

COMPLAINT
AFFIDAVIT OF FACT

1:04CR165-1

MADE UNDER DURESS November 8, 2004

For the record, I, Janet Mavis Marcusseg, PH 0127
hereby make this special limited appearance
in this foreign court under extreme duress only,
by Affidavit, in propria persona, at International
Common Law, enforcing all Constitutional limitations
against all federal government employees,
and attest to the following information. In
making this Affidavit, I expressly do not waive
extradition away from my lawful jurisdiction -
The Rules under the Speedy Trial Act of
1974 have been broken. The Rules governing
Pretrial Detention have not been followed.
I must be immediately released.

1. I received no notice that the Original
Indictment dated 7-29-04 was dismissed.
Therefore, the rules state that if the original
indictment is pending at the time the
subsequent charge is filed, the trial shall
commence within the time limit for
commencement of trial on the original indictment
or information. The original Speedy Trial time
limit was October 27, 2004, the date
of the Superseding indictment. The
superseding indictment is demonstrated to
be the result of prosecutorial misconduct,
vindictiveness and fraud in Criminal
Complaint dated November 5, 2004.
2. Further, the Benchbook for U.S. District Court

COMPLAINT
(Continued)

November 8, 2004

Judges, Fourth Edition, states on Page 38 "A trial of a defendant held in pretrial detention must also commence within ninety days of the beginning of continuous custody. The SANCTION is release from custody..." See U.S.C. 3164 (c) The 8th of November, 2004, marks 131 days of continuous custody for me. The Sanction applies - I must be released.

3. The reasons for my pretrial detention have been demonstrated to be based on fraud and perjury by Thomas Gezon and Samuel Moore. (See Criminal Complaint dated November 4, 2004) As the result, the statement under Part II, in the Order for Detention that "she previously failed to appear for a federal show cause hearing" must be stricken from the Order due to perjury.

4. In Criminal Complaint dated November 5, 2004, it is proven that the Dept. of Justice has been running a protection racket for the benefit of Robert W. Plaster, a close friend of John Ashcroft, Attorney General, against me. This protection racket has spread many lies about me quite deliberately to my clients. This

COMPLAINT

(Continued)

November 8, 2004

protection racket took property which belonged to my clients and defrauded the court to return it to self-admitted criminals, the Bosses, in order to take the property for themselves ultimately but blame me in my client's eyes. (See Criminal Complaint dated November 3, 2004.) Given these set of circumstances it would not have been prudent for me to broadcast my latest living location given all of the Dept. of Justice perjury and slander conducted against me. James Flink of the IRS even admitted at the July hearings that had he been me he would not have come forward. He should know. Given all of this undeserved abuse from simply trying to fulfill my obligation of contract to my clients unmolested, that I did not leave the country is enormous testament to the fact that I intend, have always intended, to get to the bottom of this matter for the express purpose of suing all responsible parties for as much punitive damages as an outraged jury will give me, particularly in the suit against Robert W. Plaster. To "use" the Dept. of Justice to steal from a