

Dean [Harting]
919 Summit Point Drive
Front Royal, Virginia no ZIP code as of faith in Christ

CONFIRMED COPY
THIS APPEARS TO BE A
COUNTERPART OF A
DOCUMENT FILED IN
WARREN CO. CIRCUIT COURT
ON June 14 2024
by [Signature]

RECEIVED & FILED

JUN 14 2024

WARREN COUNTY
CIRCUIT COURT [Signature]

In the Circuit Court For Warren County

Commonwealth of Virginia
AKA, Bryan Cave, Bar #78347
plaintiff,

vs.

Dean Harting
defendant

) Case CR24000120-00

) Request for discovery and Brady Request

Comes now alleged defendant, the man under Christ as his Lord and savior Dean [Harting], who hereby, in the emergent matter of defending and saving his faith harmless, requires Bryan Cave, who acts as prosecutor for the State of Virginia, the commercially trading Corporation registered with the US SEC, to provide discovery.

I do so asseverate in the nature of confession and truth that the primary defense of my faith in Christ and God's gifted and granted Dominion, is, that all my interactions with the private men and women acting as Virginia State government employees, regarding this abuse by color of law assumptions have been under threat, duress, and intimidation. Those communications were engaged upon only to avoid further aggression against I, the man under Christ, in duty to following Christ's instructions, to gain a private agreement and in duty and honor to warn those engaging the abuse by color of law and are not an acceptance of use of or submission to assumptive jurisdiction. Ezekiel 33 1611 KJVb.

This official notice to Bryan Cave, is also a Brady request in the nature of a demand for accommodation. Alleged defendant requests Bryan Cave, and demands the following accommodation:
1. The full names, not being titles, of every man or woman witness, with personal knowledge, that the prosecution relies on to prove:

A. Proof that the alleged defendant is a person of law and was born in Fairfax city.

B. Proof that a valid cause of action (injury and damage, corpus delecti) has been presented to the court.

C. The admission and recognition of the duty of all USA signatory agents to respect the International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights as Supreme law and that when a demand for

Ex. A 1

accommodation is received the service provider must go to a hardship to accommodate as per disabled people with wheel chairs and the acknowledgment of certain historically required faith based observances like James 2:9 1611 KJVB and the Year of the Bible an Act of Congress 1982. See Public Law 97-280 97th Congress. 96 STAT. 1211 and Proclamation 5018, 97 STAT. 1545

D. The proof that the Grand jury was shown the faith based demand for accommodation as a private agreement between Nick N(M)anthos the man and the alleged accused that was posted in the Front Royal Newspaper that led to the true, nolle prosecui withdrawal.

2. The full un-redacted names of any witnesses the prosecution relies upon who are experts in the interpretation and application of Virginia's law and it's inescapable relation to binding international law as related to indemnification of service providers. Provide the authorities relied upon as to overrule the accused ability to demand accommodation for his religious freedom pointing to the ICCPR.

3. Provide the evidence as to why, John Bell, (evidently Nick N(M)anthos senior), who was aware of the agreement regarding Deans Faith that was posted in the Front Royal Newspaper in November 2020, who was at the time in 2019 acting as prosecutor for Warren county withdrew the charges back in January 2021 "nolle prosequi", made statements saying:

"I then had the court appoint the Page County Commonwealth's Attorney's office as special prosecutor to review the case and decide how or if to proceed. That was a long time ago and I really have no knowledge of why they took so long or why they are proceeding now."

"If I had to guess, the file got set aside down there when the former Commonwealth's attorney in Page, Ken Alger, was appointed as a judge and the new Commonwealth's Attorney Bryan Cave, finally got around to clearing up old business."

4. Provide facts, not argument/allegation or opinion, known to the complaining agent proving that he alleged defendant has a previous agreement with a man known as Nick N(M)anthos, former prosecutor. Provide facts that such agreement was confirmed with witnesses, and the announcement of that private agreement was posted in the local Front royal newspaper November 18, 2020.

5. Provide evidence (not allegations/opinions) of a valid cause of action (legal injury and damage as witnessed by an injured party) that has been presented to the court.

6. Provide the names of any other witnesses with personal first hand knowledge the prosecution relies on to support any element of the alleged crime or cause of action against alleged defendant and which elements the witness is specifically relied on to testify to. If the witness does not have first hand knowledge, then that fact must be disclosed to avoid hearsay

7. Provide the police officer's sworn Oaths, their authenticated reports and notes regarding the original existing evidence prosecution relied upon and the arrest record in 2019 and subsequently 2024. This includes, authenticated true copies of the original complaint written by the police officer submitted to the court, front and back along with the physical evidence of the crime and that the accused was fairly notified adequately he had to return to court in 2024.

8. Provide proof of who exactly has authenticated, verifiable evidence that the alleged defendant, was was arrested and charged on February 18th, 2019.

EX-A2

9. Provide Authenticated evidence that you have in your possession to prove the witnesses relied upon have personal, first-hand knowledge of the matter(s) they are to testify to.

10. Provide the names of any witnesses relied on by the prosecution that have been dishonest during any of their career investigations and trials and anything relevant to impropriety guilt or punishment and is exculpatory or favorable to the defense. This includes, but is not limited to any information regarding the truthfulness, bad character and reputation of any of the prosecution's witnesses. This includes, but is not limited to all criminal records, contempt citations, incidents of violence, formal complaints and any history of mental illness. This also includes any complaints filed against witnesses who are government employees (i.e., police), whether or not the complaints were investigated or subsequently confirmed.

11. Provide any material including, but not limited to videos, audio recordings, actual physical evidence and written reports that may be prejudicial or bring into question the integrity and truth offered by prosecution witnesses. This also includes information from personnel files from police and investigators; any information that calls into question the witnesses' credibility, e.g., performance evaluations, disciplinary write-ups and internal affairs investigations that concern a law enforcement employee's truthfulness, integrity bias, or moral turpitude.

12. Evidence of whose intent and purpose it is to in willful blindness violate an International ratified covenant by breaching it's immutable provisions, that, being a treaty known as the International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, that the United States are bound by, including all states and any agents thereof.

13. Evidence that the grand jury were in full awareness and not deceived that the matter at BAR, was offered remedy by an honorable Christ led agreement with purpose of establishing equity by following Christ's instructions and was supported, as such, by a diligent 3 day notice in the front Royal Newspaper on November 18, 2024. I also wish to know if they were informed that this agreement binding on the man acting as prosecutor resulted in the charges being withdrawn nolle prosequi in January, 2021.

14. Offer proof that the men and women acting in public office or service of the State of Virginia are bound to observe the accused faith based freedoms under the Ratified International Covenants of Civil and Political Rights, freedoms and in recognition of their duty as service providers.

Arguing without valid factual evidence and not reliant upon legal fictions or using color of law as evidence, in awareness that it is a violation of a mans faith, is misconduct trying to use statute in fraud to deny equitable relief and is an extreme ethical violation. See: Philip Staufen vs the Attorney General of BC 2001 BCSC for generous and undeniable proof of what a legal fiction person of law as a color of law principle.

EX. A3

"By going outside the evidence, the prosecutor "violated a fundamental rule, known to every lawyer, that argument is limited to the facts in evidence." United States ex rel. Shaw v. De Robertis, 755 F.2d 1279, 1281 (7th Cir.1985) (emphasis added)

Notice: By going outside the evidence, the prosecutor violated a fundamental rule, known to every lawyer, that argument is limited to the facts in evidence. When the agreement posted in Front Royal Newspaper established an International law agreement regarding his religious freedom, the man acting as prosecutor, observant of the principle of "color of law" must acknowledge that legal fictions are not evidence as noted by pointing to and referred to in Title 18 US Code 242, 245 and with regards to the alleged accused situation US code 247. Color of law, feigned as authority, cannot be used as evidence nor abridge the alleged accused, God's gifted freedoms, in willful blindness as so the recognized and ratified International Covenants are ignored. When statute code and regulation of secular instrumentality engaging fraud come between a man and God's equity, equity shall prevail.

Submitted this 14th day of June 2024

Dean Harting
Dean [Harting]

Certificate of service

This is to certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing has been mailed this 14th day of June 2024, to Brian Cave, acting as prosecutor for the plaintiff, at the following address:

Brian Cave
116 South Street, Suite D
Luray, Virginia 22835

Dean Harting
Dean [Harting]

Certified to be a True Copy of a
Record in the Clerk's Office of
Warren County Circuit Court

Date: August 6, 2024
Aimee Dint
Deputy Clerk



EX A4

Tracking Number:

Remove X

9589071052701789751906

Copy



Add to Informed Delivery

Latest Update

Your item was delivered to an individual at the address at 10:46 am on June 17, 2024 in LURAY, VA 22835.



Get More Out of USPS Tracking:



USPS Tracking Plus®

**Delivered**

Delivered, Left with Individual

LURAY, VA 22835

June 17, 2024, 10:46 am

[See All Tracking History](#)[What Do USPS Tracking Statuses Mean?](#)[Text & Email Updates](#)[USPS Tracking Plus®](#)

Correspondence
and Evidence
and Brady Request
sent to Bryan Cave

Ex. B



DH

Dean >

Fri, Jun 21 at 11:35 AM



When you can send me those screenshots from today please

Okay 👍

Are you here today

I'm not accepting any kind of evaluation medical or mental I am just fine

Might be old but I'm not dumb yeah

Might be old but I'm not dumb yeah

Just wondering would you know if international law trump's any federal, state or local law?



I'll give you a call this afternoon

David Wall

+ Text Message



EX-102

← (540) 724-8951



Yesterday • 9:48 AM

I'll give you a call
this afternoon. I
was out recently.

I've received your
paperwork. I am
asking for a
competency
evaluation
tomorrow to have
a doctor meet with



Text me...



EXD

10:26

5G 87%

← (540) 724-8951



David could you kindly request for a continuance to give the prosecution at least 21 days to prove the evidence upon the Brady request and I do not consent to any medical evaluation



9:13 AM



Text me...



June 20 2024 10:26 AM

Mr David (Officer)

EX. E

 (540) 724-8951

Mr Harting, I have asked, and the court has ordered, a competency evaluation. It is messages like these that give me the concern that you are not able to proceed with your case. This is not a medical experiment. I have no idea what I ↓ ney you

June 27



Text mes...



EXF1

12:14 77°

71%

← (540) 724-8951



...are to proceed
with your case. This
is not a medical
experiment. I have no
idea what money you
are talking about. I
am a licensed
attorney in Virginia
and no where else. I
only practice in
Virginia. And no,
international law does
not apply here. -
Dave Walls

June 27th



Text mes...



EX F2



VIRGINIA: IN THE CIRCUIT COURT FOR THE COUNTY OF WARREN

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA

VS.

DOCKET NUMBER: CR24000120-00

DEAN FREDERICK HARTING, Defendant

COPY

WARREN COUNTY CIRCUIT COURT
WARREN COUNTY COURT HOUSE
1 EAST MAIN STREET
FRONT ROYAL, VIRGINIA 22630
DATE: JUNE 21, 2024

The above-entitled matter came on to be heard for
the purpose of HEARING at 9 o'clock, A.M.

BEFORE:

THE HONORABLE DARYL L. FUNK
presiding

APPEARANCES:

FOR THE COMMONWEALTH

BRIAN CAVE, ESQUIRE
PAGE COUNTY COMMONWEALTH'S ATTN.
116 SOUTH COURT STREET, SUITE D
LURAY, VIRGINIA 22835

FOR THE DEFENDANT

DAVID WALLS, ESQUIRE
OFFICE OF THE PUBLIC DEFENDER
1516 N. SHENANDOAH AVENUE, SUITE A
FRONT ROYAL, VIRGINIA 22630

COURT REPORTER

CARA-ELIZABETH BROWN

Valley Reporting Agency
Linda Grimsley-Logan, R.P.R.

P. O. Box 424
Front Royal, Virginia 22630

61

(540) 635-8248

1 * * * PROCEEDINGS (IN PART) * * *

2 (WHEREUPON, the Court Reporter was sworn.)

3 (WHEREUPON,

4 **THE COURT:** It is Commonwealth of Virginia
5 versus Dean Frederick Harting, CR24-120-00. Mr. Cave
6 appears as Special Prosecutor from Page County. Mr. Walls
7 appears on behalf of Mr. Harting as... On behalf of the
8 Office of the Public Defender.

9 And, what are we going to do in this case
10 today? It is on to be set.

11 **MR. WALLS:** Your Honor, our Defense is asking
12 for a competency evaluation for Mr. Harting.

13 **THE COURT:** Alright. Let us see what we have
14 got going on here. Now, we have been on a couple times, but
15 nothing egregious. Any issue from the Commonwealth's
16 perspective in that request?

17 **MR. CAVE:** No, Your Honor. In fact, based on
18 some of the correspondence I have received it is probably
19 good.

20 **THE COURT:** Alright. Do we need ninety days
21 to get that done? We have not had one in awhile.

22 **MR. CAVE:** I do not know what the time frame

G2

1 is for those evaluations over here.

2 THE COURT: Alright. That I usually what I...

3 Mr. Walls, you may be more familiar than I am what it is
4 taking these days.

5 MR. WALLS: Usually, especially for the
6 people that are out, I think they are a little less
7 priority. I think ninety days would probably make the most
8 sense.

9 THE COURT: Okay. If you find you need more
10 time you can always submit an Agreed Order if you would
11 like, Mr. Cave.

12 MR. CAVE: No problem.

13 THE COURT: Slash, Mr. Walls, obviously.

14 MR. WALLS: Thank you, Your Honor.

15 THE COURT: So, let us see. It would be
16 September. Let us not use probation day. And, you do not
17 ever have Friday court. So, whatever would work for you
18 right?

19 MR. CAVE: Regularly. So, Fridays would work
20 great.

21 THE COURT: What about October 4th at 9:00
22 A.M.?

23 MR. CAVE: October 4th?

G3

1 THE COURT: It is a bit further, but there is
2 some stuff going on in September.

3 MR. CAVE: The Commonwealth can make that
4 work. That is fine.

5 THE COURT: Mr. Walls?

6 MR. WALLS: That is great, Your Honor.

7 THE COURT: Alright. That will give us plenty
8 of time, hopefully. October 4th at 9:00 A.M. Alright. We
9 will have an Order.

10 MR. CAVE: Did I hear an affirmative waiver
11 of speedy, Your Honor?

12 THE COURT: Since he is arguably not
13 competent to stand trial how does he... I mean, there is a
14 statutory provision that deals with this request. So...

15 MR. CAVE: Just old habits when it comes to
16 continuances, Your Honor.

17 THE COURT: Yeah, I understand. That is
18 generally my position too, but that would directly fly
19 against what Mr. Walls believes is going.

20 MR. CAVE: I do not disagree.

21 THE COURT: Alright. We will have an Order.
22 Thank you all.

23 MR. CAVE: Thank you, Your Honor.

G4

* * * CERTIFICATE * * *

I, CARA-ELIZABETH BROWN, solemnly swear that I have truly taken down the evidence and incidents of trial in the aforementioned hearing to the best of my knowledge and ability.

Given under my hand, this the 11th day of July, 2024.

Cara-Elizabeth Brown
CARA-ELIZABETH BROWN, COURT REPORTER

Web

* * * CERTIFICATE * * *

I, LINDA GRIMSLEY-LOGAN, solemnly swear that I have truly transcribed, under my direction, the evidence and incidents of trial in the aforementioned hearing to the best of my knowledge and ability.

Given under my hand, this the 11th day of July, 2024.

Linda Grimsley-Logan
LINDA GRIMSLEY-LOGAN, COURT REPORTER

Valley Reporting Agency
Linda Grimsley-Logan, R.P.R.

P. O. Box 424
Front Royal, Virginia 22630

(540) 635-8248

G5

VIRGINIA: IN THE CIRCUIT COURT FOR THE COUNTY OF WARREN

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA

VS.

DOCKET NUMBER: CR24000120-00

DEAN FREDERICK HARTING, Defendant

COPY

WARREN COUNTY CIRCUIT COURT
WARREN COUNTY COURT HOUSE
1 EAST MAIN STREET
FRONT ROYAL, VIRGINIA 22630
DATE: JUNE 21, 2024

The above-entitled matter came on to be heard for
the purpose of HEARING at 9 o'clock, A.M.

BEFORE:

THE HONORABLE DARYL L. FUNK
presiding

APPEARANCES:

FOR THE COMMONWEALTH

BRIAN CAVE, ESQUIRE
PAGE COUNTY COMMONWEALTH'S ATTNY.
116 SOUTH COURT STREET, SUITE D
LURAY, VIRGINIA 22835

FOR THE DEFENDANT

DAVID WALLS, ESQUIRE
OFFICE OF THE PUBLIC DEFENDER
1516 N. SHENANDOAH AVENUE, SUITE A
FRONT ROYAL, VIRGINIA 22630

COURT REPORTER

CARA-ELIZABETH BROWN

Valley Reporting Agency
Linda Grimsley-Logan, R.P.R.

P. O. Box 424
Front Royal, Virginia 22630

H 1

(540) 635-8248

* * * PROCEEDINGS * * *

(WHEREUPON, the Court Reporter was sworn.)

(WHEREUPON,

THE COURT: It is Commonwealth of Virginia versus Dean Frederick Harting, CR24-120-00. Mr. Cave appears as Special Prosecutor from Page County. Mr. Walls appears on behalf of Mr. Harting as... On behalf of the Office of the Public Defender.

And, what are we going to do in this case today? It is on to be set.

MR. WALLS: Your Honor, our Defense is asking for a competency evaluation for Mr. Harting.

THE DEFENDANT: No. No. No. I am not doing that.

THE COURT: Alright. Let us see what we have got going on here. Now, we have been on a couple times, but nothing egregious. Any issue from the Commonwealth's perspective in that request?

MR. CAVE: No, Your Honor. In fact, based on some of the correspondence I have received it is probably good.

THE COURT: Alright. Do we need ninety days to get that done? We have not had one in awhile.

H.2

1 MR. CAVE: I do not know what the time frame
2 is for those evaluations over here.

3 THE COURT: Alright. That I usually what I...
4 Mr. Walls, you may be more familiar than I am what it is
5 taking these days.

6 MR. WALLS: Usually, especially for the
7 people that are out, I think they are a little less
8 priority. I think ninety days would probably make the most
9 sense.

10 THE COURT: Okay. If you find you need more
11 time you can always submit an Agreed Order if you would
12 like, Mr. Cave.

13 MR. CAVE: No problem.

14 THE COURT: Slash, Mr. Walls, obviously.

15 MR. WALLS: Thank you, Your Honor.

16 THE COURT: So, let us see. It would be
17 September. Let us not use probation day. And, you do not
18 ever have Friday court. So, whatever would work for you
19 right?

20 MR. CAVE: Regularly. So, Fridays would work
21 great.

22 THE COURT: What about October 4th at 9:00
23 A.M.?

H3

1 MR. CAVE: October 4th?

2 THE COURT: It is a bit further, but there is
3 some stuff going on in September.

4 MR. CAVE: The Commonwealth can make that
5 work. That is fine.

6 THE COURT: Mr. Walls?

7 MR. WALLS: That is great, Your Honor.

8 THE COURT: Alright. That will give us plenty
9 of time, hopefully. October 4th at 9:00 A.M. Alright. We
10 will have an Order.

11 MR. CAVE: Did I hear an affirmative waiver
12 of speedy, Your Honor?

13 THE COURT: Since he is arguably not
14 competent to stand trial how does he... I mean, there is a
15 statutory provision that deals with this request. So...

16 MR. CAVE: Just old habits when it comes to
17 continuances, Your Honor.

18 THE COURT: Yeah, I understand. That is
19 generally my position too, but that would directly fly
20 against what Mr. Walls believes is going.

21 MR. CAVE: I do not disagree.

22 THE COURT: Alright. We will have an Order.
23 Thank you all.

H4

1

MR. CAVE: Thank you, Your Honor.

2

THE COURT: Yes.

END OF PROCEEDINGS

H5

* * * CERTIFICATE * * *

I, CARA-ELIZABETH BROWN, solemnly swear that I have truly taken down the evidence and incidents of trial in the aforementioned hearing to the best of my knowledge and ability.

Given under my hand, this the 31st day of July, 2024.

Cara Elizabeth Brown
CARA-ELIZABETH BROWN, COURT REPORTER
(u6L)

* * * CERTIFICATE * * *

I, LINDA GRIMSLEY-LOGAN, solemnly swear that I have truly transcribed, under my direction, the evidence and incidents of trial in the aforementioned hearing to the best of my knowledge and ability.

Given under my hand, this the 31st day of July, 2024.

Linda Grimsley-Logan
LINDA GRIMSLEY-LOGAN, COURT REPORTER

Valley Reporting Agency
Linda Grimsley-Logan, R.P.R.

P. O. Box 424
Front Royal, Virginia 22630

H16

(540) 635-8248

According to Article VI, Section 2 of the United States Constitution, "This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof; and all Treaties made, or which shall be made, under the Authority of the United States, shall be the supreme Law of the Land; and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby, any Thing in the Constitution or Laws of any State to the Contrary notwithstanding."

us supreme court case 18-748 December 4, 2108

n.

it is mandated only to the provisions of the constitution and statutes of the Commonwealth of Virginia and Stafford County that were presented in support of the Respondent's position. App. 9, 10.

On February 28, 2018 the Petitioner submitted a Motion to Reconsider which objected to the February 21, 2018 Final Order. The Motion expressed how the court failed to require the Respondent to submit evidence to prove that the Petitioner's political status (nationality) was false, untrue or invalid. App. 15. The Motion expressed that by the court failing to recognize the authority of the Petitioner's nation state and of the rights secured to the Petitioner under the Constitution and Laws of his nation State also violates the Petitioner's secured rights under the United States Constitution and Laws. It further expressed how by the court ignoring the Petitioner's nationality caused the court to subject the Petitioner and his nation State to servitude under the Commonwealth of Virginia. App. 16. On March 9, 2018 the Circuit Court denied granting a hearing on the Motion to Reconsider without giving an opinion or providing finding of facts or conclusion of law. App. 3, 4.

The Petitioner then filed a Petition for Appeal in the Supreme Court of Virginia. In the Petitioner's argument he expressed that based upon the Constitution, Laws and ratified Treaties of the United States that the Circuit Court does have the power and granted jurisdiction to recognize the authority of the Petitioner's nation State for the purpose of securing certain rights invoked by the Petitioner and for the purpose of fulfilling certain international obligations under the ICCPR. On August 30, 2018 the Petitioner

7

was permitted to argue the reason(s) why the Supreme Court of Virginia should take up the case. The Petitioner expressed: (1) the obligations that the United States and the Commonwealth / State of Virginia have under the ICCPR, (2) expressed that the ratification of the ICCPR and the obligations and duties that come with its ratification grants at the very

11

least the jurisdiction to the said courts to recognize the authority of USAR so that the court may ensure that the Commonwealth / State of Virginia fulfills its obligations and duties under the ICCPR, and (3) expressed that the right to self-determination is recognized under the ICCPR and that the "authority" of USAR represents the delegate powers of the Moorish American Nationals of which power, in part, represents the fundamental rights of each individual National citizen of USAR as well as their collective right to self-determination. The Petitioner also expressed that if the Circuit Court did not truly have the jurisdiction then the Supreme Court of Virginia does pursuant to Article VI, Section 1, Clause 2 of the Constitution of Virginia. On September 18, 2018 the Supreme Court of Virginia entered its Final Order which refused the Petition for Appeal which held that there is no reversible error in the judgment complained of. The Final Order was given without an opinion or finding of facts and conclusion of law. App. 1, 2.