

Incorporated by reference in Rule 34-7.010(1)(b), F.A.C.

## **COMPLAINT**

1. PERSON BRINGING COMPLAINT:			
Name: Scott Huminski	Telephone Number: 239 300 6656		
Address: 26 Fleetwood Drive			
City: Palm Coast County: Flagler	State: <u>Fl</u>	Zip Code: <u>32137</u>	
2. PERSON AGAINST WHOM COMPLA	AINT IS BROUGHT:		
Use a separate complaint form for each p	erson you wish to comp	olain against:	
Name: Amira Dajani Fox Tele		elephone Number: 239 553 1102	
Address: P.O. Box 399			
City: Fort Myers Co	ounty: <u>Lee</u>	Zip Code: <u>33902</u>	
Title of office or position held or sought: S	tate's Attorney		
Please provide a full explanation of you person named above and why you believe the names and addresses of persons who more than 15 pages, including this form. flash drives or other electronic media; sue and will be returned.	ve he or she violated the om you believe may be very Please do not submit viuch material will not be	e law. Include relevant dates and witnesses. Please do not submit ideo or audio tapes, CDs, DVDs, considered part of the complaint	
4. OATH	STATE OF		
I, the person bringing this complaint, do swear or affirm that the facts set forth in the foregoing complaint and attachments thereto are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.	Sworn to (or affirmed) of physical presence day of	and subscribed before me by means ce or online notarization, this, ame of person making statement)	
SIGNATURE OF COMPLAINANT	(Signature o	of Notary Public)	
	(Print, Type, or Stamp Co	ommissioned Name of Notary Public)	
CE FORM 50—Effective January 9, 2017 Incorporated by reference in Rule 34-7.010(1)(b), F.A.C.	Personally Known Type of Identification Pro-	OR Produced Identification	

- 1. All times material herein Amira Fox either;
  - Supervised <u>State v. Huminski</u>, 17-mm-815, Lee County Court, (the "CASE") as Chief Assistant State's Attorney by function and her own admission, or
  - Was the State's Attorney of the 20<sup>th</sup> Judicial Circuit prosecuting the CASE.
- 2. The 2047 page full record on appeal for the CASE (the "RECORD") is located here,

https://edca.2dca.org/DcaDocs/2019/1914/2019-1914 Brief 530010 RC09.pdf

or

https://web.archive.org/web/20201005171650/https://edca.2dca.org/DcaDocs/2019/1914/2019-1914\_Brief\_530010\_RC09.pdf

- 3. No State of Florida prosecutorial executive branch official authored or signed a document that initiated the CASE and none such document exists in the RECORD nor CASE. The RECORD is a searchable pdf.
- 4. There exists no proof of service of any criminal charging instrument in the criminal CASE (17-mm-815) or RECORD. There was no indictment or any conceivable charging method legal in Florida used to initiate the criminal misdemeanor County Court CASE.
- 5. The RECORD and CASE are absent of existence of any criminal statute that would have allowed a criminal misdemeanor prosecution by Amira Fox (for the State) as a plaintiff or that conferred plaintiff status upon the State.
- 6. The initiation of the CASE is absent any legitimate procedure used by prosecutors in Florida to initiate a criminal misdemeanor CASE consistent with any law, procedure or rule.
- 7. The CASE simply appeared in the County Court criminal misdemeanor docket absent any prior legal procedure employed in Florida. One can speculate on the illegal *behind-the-scenes smoke-and-mirrors* manipulation of Court dockets that spawned the CASE.
- 8. Nothing exists in the RECORD that would convey the status of Plaintiff upon the State of Florida/Amira Fox. Amira Fox / the State had no standing to prosecute a criminal CASE or to assert Plaintiff status. Every jurisdiction in the United States requires that the Plaintiff in a criminal or civil case must file pleadings commencing the case. The mysterious docketing of the case elicits serious questions as to ethical improprieties and criminal courthouse activity.
- 9. The only document served upon Huminski in the RECORD was a show cause order authored by a judge in a civil CASE, *Huminski v. Town of Gilbert AZ*, 17-CA-421, that was filed and served in another case and in another Court (20<sup>th</sup> Circuit) prior to the existence of the County CASE. In Florida, judges do not initiate criminal misdemeanor cases in the County Courts or Circuit Courts. Prosecutors, part of the executive branch of government, prosecute crimes not the judicial branch. Judges do "prosecute" *sui generis* common law offenses, contempt, under

- F.S.A. 900.04. Amira Fox inserted herself into a matter solely reserved for the judicial branch of government violating separation of powers in her zeal to weaponize the justice system.
- 10. Shortly after the sordid details of this CASE were published in court filings in the United States District Court in two very high profile cases, the subordinate of Amira Fox, Anthony Kunasek, Esq., with duties related to the CASE committed suicide. Obvious reasons for the suicide exist related to material herein.
- 11. When speaking to Anthony Kunasek, esq., Amira Fox's subordinate, in 2017-2018 at the Lee Court Complex concerning Due Process concerns with the CASE initiation, he opined that it was his supervisor, Amira Fox, that made the choice to prosecute in the method herein described, ie. without a charging document or service. See Amira Fox campaign material below concerning supervision.
- 12. To this day, years later, after securing an incarceration in 2019, State's Attorney Amira Fox arrogantly refuses to right the wrong and file a motion to vacate the *void ab initio* judgment in the CASE attained in the absence of any and all jurisdiction in violation of ethical, constitutional and moral precepts and in the pursuit of lawfare and weaponized justice in violation of separation of powers.

## A bold violation of substantive and procedural Due Process

Due process is an essential element of the American justice system and a secured under both the State and Federal constitutions. The unknown but clearly nefarious techniques used by Amira Fox to secure the docketing of the CASE in the dark recesses of the courthouse indicate criminal conduct on her part. Nothing in the RECORD can explain how a criminal CASE came to be docketed in Lee County criminal court as a misdemeanor. ASA Anthony Kunasek, esq. himself opined at hearing (see RECORD) that no new docket number is issued in contempt cases (which are *sui generis* common law offenses). In the instance of the CASE, it was not just a new docket number; it was an entirely different court (County v. Circuit), an entirely different caption (State v. Huminski versus Huminski v. Town of Gilbert AZ) and nothing in the RECORD details how Amira Fox got the CASE docketed. Simply viewing television courthouse scenes detailing contempt authentically depict that contempt is handled by the Court (judge) and the sovereign does not participate.

The criminal CASE was prosecuted in the absence of subject matter (no statute, no charging document) and personal jurisdiction (no service). The Plaintiff, Amira Fox for the State, had no standing to participate in a matter for which she authored no pleadings to commence the CASE. Standing is a jurisdictional issue.

One circumstance where contempt does involve the State coming on as a plaintiff is violation of a family law / domestic relations protective order which is supported by statute. The two statutes that would allow State participation do not exist in the RECORD nor CASE. The only statute that exists anywhere in the CASE / RECORD is F.S.A. 900.04 which does not involve participation of the government as a plaintiff, but, only governs judges handling of contempt without the State hijacking the matter as a plaintiff in violation of separation of powers.

Statutes absent in the RECORD and CASE:

Florida Statute 741.31

Makes it a crime to violate a domestic violence injunction. The state must prove that the defendant knowingly and intentionally violated the injunction.

Florida Statute 784.047

Makes it a crime to violate a repeat violence, sexual violence, or dating violence injunction.

The CASE and RECORD citing F.S.A. 900.04 illegally stating "County Criminal", "Misdemeanor":



F.S.A. 900.04 does not define a crime and is non-actionable by the State as a plaintiff. It is solely reserved for the judicial branch. Amira Fox violated separation of powers by assuming duties that are reserved for the judicial branch of government (handling contempt under F.S.A. 900.04).

An act of moral turpitude, a violation of federal criminal law 18 U.S.C. § 241

The acts of Amira Fox constitute moral turpitude by prosecuting a criminal misdemeanor CASE in the absence of any and all jurisdiction, absent a statute, sans standing with assistance from her office personnel / courthouse personnel constituting a Due Process and separation of powers violation of both the State and Federal Constitutions and an ethical infirmity. Amira Fox needed Anthony Kunasek and both her staff and courthouse personnel to accomplish the docketing and prosecution of the CASE. One person alone, even a State's Attorney, can not accomplish the acts set forth herein. A *per se* conspiracy against rights exists.

Due Process is a fundamental and constitutionally established right that Amira Fox deliberately and maliciously violated achieving a *void ab initio* judgment in the CASE. Amira Fox deliberately and maliciously failed to provide a document describing the details of the CASE (charging information) and did not serve the non-existent charging document; her conduct is the epitome of Due Process violations and indicative of evil intent and a corrupt design.

Due Process is a federally secured constitutional right whereby a conspiracy between Amira Fox and Anthony Kunasek is actionable under federal criminal law. A crime is a *per se* act of moral turpitude regardless of whether the federal crime was prosecuted.

Separation of Powers is fundamental to the operation of the federal and various State governments. Amira Fox's (executive branch) trespassing into judicial branch duties is an extreme ethical violation and contrary to the fundamental operation of government at all levels. Lawfare and weaponized justice can result in chaos and the heinous loss of rights including liberty. The complainant was incarcerated related to the herein acts of Amira Fox in 2019 under the Fox State's Attorney regime. Liberty was lost in her lawfare scheme.

The conspiracy between supervisor (Amira Fox) and the subordinate (Anthony Kunasek, deceased) consist of a conspiracy against rights which is a criminal violation of federal law. (18 U.S.C. § 241) The conspiracy is presumed once Amira Fox was elected as the State's Attorney. Prior to taking office, Amira Fox admitted prior supervisory involvement in the CASE.

The aforementioned memorializes ethical and criminal violations of Amira Fox. How the prosecution of the CASE was initiated raises grave issues, however, the complainant has no idea of what went on behind the scenes in the Lee County Court Complex that resulted in the docketing and commencement of the CASE absent any statute, service, procedure, rule and a sans single sheet of paper authored by any State prosecutor (an executive branch official) under Amira Fox's leadership.

## 18 U.S.C. §241. Conspiracy against rights

If two or more persons conspire to injure, oppress, threaten, or intimidate any person in any State, Territory, Commonwealth, Possession, or District in the free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege secured to him by the Constitution or laws of the United States, or because of his having so exercised the same; or

If two or more persons go in disguise on the highway, or on the premises of another, with intent to prevent or hinder his free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege so secured—

They shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both; and if death results from the acts committed in violation of this section or if such acts include kidnapping or an attempt to kidnap, aggravated sexual abuse or an attempt to commit aggravated sexual abuse, or an attempt to kill, they shall be fined under this title or imprisoned for any term of years or for life, or both, or may be sentenced to death.

(June 25, 1948, ch. 645, 62 Stat. 696; Pub. L. 90–284, title I, §103(a), Apr. 11, 1968, 82 Stat. 75; Pub. L. 100–690, title VII, §7018(a), (b)(1), Nov. 18, 1988, 102 Stat. 4396; Pub. L. 103–322, title VI, §60006(a), title XXXII, §8320103(a), 320201(a), title XXXIII, §330016(1)(L), Sept. 13, 1994, 108 Stat. 1970, 2109, 2113, 2147; Pub. L. 104–294, title VI, §8604(b)(14)(A), 607(a), Oct. 11, 1996, 110 Stat. 3507, 3511.)

