
UNIFIED UNITED STATES COMMON LAW GRAND JURY

c/o NLA, 3979 Albany Post Road, suite 107, Hyde Park, NY. 12538

Fax (845) 233-4879 Phone (845) 229-0250

AL, AK, AZ, AR, CA, CO, CT, DE, FL, GA, HI, ID, IL, IN, IA, KS, KY, LA, ME, MD, MA, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NE, NV, NH, NJ, NM, NY, NC, ND, OH, OK, OR, PA, RI, SC, SD, TN, TX, UT, VT, VA, WA, WV, WY

WE THE PEOPLE via the UUSCLGJ, have been Providentially Entrusted via Natural Law to dispense justice and were provided legal recourse to address the criminal conduct of the Judiciary and our Representatives; We the People have the unbridled right to empanel our own grand juries and present True Bills of Information, Indictments, and Presentments to a Court of Justice, which is then required to commence a criminal proceeding.¹

We the People

– Against –

Clerk Robert Meek of The Supreme Court of the United States

GRAND JURY INDICTMENT

FILED WITH ATTORNEY GENERAL TODD BLANCHE²

“William Blackstone - a legal maxim - Every right when withheld must have a remedy, and every injury its proper redress.; In the third volume of his Commentaries, page 23, Blackstone states two cases in which a remedy is afforded by mere operation of law. “In all other cases,” he says, it is a general and indisputable rule that where there is a legal right, there is also a legal remedy by suit or action at law whenever that right is invaded. And afterwards, page 109 of the same volume, he says, I am next to consider such injuries as are cognizable by the Courts of common law. And herein I shall for the present only remark that all possible injuries whatsoever that did not fall within the exclusive cognizance of either the ecclesiastical, military, or maritime tribunals are, for that very reason, within the cognizance of the common law courts of justice, for it is a settled and invariable principle in the laws of England that every right, when withheld, must have a remedy, and every injury its proper redress” – 5 U.S. 137, Marbury v. Madison.

¹ US v Williams 1992, 112 S.Ct. 1735, 504 U.S. 36, 118 L.Ed.2d 352.

² Filed with U.S. AG Todd Blanche because federal judges deny the People’s sovereignty and hold them in contempt.

Because our Justice Courts of Common Law and their Common Law Rules have been allegedly abrogated by the 1934 Rules Enabling Act and replaced with civil law and its repugnant rules, we find it necessary to declare the following facts.

Whereas, the ABA's education monopoly that has an iron grip on our courts has blinded ABA taught lawyers to the Natural Law and taught that we are under Roman civil law.

BLACKS LAW: "Civil Law," "Roman Law" and "Roman Civil Law" are convertible phrases, meaning the same system of jurisprudence. That rule of action which every particular nation, commonwealth, or city has established peculiarly for itself; more properly called "municipal" law, to distinguish it from the "law of nature," and from international law. See Bowyer, Mod. Civil Law, 19; Sevier v. Riley, 189. Cal. 170, 244 P. 323, 325.

Whereas, the Declaration of Independence, the foundation of American Law, clearly declared that we are under the Laws of nature and nature's God, "the Judeo-Christian God."

Isa 44:6-8 Thus saith the LORD the King of Israel, and his redeemer the LORD of hosts; I am the first, and I am the last; and beside me there is no God. And who, as I, shall call, and shall declare it, and set it in order for me, since I appointed the ancient people? and the things that are coming, and shall come, let them show unto them. Fear ye not, neither be afraid: have not I told thee from that time, and have declared it? ye are even my witnesses. Is there a God beside me? yea, there is no God; I know not any.

Whereas, We the People have been cast out of our own courts and are being denied natural law and access to the Peoples' courthouse to be under judicial auspices, thereby forcing us to gather in a tent outside our court "so to speak."

Whereas, Grand Juries under judicial auspices are statutory controlled by the BAR through their well-trained Esquires; And therefore, are not free and independent and are ignorant of their sovereignty and are thereby steered to the will of the state. This is the epitome of jury tampering.

We read in UNITED STATES V WILLIAMS, 1992, Justice Anton Scalia writing for the majority,³

"The grand jury is an institution separate from the courts, over whose functioning the courts do not preside. Because the grand jury is an institution separate from the courts, over whose functioning the courts do not preside, we think it clear that, as a general matter at least, no such "supervisory" judicial authority exists, and that the disclosure rule applied here exceeded the Tenth Circuit's authority. [R]ooted in long centuries of Anglo-American history,⁴ the grand jury is mentioned in the Bill of Rights, but not in

³ UNITED STATES V WILLIAMS 112 S.Ct. 1735, 504 U.S. 36, 118 L.Ed.2d 352; No. 90-1972. Argued Jan. 22, 1992. Decided May 4, 1992.

⁴ Hannah v. Larche, 363 U.S. 420, 490, 80 S.Ct. 1502, 1544, 4 L.Ed.2d 1307 (1960) (Frankfurter, J., concurring in result)

the body of the Constitution. It has not been textually assigned, therefore, to any of the branches described in the first three Articles. It ‘is a constitutional fixture in its own right.’⁵ In fact the whole theory of its function is that it belongs to no branch of the institutional government, serving as a kind of buffer or referee between the Government and the people.⁶ Although the grand jury normally operates, of course, in the courthouse and under judicial auspices, its institutional relationship with the judicial branch has traditionally been, so to speak, at arm’s length. Judges’ direct involvement in the functioning of the grand jury has generally been confined to the constitutive one of calling the grand jurors together and administering their oaths of office.⁷ The grand jury’s functional independence from the judicial branch is evident both in the scope of its power to investigate criminal wrongdoing, and in the manner in which that power is exercised. “Unlike [a] [c]ourt, whose jurisdiction is predicated upon a specific case or controversy, the grand jury ‘can investigate merely on suspicion that the law is being violated, or even because it wants assurance that it is not.’⁸ It need not identify the offender it suspects, or even “the precise nature of the offense” it is investigating.⁹ The grand jury requires no authorization from its constituting court to initiate an investigation,¹⁰ nor does the prosecutor require leave of court to seek a grand jury indictment. And in its day-to-day functioning, the grand jury generally operates without the interference of a presiding judge.¹¹ It swears in its own witnesses, and deliberates in total secrecy.¹²“ Recognizing this tradition of independence, we have said that the Fifth Amendment’s “constitutional guarantee presupposes an investigative body ‘acting independently of either prosecuting attorney or judge.’¹³“

“There can be no legal right to resist the oppressions of the government, unless there be some legal tribunal, other than the government, and wholly independent of, and above, the government, to judge between the government and those who resist its oppressions. The authority to judge what are the powers of the government, and what are the liberties of the people, must necessarily be vested in one or the other of the parties themselves--the government, or the people; because there is no third party to whom it can be entrusted. If the authority be vested in the government, the government

⁵ *United States v. Chanen*, 549 F.2d 1306, 1312 (CA9 1977) (quoting *Nixon v. Sirica*, 159 U.S.App.D.C. 58, 70, n. 54, 487 F.2d 700, 712, n. 54 (1973)), cert. denied, 434 U.S. 825, 98 S.Ct. 72, 54 L.Ed.2d 83 (1977).

⁶ *Stirone v. United States*, 361 U.S. 212, 218, 80 S.Ct. 270, 273, 4 L.Ed.2d 252 (1960); *Hale v. Henkel*, 201 U.S. 43, 61, 26 S.Ct. 370, 373, 50 L.Ed. 652 (1906); G. Edwards, *The Grand Jury* 28-32 (1906).

⁷ *United States v. Calandra*, 414 U.S. 338, 343, 94 S.Ct. 613, 617, 38 L.Ed.2d 561 (1974); Fed.Rule Crim.Proc. 6(a).

⁸ *United States v. R. Enterprises*, 498 U.S. ----, ----, 111 S.Ct. 722, 726, 112 L.Ed.2d 795 (1991) (quoting *United States v. Morton Salt Co.*, 338 U.S. 632, 642-643, 70 S.Ct. 357, 364, 94 L.Ed. 401 (1950)).

⁹ *Blair v. United States*, 250 U.S. 273, 282, 39 S.Ct. 468, 471, 63 L.Ed. 979 (1919).

¹⁰ *Hale*, supra, 201 U.S., at 59-60, 65, 26 S.Ct., at 373, 375.

¹¹ *Calandra*, supra, 414 U.S., at 343, 94 S.Ct., at 617.

¹² see *United States v. Sells Engineering, Inc.*, 463 U.S., at 424-425, 103 S.Ct., at 3138

¹³ *Id.*, at 16, 93 S.Ct., at 773 (emphasis added) (quoting *Stirone*, supra, 361 U.S., at 218, 80 S.Ct., at 273).

is absolute, and the people have no liberties except such as the government sees fit to indulge them with.¹⁴

COMES NOW, the Constituted¹⁵ Unified¹⁶ United States Common Law¹⁷ Grand Jury,¹⁸ (UUSCLGJ) to bring an Indictment against Clerk Robert Meek for twice unlawfully blocking the Grand Jury's Presentment concerning Treason to be brought before the United States Supreme Court Justices. That is incumbent upon both "We the People" and Clerk Robert Meek under both Natural Law and 18 USC §2382. *See copy of said Presentment addressed to all nine Justices individually and cover letter to Clerk Robert Meek attached.*

The Common Law Grand Jury charges that,

- 1) On two occasions Clerk Robert Meek unlawfully and knowingly prevented and thereby concealed the Grand Jury's Presentment concerning Treason from reaching the Justices of the US Supreme Court (see letters from clerk dated June 4, 2026 and September 1, 2026 attached) in violation of 18 USC §2382 which states,

"Whoever, owing allegiance to the United States and having knowledge of the commission of any treason against them, conceals and does not, as soon as may be, disclose and make known the same to the President or to some judge of the United States, or to the governor or to some judge or justice of a particular State, is guilty of misprision of treason and shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than seven years, or both."

- 2) Clerk Robert Meek unlawfully and knowingly blocked and willfully refuses to forward the Grand Jury's "Petition for redress of grievances" which is a 1st Amendment Right that cannot be abridged by rule or statute. No government has authority to oppose (directly or indirectly) the exercise of a right. As it is clearly stated in, *Miranda v. Arizona*, 384 U.S. 436, 491 (1966) *"Where rights secured by the Constitution are involved, there*

¹⁴ Lysander Spooner – An Essay on the Trial by Jury, 1852

¹⁵ CONSTITUTED – The People of each county have come together to agreed and declared a return to Common Law Juries.

¹⁶ UNIFIED - Every county in all fifty states have constituted State Common Law Grand Juries and thereby came together forming the Unified United States Common Law Grand Jury for the sole purpose to expose and indict enemies domestic against the People and our Natural Law Republic.

¹⁷ COMMON LAW – Article VI – 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, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.

¹⁸ COMMON LAW GRAND JURY – Amendment V No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a Grand Jury...; The Court of Appeals' rule would neither preserve nor enhance the traditional functioning of the grand jury that the "common law" of the Fifth Amendment demands. *UNITED STATES v. WILLIAMS, Jr.* 112 S.Ct. 1735; 504 U.S. 36; 118 L.Ed.2d 352.

can be no rulemaking or legislation which would abrogate them.” Joseph Story, *Commentaries*, §1886-1888 (1833). “§1886 which states,

“The remaining clause secures “the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the government for a redress of grievances.” §1887. “This would seem unnecessary to be expressly provided for in a Republican government, since it results from the very nature of its structure and institutions. It is impossible, that it could be practically denied.” Additionally on August 5, 2026, Chief Justice Roberts, restored the Supreme Court’s independence from Congress by giving its Clerks notice that, *“the First Amendment includes the right to petition.”*

- 3) Clerk Robert Meek unlawfully and knowingly blocked and removed the Grand Juries 1st Amendment petition in the form of a Presentment concerning Treason in violation of 18 USC §2076 which states,

“Whoever, being a clerk of a district court of the United States, willfully refuses or neglects to make or forward any report, certificate, statement, or document as required by law, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.”

- 4) Clerk Robert Meek owing allegiance to the United States unlawfully and knowingly gave aid and comfort to the enemy waring against the Constitution and the People in violation of 18 USC §2381 which states,

“Whoever, owing allegiance to the United States, levies war against them or adheres to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort within the United States or elsewhere, is guilty of treason and shall suffer death, or shall be imprisoned not less than five years and fined under this title but not less than \$10,000; and shall be incapable of holding any office under the United States.”

- 5) Clerk Robert Meek unlawfully and knowingly blocked and willfully refuses to forward a document as required by law in violation of 18 USC §2076 which states,

“Whoever, being a clerk of a district court of the United States, willfully refuses or neglects to make or forward any report, certificate, statement, or document as required by law, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.”

- 6) Clerk Robert Meek unlawfully and knowingly blocked and willfully removed a Presentment filed with Clerk Robert Meek in violation of 18 USC §2071 which states,

(a) Whoever willfully and unlawfully conceals, removes, mutilates, obliterates, or destroys, or attempts to do so, or, with intent to do so takes and carries away any record, proceeding, map, book, paper, document, or other thing, filed or

deposited with any clerk or officer of any court of the United States, or in any public office, or with any judicial or public officer of the United States, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than three years, or both. (b) Whoever, having the custody of any such record, proceeding, map, book, document, paper, or other thing, willfully and unlawfully conceals, removes, mutilates, obliterates, falsifies, or destroys the same, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than three years, or both; and shall forfeit his office and be disqualified from holding any office under the United States. As used in this subsection, the term "office" does not include the office held by any person as a retired officer of the Armed Forces of the United States.

We the People gave every opportunity to Clerk Robert Meek to obey the Law by filing twice and offered that, *"If any Clerk or Justice believes we are wrong in the law or that rules can abrogate rights, he or she may submit affidavit, sworn under penalty of perjury and postmarked within ten (10) days receipt of this Remonstrance, showing the constitutional provision or fundamental principle of law authorizing constitutional rights to be abrogated by rules, or, by tacit acquiescence, each Justice of the Supreme Court agrees that all written herein is truth, and that each time hereafter that a Clerk rejects a petition, it shall stand as each Justice has denied the right to petition with full knowledge, malice, and intent to perform maladministration in breach of the public trust of the Constitution, and that each of the Justices performs an unofficial act contrary to their oath and to deny justice. This is sent to you in the peace and love of Jesus Christ, so that this Court continues its good faith restoration of original law and fundamental form."* Clerk Robert Meek denied this opportunity.

Therefore, the Common Law Grand Jury being the Sureties of the Peace charge the defendant with the aforesaid six (6) counts.

A TRUE BILL

Seal

Grand Jury met on February 14, 2026 and decided for a True Bill against Robert Meek.



Grand Jury Foreman

A Free and Independent Grand Jury needs no co-signature from the ABA

Trump v. United States, 603 U.S. 593 (2024) "There is no immunity for unofficial acts."

COPIED: President Donald J. Trump, Press Secretary Karoline Leavitt, Vice President JD Vance, White House Chief of Staff Susie Wiles, Secretary of State Marco Rubio, Deputy Chief of Staff Stephen Miller, Secretary of War Pete Hegseth, Secretary of the Interior Doug Burgum, CIA Director John Ratcliffe, Secretary of Commerce Howard Lutnick, Director of Dept. Justice Todd Blanche, Secretary of Health and Human Services Robert F. Kennedy Jr., Director of National Intelligence Jay Clayton, Secretary of Homeland Security Markwayne Mullin, Secretary of Education Linda McMahon, Secretary of the Treasury Scott Bessent, Congressman Tim Burchett, Congressman Mike Johnson, Congressman Jim Jordan, Congressman Steve Scalise, Congressman Brandon Gill, Congressman Chip Roy, Senator John Kennedy, Senator Josh Hawley, Senator Ted Cruz, Sen Rick Scott, Donald Trump Jr., Congressman Thomas Massie

ATTACHMENTS:

- Copy of the Presentment addressed to all nine Justices individually.
- Cover letter to Clerk Robert Meek dated August 26th.
- Letter from Clerk Robert Meek dated June 4, 2026.
- Letter from Clerk Robert Meek dated September 1, 2026.