

1 **WO**

MDR

2
3
4
5
6 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
7 **FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**
8

9 Laura Marcos,

No. CV-25-08162-PCT-MTL (ASB)

10 Petitioner,

11 v.

ORDER

12 The Superior Court of Yavapai County,
13 Arizona,

14 Respondent.
15

16 Self-represented Petitioner Laura Marcos filed a “Petition for Writ of Habeas
17 Corpus Ad Subjiciendum” pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241, a “Motion to Enjoin Attorney
18 Generals, Riverside General Hospital and New Jersey Registrar – Rule 19
19 Joinder” (Doc. 2), and a “Motion to Dismiss/Vacate Fugitive Extradition
20 Hearings” (Doc. 3). She subsequently filed an Amended Petition (Doc. 5).

21 In her Amended Petition, Petitioner makes various contentions consistent with
22 sovereign citizen ideology.* Such contentions are considered frivolous, and “courts
23 ordinarily reject similar contentions without extended argument.” *United States v. Ward*,
24 182 F.3d 930, 1999 WL 369812, at *2 (9th Cir. 1999). For decades, claims of the sovereign
25 citizen ilk have been repeatedly dismissed for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction and as
26

27 * Among other things, Petitioner contends she is “operating exclusively under the
28 protection of a Foreign Express Trust,” “[t]he name ‘LAURA MARCOS’ is private trust
property held under UCC protections,” “[t]he use of trust name violates 15 U.S.C. § 1125,”
and “[n]either New Jersey nor Arizona has no [sic] authority to arrest, extradite, or detain
Petitioner.”

frivolous or meritless. *See United States v. Jagim*, 978 F.2d 1032, 1036 (8th Cir. 1992) (holding defendant’s “sovereign citizen” arguments were “completely without merit” and “patently frivolous”); *United States v. Schneider*, 910 F.2d 1569, 1570 (7th Cir. 1990) (describing “sovereign citizen” arguments as having “no conceivable validity in American law”); *Banks v. Florida*, CV-19-00756, 2019 WL 7546620, at *1 (M.D. Fla. Dec. 17, 2019) (collecting cases and stating that legal theories espoused by sovereign citizens have been consistently rejected as “utterly frivolous, patently ludicrous, and a waste of . . . the court’s time”) (citation omitted), *R. & R. adopted*, 2020 WL 108983 (M.D. Fla. Jan. 9, 2020). As the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina succinctly put it, Petitioner “cannot claim to be a sovereign independent of governmental authority while simultaneously asking the judicial system to grant [her] recourse.” *Harrison v. Gunnells*, CV-23-00584-RMG-MHC, 2024 WL 4682522, at *7 (D.S.C. Sept. 10, 2024).

Thus, the Court will dismiss the Amended Petition and this action. The Court will deny as moot Petitioner’s pending Motions.

IT IS ORDERED:

- (1) Petitioner’s Amended Petition (Doc. 5) and this action are **dismissed**.
- (2) The Clerk of Court must enter judgment accordingly and close this case.
- (3) Petitioner’s “Motion to Enjoin Attorney Generals, Riverside General Hospital and New Jersey Registrar – Rule 19 Joinder” (Doc. 2) and “Motion to Dismiss/Vacate Fugitive Extradition Hearings” (Doc. 3) are **denied as moot**.

Dated this 14th day of October, 2025.



Michael T. Liburdi
United States District Judge