

Republic of Cascadia Reports

OFFICIAL REPORTS
OF
THE SUPREME COURT

NOVEMBER 27, 2022 THROUGH THE PRESENT



REPUBLIC OF CASCADIA
SUPREME COURT OF CASCADIA
CITY OF OLYMPIA

J U S T I C E S
OF THE
S U P R E M E C O U R T
DURING THE TIME OF THESE REPORTS

XBEST_NAME_EVERX, Chief and Associate Justice.
WRESTLINGWITHGOD, Chief and Associate Justice.
ARATHORN52, Associate Justice.
FURBALLEN, Associate Justice.
AURIVIA, Associate Justice.
JO_STAR, Associate Justice.
BEAMZ30, Chief and Associate Justice.
SAYERQT, Chief and Associate Justice.
MOGGS, Chief and Associate Justice.
BACHINUNI, Associate Justice.
YAPANNN, Associate Justice.
JAGL05, Associate Justice.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

The XBEST_NAME_EVERX Court	pg. 4
<u>The People v. Cowilo, et al.</u>	4
<u>SayerQT v. Cascadia</u>	6
The WRESTLINGWITHGOD Court	pg. 8
<u>Akeboun v. N S X</u>	8
<u>Cascadia v. AllStarPro90</u>	10
<u>OhGizmo v. Milgorn123</u>	11
<u>Akeboun v. Moxies_hoe</u>	13
The BEAMZ30 Court	pg. 16
<u>Bon_Kranch v. Cascadia</u>	16
The SAYERQT Court	pg. 20
<u>Hersheylr v. Cascadia</u>	20
<u>Flatvent_one v. WrestlingWithGod</u>	22
<u>Bunilky v. City of Fresno</u>	25
<u>City of Fresno v. myfriendisdumb</u>	27
<u>Cascadia v. Town of Death Valley</u>	28
<u>Cascadia v. Draconian, Capitanfra</u>	30
<u>Public Advocate v. Cascadia In Re: Pub.L. 23-7</u>	32
<u>Cascadia v. Limao_mao</u>	36
<u>In Re: Livestock Protection Act</u>	38
<u>Paper1emur v. ShadowCipher</u>	43
<u>The People v. Akeboun</u>	45

CASES ADJUDGED
IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF CASCADIA
AT
OLYMPIA, 2022–

THE PEOPLE *v.* COWILO ET AL.

ORIGINAL JURY TRIAL IN THE SUPREME COURT OF CASCADIA
No. 0006. Argued December 29, 2022—Decided December 31, 2022.

SYLLABUS

This case concerns the criminal prosecution of Cowilo, Paradox_1080, and AllStarPro90 for violations of Public Laws 3-16 and 5-15, collectively referred to as "The Anti-Hunter Act." The Act prohibits the killing of foreign individuals who are not part of a nation in conflict with the Republic of Cascadia. The defendants were charged with killing three foreign individuals, including one subject of the Russian Empire, a nation allied with Cascadia under an active treaty agreement.

During the trial, evidence included an audio recording made by bystander Covenhel_01. The recording captured the defendants conspiring to commit the crime and subsequently carrying out the killings. This evidence was pivotal in establishing intent and premeditation. The trial began on December 29, 2022, and concluded with a guilty verdict on December 31, 2022.

Justice WrestlingWithGod, presiding, delivered the sentencing upon the guilty verdict of the Jury.

SayerQT argued the cause for the People.
Akeboun argued the cause for Cowilo. *Paradox_1080* and *AllStarPro90* argued their own cause.

OPINION OF THE COURT

Justice WrestlingWithGod delivered the sentencing.

This Court has carefully considered the evidence presented during the trial of Cowilo, Paradox_1080, and AllStarPro90 for violations of the Anti-Hunter Act (Pub.L. 3-16). The defendants were found **guilty** by a jury of their peers on December 31, 2022, for the unlawful killing of three foreign individuals, including a subject of the Russian Empire, an ally of Cascadia.

The evidence, particularly the audio recording provided by bystander Covenhel_01, clearly established the defendants' intent and premeditation in committing these acts.

In accordance with the Anti-Hunter Act, this Court orders the following:

1. The defendants shall immediately return any and all items obtained from the victims of their crimes.
2. Each defendant is hereby fined 10 gold, to be paid to the Cascadian Treasury within 30 days of this ruling.
3. Failure to comply with items 1 and 2 will result in additional criminal charges as stipulated by the Act.

It is so ordered.

SAYERQT *v.* BACHINUNI

ORIGINAL ACTION IN THE SUPREME COURT OF CASCADIA

No. 0010. Argued January 8, 2023—Decided January 10, 2023.

SYLLABUS

The Legislature had passed a bill to repeal the Anti-Hunter Act. The bill was vetoed by President TylenolEC, however the Legislature proceeded to overturn, with the constitutionally required threshold of $\frac{2}{3}$ being declared met. The votes were 10 votes yes, 5 votes no, with a total membership of 17.

When the Department of Defense decided not to enforce the law as a result, purporting it to be repealed by the Repeal act, the Speaker of the House SayerQT sued for allowing the bill to be enacted over the president's veto, as the petitioner claimed that the National Constitution's wording in Article III §3b "If after such reconsideration two thirds of the House shall agree to pass the proposal, it shall become a law", means that two-thirds of the total membership (that being 12 at the time of the case) must be met to enact a law over the President's veto.

The court ruled in the favor of the petitioner, declaring the law as not in effect as a result, and allowing the veto to stand.

Chief Justice xBest_Name_Everx delivered the opinion for the unanimous court.

SayerQT argued the cause for petitioner.

(unknown) argued the cause for the Republic of Cascadia.

OPINION OF THE COURT

Chief Justice XBEST_NAME_EVERX delivered the opinion of the Court, joined by Justices WrestlingWithGod and Arathorn52.

The question before this Court is whether the Legislature's attempt to override President TylenolEC's veto of the bill repealing the Anti-Hunter Act met the constitutional threshold required by Article III §3b of the National Constitution. We hold that it did not.

The Constitution clearly states that "two thirds of the House shall agree to pass the proposal" for it to become law over a presidential veto. The petitioner, SayerQT, argues that this provision requires two-thirds of the total membership of the House, not merely two-thirds of those present and voting. We agree.

At the time of the vote, the House had 17 members. Two-thirds of 17 is 11.33, which rounds up to 12 votes required to override the veto. The actual vote tally was 10 in favor and 5 against, falling short of the necessary 12 votes.

The defendants argue that the two-thirds requirement should apply only to those present and voting. However, this interpretation would allow a minority of the House to override a presidential veto, potentially in a session with low attendance. Such an outcome would undermine the careful balance of powers established by our Constitution.

Our ruling is consistent with the plain text of the Constitution and ensures that overriding a presidential veto requires a genuine supermajority of the entire legislative body. This interpretation preserves the President's veto power as a meaningful check on legislative action.

Therefore, we rule that the attempt to override President TylenolEC's veto failed to meet the constitutional threshold. The Anti-Hunter Act remains in effect, and the bill purporting to repeal it is null and void.

It is so ordered.

AKEBOUN *v.* N_S_X

ORIGINAL ACTION IN THE SUPREME COURT OF CASCADIA
No. 0019. Argued February 26, 2023—Decided February 27, 2023.

SYLLABUS

Akeboun, Secretary of Social Services, filed a suit against the Treasury of Cascadia, represented by then-Treasurer N_S_X, for not allowing the Secretary of Social Services to have permissions to withdraw gold from the Treasury in order to enforce the Cascadian Town Expansion Act, also known as *Cascaid*.

The Treasury had previously had authority over the program, which requires withdrawal of significant portions of the Treasury in order to grant gold from the Treasury to recipients. The Department of Social Services was transferred the responsibility with the creation of the Department.

The court ruled in the favor of the respondent in a 2-1 decision, upholding the policy of the Treasury.

Associate Justice Jo_Star delivered the opinion of the court, with a concurring opinion from Associate Justice Aurivia, and a dissenting opinion from Chief Justice WrestlingWithGod.

Akeboun argued the cause for petitioner.

N_S_X argued the cause for respondent.

OPINION OF THE COURT

Justice JO_STAR delivered the opinion of the Court.

The court rules in favor of The Treasury Dept. of Cascadia. Those who have the esteemed position can have the perms granted such as /n withdraw. The Executive Organization Act of September 2022, the act establishing the Treasury, grants the authority over public money to the Treasury, saying it is “consisting of and overseeing all public funds and property of the state”. If one needs to withdraw, then they must ask the Treasurer or those the Treasury has employed , as stated in the law.

It is so ordered.

Justice AURIVIA, concurring.

As the treasurer and understanding the management of the bank that is for the whole nation, I don't believe Akeboun should have full access to the money. He should wait for the treasurer. I suggest we consider adding another treasurer, as it's hard for one person to be able to reply 24/7.

Chief Justice WRESTLINGWITHGOD, dissenting.

I rule in favor of the Secretary of Social Services to have /n withdraw but only be allowed to withdraw their allocated budgeted amount at any time during the term they see fit according to the legislation in H.R. 13. They still must note it in #bank-history as required by the Constitution, and the Treasury department is allowed to investigate if the funds are mishandled or misused as a part of their oversight, which can lead to criminal charges. The House should relook and readjust past legislation to clarify and clear up the powers of the executive departments.

THE PEOPLE *v.* ALLSTARPRO90

CRIMINAL TRIAL IN THE SUPREME COURT OF CASCADIA
No. 0020. Argued March 5, 2023—Decided March 6, 2023.

SYLLABUS

AllStarPro90 said many offensive and obscene statements, which led to his prosecution by the State for violation of Pub.L. 4-1, the “Anti-Discrimination Act”.

The respondent pled guilty to the violation in criminal court and was fined by unanimous decision of the court. He was sentenced via the opinion of the court, delivered by Chief Justice WrestlingWithGod.

Akeboun argued the cause for petitioner.

AllStarPro90 argued the cause for respondent.

OPINION OF THE COURT

Chief Justice WRESTLINGWITHGOD delivered the sentencing for the court.

The respondent, AllStarPro90, pleaded guilty of violating the Anti-Discrimination Act and was forced to liquidate his ender chest and assets and to pay 805 gold fine and apologize to all those he may have offended and had to witness his behavior. Allstarpro90 will also not be able to run for office until the following presidential and legislative elections.

Allstarpro90 being a child doesn't understand the consequences of his words and although he can say whatever doesn't mean he is free from the consequences of such language. The Anti-Discrimination Act is to help prevent racist, sexist, and simply toxic behavior out of Cascadia.

It is so ordered.

Justice AURIVIA, concurring.

I agree with Cascadia and believe that it was right for him to liquidate his assets as he should have already been aware of The Anti-Discrimination Act, as it's not only unacceptable in the Nation but that language is unacceptable on the server.

OHGIZMO v. MILGORN123

ORIGINAL ACTION IN THE SUPREME COURT OF CASCADIA
No. 0023. Argued March 20, 2023—Decided March 25, 2023.

SYLLABUS

During the March 19, 2025 general election, rumors were circulated that foreigners had obtained the link and were utilizing it to illegally vote and attempt to influence the results of the Presidential and Legislative election. Milgorn123, the sitting President of Cascadia seeking a second term in office, had come upon information leading to Ohgizmo, a Citizen of Cascadia, as a suspect in the election leak. While the election was still ongoing, in order to prevent any further damages the suspect could have caused if they remained in the discord, Milgorn123 kicked and temporarily banned Giz from the Cascadian Discord.

When Giz was confronted by Milgorn he wasn't given an explanation and a harsh dismissal. Milgorn reached out to the Electoral Commission to confirm if Giz had voted yet, and Giz was eventually allowed to vote by the Electoral Commission, however Giz did not receive the total 24 hours to vote, and claimed a violation of his right to vote and his unjust detainment. Giz filed a suit against Milgorn123 for this perceived wrongdoing.

The court unanimously ruled in the favor of the respondent, president Milgorn123, upholding the legality of the President's actions.

Chief Justice WrestlingWithGod delivered the opinion of the Court, with a concurring opinion from Justice Aurivia.

Ohgizmo argued the cause for petitioner.

Milgorn123 argued the cause for respondent.

OPINION OF THE COURT

Chief Justice WRESTLINGWITHGOD delivered the opinion of the Court.

This court shall, and must, rule in favor of President Milgorn. It's a necessity for the president to be able to time out, mute, and temp ban national security

threats, but as he was a citizen, he should have been given a proper communication of the accusations Milgorn perceived he had done. We have in the past treated citizens who admit to espionage and treason with better treatment. I also noted with Milgorn that double-checking Giz's voting status shows he was trying his best not to deny Mr. Giz's ability to vote, however, caused Giz to have less than the normal 24 hours he would have been given in the polls.

I believe Giz should be compensated 50g for the time denied for his voting period. As for the right violations, Article I §2 wasn't violated as he was able to participate, Article I §4 was not violated as no property was taken from Mr. Giz, and Article I §5 was also not violated as this was not a criminal case, so no trial was required. Article I §7 wasn't violated because he retained his citizenship throughout.

It is so ordered.

Justice AURIVIA, concurring.

I must also agree with Chief Judge WrestlingWithGod; as president, Milgorn should be allowed to take these precautions as president to protect his people. I also agree that Giz should be compensated, and it must be remembered that citizens do have rights. In the future, a proper investigation must be done first. I suggest a ban or mute until you know for certain.

AKEBOUN *v.* MOXIES_HOE

ORIGINAL ACTION IN THE SUPREME COURT OF CASCADIA

No. 0026. Argued May 2, 2023—Decided May 14, 2023.

SYLLABUS

On May 1, 2023, member of the House of Representatives Akeboun introduced articles of impeachment against President AghastBlock. In response, former representative Moxies_hoe reacted to the filing with discord emojis spelling "KYS", an short-form acronym for "Kill yourself".

Under the Pub.L. 4-1, the Anti-Discrimination Act, Akeboun sued Moxie for a redress of grievance and for compensation of emotional damage due to Moxie's comment. Specifically, the petitioner claimed the Anti-Discrimination Act was being violated by Moxie due to its ban on discrimination against a specific group or view, in this case a political group or view in opposition to President AghastBlock.

The respondent cited freedom of speech rights in Article I §1, and that it was protected free speech. The respondent also criticized the court for allowing the trial to go on without a mistrial (which was requested), due to the petitioner's filing of a civil trial instead of a criminal trial, which the respondent claimed was required for enforcement of the ADA.

The court unanimously ruled in the favor of the petitioner, expanding the protections of the Anti-Discrimination Act, and finding the respondent financially liable.

Beamz30, C.J., delivered the opinion of the Court, with concurring opinions from Justice WrestlingWithGod and Justice Aurivia.

Akeboun argued the cause for petitioner.

SayerQT argued the cause for respondent.

OPINION OF THE COURT

Chief Justice BEAMZ30 delivered the opinion of the Court.

During one of Akeboun's House Debates titled "The Impeachment of Aghast" Moxie decided to use the stickers to make the phrase "KYS" which obviously means kill yourself. Akeboun took offense to this and messaged Moxie about this, and told her that it was not right. Moxie said that "it was a joke" and didn't take it seriously. Akeboun soon took Moxie to court where we now stand. Moxie is being charged with the ADA Act, along with a 130 gold fine for Akeboun's "health".

In this case, the ADA act is limiting the freedom of speech, which means this does limit free speech but we have precedent of limiting free speech such as shown from Moxie here in case Cascadia vs. AllStarPro90. The prosecution's evidence did show that Moxie put "KYS" with the stickers on the message. Moxie is to be fined the full amount to Cascadia and 50% of the fine will be provided to the plaintiff. Moxie and Sayer put up a good fight but this could rules in favor of Akeboun and the plaintiff.

It is so ordered.

Justice WRESTLINGWITHGOD, concurring.

In this case, legal precedent was once again questioned about the ADA Act (Anti-Discrimination Act). As the senior member of the bench, I have seen many suits brought by this singular legislation, and as such, I strongly urge the House to revoke or amend this Act, as it unduly limits the freedom of speech promoted by Article I §2.

However, freedom of speech is already limited with Discord TOS as an example. We have also seen the government of Cascadia throw out a town whose mayor would violate the ADA Act with homophobic/transphobic rhetoric like Billings. We also have individual citizens violating the ADA Act and being forced to pay hefty fines. An example of such an incident is *Cascadia v. AllStarPro*.

It is my opinion, as well as the opinion of the court, that Moxie did violate the ADA Act with the evidence provided. Just like *AllStarPro*, there is no tolerance for such behavior in Cascadia. I believe Moxie should pay a fine with the victim able to

claim part from Cascadia. Thus, I rule in favor of Akeboun and the plaintiff on this matter.

Justice AURIVIA, concurring.

In this case, *Akeboun v. Moxie*, it has been clear that Moxie did in fact say "kill yourself" to the prosecution. Whether they meant it as a joke or not, it's not something you joke about. The prosecution's evidence indicated that Moxie did in fact leave the letters "K Y S" and then stated in court that they said it because they did not like the prosecution.

This is why I believe Moxie should pay the full 130 gold to the nation, and up to 50% of the payment should be given to the victim for reparations if they claim. I also rule in favor of Akeboun.

BON_KRANCH *v.* CASCADIA

ORIGINAL ACTION IN THE SUPREME COURT OF CASCADIA
No. 0032. Argued July 3, 2023—Decided July 7, 2023.

SYLLABUS

Bon_Kranch, Chief Minister of the Territory of Oregon, on behalf of the Executive Council of Oregon Territory, filed a challenge in the Supreme Court of Cascadia under the judicial authority vested in the court by the Oregon Organic Act (Pub.L. 9-8).

The petitioner accused the executive branch of Cascadia of attempting to force Oregon into a specific state of existence in relation to the Government of Cascadia in order to receive the right to vote in Cascadian national elections, and also argued that the concept of a Cascadian national as defined in the Territorial Organization Act (Pub.L. 9-1) violated Article I §7 of the National Constitution, by denying key fundamental rights of the Constitution.

The court unanimously ruled in the favor of the respondent, upholding the concept of a Cascadian national in law and the existing political and legal status of the Oregon Territory.

Justice SayerQT delivered the opinion for the unanimous court.

Bon_Kranch argued the cause for petitioner.
Akeboun argued the cause for respondent.

OPINION OF THE COURT

Justice SAYERQT delivered the opinion of the Court, joined by Chief Justice BEAMZ3O.

The court has, in a unanimous decision, held that any actions of the Executive branch that Bon_Kranch accused of occurring, relating to Oregon's status with Cascadia, were not illegal nor unconstitutional, and upholds that the concept of a Cascadian National in the context of the Territory of Oregon is not unconstitutional, due to the fact that the Oregon Organic Act clarifies that the

Constitution of Cascadia is not in effect in the Territory of Oregon, and that instead the Oregon Organic Act is the supreme legal authority in the territory; however clarifying that certain aspects of the Territorial Organization Act (Pub.L. 9-1) are unconstitutional. The claims of Bon_Kranch can be largely divided into two sections, which will be addressed in this majority opinion.

Firstly, the petitioner argues, quote "Oregon is being blocked from entering Cascadia unless the nation is given up, [and] while not against a specific law it does go against [precedent] set in the past due to other nations being allowed entry, It seems to be an unfair way of blocking entry to the nation by trying to force a ridiculous condition." The first subclaim is that Oregon is being blocked from Cascadia unless the nation is "given up", assumingly to the Government of Cascadia. This is fundamentally an untrue statement. It is not a law passed through the Legislature, nor even a defined policy of the executive branch, to block Oregon from entering Cascadia unless the nation is "given up". The petitioner counters by claiming that "while not against a specific law, it does go against [precedent] set in the past due to other nations being allowed entry [and] seems to be an unfair way of blocking entry to the nation by trying to force a ridiculous condition.". No in-game nation has ever been allowed entry to Cascadia in the manner that the petitioner seems to wish for. New_Mexico was allowed into Cascadia as a Trade Possession, in which the nation was financial property of the Government. This has been the same for Washington, and for Bering Sea. The only nation, ironically, not to be let under the realm of Cascadia as a trade possession under the possession of the executive branch, is the Territory of Oregon. Bon_Kranch in this claim seems to not understand the provisions of the Territorial Organization Act (Pub.L. 9-1), which outlines the differences between a trade possession and a national.

The petitioner additionally claims "There is also no reason that the executive branch needs to own Oregon, [there] is no reason to see it as more dangerous than any of the other nations in Cascadia, especially since Oregon is already the same as any other place in Cascadia except the right to vote." Both statements in this sentence are untrue. The Executive Branch never attempted to illegally force Oregon from being converted to a Trade Possession under the authority of the executive branch, as in the status quo Oregon is not a TPO, and no such violation has been made. That would have to be done by the Legislature, which even the Legislature has not done or even attempted. Any change in the relationship between Oregon and Cascadia would have to be performed by the Legislature, and Bon can not simply sue the state to compel the individual members of the House of

Representatives to vote a specific way. This issue that the petitioner brings up in this claim is an issue to be resolved by legislative means and not by judicial ones. The petitioner also claims that Oregon is no different than any other place in Cascadia, which is false for a multitude and reasons which brings us onto the petitioner's second claim.

The petitioner's second argument is based around the issue of the concept of a Cascadian National. As established in the Territorial Organization Act (Pub.L. 9-1), a Cascadian national is the classification for any resident of a Cascadian territory, a classification upon which Oregon is designated within the Oregon Organic Act (Pub.L. 9-8); and a National shall have certain specific rights enjoyed by citizens but not every single one of them as defined in law. Bon argues that the concept of a Cascadian national is unconstitutional, citing Article I §7, which states "Any person who, in-game, is apart of an incorporated town or nation under the jurisdiction of the Constitution of Cascadia, shall be determined as a citizen, and all others shall be foreign." This court holds that the Territory of Oregon is not a part of an incorporated nation under the jurisdiction of the Constitution of Cascadia. The Territorial Organization Act (Pub.L. 9-1) defines an incorporated territory as a territory in which the Constitution of Cascadia is in effect. The Oregon Organic Act (Pub.L. 9-8) explicitly defines Oregon as an unincorporated territory, and one in which the Constitution of Cascadia is not in force.

Due to that, the Constitution of Cascadia views Oregon's residents as foreign. Oregon is a separate entity from the Republic of Cascadia, that is under the legislative authority of the Legislature of Cascadia, due to the fact that it was established as a polity by an organic act by the Legislature; however it is not one in the same with Cascadia. Therefore, considering the Constitution views Oregon's residents as foreign, then they shall not be considered citizens, therefore not enjoying constitutional rights that are not bestowed upon them by the Oregon Organic Act; which is the highest legal authority within the territory.

The Constitution not only sees the idea of a Cascadian National as simply constitutional, but rather in many instances a constitutional necessity to exist in some form. For example, Article IV §2 of the Constitution states "The President of Cascadia shall be elected...by direct voting of citizens of Cascadia...". If an unincorporated territory was granted voting rights, that would violate this section, as the Constitution requires the President to be elected by citizens, with the term of citizen being defined by a persons' state of being subject to the Constitution or not. This, however, is not entirely absolute in regards to territories.

If Oregon's organic act was, for example, to be amended to incorporate the territory, and to switch its classification to an incorporated territory (mind you, still not described by the Territorial Organization Act as an integrated part of Cascadia), in which the Constitution fully applies, then the court holds that this would in fact be unconstitutional in that instance for an incorporated territory under the authority of the Constitution to be denied citizenship, and therefore the rights that come with Cascadian Citizenship, such as suffrage and political rights; and thereby the court strikes down parts of the Territorial Organization Act (Pub.L. 9-1), relating to residents of Incorporated Territories being granted the classification of Nationals; a classification that would violate the Constitution.

Thus, because the Oregon Organic Act declares that the Constitution of Cascadia is not in effect in the Territory of Oregon and that the Oregon Organic Act is instead the supreme legal authority in the territory, this court holds that the petitioner's accusations of wrongdoing are not true and that the concept of a Cascadian National in the context of the Territory of Oregon is not unconstitutional, while clarifying certain aspects of the Territorial Organization Act (Pub.L. 9-1) may have the capacity to violate the National Constitution.

It is so ordered.

HERSHEYLR v. CASCADIA

ORIGINAL ACTION IN THE SUPREME COURT OF CASCADIA

No. 0034. Argued July 30, 2023—Decided August 31, 2023.

SYLLABUS

On July 23, 2023, the Republic of Cascadia ratified the Treaty of Freewater, an international agreement between the Republic of Cascadia and the Union of Laurentia. Hersheyrl, a private citizen, challenged the constitutionality of Article IV of the Treaty of Freewater by filing an original action in the Supreme Court. The treaty provision in question requires the return of stolen property to rightful owners across national boundaries. The petitioner argued that this provision violates the National Constitution of Cascadia, specifically Article I §4, which protects property rights.

The Court unanimously affirmed the constitutionality of the Treaty of Freewater's Article IV, rejecting Hersheyrl's challenge. The Court held that Article IV of the Treaty of Freewater and similar laws are consistent with the National Constitution, due to the Constitution's implication of inherent criminality of theft, and extended property rights to foreign property owners.

SayerQT, C.J., delivered the opinion for the unanimous court, with a concurring opinion from Justice xBest_Name_Everx.

Hersheyrl argued the cause for petitioner.

Akeboun argued the cause for respondent.

OPINION OF THE COURT

Chief Justice SAYERQT delivered the opinion of the Court, joined by Justice FURBALLEN.

The court has, in an unanimous decision, held that Article IV of the Treaty of Freewater and any similar treaties or laws are in fact consistent with the Constitution and do not violate Article I §4 of the National Constitution. The court has previously held, as seen in *The People v. Cowilo, et. al.*, that laws that criminalize hunting of allies and require the compulsory return of stolen property have been upheld and enforced. The court, through common law precedent, as well

as its own precedent that it has developed in its own rulings, has found an implied criminality of theft in the National Constitution, specifically Article I §4. Article I §4 specifically reads: *"No person shall be deprived of liberty or property without the due process of law; nor shall private property be taken by the government without just compensation; nor shall excessive fines imposed; nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted."* The deprivation of property without the process of the law implies theft being a crime able to be legislated, and that property that is stolen is not truly the property of the thief, rather, in the eyes of the Constitution, it is with the person who had held that property legally.

The petitioner argues that foreigners' property are not protected by the Constitution, and if it is stolen by a Cascadian citizen, then it becomes the Cascadian's property. This is not true. Article I §4 does not simply extend property rights to citizens, but rather to persons in general. As theft is an implied common law crime in Cascadia, a Cascadian committing theft against an ally (*something already criminalized by law, and further by this treaty*) involves the foreigner who had property stolen, meaning that this clause applies to them if they, or a representative of them, wishes to exercise it; and therefore, their property is their property, even if stolen by a Cascadian. Returning stolen property from a Cascadian thief to a foreign property-owner is not the government taking property without compensation; rather, it is abiding by the property rights of the person who was stolen from, and by both a law and a treaty that is not in violation of the National Constitution.

Thus, the Court upholds the legality of the Treaty in question in full.

It is so ordered.

Justice XBEST_NAME EVERX, concurring.

Hersheylr's claim that property stolen from non-Cascadians is not subject to our laws regarding theft and therefore not subject be returned to its owners is fundamentally flawed. Article 1 § 4 extends property rights to all players of the game, "No Person" shall have their property rights violated, not just "No Citizen".

FLATVENT_ONE v. WRESTLINGWITHGOD

ORIGINAL ACTION IN THE SUPREME COURT OF CASCADIA

No. 0039. Argued September 24, 2023—Decided October 7, 2023.

SYLLABUS

Flatvent_One, a private citizen, sued WrestlingWithGod, the Treasurer of Cascadia, in his capacity as an administrator of the National Discord of Cascadia, alleging violation of Article I §1 of the National Constitution of Cascadia regarding free speech. WrestlingWithGod used his permissions to “time out” the speech of Flatvent_One during a heated exchange between each other within the National Discord of Cascadia.

The Court held, unanimously, that WrestlingWithGod, as a civil officer of the Government of the Republic of Cascadia, is not liable for damages to Flatvent_One under Cascadian law and the Constitution, however were improper for a law enforcement official due to personal involvement in the dispute. The Court recognized the dual role of Discord administrators as both Cascadian officials and enforcers of Discord's Terms of Service, which all members agree to upon joining.

SayerQT, C.J., delivered the opinion for the unanimous court, with a concurring opinion from Justice xBest_Name_Everx.

KARN4 argued the cause for petitioner.

Akeboun argued the cause for respondent.

OPINION OF THE COURT

Chief Justice SAYERQT delivered the opinion of the Court, joined by Justice FURBALLEN.

The court hereby rules unanimously that Wrestlingwithgod as a civil officer of the Government of the Republic of Cascadia is not liable for damages to Flatvent_One under the laws and constitution of the Republic of Cascadia, and that Wrestlingwithgod did not violate any law or constitutional clause towards Flatvent_One. The petitioner claimed that Article I §1 of the National Constitution was abridged by the respondent, citing- *“The Legislature shall make no law...abridging the freedom of speech, or of their expression, except in cases where the*

public safety may require it". The petitioner's claim upon WrestlingwithGod is that he violated this law as a law enforcement officer of the Republic. This article is taken by the court to mean that it is not prohibited for a law enforcement officer of the Republic to abridge the freedom of speech, rather it is prohibited for the Legislature to create any law to abridge such freedoms.

The issue relating to this case is not one about the freedom of speech itself, and is rather about whether or not the Legislature has provided for the proper regulations for the powers of law enforcement officers. If the Legislature were to entitle law enforcement officers with the ability to broadly silence free speech even if the public safety is not threatened, then such a law would be unconstitutional.

The court holds that while what Wrestling did was not illegal within Cascadian law, it was not proper of a law enforcement official. While Flatvent's statements may have been perceived as inflammatory, Wrestling was not in a state of mind to properly adjudicate the situation, which led to his abuse of his authority as, what was, in effect, a law enforcement officer. Flatvent was in an active argument with Wrestling over personal disputes, which led to high tempers on both sides. Wrestling was not excused from this behavior himself. Thus, it is neither Flatvent or Wrestling to blame for inciting what was claimed by the respondent as "unwanted behavior".

Despite Wrestling's role as an apparent law enforcement officer, the court understands that such a job's purview may extend beyond the lengths of the laws of Cascadia, in order to enforce the discord Terms of Service. The Discord Terms of Service affects the National Discord of Cascadia, as Discord is a private corporation with the ability to set its own rules and regulations. All members of the Cascadia discord have signed onto the Terms of Service; thus, it is also under the purview of such an enforcement officer to also enforce such rules. However, the unclear area around the powers of such law enforcement officers remains unclear, and the court recommends to the Legislature such action as may be necessary to properly define the powers of law enforcement officers to clear any disputes.

The court holds that neither the petitioner nor the respondent were legally in the right, nor were any in the wrong; rather, that Wrestlingwithgod, while being legally able to perform the action he did due to no such statute on the books relating to his action's legality, was also on the line of abusing his authority as, what the court recognizes, as a *de facto* law enforcement officer. Thus, it recommended to the

Legislature to clear the grey area in the legal precedent as it is their legal authority to do so.

It is so ordered.

Justice XBEST_NAME EVERX, concurring.

It is my opinion that WrestlingWithGod did not violate the constitution or law per se, but I do think that his decision was a mistake in discord moderation because of the fact that Wrest had a conflict of interest as a moderator since he was directly involved in a *very heated* argument with Flatvent. I think that the facts of whether or not Flatvent actually deserved to be punished will no longer matter to many citizens because of the context around when he was timed out and by whom, given the argument they were having. I believe it creates a situation where the act of the admin reflects negatively on the moderator in question and potentially other admins/moderators irrespective of the merit of the punishment.

I also agree with the majority's position that no one was legally or constitutionally in the right or wrong here, but the action still should not have happened as it did because it at the very least creates that negative reflection. I believe that if a moderator has a conflict of interest with regard to punishing a certain citizen they should leave the decision to a different moderator. If the petitioner's actions/words merited punishment it should've been decided by someone who was not directly engaged in the argument with him.

BUNILKY v. CITY OF FRESNO

ORIGINAL ACTION IN THE SUPREME COURT OF CASCADIA

No. 0050. Argued February 3, 2024—Decided February 14, 2024.

SYLLABUS

The City of Fresno, a town in Cascadia, seized property belonging to bunilky, who was at the time a resident of the City, prompting a legal challenge based on constitutional grounds. Bunilky, via their counsel Hersheyrl, argued that the City of Fresno violated Bunilky's rights afforded by Article I §4 of the National Constitution of Cascadia to their property from seizure without just compensation.

The Court held, unanimously, that Article I §4 of the National Constitution applies to town governments, requiring them to provide just compensation for seized property. However, the City of Fresno is not liable for damages to the petitioner in this case, as the just compensation in this case was deemed as zero gold due to the petitioner achieving the property for free, and since the City offered just compensation, but was denied by the petitioner, then the petitioner waived their right to further compensation by a court.

SayerQT, C.J., delivered the opinion for the unanimous court.

Hersheyrl argued the cause for petitioner.

Milgorn123 argued the cause for respondent.

OPINION OF THE COURT

Chief Justice SAYERQT delivered the opinion of the Court, joined by Justice FURBALLEN and Justice XBEST_NAME_EVERX.

The court hereby rules unanimously that the City of Fresno is not liable for damages to be paid to the plaintiff under Art. 1 §4 of the National Constitution. The relevant portion of Art 1. §4 reads "...nor shall private property be taken by the government without just compensation". The court holds that Art. 1 §4 does in fact apply to town governments, as explained in the second paragraph of this opinion, requiring towns to grant just compensation to those whose property is seized.

The facts of the case have shown through several testimonies that the petitioner's client paid 0 gold for the property, and that while they did have several minor possessions of worth and gold located on the premises of the property when seized, the Fresno City Council took necessary steps to grant just compensation for this property to the petitioner, however when the petitioner was given a chance to receive the compensation, they effectively denied it. Thus, Fresno is not liable for damages to the petitioner in this case as the petitioner had already in effect ceased claim to their constitutional just compensation.

While the court does hold that Fresno is not liable, the court finds most of the arguments made by the City of Fresno in court to be unfounded in law. The City's central argument could largely be boiled down to the idea that Fresno City Ordinances, specifically City Ordinances A0001 and AI11100000, grant sufficient legal ability to the City to "confiscate all property in the city" (Fresno Ordinance AI11100000), and justifies the City's ability to have and enforce such an ordinance by Art. 3 §7 of the National Constitution of Cascadia which grants towns the exclusive power "to manage the sale and management of property within the jurisdiction of the town".

However, the court holds that while Art. 3 §7 does grant exclusive authority over property management to town governments, this does not permit town governments to infringe on residents' right to just and fair compensation that is granted by Art. 1 §4 for the seizure of property. The court recognizes town governments as falling under the meaning of the term "government" as used in Art. 1 §4, as Art. 3 §7 in subsection I specifically references towns as being "municipal governments"; thus, municipal governments are obliged to comply with the constitutional rights of Cascadian citizens who reside under their jurisdiction.

It is so ordered.

CITY OF FRESNO *v.* MYFRIENDISDUMB

ORIGINAL ACTION IN THE SUPREME COURT OF CASCADIA

No. 0051. Argued February 27, 2024—Decided February 29, 2024.

SYLLABUS

City Councillor DavidPlayz58, on behalf of the City of Fresno, filed a prosecutorial suit against MyFriendIsDumb of the City of Fresno in order to have him fined due to questionable construction actions taken by MyFriendIsDumb in violation of Fresno City Ordinances.

The Court unanimously held that entertaining and adjudicating such a case was beyond the constitutional power of the National Judiciary in Article 5 §2 of the National Constitution, as the case is a controversy between a town and a citizen of the same town, thus the case was dismissed for lack of standing.

SayerQT, C.J., delivered the opinion for the unanimous court.

DavidPlayz58 argued the cause for petitioner.

SergioTheCrafter argued the cause for respondent.

OPINION OF THE COURT

Chief Justice SAYERQT delivered the opinion of the Court, joined by Justice XBEST_NAME_EVERX and Justice JAGLO5.

The court has determined that Art. 5 §2 of the National Constitution does not grant the Supreme Court original jurisdiction over controversies between a town and a citizen of the same town. Judicial processes in the City of Fresno should instead deal with the case. However, MyFriendIsDumb, just as is the case with any citizen of Cascadia, has the right to appeal any ruling at the municipal level to the Supreme Court if he disagrees with the ruling, pursuant to the Judiciary Act of February 2024.

It is so ordered.

CASCADIA *v.* TOWN OF DEATH VALLEY

ORIGINAL ACTION IN THE SUPREME COURT OF CASCADIA

No. 0051. Argued April 3, 2024—Decided April 20, 2024.

SYLLABUS

The Town of Death Valley, located on an international boundary with the municipality of Area 51 under the jurisdiction of the Nevadan State, overclaimed several plots into Area 51. Attorney-General of Cascadia Akeboun filed a suit against the Town of Death Valley on the grounds that the Town had violated Pub.L. 17-1, known as the International Overclaim Act, by overclaiming 24 chunks into the municipality of Area 51 in the State of Nevada, a foreign state whom Cascadia was not presently at a state of declared war.

The court unanimously held that the Town did violate the law and in accordance with the provisions of the Act, must attempt to compensate the local authorities of Area 51.

SayerQT, C.J., delivered the opinion for the unanimous court, with a concurring opinion from Justice xBest_Name_Everx.

Akeboun argued the cause for petitioner.

Milgorn123 argued the cause for respondent.

OPINION OF THE COURT

Chief Justice SAYERQT delivered the opinion of the Court, joined by Justice WRESTLINGWITHGOD.

In the matter at hand, this Court, acting unanimously, renders its decision that that Town of Death Valley did violate the provisions of Pub.L. 17-1, known as the International Overclaim Act, and that in accordance with the provisions of said law, the Town of Death Valley must compensate the local authorities of the overclaimed town, Area 51, with the lost amount of gold- in this case, 384 gold.

It shall be up to the local authorities of Death Valley in conjunction with authorities in Area 51 to coordinate this transaction, if Area 51 wishes to accept said gold or responds to contact from the authorities of Death Valley.

It is so ordered.

Justice XBEST_NAME_EVERX, concurring.

During this court's deliberation process we encountered several dilemmas in figuring out how to handle this case. Considering the current mayor of Death Valley has cooperated with the government at every opportunity to unclaim the territory that the previous mayor had overclaimed, it feels unfair to us to force them to pay back such a large amount of gold for a mistake someone else made and that they worked to fix it.

However, the law as it is currently written requires that our towns unclaim chunks and make reparations if it overclaims a foreign nation's town. It would also however be genuinely unfair and contrary to Cascadian values if we did not make some attempt to make reparations to foreign towns when we are the ones who are overclaimed. Yet it does not sit well with us to put this repayment upon the person who has gone out of their way to fix the issue instead of the person who broke the rule to begin with.

As well, I think there are problems with how this law is designed to be enforced. In the future I think it makes more sense to modify the current law so that the individual mayor/trusted players responsible for the overclaim are also the ones required to pay compensation. This would prevent mayors from evading punishment by temporarily putting in a new mayor after breaking overclaim laws (though we do not believe that to be what has happened in this case).

CASCADIA *v.* DRACNOIAN, CAPITANFRA

ORIGINAL ACTION IN THE SUPREME COURT OF CASCADIA

No. 0065. Argued August 20, 2024—Decided October 3, 2024.

SYLLABUS

Attorney-General Milgorn123 filed a suit against the Department of State, represented at the time by then-Secretary of State Dracnoian and at the time of ruling by Secretary of State Capitanfra, for the issuance of dual citizenships by the State Department under Pub.L. 9-5 (and 9-7 which amends it).

The court unanimously held that the issuance of dual citizenship by the Secretary of State was in violation of the National Constitution's Article I §7, striking down the aforementioned Dual Citizenship Act and subsequent amendments.

SayerQT, C.J., delivered the opinion for the unanimous court.

Milgorn123 argued the cause for petitioner.

Dracnoian argued the cause for respondent.

OPINION OF THE COURT

Chief Justice SAYERQT delivered the opinion of the Court, joined by Justice XBEST_NAME_EVERX and Justice WRESTLINGWITHGOD.

In the matter at hand, this Court, acting unanimously, renders its decision that the Department of State of the Republic of Cascadia's issuance of dual citizenships pursuant to Pub.L. 9-5 (The Dual Citizenship Act) was in violation of the National Constitution of Cascadia, due to Pub.L. 9-5 and its subsequent amendments being in violation of Art. 1 §7 of the National Constitution.

Article 1 §7 of the Constitution reads, "Any person who, in-game, is apart of an incorporated town or nation under the jurisdiction of the Constitution of Cascadia, shall be determined as a citizen, and all others shall be foreign." The explicit definition of "all others shall be foreign", and with citizenship explicitly granted solely to those within the towns of Cascadia in-game, would mean that the practice of granting persons residing in towns not within the territory of Cascadia

would be in violation of the constitutional definition of citizenship. Thus, any outstanding persons with this status granted upon them who are not residents of Cascadia are not citizens and do not enjoy the privileges of citizenship of the Republic bestowed upon them and enumerated by the Constitution.

It is so ordered.

PUBLIC ADVOCATE v. CASCADIA
IN RE: Pub.L. 23-7 (*Honorary Citizenship Redefinition Act*)

ORIGINAL ACTION IN THE SUPREME COURT OF CASCADIA
No. 0068. Argued September 15, 2024—Decided October 3, 2024.

SYLLABUS

The Office of the Public Advocate of Cascadia, acting in its capacity as a general ombudsperson for the people of Cascadia, filed a suit against Cascadia, represented by Attorney-General Milgorn123, for allowing individuals to hold "honorary citizenship" of the Republic as legally classed and defined by Pub.L. 23-7, known as the Honorary Citizenship Redefinition Act, to which the Public Advocate argued was in violation of the National Constitution.

The court, in a split 2-1 decision, upheld the existence of Honorary Citizenship by referencing precedent, and lack of constitutional citizenship benefits coming from honorary citizenship beyond title.

SayerQT, C.J., delivered the opinion for the court, with a concurring opinion from Justice xBest_Name_Everx, and a dissenting opinion from Justice WrestlingWithGod.

Akeboun argued the cause for petitioner.

Milgorn123 argued the cause for respondent.

OPINION OF THE COURT

Chief Justice SAYERQT delivered the opinion of the Court.

In the matter at hand, this Court, acting on behalf of the majority, renders its decision that the Republic of Cascadia's issuance of honorary citizenship is lawful and is not in conflict with the National Constitution of Cascadia. The plaintiff argued that Art.1. §7 of the Constitution, which reads "any person who, in-game, is apart of an incorporated town or nation under the jurisdiction of the Constitution of Cascadia, shall be determined as a citizen, and all others shall be foreign", would annul the concept of honorary citizenship. This is false, because unlike what both the plaintiff and my colleague the Honorable WrestlingWithGod might believe, honorary citizenship under the current state of Pub.L. 23-7, does not claim to entitle

those with the honorary citizenship honor any of the benefits or rights enjoyed and granted upon citizens of Cascadia. No law referencing honorary citizenship claims to grant any rights granted by law or the Constitution that are reserved to citizens, to honorary citizens. #Nation-General is not a constitutionally granted right of citizens, thus honorary citizens may be granted that ability if the Government wishes.

The concept of honorary citizenship is one that has a precedent within Astorian common law. The judicial and legislative traditions of the Republic of Cascadia can trace many precedents to the Republic of Cascadia on Terra Nova and the Salish Confederation on Terra Nova, with a shared cultural heritage and legal tradition to the present Republic. As a court operating on the precedent and concept of common law and precedent, on the issue of honorary citizenship in all manners that are not defined by law, i.e. Pub.L. 23-7, the holding of the court shall be one of deference to the precedent on honorary citizenship existing in Cascadia for the duration of its whole existence- that being that honorary citizens are not citizens, and are in fact just that; honorary. Honorary citizenship is an honor granted by the Legislature, similar to how Honorary citizenship has worked in Cascadia for the whole of its existence, Cascadia and Salish on Nova operated honorary citizenship, and every nation on earth in real-life operates the concept of Honorary Citizenship. Honorary citizenship has never been claimed by any legal authority in Cascadia to hold the same weight of Citizenship and is unequivocally not citizenship, and any attempt to grant honorary citizens with the rights granted exclusively to citizens of Cascadia would be in violation of the constitutional definition of Citizenship laid out in Art.1 §7 and upheld in *Cascadia v. Dracnoian, Capitanfra* (2024/10).

It is so ordered.

Justice XBEST_NAME EVERX, concurring.

My opinion on this case is that the concept of Honorary Citizenship is a valid and constitutional concept, and that "Honorary Citizenship" is sufficiently distinct from "Citizenship" as a general concept. Using the adjective "Honorary" distinguishes that it is a ceremonial title without the normal powers or rights associated with the role of Citizen as defined per the constitution. Also, as Sayer explained in the majority opinion, there are other historical examples both for Cascadia/EMC and from the real world to draw from for additional context to honorary titles like this.

To be clear, Honorary Citizens are NOT full legal citizens of Cascadia with all the rights entailed by the constitution, they are foreign citizens who we recognize with the title of "Honorary Citizen" for their contributions and connections to our community and who we grant the right to participate in our community (but not our politics). There is also no reason that this specific honor could not be re-titled to avoid using the word "citizen" in it, as this has apparently caused confusion for some in our community.

However, despite the points I made above, the Public Advocate makes a compelling argument that the current law surrounding honorary citizenship is insufficient and too ambiguous to meet the standards of our nation. It only lists the requirements to become an Honorary Citizen and does not attempt to define the specific rights associated with this honor. Context and historical examples help but are not a replacement for a solid definition of the title. We need actual, specific definitions of what rights are associated with this title to eliminate any room for guesswork or assumptions.

So while I believe the role of honorary citizenship is constitutionally valid and legal, as a Justice I very strongly recommend to the House of Representatives that the current law as it stands must be amended or rewritten to provide clear details about the exact rights afforded by the title; specifically detailing that they are not full citizens and do not have the right to participate in Cascadian elections or run for office.

Justice WRESTLINGWITHGOD, dissenting.

The constitution states citizenship is not merely a title but a status earned by specified requirements. Allowing the House to bestow honorary citizenship undermines the framework by granting select status to individuals who have not fulfilled the requirements laid out in our constitution. Moreover? The house bestowing that title of honorary citizen also gives some rights previously only reserved to true Cascadian citizens, such as participation in national general elections or even the ability to read and speak in election discussions. This risks diluting the value of true citizenship and potential confusion of the responsibility and rights accompanying the status.

This could also diminish the desire to be true citizens and will push away potential immigrants with this alternative available. We have also seen those who have received the status of honorary citizenship either for journalistic access, have contributed large sums of financial aid, or want to participate as citizens of Cascadia without joining Cascadia.

Properly, all these reasons do not justify not meeting the requirements for citizenship. For these reasons, I oppose the statue of honorary citizens and suggest the House rename it to prevent such issues. I believe it's crucial to uphold the integrity of the Constitution's definition of citizenship, ensuring it stays a respectful status reflective of our commitment and the values of our nation.

CASCADIA *v.* LIMAO_MAO

ORIGINAL ACTION IN THE SUPREME COURT OF CASCADIA

No. 0076. Argued January 4, 2025—Decided January 7, 2025.

SYLLABUS

Attorney General John_by, on behalf of the Department of Justice, filed a request for a court injunction suspending and vacating the seat of the Honorable Limao_mao, member of the House of Representatives for the Metropolitan division, who was elected at the December 15, 2024 general election.

The injunction request was made on the claim that limao was not a citizen of Cascadia at the time of election due to him holding the town of Husky Valley, thus making him eligible to have been elected on December 15, 2024, necessitating the court to remove limao from the court.

The court unanimously held that the Supreme Court did not have the jurisdiction to unilaterally vacate a seat in the House of Representatives whose member had already been seated by the House, as the Constitution grants the Legislature power to determine the rules of its proceedings, reserving the sole power to expel its own members.

SayerQT, C.J., delivered the opinion for the unanimous court.

John_by and *Xeocas* argued the cause for petitioner.
Shadowcipher argued the cause for respondent.

OPINION OF THE COURT

Chief Justice SAYERQT delivered the opinion of the Court, joined by Justice WRESTLINGWITHGOD.

In the matter at hand, this Court, acting unanimously, renders its decision that the injunction request by the Department of Justice shall not be granted, on the basis that the Supreme Court lacks jurisdiction to vacate the seat of a member of the House of Representatives who was elected and seated by the House of Representatives.

While the court does find and conclude that Limao_mao was in fact neither a citizen of Cascadia nor a resident of the electoral division they were elected from (as they were elected to represent Metropolitan), it is the opinion of the court that the authority granted by Art. 3 §3e of the National Constitution to correct this violation of the Constitution is solely vested in the Legislature, and does not fall under the purview of judicial review, as the power is explicitly granted to the Legislature to expel members. If the Legislature wishes for a situation like this not to arise again, then the court recommends the Legislature legislate amendments to the Constitution or applicable laws that would address the question of citizenship and extraordinary cases such as the case of limao_mao.

It is so ordered.

Justice XBEST_NAME EVERX, concurring.

In addition to concurring with the majority opinion of the Court, I would personally recommend that the Legislature also create and pass an amendment that outlines rules establishing special temporary citizenship for nation members who must leave the nation in-game in order to perform jobs for the government, such as acquiring new towns. This would prevent confusion over citizenship in similar future cases.

I think one possible way this could be done would be to require players seeking temporary leave to request permission from the President, and that the specific task and amount of time they are to be outside the nation must be specified before they can retain their citizenship during a temporary leave. This is however just one possible way to deal with the issue, and the final say over any potential solution to this issue is at the discretion of the legislature.

IN RE: Livestock Protection Act

JUDICIAL REFERRAL BY THE PRESIDENT OF CASCADIA #1

Referred January 7, 2025 —Decided January 12, 2025.

SYLLABUS

4whatok, President of the Republic, referred the Livestock Protection Act passed by the 29th House of Representatives as H.R. 13. to the Supreme Court to adjudicate its constitutionality in accordance with his powers under Amendment IV to the National Constitution.

The court ruled in a 2-1 decision that the bill was not constitutional, and thus was not signed into law, due to its mandate of towns to violate the constitutional rights of non-mayor residents.

SayerQT, C.J., delivered the opinion for the court, with a concurring opinion from Justice xBest_Name_Everx, and a dissenting opinion from Justice WrestlingWithGod.

OPINION OF THE COURT

Chief Justice SAYERQT delivered the opinion of the Court.

This Court, acting upon the decision of its majority, renders its judgment on the referral of H.R. 13. We find that the bill, despite potentially positive and constitutional intentions, violates the National Constitution on two grounds.

First, the bill's wording mandates municipal governments to unilaterally seize livestock property from residents, designating it as town property. Section 3, Clause 3 of the act states: "Livestock within the confines of a town's property, if shown proof to have existed within, is to be considered the property of said town unless otherwise sold to another individual with proof of sale." This provision conflicts with Article I §4 of the National Constitution, which prohibits the taking of private property without just compensation, as well as the Due Process Clause of the 8th Amendment. The bill would require citizens to provide rigorous validation of ownership, a requirement of which most current livestock owners would likely be unaware, effectively depriving them of their property without compensation.

Second, the bill infringes upon Town Rights as established in Article III §7 of the National Constitution. By mandating that towns shall take over all private livestock property unless a private individual is able to go through a nationally-mandated verification process, the bill overrides the constitutional right of towns to manage and regulate property sales within their jurisdictions in addition to inhibiting individuals to exercise their constitutional private property rights.

Given these constitutional conflicts, this Court recommends that the legislation be rewritten if its intent is to be preserved in future legislative action.

It is so ordered.

Justice XBEST_NAME EVERX, concurring.

I would like to preface my decision by saying that this was not an easy decision for me to come to, and I thought a great deal about this question as my fellow justices would attest. Still, after a great deal of consideration and discussion with my fellow justices I have come to the conclusion. Unfortunately, some of the wording used in H.R. 13 could potentially violate the constitutional rights of citizens, and therefore I believe that this law is unconstitutional as it is currently written.

Despite this, the law's basic concept is not fundamentally unconstitutional. It intends to expand on the basic constitutional protections of property, by protecting a town's livestock from theft. I think this goal is noble and worth pursuing. I say this all to say that I do not believe the problem is with the intention of the law per se but a secondary consequence of word choice. First, I will explain the specific constitutional issues with this resolution. Second, I will explain how I think this law can easily be made to fit within the constitution with just a few minor changes.

There are two specific points where I believe this resolution contradicts constitutional rights. The first is a minor and more technical issue. The resolution as it is written would effectively require that town mayors/governments claim ownership of all the livestock present within the town unless a citizen can present proof they own specific mobs. This may not sound like an issue since it's trying to protect towns from livestock theft, but ironically if legislation were to require this it would technically violate the right of towns to manage themselves as they see fit if the national government required towns to claim ownership of the livestock. This

could be fixed easily by changing the wording of this part of the proposal from ["...is to be considered the property of said town..."] to ["...may be considered..."], or something like ["...mayors have the ability to claim ownership..."]

The second point is fundamentally about due process, and gets way deeper into constitutional issues than I would've expected from this case. The constitution recognizes two rights that potentially conflict with each other, between citizens' and towns' right to property. Specifically, the constitution recognizes that mayors/town governments have the right "to manage the sale and management of property within the jurisdiction of the town" (Article 3 § 7). The constitution also recognizes a citizen's right to property and for it not to be taken away by the government without due process or just compensation (Amendment VIII and Article 1 § 4). Now, because of the limitations of the Towny mod that is used on EMC, mayors de facto control and have full access to all plots in their towns no matter what our constitution says.

While we cannot prevent mayors from taking players' belongings, this is why in order to protect citizens and their valuable belongings, we have due process and fair compensation ensured in our constitution. This resolution even attempts to account for due process by requesting proof of a bill of sale. However, I think that as it is written now and without extra clauses outlining more specifics on the process, this is insufficient to meet the standard of due process outlined by the Cascadian constitution.

The problem arises when players who don't own a town but want to own livestock would have to make a record of themselves buying a mob or capturing wild mobs, such as a screenshots, video, or in-game/discord messages, or a recorded deal that meets the standards of Cascadian contract law. This is not an entirely unreasonable expectation going forward, but it cannot be expected that players who already own livestock would have kept a record of such proof before this law was passed. Without provisions for a grace period to acquire proof of ownership or a 'grandfather clause' for mobs owned before the proposal, this would in my opinion violate a citizen's right not to have their property confiscated without due process.

I offer the legislature a solution to fix this resolution and to eliminate the current constitutional issues. I suggest the following adjustments;

1. Change wording so that towns have the ability to choose to claim ownership over livestock within their borders, not a requirement.

2. Before the law goes into effect, citizens should have a grace period to acquire proof of ownership/sale for the mobs they already owned prior to the law passing.
3. After the law goes into effect and upon request by the mayor/town government, citizens should have a short period of time (up to the legislature to determine the specific amount of time, but maybe 12-24 hours after the request) to produce proof of ownership for the mayor/town government before the mayor can claim ownership of the livestock.

Justice WRESTLINGWITHGOD, dissenting.

This Week, the Supreme Court was brought the question "Is H.R. 13, The Livestock Protection Act consistent within the Constitution of Cascadia?" The Act defines livestock ownership as the property of a town, normally represented by its mayor, and creates penalties for theft, transport, and rustling of livestock. After thorough review, I believe H.R. 13 to be constitutional.

First, Article III of the Constitution grants the Legislature the authority to "make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper." This provision vests the House with powers broad in discretion to address matters of national significance including the regulations of property and the prevention of crime. The Livestock Protection Act looks to address theft, rustling, smuggling, and trafficking of livestock, which is a matter of economic and cultural importance to many towns within Cascadia. Creating such a national framework to protect livestock as property of the town, are within those powers.

Secondly, Article III § 7 reserves significant powers to the towns including authority over their municipal governance and property. While this Clause in the Constitution safeguards local autonomy it does not exclude the legislature from enacting laws that provide a general framework for property protection and criminal accountability. The Livestock Protection Act harmonizes with these reserved powers by recognizing the livestock within a town's borders as property of the town, represented by the Mayor.

Importantly, the Act does not preclude towns from adopting their own rules governing the use, sale, or management of the livestock. Rather, it creates a baseline for legal protection against theft and rustling, leaving room for further defining and regulating livestock ownership in a manner consistent with their local

government structure. Meaning the Mayor can just immediately distribute the proof of sale of all Livestock within the towns so the residents within don't have any issues with Theft, Rustling, or Trafficking of their Property outside the town in the future.

In conclusion, despite the opinion of the court's majority, I believe in this bill's constitutionality.

PAPER1EMUR *v.* SHADOWCIPHER

ORIGINAL ACTION IN THE SUPREME COURT OF CASCADIA

No. 0077. Argued January 7, 2025—Decided January 19, 2025.

SYLLABUS

In the month of December, 2024, the Department of the Interior hosted an Icerail Design Competition, for a gold prize. The Department of the Interior stated a deadline for entries, however the Department extended the deadline to allow an additional entry, City Central Station, into the competition, which then received a portion of the gold prize.

Paper1emur, a participant in the competition, sued the Department of the Interior, led by then-Secretary Shadowcipher, for the admittance of the City Central Station into the iceraill station competition on the basis that it was a violation of Cascadian contract law, and potentially a violation of equal protection under Amendment VIII of the National Constitution.

The court unanimously upheld the legality of the competition and inclusion of City Central Station, rejecting the legal arguments made by the petitioner.

SayerQT, C.J., delivered the opinion for the unanimous court, with a concurring opinion from Justice xBest_Name_Everx.

Akeboun argued the cause for petitioner.
Xeocas argued the cause for respondent.

OPINION OF THE COURT

Chief Justice SAYERQT delivered the opinion of the Court, joined by Justice WRESTLINGWITHGOD.

In the matter at hand, the Court unanimously upholds the legitimacy of the Icerail Station Competition organized by the Department of the Interior and its results.

Amendment XIII of the Constitution requires all citizens be granted equal protection under the law. The question, in my view, was whether or not the

Department of the Interior violated equal protection by granting extra time to an individual. As there was no evidence provided showing malicious intent by the Department of the Interior to grant extra time to a specific individual and not all citizens equally, or that other individuals were denied ability to submit, the court defers to the discretion of the Department of the Interior to operate their competition as appropriated by the National Budget in the way that the Department sees best fit.

The court also upholds the argument made by the defendant that Cascadian Contract Law does not presently allow for judicial interpretation of informal "simple" contracts, as current law requires "all" contracts to be signed in the presence of the Attorney-General. Thus, the original competition date did not constitute a contract.

It is so ordered.

Justice XBEST_NAME EVERX, concurring.

I want to preface my opinion by stating that it is an unfortunate reality that the law does not always directly correspond to what is rational or fair practice. My opinion on who is morally in the right in this case differs from my opinion on the merits of the case.

That being said, I believe it is the case that the National Constitution and law are on the side of the respondent for the reasons articulated in the majority court opinion. Unfortunately the Cascadian Contract Law does use language that requires "all" contracts to be verified by the attorney general, including what the law otherwise defines as "Simple Contracts". It is also clear to me that while this was not the original intention of the law, nonetheless it is the actual meaning of the law as written.

Additionally, the extension of the contest for one person to submit does certainly creates an appearance of impropriety, irrespective of whether or not the secretary was actually conspiring with the contestant. While I strongly believe and recommend that our government should avoid taking actions that create such an appearance of corruption, absent actual proof that the contest was decided unfairly this appearance of impropriety is not enough to violate the law as it stands today.

Tl;dr they don't think it be like it is but it do.

THE PEOPLE *v.* AKEBOUN

ORIGINAL CRIMINAL TRIAL IN THE SUPREME COURT OF CASCADIA

No. 0095. Argued XX—Decided XX.

SYLLABUS

Akeboun, as Secretary of Defense, made several statements in a diplomatic channel without authorization from the Secretary of State. The Department of Justice, under Attorney General Flors, filed charges against Akeboun under the Diplomatic Re-Organization Act of February 2025.

Chief Justice SayerQT, presiding, delivered the verdict of the court following the court's unanimous decision.

Flors argued the cause for the People.

Akeboun argued the cause for himself.

OPINION OF THE COURT

Chief Justice SAYERQT delivered the verdict.

The court unanimously rules Akeboun **not guilty** of the charges of violation of the Diplomatic Re-Organization Act of February 2025.

While the court recognizes that Akeboun in his capacity as Secretary of Defense was not immune to the provisions of the act restricting unauthorized discussion in diplomatic discussions as a diplomat of Cascadia, the court finds that the actions taken by Akeboun were not "conduct[ing] discussions, [making] promises, or otherwise interfer[ing] in diplomatic channels".

Thus, the court finds Akeboun not guilty of the charges.

It is so ordered.