to which denied access to the public lest those barriers were already taken down and therefore the Defendant wouldn't have known, and

Mentioning that the Metropolitan Capitol Police having video cameras, and the quality, video footage of the events of the assembly, and the costs for the riot shields does not equate of being any proof of evidence of any sedition, rebellion, damage to property, violence or injury to persons and therefor this case does not have any reason from the soul of law to be tried having no material evidence and not being in social compact where the Defendant has granted this court judicial powers, and

The Plaintiff through both the Democrat and Republican parties have disrupted trade and commerce for more then two years from a flu the mainstream media propogated as a pandemic and was obviously not, and by and through the complaint, the accusation made against the Defendant for disrupting trade and commerce as if the Defendant knew every single human being at the Capitol Building on January 6, 2021 and had control of what the entire assembly was doing and therefor the Defendant, as much as the Metropolitan Capitol Police, was inadequate from preventing any of the chaos and therefor the claim against the Defendant is political and predatory, and

On the day of January 6th, 2021, the Defendant did not understand peremptory norms and customary international law as the Defendant does now and was misinformed of the facts. The Defendant did not understand that the “United States” or by action by this court by and through its title “United States of America” is a private company, secret society, private club, and is foreign to this geographical Country “The United States of America” by and through its chain of title styled the way it was recorded in the Articles of Confederation ratified in the year 1781 as to which the Northwest Ordinance, its survey and its political division allowing new States into the Union 1784-1787, belong to the Articles of Confederation where the United States Constitution did not meet any of the prerequisites or criteria listed in Article 13 of the Articles of Confederation of its unanimous and perpetual clause, and

The elections were handled by private companies acting as incorporating counties, corporations owning shares and trading stock, operating under home rule charters that the 48 contiguous respective States, in their individual capacity, have not ceded the public property by and through an election process by the people who live and reside in the respective geographical county of the individual person's State and therefor the election is a fraud ex facie, and

There is no social compact that exists between the Defendant and any officer in the executive, legislative, or judicial branch of the United States and besides this matter of fact, it is quite obvious that no common man likes, in fact strongly dislikes Joe Biden. It is common that people all over the Country which has been proven again and again by video evidence, mass witness testimony, billboards and signs posted all over other Country that can be referenced in exhibit, using Joe Biden's name with obscenities and ad hominem. It is that your common man knows and have seen the evidence that Joe Biden is purposely, with the absolute intent to sabotage commerce and trade as to create a war of attrition against the American people to destroy this Country, and

The purpose of this illegal political trial against the Defendant is for the purposes to ridicule the claim of the people whom did not want to be forced into association with Joe Biden, Joe Biden's administration, and the divided legislature with two houses with no social compact with the people that is signed and published operating in foreign survey and a private constitution, reference Exhibit C and

The Plaintiff's parties holding these J6 trials is to ridicule the people. Ridicule is defined as the subjection of someone or something to contemptuous or dismissive language and or behavior. The Plaintiff's are ridiculing the people because of the massive fraud committed by the November 2020 elections, and

The plaintiff's parties are attempting by this court action to create an adhesion contract against the Defendant, where the Defendant is the inferior party being subjected to perpetual exile which is a form of statelessness placing the defendant as dead to rights and therefor the Defendant motions the court to dismiss this case as for relief for the Defendant and not having prejudice as to sue the plaintiff's parties for attempted murder, and

Exhibit A:




Exhibit B:




Exhibit C:

§ 16. A nation is under an obligation to preserve itself.

In the act of association, by virtue of which a multitude of men form together a state or nation, each individual has entered into engagements with all, to promote the general welfare; and all have entered into engagements with each individual, to facilitate for him the means of supplying his necessities, and to protect and defend him. It is manifest that these reciprocal engagements can no otherwise be fulfilled than by maintaining the political association. The entire nation is then obliged to maintain that association; and as their preservation depends on its continuance, it thence follows that every nation is obliged to perform the duty of self-preservation,

This obligation, so natural to each individual of God's creation, is not derived to nations immediately from nature, but from the agreement by which civil society is formed: it is therefore not absolute, but conditional, — that is to say, it supposes a human act, to wit, the social compact. And as compacts may be dissolved by common consent of the parties — if the individuals that compose a nation should unanimously agree to break the link that binds them, it would be lawful for them to do so, and thus to destroy the state or nation; but they would doubtless incur a degree of guilt, if they took this step without just and weighty reasons; for civil societies are approved by the Law of Nature, which recommends them to mankind, as the true means of supplying all their wants, and of effectually advancing towards their own perfection. Moreover, civil society is so useful, nay so necessary to all citizens, that it may well be considered as morally impossible for them to consent unanimously to break it without necessity. But what citizens may or ought to do — what the majority of them may resolve in certain cases of necessity or of pressing exigency — are questions that will be treated of elsewhere: they cannot be solidly determined without some principles which we have not yet established. For the present, it is sufficient to have proved, that, in general, as long as the political society subsists, the whole nation is obliged to endeavor to maintain it.

Defendant further sayeth naught _____ Date _____

Title: **Motion to Dismiss**
CERTIFICATE OF ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF NOTARY PUBLIC

}SS:
The United States of America)

On this _____, the Defendant 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 trust 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: _____