

I. CONTEXTUAL BACKGROUND

Given that- in general- a party asserting a claim may join alternative claims against an opposing party when the claims have a contingent disposition, the relevancy across claims may, from time to time, point to a non-jural entity as the opposing party. In the case of the opposing party in question in this motion, the Police are effectively a non-jural, multi-municipality opposing party who act as one entity and thus create a contingent disposition across claims with different municipal entities as the defendants instead of the Police themselves. Allowing the Police to deliver injustice across multiple municipal entities while absolving themselves of any risk as an entity. Creating a near inevitability of countless civil rights violations precipitated by the coordination of multiple sub-entities controlled by the Police. Acting with almost complete impunity, unlike the citizens and companies who take the bulk of the risk in this country.

In the past two decades, there have been a number of high profile lawsuits against ride sharing companies exhibiting unfairness. For example, imagine popular ride sharing company, Lyft is alleged to have rigged prices and rides unfavorably for certain types of customers. In one case, a customer alleges that Lyft rigged a statistically improbable and extreme wait time in order to force a rushed driving error for a customer. And the customer files a commensurate complaint. Made worse by private information from a Lyft ride from that same customer being recorded and leaked in a derogatory manner. Prompting that customer to file a separate complaint against Lyft. Where- Lyft clearly is exhibiting the likelihood of coordinated, unjust treatment of that particular customer— there is a reasonable case for the court to grant a motion for a joinder of the two claims. Especially with a logical, evidence-driven case behind the contingent disposition of the claims. Making the court likely to join the claims for the sake of efficiency and justice. As the core errant behavior creating injustice for the customer comes from the same place within Lyft.

But what happens when errant behavior from an organization like the Police runs rampant because it is impossible to file a lawsuit against them, let alone a joinder across multiple claims that were coordinated by the same intention. Abuse of power from the shadows, hidden in plain sight behind uniforms and badges. In response, this motion for joinder- in effect- is a mechanism to shed light on a larger case against a non-jural entity. An entity whose efforts should be examined in the context presented in this motion that connects the three claims. At a minimum- improving the available, relevant information and increasing the probability of the court ruling justly on the available claims.

Claims that center around abuse of power and poor leadership from the very organization that should be protecting the people they are abusing. The antithesis of what is taught at the premier leadership training institution in the United States: The United States Military Academy. Where Cadets govern and lead themselves, creating countless instances of older Cadets abusing their power over younger Cadets. An integral piece of the model for younger Cadets to be pushed to the point of tears so they understand what it is like for someone to abuse power over them. Burning lessons into the future leaders of America to never abuse power over the people they are leading to protect the United States from active threats of terrorism.

Before becoming an Intelligence officer in the US Army, The Plaintiff learned the patterns of power abusers firsthand at the United States Military Academy. Where he saw that the pattern behind abuse of power had a central binding force: hypocrisy. The worst abusers of power via overly strict enforcement of the rules were the ones who had the most to hide. And abusing power once is never enough, it becomes a lifestyle; a *modus operandi*, if you will. Unfolding again and again across actions that are intentionally meant hide abuse of power but always bear marks of hypocrisy.

For example, the Police started exhibiting such a pattern on or about January 10, 2025 when the Plaintiff was returning from looking at property with his real estate agent. The Plaintiff was in a rush to check on a large wire transfer for a vehicle that was unaccounted for- likely due to the Police suppressing the wire confirmation— and was traveling approximately 15mph over the speed limit on US60/77 W. When, a few miles from Globe proper, the Plaintiff was pulled over and given a ticket. In such a manner that Plaintiff's real estate agent described it as something akin to "a hit" by the Police. Which would not come as a surprise given that the ticket the Police gave the Plaintiff did not include the citation amount- one of the only critical pieces of information required to pay the ticket. Noting further that the Police officer was clearly not a rookie in terms of experience.

Imagine a judge presiding over an accessory to murder case where the outcomes are notoriously subjective based on how the judge interprets the evidence. The alleged felon could end up with anything from community service, to anywhere from 1 to 10 years in prison. All for being at the wrong place at the wrong time or saying the wrong thing at the wrong time. So in this notional case, imagine a long case with lots of hearsay and a crescendo to the verdict. And with everyone leaning on the two decades of experience the judge has on the bench to find justice, all eyes are on the judge as they deliver the verdict. Starkly, the judge utters two words; first- the word "Guilty" then- as if they cannot be bothered to stay sitting while they say the second word, they start rising and say "Prison" as they walk to their chambers and lock the door. The entire court, including the staff, is shocked- as they puzzle through why the judge did not speak or record the number of years of the sentence, along with other important information like what percentage was available for parole. Truly, such behavior from a judge should be considered unprecedented and unacceptable. As if they had sat on the bench all that time and they somehow still cannot give a basic prison sentence appropriately. Perhaps one instance can be explained as an outlier, but a second occurrence would almost surely merit a major policy change.

And while a judge issuing a prison sentence may not be a precise analog to a police officer issuing a ticket, the unilateral decision and responsibility are clearly the same. Anyone who has the power over someone to impact their life but does not have the professional competency and courtesy to correctly follow the process that impacts their life, should euphemistically be considered a hypocrite. Hypocrites who have a pattern of abusing power. Evidenced by the Police watching the Plaintiff not pay the first ticket because of the missing amount, and then issuing another ticket in the exact same way on or about March 10, 2025 where they again did not specify the amount of the ticket, critical to pay the ticket. Then, by analogy, can you imagine another judge the district over from the judge who did the notional two-word sentencing and creating a massive scandal— literally doing the exact same two-word mic-drop sentencing. As if they felt so powerful that they were impervious to the scrutiny the other judge received. How could outrage not ensue followed by an investigation into how the judges could ever exhibit such glaring incompetency and hypocrisy. As judges are supposed to be model citizens who know civil procedure and rules far better than the citizens they judge.

So given the clear corruption that the Plaintiff had experienced from the Police in Arizona, the Plaintiff made an attempt to register his vehicles in his home state of Michigan, where he would fallback to if the abuse from the Police waxed beyond tolerability. A reasonable plan that was met with more abuse of power from the Police, as the Plaintiff encountered an undercover Police officer in a Michigan DMV who looked the Plaintiff in the eyes and lied to him by telling him that he needed the titles of the vehicles to register the vehicles in Michigan. A clear lie and abuse of power, as the Plaintiff had registered a Toyota Tundra using the same driver's license and a Bill of Sale showing the vehicle was paid for in cash. The exact same registration scenario the Plaintiff was attempting but met with a quietly hostile Police officer pretending to be a DMV worker to degrade the Plaintiff. Clearly establishing a pattern of the Police coloring regulations to abuse power against the Plaintiff across multiple municipalities.

With a clearly established pattern of abusing power within their domain of influence, it is reasonable to believe that any statistically anomalous motor vehicle issues that occurred while the Plaintiff has traveled on public roads, are likely to have been influenced by the Police. Two issues in particular combined to cost the Plaintiff close to \$20,000 in damages to his Subaru WRX STI. Marked as statistically anomalous and abusive because both major issues occurred at operational states that were well within the tolerance of comfort for the legendary rally vehicle that barely has miles on it for the age. In the first instance, it is almost impossible for a turbo charger to cut while the vehicle is at a comfortable, steady-state on the freeway. Alluding to a remote attack by the Police. Abusive but not nearly as bad destroying an entire engine during a standard but firm acceleration on to the freeway. Again- offensively improbable as Subaru can probably count the number of STI engines that they have lost under 50,000 miles on one hand. Clearly pointing to a high probability of Police abuse in the domain where they have undue state sponsored power.

II. ARUGMENT

The Plaintiff hereby moves the court for a joinder of the cases _____, _____, and _____ according to form attached to this motion based on the following criteria:

1. **Efficient Judicial Process.** The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure convey a utilitarian objective of an efficient judicial process. Aiming for the settlement of multiple related claims in a single transaction.
2. **Contingency of Disposition.** Given that this motion cites multiple abuses of power by the Police that are outside even the claims themselves, but connected, it is clear that the disposition of the proposed joined claims are contingent on the base claim. A contingent nature summarized by Police action without a clear understanding of the rules that govern the dispatching and execution of the actions. Actions that all resulted in related degradation of the Plaintiff and civil rights violations.
3. **Non-Jural Entity Joinder Precedent.** Ubiquitous non-jural entities like the Police have the freedom to use several organizations against one person or entity. While that one entity cannot then file civil claims against an organization like the Police. Leaving the prosecuting entity to file smaller claims against municipal organizations, thus mutating the true identity and reach of the actual Defendant- the Police. So one of the only available methods to improve the fidelity of the overall case is to file a joinder that suggests the linkage of the cases, along with any additional relevant information. Consequently, approving this motion will help set precedent in the spirit of using a joinder to ensure all the relevant information is efficiently included into the justice process .
4. **Public Interest.** The Public needs the court to grant this motion of joinder for cases in order to address the lack of accountability of the American Police force. An organization who is supposed to be honorable and protect the public but often does the opposite with immunity as they hide behind their non-jural status. Committing violations that U.S.C. 42 section 1983 aims to address when the appropriate information is included and processed in complaints.

III. CONCLUSION

The Defendant listed in the Plaintiff's base civil rights violation complaint is misrepresentative of the actions in question in the complaint. Actions that have established a pattern of abuse of power across multiple municipal entities that act as one Police force. Making a coordinated effort against the Plaintiff that creates a clear contingency across the three cases that the honorable court will join for the most efficient administration of justice.

Date

Printed Name of Plaintiff

Signature of Plaintiff
