

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA  
TALLAHASSEE DIVISION

IN RE:

PAPERS SUBMITTED  
AND RETURNED AS IN  
VIOLATION OF INJUNCTION  
ORDER ENTERED IN  
CASE NO. 20-40375-KKS

CASE NO.: 21-00401-KKS

\_\_\_\_\_/

**ORDER DIRECTING CLERK TO RETURN PAPERS SUBMITTED,  
PURSUANT TO INJUNCTION ORDER (DOC. 56) ENTERED IN IN-  
VOLUNTARY CASE: *In Re U.S. CORP. CO.*, NO. 20-40375-KKS  
(Bankr. N.D. Fla. Jan. 22, 2021)**

THIS CASE is before the Court due to the submission of certain papers (collectively “Papers”) by three (3) persons, two (2) of whom filed an involuntary Chapter 11 petition against United States Corporation Company (“Involuntary Case”).<sup>1</sup> The Papers include a document entitled *Counter-Affidavit and and [sic] Commercial Lien and Order Voiding Judgments for Fraud, Civil Cover Sheet* (“Counter-Affidavit”), which comprises forty-three (43) numbered pages plus a Civil Cover Sheet.<sup>2</sup>

\_\_\_\_\_  
<sup>1</sup> *In re U.S. Corp. Co.*, Case No. 20-40375-KKS.

<sup>2</sup> The Papers include other attached documents not addressed or enumerated here.

The Court issues this Order pursuant to an injunction order entered in the Involuntary Case (“Injunction Order”).<sup>3</sup> For the reasons set forth below, the Court has had the Papers docketed in the instant “miscellaneous” case, enters the instant Order, and will not docket the Papers in the Involuntary Case or take any further action regarding same.

### A. The Injunction Order.

On November 25, 2020 this Court entered an order in the Involuntary Case requiring Syteria Hephzibah, a/k/a Highly Favored Shekinah-El (“Hephzibah a/k/a Shekinah-El”), to show cause (“OTSC”) why she should not be declared a vexatious litigant based on filing the Involuntary Petition and other litigation in this and other courts.<sup>4</sup>

On December 2, 2020, the Court dismissed the Involuntary Case as having been filed in bad faith.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> *Order Enjoining Petitioning Party, Syteria Hephzibah, a/k/a Highly Favored Shekinah El, Pursuant to Order for Petitioning Party, Syteria Hephzibah, to Show Cause Why She Should Not be Declared Vexatious Litigant (Doc. 38), In re U.S. Corp. Co.*, No. 20-40375-KKS (Bankr. N.D. Fla. Jan. 22, 2021), Doc. 56.

<sup>4</sup> *Order for Petitioning Party, Syteria Hephzibah, to Show Cause Why She Should Not be Declared Vexatious Litigant, In re U.S. Corp. Co.*, No. 20-40375-KKS (Bankr. N.D. Fla. Nov. 25, 2020), Doc. 38 (summarizing Hephzibah a/k/a Shekinah-El’s litigation history).

<sup>5</sup> *Order Granting Alleged Debtor’s Emergency Motion for Order Dismissing Involuntary Petition (Doc. 28), In re U.S. Corp. Co.*, No. 20-40375-KKS (Bankr. N.D. Fla. Dec. 2, 2020), Doc. 45.

The Court held a hearing on the OTSC on December 17, 2020; at the conclusion of that hearing the Court announced that Hephzibah a/k/a Shekinah-El had failed to show cause why she should not be declared a vexatious litigant.<sup>6</sup> The Court reduced its ruling to writing in the form of the Injunction Order entered on January 22, 2021. The relevant portions of the Injunction Order provide:

Hephzibah a/k/a Shekinah-El has a history of filing duplicative, vexatious, and frivolous lawsuits, including the Involuntary Petition commencing this case. The Court has the responsibility and authority to prevent vexatious litigants, such as Hephzibah a/k/a Shekinah-El, “from unnecessarily encroaching on the judicial machinery as needed by others.” Because Hephzibah a/k/a Shekinah-El has demonstrated an intent to continue her abusive litigation history, sanctions, including limiting future access to the judicial system, are warranted. . . .

Pursuant to the Court’s inherent authority and 11 U.S.C. § 105(a), Petitioning Party, Syteria Hephzibah, a/k/a Highly Favored Shekinah-El, and *any anyone acting in concert with or at her behest*, is permanently ENJOINED from initiating any matter or filing any papers in this Court without prior approval from this Court.<sup>7</sup>

The Clerk’s Office received the Papers on or about January 15, 2021, after the December 17 hearing but before the Injunction Order was

---

<sup>6</sup> *Hearing Held on Dec. 17, 2020 re: OTSC at Doc. 38, In re U.S. Corp. Co.*, No. 20-40375-KKS (Bankr. N.D. Fla. Dec. 18, 2020), Doc. 50.

<sup>7</sup> Injunction Order, at pp. 8, 12 (emphasis added) (footnotes omitted).

finalized, signed, and entered on the docket. After date-stamping and scanning the Papers in accordance with the Injunction Order, the Clerk provided the Papers to the undersigned's chambers for review on or about January 22, 2021.

The persons who submitted the Papers and denominated themselves as "Plaintiffs" on the Civil Cover Sheet are: "Highly Favored Shekinah El," "Zoser-Ra Neterkeht El," and "Maalik Rahshe El" (collectively, "Submitters").<sup>8</sup> On the first two pages of the Counter-Affidavit the Submitters listed themselves as:

- "Minister of Defense for the Asiatic Nation of North America, under the jurisdictional authority of The MOORISH SCIENCE TEMPLE OF AMERICA, d/b/a Sheik, Zoser-Ra Neterkeht El, Trustee . . . .;"
- "Sheikess, Highly Favored El, Moorish American National . . . and Citizen of foreign Nation State . . . i.e., Asiatic Nation of North America;" and
- "Sheik, Maalik Rahshe Moorish American National . . . and Citizen of the Asiatic nation of North America Nation/State . . . i.e., Asiatic Nation of North America."<sup>9</sup>

As "Defendants" in the Counter-Affidavit the Submitters named:

- United States Corporation Company [Alleged Debtor];
- Karen K. Specie, Chief U.S. Bankruptcy Judge [the undersigned];

---

<sup>8</sup> Civil Cover Sheet, p. 1.

<sup>9</sup> Counter-Affidavit, pp. 1–2.

- United States Bankruptcy Court for the Northern District of Florida;
- International Monetary Fund;
- United States Treasury;
- Internal Revenue Service;
- Depository Trust Company;
- Department of State;
- Department of Defense;
- Department of Commerce; and
- United Nations, et. al.<sup>10</sup>

**B. The Papers are unrelated to bankruptcy or the Involuntary Case and require no further action.**

The operative paper among those submitted to the Clerk is the Counter-Affidavit. Much of that paper consists of virtually incomprehensible and overall irrelevant assertions, including: portions of federal admiralty, antitrust and other statutes; excerpts from Articles of the U.S. Constitution and District of Columbia Code; and declarations regarding “the Asiatic Nation of North America” and the “MOORISH SCIENCE TEMPLE OF AMERICA . . . As de jure Republican form of Constitutionally sanctioned Government . . . .”<sup>11</sup>

The gravamen of the Papers appears to be the extreme displeasure of one of the Submitters, Sheik, Zoser-Ra Neterkeht El, stemming from a

---

<sup>10</sup> *Id.* at pp. 2–3.

<sup>11</sup> *Id.* at p. 9.

telephonic hearing held in the Involuntary Case on November 30, 2020.<sup>12</sup>

One of the matters set for hearing that day was an order for Hephzibah a/k/a Shekinah-El and her son, Taquan Gullett, a/k/a Maalik Rahshe El (“Gullett a/k/a Rahshe El”), to show cause why the Involuntary Case should not be dismissed as having been filed in bad faith.<sup>13</sup> At the commencement of that hearing Sheik, Zoser-Ra Neterkeht El, who has never previously been a party to or involved in a case before this Court, logged an appearance and stated he was there to represent Hephzibah a/k/a Shekinah-El and Gullett a/k/a Rahshe El.<sup>14</sup> When the Court asked Sheik, Zoser-Ra Neterkeht El if he was a licensed attorney authorized to practice law, he replied: “No, I do not practice law, I am law.”

After explaining that only licensed attorneys may represent parties, the Court permitted Sheik, Zoser-Ra Neterkeht El to listen in on the

---

<sup>12</sup> *Hearing Held on Nov. 30, 2020 re: Order to Show Cause at Doc. 26, Alleged Debtor’s Motion to Dismiss at Doc. 28, & Order to Show Cause at Doc. 34, In re U.S. Corp. Co.*, No. 20-40375-KKS (Bankr. N.D. Fla. Nov. 30, 2020), Doc. 43.

<sup>13</sup> *Order to Show Cause (1) Why Chapter 11 Involuntary Petition Should Not Be Dismissed; (2) Why Petitioning Parties Should Not Have to Post a Bond; and (3) Whether Petitioning Parties Should Be Sanctioned Pursuant to Bankruptcy Rule 9011 and 11 U.S.C. §105(a)*, *In re U.S. Corp. Co.*, No. 20-40375-KKS (Bankr. N.D. Fla. Nov. 23, 2020), Doc. 34.

<sup>14</sup> Petitioning Party, Gullett a/k/a Rahshe El was also enjoined from filing any voluntary or involuntary petitions in this Court. *Order Enjoining Petitioning Parties Pursuant to Order to Show Cause (1) Why Chapter 11 Involuntary Petition Should Not Be Dismissed; (2) Why Petitioning Parties Should Not Have to Post a Bond; and (3) Whether Petitioning Parties Should Be Sanctioned Pursuant to Bankruptcy Rule 9011 and 11 U.S.C. §105(a) (Doc. 38)*, *In re U.S. Corp. Co.*, No. 20-40375-KKS (Bankr. N.D. Fla. Dec. 18, 2020), Doc. 49.

hearing as a non-participant. The Court warned Sheik, Zoser-Ra Neterkeht El that if he disrupted the proceedings he would be removed. Despite this warning, Sheik, Zoser-Ra Neterkeht El continued to interrupt. For that reason, the Court instructed the CourtCall operator to mute or disconnect the telephone line on which Sheik, Zoser-Ra Neterkeht El was speaking, which she did.

The Papers purport to assess a “civil penalty” against the Court for not permitting Sheik, Zoser-Ra Neterkeht El to represent Hephzibah a/k/a Shekinah-El and Gullett a/k/a Rahshe El at the hearing. Among other things, the Papers purport to assess a fine of “\$ TEN QUADRILION DOLLARS” against the Court for actions the Submitters describe as “fraudulent,” “Shockingly Incomplete,” and “clear” error, and over \$100 billion in attorneys’ fees for legal services allegedly provided by Sheik, Zoser-Ra Neterkeht El:

The United States Bankruptcy Court for the Northern District of Florida Tallahassee division under the stewardship of Chief Judge KAREN K. SPECIE . . . committed clear upon the record PERJURY OF OATH and Fraud in connection the telephonic court hearing for the purpose of hearing lawful arguments as to whether Zoser-Ra Neterkeht El , Minister of Defense, General and Minister of Finance for the Asiatic Nation of North America, under the Jurisdictional Authority of the MOORISH SCIENCE TEMPLE OF AMERICA, . . .The Affiant was prohibited as a matter of

law from representing Moorish American Nationals, Stating the affiant did not have a license to practice law in the State of Florida and was subsequently excluded from other proceedings in violation of the right to render the effective assistance of counsel, to due process , the right to redress of grievances . . . .

United States Bankruptcy court Chief Judge KAREN K. SPECIE, shows she is “ Shockingly Incomplete ” in that she has interpreted and applied fundamental law in a manner that is inconsistent with and violate fundamentally established international standards of Civilized decency which violates the “ shock- the- conscious test ” established in the U.S. Supreme Court case of ROCHIN V. CALIFORNIA, 342 U.S. 165,72 S. ct..205, 96 L. Ed.183 (1952).<sup>15</sup>

. . .

The United States Bankruptcy Court for the Northern District of Florida Tallahassee Division . . . shall make payment of reasonable attorney fees, in lawfully commanded amount due pursuant to law and pursuant to fee schedule in the case number listed below which is self-Executing and unconditionally subscribed to as follows:

. . .

- 1.) \$10 million per court appearance.
- 2.) \$10 million for every directive given to a corporate entity, agent operative.
- 3.) For each and every lawful counterclaim\$ 10 million X 20 = \$200 Million.
- 4.) For each meeting scheduled or meetings scheduled without consent \$500, 000.00.
- 5.) For each phone call I have to make to relevant bodies \$50,000.00 , plus \$10,000.00 a minute equaling \$

---

<sup>15</sup> Counter-Affidavit, pp. 5–7, 38. All capitalization, spelling, grammar, and punctuation in quoted portions of the Counter-Affidavit appear as in the original.



150,000.00 dollars for my 10-minute telephonic court appearance.

6.) Miscellaneous fees: \$100,000,000,000.00 / One Hundred Billion in additional attorney fees. Per Clause in Fee Schedule Asserting and Reserving Right to change fee charges without notice.<sup>16</sup>

...

IT IS ORDERED, awards of attorney fees shall be paid not less than three days after the date of this order.

BE IT FURTHER KNOWN is [sic] that anyone disregarding this ORDER . . . faces Immediate arrests [sic] and detainment at Guantanamo Bay detention facility or equivalent in kind.<sup>17</sup>

Nothing in the Papers alleges or suggests an actionable cause of action or claim subject to the jurisdiction of this Court, nor do the Papers relate to issues raised in the Involuntary Case in which the Injunction Order was entered.

### **C. Recusal of the undersigned is unnecessary and unwarranted.**

Generally, a judge shall recuse herself when “the judge . . . is . . . a party to the proceeding.”<sup>18</sup> The Papers attempt to make the undersigned a party to some proceeding, although precisely what type of proceeding is

---

<sup>16</sup> *Id.* at pp. 30–31.

<sup>17</sup> *Id.* at p. 41.

<sup>18</sup> *Code of Conduct for United States Judges*, Canon 3(C)(1)(d)(i), [https://www.uscourts.gov/sites/default/files/code\\_of\\_conduct\\_for\\_united\\_states\\_judges\\_effective\\_march\\_12\\_2019.pdf](https://www.uscourts.gov/sites/default/files/code_of_conduct_for_united_states_judges_effective_march_12_2019.pdf) (last revised Mar. 12, 2019).

unclear. What is abundantly clear is that Submitters, Hephzibah a/k/a Shekinah-El and Gullett a/k/a Rahshe El, have demonstrated their *modus operandi*: to sue or file frivolous claims against any judge that has the misfortune of finding him- or her-self presiding over a case in which they have participated.<sup>19</sup> Submitter Sheik, Zoser-Ra Neterkeht El has now joined these endeavors.

Even though the Papers do not make the undersigned a party to a true proceeding, a judge must disqualify herself pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 455(a) in any case in which her impartiality might reasonably be questioned, or in any of the circumstances set forth in 28 U.S.C. § 455(b).<sup>20</sup> The purpose of 28 U.S.C. § 455 is to “promote confidence in the judiciary by avoiding even the appearance of impropriety whenever possible.”<sup>21</sup> The standard is objective; in other words, the Court asks whether the

---

<sup>19</sup> See *Gullet-El v. Corrigan*, No. 3:17-cv-881-J-32JBT, 2017 WL 10861313, at \*1 n.1 (M.D. Fla. Sept. 20, 2017) (“Although named as a Defendant, the undersigned need not recuse himself because the suit is patently frivolous and, with each recusal, the judge to whom the case is reassigned then becomes a target of [the party’s] vindictiveness which culminates with that judge being named as a defendant in their next frivolous and retaliatory lawsuit.”); *accord Erickson v. Fed. Land Bank (In re Erickson)*, 107 B.R. 222, 224 (Bankr. D. Neb. 1989) (“The appearance of a conflict of interest is not created by the assertion of a frivolous claim against a judge.”).

<sup>20</sup> 28 U.S.C. § 455(a)–(b) (2020).

<sup>21</sup> *Liljeberg v. Health Servs. Acquisition Corp.*, 486 U.S. 847, 865 (1988) (citation omitted).

facts “might reasonably cause an objective observer” to question the judge’s impartiality.<sup>22</sup>

The facts here would not reasonably cause an objective observer to question the undersigned’s impartiality. As stated by District Judge Corrigan in *Gullett-El v. Corrigan*, an action Gullett a/k/a Maalik Rahshe El and Hephzibah a/k/a Shekinah-El filed against him and others in the Middle District of Florida, “[b]ecause this case is patently frivolous and one of [the party’s] tactics is to sue every judge who rules against them, the undersigned need not recuse, despite being named as one of the 182 defendants in this case.”<sup>23</sup>

The undersigned is the most recent judge to fall victim to the frivolous claims of Submitters, including Hephzibah a/k/a Shekinah-El and Gullett a/k/a Maalik Rahshe El, who have a proven track record of suing any judge who rules against them.<sup>24</sup> Recusal of the undersigned under

---

<sup>22</sup> *Id.*; see also *Parker v. Connors Steel Co.*, 855 F.2d 1510, 1523 (11th Cir. 1988) (quoting *Offutt v. United States*, 348 U.S. 11, 14 (1954)).

<sup>23</sup> *Order to Show Cause* at 1 n.1, *Gullett-El v. Corrigan*, No. 3:17-cv-J881-J-32JBT (N.D. Fla. Aug. 24, 2017), Doc. 6 (citing *Order to Show Cause* at 2 ¶ 2, *Cuyler v. Presnell*, No. 6:11-cv-623-Orl-22DAB (M.D. Fla. July 8, 2011), Doc. 9).

<sup>24</sup> In Judge Corrigan’s case, Hephzibah a/k/a Shekinah-El and her cohorts sued at least seventeen (17) state court judges and seventeen (17) federal judges including Judge Corrigan. *Universal and International Humanitarian Declaration for Common Law Prejudgment Writ of Personal Replevin* (“Complaint”), *Gullett-El v. Corrigan*, No. 3:17-cv-881-J-32JBT (M.D. Fla. Aug. 1, 2017), Doc. 2.

these facts would be a waste of judicial resources. If the undersigned were to have the Papers docketed and then recuse, any judge then assigned, whether another bankruptcy judge, or a magistrate or district judge, would end up in the same situation.

A judge must remain vigilant to “the need to prevent parties from too easily obtaining the disqualification of a judge, thereby potentially manipulating the system for strategic reasons, perhaps to obtain a judge more to their liking.”<sup>25</sup> As the district judge in *Cuyler v. Presnell* stated when she did not recuse from a case where the litigants had sued other judges in the same court:

Ordinarily, the undersigned judge would have recused herself from this case . . . . However, because Plaintiffs sue every district judge who rules against them, recusal now would merely shift the case to yet another judge whom the Plaintiffs would then sue.<sup>26</sup>

Submitters have named the undersigned as a “defendant” in the Papers solely because this Court has ruled against Hephzibah a/k/a Shekinah-El. This Court should not and will not cave in to such groundless

---

<sup>25</sup> *Liberty Mut. Ins. Co. v. Com. Concrete Sys., LLC*, No. 4:16cv658-MW/CAS, 2017 WL 1234140, at \* 3 (N.D. Fla. Apr. 1, 2017) (quoting *In re Allied-Signal Inc.*, 891 F.2d 967, 970 (1st Cir. 1989)).

<sup>26</sup> *Order to Show Cause* at 2 ¶ 2, *Cuyler v. Presnell*, No. 6:11-cv-623-Orl-22DAB (M.D. Fla. July 8, 2011), Doc. 9. In *Cuyler*, the plaintiffs sued every active district judge in the Orlando Division of the Middle District of Florida who ruled against them in civil litigation. *Id.* at 1 ¶ 1.

intimidation and permit Submitters to continue pursuing their nefarious goals. This Court has a duty and obligation to review the Papers pursuant to the Injunction Order and determine whether they are frivolous or vexatious, even if a benefit to the undersigned may be that the Papers result in no further litigation:

Some courts have entered protective orders against litigants who engage in a pattern of repeated frivolous filings, enjoining the litigants from future filings without the approval of a designated judge. As a preliminary matter, the issuing of a protective order of broad applicability by a judge is not improper, even though it may indirectly or incidentally benefit the issuing judge.<sup>27</sup>

**D. If necessary, this Order shall constitute a Report and Recommendation to the District Court.**

In the event a Submitter should file an appeal or take other action to contest this Order, or in the event the District Court should determine that this Court does not have requisite authority to enforce the Injunction Order, this Order shall constitute a Report and Recommendation.

---

<sup>27</sup> *Committee on Codes of Conduct Advisory Op. No. 103: Disqualification Based on Harassing Claims Against Judge*, 187–88, <https://www.uscourts.gov/sites/default/files/vol02b-ch02.pdf> (last revised Feb. 28, 2019).

## CONCLUSION

Having reviewed the Papers as provided in the Injunction Order under the appropriate standards set forth above, the Court has determined that the Papers warrant no further action.

For the reasons stated, it is

### ORDERED:

1. The Papers submitted are meritless, abusive, frivolous, scandalous, and impertinent.
2. The Clerk shall not file the Papers in the Involuntary Case. Instead, after making appropriate copies the Clerk will return the Papers to Hephzibah a/k/a Shekinah-El, or the original sender, together with a copy of this Order.
3. The Clerk shall file this Order and a copy of the Papers only in the instant miscellaneous case.
4. The Clerk shall provide copies of this Order and the Papers to the Office of the United States Trustee in paper format, PDF format on a thumb drive, or electronically via this Court's electronic filing system.

5. The Court reserves jurisdiction to assess such additional sanctions as may be necessary or appropriate.

DONE and ORDERED on February 2, 2021.



KAREN K. SPECIE  
Chief U. S. Bankruptcy Judge

cc:

Traci E. Abrams, Clerk of Court

Charles. F. Edwards, Assistant United States Trustee

Submitters, specifically including

Syteria Hephzibah a/k/a Shekinah El

422 East 27th Street

Jacksonville, FL 32206-2211