

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FILED  
IN CLERKS OFFICE  
2020 NOV 12 AM 10:36  
U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF MASS.

:Manestream: Gray-Bey: Fourty-Four.  
Party Aggrieved

VS.

42 U.S.C. §654(3) MASSACHUSETTS  
DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE CHILD  
SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT DIVISION  
45 CFR §302.34 SUFFOLK PROBATE AND  
FAMILY COURT *et al.*  
DEFENDANTS

CASE NUMBERS  
#026506692, Pin:00.1205.9205  
000.673.699  
002.231.055  
002.656.834  
003.276.873

COMPLAINT BOUGHT UNDER 42 U.S.C. § 1983 FOR  
DEPRIVATION OF RIGHTS UNDER COLOR OF LAW

COMES NOW, :Manestream: Gray-Bey: Fourty-Four. In ex rel Howard Junior, of the Family Gray who moves the Court for entry of judgment in his favor because the Defendants deprived him of his Article I. Section 9 Paragraph 3, First, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Thirteenth Amendments with its Twenty section (13-20). With rights, privileges, and immunities secured by the Constitution and Laws, and brings this suit under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 for deprivation of those rights under color of law and seeks declaratory relief and damages.

I. INTRODUCTION AND FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

Defendants while operating a private business for profit under a contractual obligation outside of their Constitutional creation and duties compelled, :Manestream: Gray-Bey: Fourty-Four., to disclose a social security number so they could Hunt him like an animal in order to employ unconstitutional IV-D collection remedies to illegally seize his honestly acquired income against his will in violation of the Law thus depriving him of his secured rights, privileges and immunities.

II. JURISDICTION IS PROPER

Section 460 of the Social Security Act provides that the district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction, without regard to any amount in controversy, to hear and determine any civil action certified. A civil action under section 460 may

be brought in any judicial district in which the claim arose, the plaintiff domicile, or the defendant resides. WHEREFORE, :Manestream: Gray-Bey: Fourty-Four., invokes his Constitutional Right to Equal Protection of Sec. 406.

### III. DIVERSITY JURISDICTION IS PROPER

In *Hertz Corp. v. Friend*, the U.S. Supreme Court's unanimous decision clarified the test for corporate citizenship to be applied when determining federal courts' diversity jurisdiction, a corporation is a citizen of the state where its "nerve center" is located. The single and separate DCSS operates in this state as an arm of the federal OCSE concealed in the MA Executive Branch. When performing under 31 U.S.C. §6305 and 45 C.F.R. § 302.34 contractual obligations, IV-D agents, staff, employees, and 45 C.F.R. § 75.2 contractors represent the Federal OCSE under control of the Secretary of the U.S. DHHS, which is a foreign corporation with respect to this state, *19 C.J.S. §883*. Corporations therefore, being not a natural person, but a mere creature of the mind, invisible and intangible, cannot be a citizen of a State, or of the United States". *Rundle v. Delaware & Raritan Canal Co.*, 55 U.S. 80. "A corporation is a citizen, resident, or inhabitant of the state or country by or under the laws of which it was created, and of that state or country only." *19 Corpus Juris Secundum Corporations, §886*. Defendants were created under 42 U.S.C. § 654 (3) in compliance with Title IV-D of the Social Security Act, Pub. L. No. 93-647, 88 Stat. 2351 (1975), 42 U.S.C. § 651, not the state constitution.

WHEREFORE, :Manestream: Gray-Bey: Fourty-Four., is not a U.S., State citizen or resident of Suffolk County within the meaning. He is a Man with a National origin a Hebrew Moslem of Moorish descendant created by the great God Allah, and he dwells in a country, a portion of the earth's surface of Massachusetts Bay outside of the corporate U.S. State, and County jurisdiction.

WHEREFORE, :Manestream: Gray-Bey: Fourty-Four., and the Defendants are "diverse" in citizenship and state of incorporation, which clearly indicates that they differ in state and/or Nationality. Therefore, diversity jurisdiction is satisfied pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332.

### IV. VENUE

Venue in this Court is proper as to all defendants pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1391(a)(2) and (b)(2) because the constitutional deprivations giving rise to the claims occurred within this district.

### V. COMPLAINT IS NOT BARRED UNDER ROOKER FELDMAN

"Participation by the Defendants in the IV-D program is voluntary". *Wehunt v. Ledbetter*, 875 F.2d 1558. "In *Oliphant*, slip op. at 16, the state, like other states which have [voluntarily] agreed to participate in the AFDC program are required to offer IV-D services as a condition of receiving federal funds. *Mason vs. Bradley*, 789 F. Supp. 273 1992 U.S. Dist. Lexis 8975 at \*23 N D IIM. "It is much in

the nature of a contract in return for federal funds, the State agreed to comply with federally imposed conditions". *Pennhurst*, 451 U.S. at 17, 101 S. Ct. at 1540, 67 L.Ed.2d at 707. Participation in the statewide integrated system for child support and medical support enforcement by a county is voluntary, and nothing in this section shall be construed to mandate participation. *Texas Family Code Title 5 Subchapter D, 231.0011 Sec. (g)*.

## VI. AUTOMATIC WAIVER OF ELEVENTH AMENDMENT IMMUNITY

By Law, the IV-D program is a partnership between the Federal Government and the State "to carry on as co-owners a business for profit. *Schleicher v. Krier*, 218 Wis. 376, 261 N.W. 413. See also Uniform Partnership Act, § 6(1). The Title IV-D Program is "federally operated and funded" and 31 U.S.C. §6305 created this partnership. The 45 C.F.R. 302.34 created a partnership between the single and separate IV-D agency and the County. "When the U.S. enters into contract relations, its rights and duties therein are governed generally by the law applicable to contracts between private individuals who are parties to such instruments, there is no difference". *United States v. Windstar Corp.* 518 U.S. 839. "Once the United States waives its immunity and does business with citizens, it does so much as the party never cloaked in immunity". *Franconia Association v. United States*, 536 U.S. 129. As such under 31 U.S.C. §6305 Title IV-D contract while overseeing 45 C.F.R. §302.34 County contracts the Defendants do not represent the state, it represents the U.S. DHHS, AFDC, OSCE.

Under the current contract, 42 U.S.C. § 654 (3) created the single and separate DCSS as an arm of the U.S. DHHS, AFDC, OSCE not an arm of the State, concealed in Executive Branch while contractually performing IV-D obligations and duties of the OCSE. the federal government provides Defendants shares of billions to carry out the IV-D activities of the OCSE which is under the control of the Secretary of the U.S.DHHS, a foreign corporation with respect to the state *19 C.J.S. §883*. The powers of this state and county are vested by the Constitution of U.S.A. which mandates the basic principles and laws that the government was instituted to be a benefit security and protection of the people, and also limits the power and duties of this state and county government to that end and more importantly, the Constitution guarantees certain rights to the people living in it. Title IV-D services are far cry from being Constitutional in nature.

True indeed that the Title IV-D agency is not a "person" against whom a §1983 claim for money damages might be asserted". At Common Law, a "corporation" was an "artificial person. *Ngiraingas v. Sanchez*, 495 U.S. 182 (1990). The Title IV-D program is a "private business" affecting or belonging to private individuals, as distinct from the public generally, not official, not clothed with office". *People v. Powell*, 280 Mich. 699, 274 N.W. 372, 373, 111 A.L. R. 721, and can be sued. Wherefore, the standing jurisprudential principle is the State volunteered to enter to perform contractual obligation outside of its Constitutional creation amount[s] to the automatic waiver of its Eleventh Amendment Immunity." By

reasserting this principle, the question has answered regarding whether the state through voluntarily participates in the IV-D program waives its Eleventh Amendment Immunity.

## VII. STATEMENT OF FACTS

The Defendants deprived :Manestreem: Gray-Bey: Fourty., of his interest pursuant to established IV-D procedures, and due process was not satisfied because under 45 C.F.R. § 302.34 there was no Constitutional court hearing provided before he was deprived of his property interest. *Nnebe v. Daus*, 644 F.3d 147,158 (2d Cir. 2011). Defendant's, contractors, agents, staff, and employee's premeditated acts and omissions violated due process because they knew well in advance that no law requires them to offer and sell IV-D services, and said services are not intended to benefit custodial parents and children, *Blessing v. Freestone*, 520 U.S. at 343, 117 S. Ct. at 1361, 17 L. Ed. 2d at 584, and that IV-D services was intended to benefit the public treasury Not :Manestreem: Gray-Bey: Fourty-Four., *Wehunt v. Ledbetter*, 875 F2.d 1558.

## VIII. THE PARTIES

**Party Aggrieved** :Manestreem: Gray-Bey: Fourty-Four., of the Family Gray the adult male of the *Hue-man* species above the age of puberty, created by the Creators of the universe, Genesis 1;26, (see Preamble), born equal, free, and independent, not subject to" the "legal" constraint of another, unconstrained having power to follow the dictates of his own free will, "not subject to" control, restriction, modification or limitation from a given outside source, possessing inalienable inherent rights among which are enjoying and defending his life and liberty, acquiring, possessing, protecting property and reputation, and seeking and obtaining happiness and safety.

### DEFENDANTS

The 42 U.S.C. § 654 (3) single and separate Division of Child Support Services;

Suffolk County incorporated as a municipal corporation under 45 C.F.R. §302.34 IV-D contract that target only individuals subject to IV-D enforcement activities in return for payment from the 42 U.S.C. §654(3).

Suffolk County Probate and Family Court

### A. DEFENDANTS PROPERLY NAMED AND IDENTIFIED

45 C.F.R. 75.2 Contractor means an entity under contract providing IV-D services and functions of the IV-D Program under 45 C.F.R §302.34 and is inclusive of those agents of the program procured through purchase-of-service contracts, contractual agreements or memoranda of understanding with the IV-D Agency.

IV-D employees within the meaning of chapter 24 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, Subject to 42 U.S.C. §1983, always relevant to this complaint is IV-D agency personnel performing IV-D enforcement functions that target only individuals subject to Title IV-D activities in return for payment from the OCSS.

Defendants are within the meaning of § 1983 pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 2000e(a) definition of the term person individuals, governments, governmental agencies, political subdivisions, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trusts, unincorporated organizations, and trustees.

### **1. Claim for Relief under 42 U.S.C. §1983 Against Defendants for Deprivation of Rights Under Color of Law**

Title 42 is comprised of IV-D Program editorially compiled and organized into the title, but Title 42 itself has never been enacted into positive law. "Although state participation in the Social Security Act itself is mandatory, participation by the State in the IV-D program is voluntary". *Wehunt v. Ledbetter*, 875 F.2d 1558. The distinction is constitutionally significant because a non-positive law title is merely (presumed) evidence of law, in contrast to 1 U.S.C. §204, positive law titles constitute legal evidence of the law in all Federal and State Courts.

### **2. Claim for Relief under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 Against defendants under 42 U.S.C. §408, Compelled Disclose and Use of an SSN.**

Sec. 466(a)(13) of the Social Security Act 42 U.S.C. § 666(a)(13) compelled the disclosure of :Manestream: Gray-Bey: Fourty-Four.'s SSN for the sole purpose of hunting him and then forcing him under coercion to succeed to the status of non-custodial parent in order to establish, modify, and enforce IV-D collections.

**WHEREFORE**, there is a Constitutional violation pursuant to Title 42 U.S.C. Chapter 7 Sec. 408. Penalties (a) In general defendants in an act of collusion (8) did compel the disclosure of the social security number held by the \_\_ in violation of the laws of the United States and defendants shall be guilty of a felony and upon conviction thereof shall be fined under title 18 or imprisoned for not more than five years, or both.

### **3. Claim for Relief under 42 U.S.C. §1983 Against Defendants Under Article I. Section 9 Paragraph 3.**

Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 405 (C)(2)(A)(B)(i), the 20 C.F.R. § 422.103(d) social security card, name and account number are assigned to appropriate groups or categories of individuals. Pursuant to §666 (a)(1)(3)(C) the non-custodial parent in the current IV-D case is positively identified by the SSN. Defendants acted under color of 42 U.S.C. §666(a)(4)(A) to place liens on his real and personal property to collect amounts allegedly owed, which arose by operation of law, the manner in which involuntary financial servitude developed upon the person, non-custodial



parent, by the mere application of IV-D without the act or cooperation, of :Manestream: Gray-Bey: Fourty-Four., himself for profit.

**WHEREFORE**, there is valid Constitutional violation because IV-D enforcement remedies target only the individual group through an intentional infliction of a bill of attainder, or a bill of pain and penalties. IV-D is an act of the legislature that declares non-custodial parents guilty of non-payment and punishing them without a trial by jury in violation of the Sixth Amendment.

#### **4. Claim for Relief under 42 U.S.C. §1983 Against Defendants for First Amendment Violations and Deprivations**

Congress approved H.R. 4195, a bill for inclusion for the publication of the Code of Federal Regulations. Title 45 Sec. 300-399 is comprised of the principle set of regulations for IV-D issued by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services regulating IV-D contractor and employee activities. **WHEREFORE**, there is a valid First Amendment Violation and deprivation of rights because Congress enacted 45 C.F.R. §303.11 (12) knowingly prohibiting and abridging :Manestream: Gray-Bey: Fourty-Four., right to petition Government for redress of grievances.

#### **5. Claim for Relief under 42 U.S.C. §1983 Against Defendants for Fourth Amendment Violations and Deprivations**

In accordance with the SS-5 application the social security card must be shown in order to obtain "benefits" from certain U.S. agencies. A benefit is a pecuniary advantage profit or gain, the whole benefit and entire beneficial interest. *Bird v. Newcomb*, 170 VA. 208,196 S.E. 605, 608. Under the current contracts IV-D establishment and enforcement was intended to benefit the public treasury Not :Manestream: Gray-Bey: Fourty-Four. *Wehunt v. Ledbetter*, 875 F2.d 1558. The SSN was the key piece of information the defendants used to employ High-Volume Automated IV-D Systems in order to consistently violate his right to privacy by using the number to hunt him down through Proactive Matching, Federal Parent Locator Service, State Parent Locator Service, National Directory of New Hires, State Directory of New Hires, New Hire Reporting, Multistate Financial Institution Data Match, and the Uniform Interstate Family Support Act.

**WHEREFORE**, there is a valid Fourth Amendment Constitutional violation and deprivation because the SSN which was issued to :Manestream: Gray-Bey: Fourty-Four., to obtain benefits from certain U.S. agencies was deceptively used by the Defendants to "subject him to" the deprivations for profit with the intent to continually and consistently deprive him of his secured right to privacy for their benefit not his.

## **6. Claim for Relief under 42 U.S.C. §1983 Defendants for Fifth Amendment Violations and Deprivations**

P.L. 105-187, and P.L. 102-521 imposes federal “criminal penalties” that target only the group of individual, non-custodial parents for the “willful failure” to pay a past due IV-D obligation to the 42 U.S.C. §654 (3) that remains unpaid for longer than a year or is greater than \$5,000. The first conviction and penalty is a fine of up to \$5,000, “imprisonment” for not more than 6 months, or both; for a second conviction, the penalty is a fine of not more than \$250,000, “imprisonment” for up to 2 years, or both. This is constitutionally relevant because the Fifth Amendment, P.L. 103-66, 45 C.F.R. §303.101(c)(2), Sec. 466, 42 U.S.C. §666 (a)(3)(A), and 42 U.S.C. §666 (a)(5)(C)(i) which requires that the due process and the rights of :Manestream: Gray-Bey: Fourty-Four’s., must be protected.

Defendants knowingly did not afford due process safeguards and intentionally did not provide adequate notice that the SSN issued to Gray-Bey: Fourty-Four, to obtain benefits from certain U.S. agencies would be under the List of Routine Uses, System # 50-6692 Master Files of Social Security Number Holders would be provided to the federal OCSE in order to subject him to IV-D enforcement remedies from which defendants profits in the billions. There is a §1983 claim for denial of due process because :Manestream: Gray-Bey: Fourty-Four., possessed the “liberty and property interest” protected by the Constitution and federal statutes was due before he could be deprived of that interest and property. *Green v. Bauvi*, 46 F.3d 189, 194 2d. Cir.1995. Property and income which :Manestream: Gray-Bey: Fourty-Four., honestly acquired, he retained full control of, subject to these limitations, first he did not use it to his neighbor’s injury, and that does not mean that he must use it for his neighbors benefit, Second, that [[if]] he devotes it to public use, he gives the public the right to control that use, and third whenever their needs require, they may take it upon payment of due compensation”.

**WHEREFORE**, there are multiple valid Fifth Amendment Constitutional violations and deprivations under §1983 because defendants, IV-D contractors and employees did not inform :Manestream: Gray-Bey: Fourty-Four., that paternity or non-paternity through marriage or non-marriage were admissible as evidence and would be used against him. Especially since he did not devote his honestly acquired income to the defendant’s use or grant them the right to control that use so that whenever their needs require and honestly acquired income, private property was taken for public use to gain federal profits without just compensation. He was subject for the same IV-D remedies and more than twice put in jeopardy of life, he was compelled to be a witness against himself under their requirement to provide the SSN account number.

### **7. Claim for Relief under 42 U.S.C. §1983 Against Defendants for Sixth Amendment Violations and Deprivations**

The Federal OCSE is under a contract with the American Bar Association IV-D for Project, training on legal issues to persons working in the field of IV-D, and to provide continual education to lawyers and judges who serve under IV-D contracts to increase IV-D profits. As such no attorney would accept, :Manestream: Gray-Bey: Fourty-Four's., case because it caused a conflict of interest under the current contracts. **WHEREFORE**, there is a valid Sixth Amendment violation and deprivation because :Manestream: Gray-Bey: Fourty-Four., was unable to obtain council due to a conflict of interest. The American Bar Association approved IV-D for Congress which created contractual bias in the legal profession and the justice system, and he was subject to IV-D enforcement remedies without a trial by jury.

### **8. Claim for Relief under 42 U.S.C. §1983 Against Defendants for Thirteenth Amendment Deprivations and Violations**

Defendants performing under contractual habits, customs and practices assure under §403 Grants (a)(5)(C)(iii)(III), that a non-custodial parent becomes enrolled in the project and is in compliance with the terms of an oral or written personal responsibility contract entered into with the defendants, and (bb) a commitment to cooperate in the payment of IV-D, and (cc) a commitment to participate in employment or related activities to make regular payments to the defendants, and (dd) a commitment to participate in services, designed to assist a non-custodial parent obtain and retain employment, to increase earnings enhance federal profits, and Sec. 466(a) 42 U.S.C. §666(a)(15)(A)(I) procedures to ensure that "persons" owing past-due, work or have a plan for payment.

Wage withholding; Liens on property; Offset of unemployment compensation payments; Seizure and sale of personal or real property; Reporting to credit agencies to prevent the underserved extension of credit; Seizure of State and Federal income tax refunds; Revocation of various types of licenses (driver's, passport, business, occupational, recreational); Attachment of lottery winnings and insurance settlements of debtor parents; Requirement that recipients of financial assistance from the Small Business Administration, including direct loans and loan guarantees, must certify that the recipient is not more than 60 days delinquent in the payment of child support; Seizure of assets held by public or private retirement funds and financial institutions; Deprivation of a debtor to a fresh start to discharge a debt completely, pay a percentage of the debt, or pay the full amount of the debt over a longer period of time because debts for child support and alimony are not dischargeable; State or Federal imprisonment, fines or both.

The above remedies constitute slavery and involuntary servitude not inflicted as punishment for crime whereof, :Manestream: Gray-Bey: Fourty-Four., was duly convicted, that now exist within this jurisdiction. **WHEREFORE** there are multiple Thirteenth Amendment violations and deprivations because he was compelled to labor against his will under P.L. 109-8 provisions related to establishing paternity, orders and to enforcing IV-D obligations (1) stipulate that a IV-D obligation" is paid first priority over his financial needs. Involuntary servitude and involuntary slavery



is now the Constitutional term for him laboring against his will under coercion from which defendant's profit, for other than his financial needs.

### **9. Claim for Relief under 42 U.S.C. §1983 Against Defendants for Fourteenth Amendment Deprivations and Violations**

Defendants offer 45 C.F.R. § 303.11 case closure criteria (12) to a non- IV-A recipient custodial parent (a woman) who requests "closure of a case", but the non-custodial parent the man in this case is denied the same. The Fourteenth Amendment required defendants to provide :Manestream: Gray-Bey: Fourty-Four., equal protection under the law within its jurisdiction and unnecessary discrimination against various groups. WHEREFORE, there is a valid Fourteenth Amendment Constitutional violation and deprivation because :Manestream: Gray-Bey: Fourty-Four., was denied the "equal" protection of the laws when he requested case closure. Under §1983 a similarly situated person (a woman) was treated differently and the defendant's actions were motivated by an unlawful factor. In this context "similarly situated" proves more than some specificity. *Campbell v Rainbow City*, 434 F.3d 1306, 1314 (11<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2006). The comparator in this case, the custodial parent a (woman) born "equal" is similarly situated in all relevant aspects. *Griffin Inds. v. Irvin*, 496 F.3d 1189, 1202-03 (11<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2007). Equal protection was denied because the challenged conduct was clearly motivated by intent to discriminate. *Wash v. Davis*, 426 U.S. 229, 239-48 (1976).

### **IX. FEDERAL RULES OF EVIDENCE SEC 406**

Evidence of the Defendant's IV-D contractual performance, habits and routine practices for profit is hereby admitted and proves that on every occasion the defendants acted in accordance with the habit and routine practices of IV-D employment or contracts. The court may admit this evidence regardless of whether it is corroborated or whether there was an eyewitness. In this §1983 claim against Defendants, 31 U.S.C 6305 and 45 C.F.R. §302.34 contractual duties are concrete evidence proving (1) the existence of the municipal policy custom and practice, (2) that policy, custom or practice contributed to the deprivation and violation of federal rights. *Jones v. Town of East Haven*, 691 F.3d 72, 80 (2d Cir 2012); *Bd. of Comm'rs of Bryan County. v. Brown*, 520 U.S. 397, 403 (1997). *Connick v. Thompson*, 131 S. Ct. 1350, 1359 (2011) "A municipality or other local government may be liable under this section §1983 if the governmental body itself subjects a person to a deprivation of rights or causes a person to be subject to such deprivation" (quoting *Monell v. New York City Dept. of Soc. Servs.*, 436 U. S. 658, 692 (1978). *Cash v. City of Erie* 654 F.3d 324, 333 (2d Cir 2011).

## **XI. CONCLUSION**

**WHEREFORE**, had it not been for the Defendants entering into a partnership and performing contractual obligation and duties the federal OCSE in contrast to Constitutional functions for a private for profit business to sell IV-D collection services with the freedom to spend its share of profits in any manner they see fit, :Manestream: Gray-Bey: Fourty-Four., would not be subjected within this jurisdiction to the deprivation of his rights, privileges, and immunities secured by the Federal State and Constitution for the U.S.A. and the Laws, under color of non-positive Title IV-D provisions customs and usage, in this District.

## **XII. REMEDY BY DUE COURSE OF LAW**

State and family law must do “major damage” to clear and substantial federal interest before a plaintiff can demand intervention of a federal court. *Hisquierdo*, 439 U.S. at 581. There is a factual nexus between the Defendants who deliberately and with premeditation deprived :Manestream: Gray-Bey: Fourty-Four., of his rights, privileges and immunities that resulted in the injuries and damages he now suffers which is now remediable by the Defendants. See *Allen v. Wright*, 468 U.S. 737, 750-51, 104 S. Ct. 3315, 3324, 82 L.Ed.2d 556, 569.

## **XIII. TRIAL BY JURY**

:Manestream: Gray-Bey: Fourty-Four., hereby exercises his right to trial by jury on all claims and issues so triable.

## **XIV. PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

**WHEREFORE**, because the defendants acted fraudulently and with reckless malice for profit, to set right the above unconstitutional situation this Court should enter judgment in :Manestream: Gray-Bey: Fourty-Four’s favor to terminate the private for profit contractual non-judicial IV-D Collections Cases # 000.673.699/002.231.055/002.656.834/003.276.873 effective immediately to end the deprivation of his rights privileges and immunities and uphold his right to provide for his offspring in private and,

- Enter judgment in his favor for punitive damages for the deprivations and violations of his rights, privileges and immunities so secured in the amount of \$1,000,000.00 against the 42 U.S.C. §654(3) Single and separate Division of Child Support Services for actual general, special compensatory damages and,
- Enter judgment in his favor for punitive damages for the deprivations of his rights, privileges and immunities so secured in the amount of \$1,000,000.00 against Suffolk County for actual general, special compensatory damages and,
- Enter judgment in his favor for punitive damages for the deprivations of his rights, privileges and immunities so secured in the amount of \$1,000,000.00 against Suffolk County Family and Probate Court for actual general, special compensatory damages and,

- Enter judgment in his favor for a full refund of his honestly acquired income of \$41,000.00 against each defendant and,
- Enter judgment in his favor for the 42 U.S.C. §654(3)'s DCSS's 66 percent and the 45 C.F.R. §302.34's Suffolk County's 34 percent share of federal revenue as well as penalties and 18 percent interest and,
- Enter judgment in his favor to remove any and all negative reporting to all credit bureaus and (Drives License/Passport) affecting his private person and professional credit reputation and,
- Enter judgment in his favor for legal fees and cost \$5000.00 each against all defendants.
- Enter judgment in his favor for a letter of apology each against all defendants.

The undersigned being duly affirms that he suffers from injuries and damages voluntarily and contractually inflicted upon him with premeditation by the 42 U.S.C. §654 (3), DCSS and 45 C.F.R. §302.34 Suffolk County who committed the above violations and deprivations voluntarily, under contract and under color of law for profit. The concrete evidence and facts presented herein are true.

Subscribed and Affirmed, to on this \_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2020, by

:Manestream: Gray-Bey: Fourty-Four. In ex rel, Howard Junior, of the Family Gray

---