



**WORD IN ACTION MINISTRY ECCLESIASTICAL
COURT OF JUSTICE**

100 North 21 East, Suite 105, American Fork, Utah 84003

Tel: 310-200-0166 / Tel: 801-857-7823

Email: scripturalaw@yahoo.co.uk Website: www.scripturalaw.org

**JUDGMENT AND ORDER OF THE ECCLESIASTICAL COURT OF
JUSTICE**

Carol Lynn McMeel)	
(fka Carol Lynn Engen),)	
)	CLM-6-2012-ECJ
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	
)	JUDGMENT AND ORDER
CITY OF BELLEVUE, a municipal)	
corporation; Steve Sarkozy, City)	
Manager, City of Bellevue, an)	
official and an individual;)	
)	
KING COUNTY, a municipal)	
corporation; Dow Constantine,)	
King County Executive, an official)	
and an individual;)	
)	
John Doe 1-100)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

FACTS AND BACKGROUND

This case is all about a process server who enters a property to deliver documents with an intruder mentality, and when accosted by the property owner - the plaintiff in the instant case – decides to raise an alarm, and calls

in the entire police department of the City of Bellevue. The police, as usual, decide to use all necessary and unnecessary force to bring the plaintiff woman down as if she is a psychopathic killer. The plaintiff is tazed, and handcuffed, and arrested for being a danger to the community.

The actions of the defendant City of Bellevue is typical of police in any part of our country especially when a firearm is involved. In this case, a firearm was not involved, only the false allegation of the process server that the homeowner threatened to shoot him. The “intruder” process server could very well have knocked on the door or rang the doorbell rather than kick in the door. But process servers like to imitate Navy Seals. They think they are beyond the law because the law allows them the opportunity to serve court documents. The bank intending to serve court documents decides to use an un-uniformed process server instead of an uniformed police officer. The process server is the one who should have been charged and arrested for breaking and entering and filing a false complaint.

The Defendants in this case, the City of Bellevue and the City of Seattle, were served Summonses and Complaints to defend an action initiated by the Plaintiff for violations of her constitutional rights.

Defendants chose to ignore these Summonses and Complaints. They probably entertain the notion that this Court is a powerless one with no enforcement authority and power.

LAW AND ARGUMENT

A misguided belief and a correspondingly miscast trend prevail in this country that Church and State are separate. Checking the Reports on the Continental Debates, and the Resolutions passed in the first Congress leading up to the ratification of the U.S. Constitution of the United States dispel such a misapplied belief that Church and State are separate. They are, instead, like oil and water contained in the same vessel. They cannot coagulate because their properties and characteristics differ, but they exist side by side. Each does not need the other to survive, but they compliment and complement one another because we are simply a Christian nation that presupposes a Supreme Being.

Ecclesiastical courts cannot be ordained and established by the Congress because of the constraints and restraints of the Free Exercise Clause, Bill of

Rights, U.S. Constitution, despite the language of Article 1, section 8, clause 9 of the U.S. Constitution that grants power to Congress to ordain and establish inferior tribunals to the United States Supreme Court.

Ecclesiastical courts are the *sine qua non* of the Church. There are some in this country that believe ecclesiastical courts handle only canon law involving disputes between clergy and the laity, or between clergy as an intra-corporate controversy. Nothing could be further from the truth. The Holy Bible declares in 1 Corinthians 6:1-8 that Christians are prohibited from defending or initiating lawsuits in secular courts. A federal law, PL 97-280, 96 Stat.1211 of 1982, declared that the Bible is the Word of God. I believe that settles the issue that ecclesiastical courts need no legislative or executive orders and edicts to exist and operate.

Plaintiff has asked for total damages amounting to \$ 19,620,000.00. She has evidenced pain, suffering, humiliation, depression, odium, contempt, hatred and ridicule from her family, neighbors, friends, and associates as result of the defendants' high-handed and arbitrary actions. Destroying one's reputation and standing in the community is a serious matter. Our law contemplates defamation, libel and slander as veritable causes of action.

The financial institution that wanted Plaintiff evicted from her home failed to furnish the necessary documents to evidence ownership of the Note. Court clerks in our country are readily jump in favor of issuing a non-judicial foreclosure sale proceeding without performing the civilized act of due diligence. When a lender appears in court with a foreclosure request, due process and equal protection of the laws are quickly abandoned and ignored. The sequence of events that unfold is usually traumatic and painful for foreclosure victims which this country has failed to address and redress since the housing bubble burst. Instead more and more laws are created to bring the Wall Street financial juggernauts to heel. They get away with a slap on their wrists while the homeowners face enforceable writs usually to their detriment. Most are unable to hire attorneys. The result is the inexorable loss of their nest eggs.


The contempt exhibited by the defendants in not defending the Plaintiff's Motion For Relief tells this Court that the defendants have no regard for the U.S. Constitution and federal laws guaranteeing and protecting religious rights.

Be that as it may, this Court has given latitude by extending time for the defendants to respond. They chose to ignore this Court's Notice.

Under the circumstances, Plaintiff is awarded total damages in the amount of \$19,620,000.00; Defendant City of Bellevue is liable to the extent of \$8,620,000.00 and Defendant City of Seattle to the extent of \$11,000,000.00. There shall be no interest computed to this sum certain as the Bible frowns on usury pursuant to the edicts of Exodus 22:25; Deuteronomy 23:20 and Proverbs 28:8.

Defendants have (30) thirty days from the date of this judgment to satisfy this judgment debt.

SO ORDERED, this 5th day of September, 2012

A handwritten signature in purple ink, appearing to read "Navin-Chandra Naidu", written over a horizontal line.

Judge Navin-Chandra Naidu
Member #160325, American Judges Association