OFFICIAL REPORTS

OF

THE SUPREME COURT

NOVEMBER 27, 2022 THROUGH APRIL 12, 2026



REPUBLIC OF CASCADIA

SUPREME COURT OF CASCADIA

CITY OF OLYMPIA

JUSTICES

OF THE

SUPREME COURT

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.
SAYERLEFT, Chief and Associate Justice.
MOGGS, Chief and Associate Justice.
BACHINUNI, Associate Justice.
YAPANNN, Associate Justice.
JAGL05, Associate Justice.
DRACNOIAN, Associate Justice.
FAROSH, Chief and Associate Justice.
AHEA, Associate Justice.
THEEHAWAIIAN, Associate Justice.
MILGORN123, Associate Justice.
BERGENFLY, Associate Justice.

Table of Contents

The xBEST_NAME_EVERx Court pg. 4

The People v. Cowilo, et al. . . . 5

Sayerleft *v.* Bachinuni . . . 7

The First WRESTLINGWITHGOD Court pg. 9

Akeboun *v.* N_S_X . . . 10

Cascadia *v.* AllStarPro90 . . . 12

OhGizmo *v.* Milgorn123 . . . 13

Akeboun *v.* Moxies_hoe . . . 15

The BEAMZ30 Court pg. 18

Bon_Kranch *v.* Cascadia . . . 19

The SAYERLEFT Court pg. 23

Hersheylr *v.* Cascadia . . . 24

Flatvent_one *v.* WrestlingWithGod . . . 26

Bunilky *v.* City of Fresno . . . 29

City of Fresno *v.* myfriendisdumb . . . 31

Cascadia *v.* Town of Death Valley . . . 32

Cascadia *v.* Draconian, Capitanfra . . . 34

Public Advocate *v.* Cascadia In Re: Pub.L. 23-7 . . . 36

Cascadia *v.* Limao_mao . . . 40

In Re: Livestock Protection Act . . . 42

Paper1emur *v.* ShadowCipher . . . 47

The People *v.* Akeboun . . . 49

Zerospace007 *v.* CheesyTomatos . . . 50

Akeboun *v.* Cascadia (2025) . . . 52

Raptormm4 *v.* Setrus . . . 53

The Second WRESTLINGWITHGOD Court pg. 51

The People *v.* Explosivefirework, et al. . . . 56

Cascadia *v.* City of Seattle . . . 58

LadyEsquimalt *v.* Milgorn123 . . . 60

The People *v.* Setrus . . . 62

TomasSMP *v.* StarSlayer0818 . . . 70

(Continued)

The FAROSH Court pg. 72
Akeboun *v.* Bergenfly 73
Akeboun *v.* Cascadia (2026) 76
Raptormm4 *v.* Cascadia 78
Lovelyfurball *v.* EmpressCorgo 81
Final Words pg. 83

CASES ADJUDGED

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF CASCADIA

AT

OLYMPIA, 2022–2026

THE FOLLOWING CASES WERE ADJUDGED

DURING THE TENURE OF

XBEST_NAME_EVERX

CHIEF JUSTICE OF CASCADIA



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.

Sayerleft 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.

SAYERLEFT *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 ⅔ 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 Sayerleft 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.

Sayerleft 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, Sayerleft, 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.

CASES ADJUDGED
IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF CASCADIA
AT
OLYMPIA, 2022–2026

THE FOLLOWING CASES WERE ADJUDGED
DURING THE FIRST TENURE OF
WRESTLINGWITHGOD
CHIEF JUSTICE OF CASCADIA



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.
Sayerleft 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.

CASES ADJUDGED
IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF CASCADIA
AT
OLYMPIA, 2022–2026

THE FOLLOWING CASES WERE ADJUDGED
DURING THE TENURE OF

BEAMZ30

CHIEF JUSTICE OF CASCADIA



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 Sayerleft 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 SAYERLEFT delivered the opinion of the Court, joined by Chief Justice BEAMZ30.

The court has, in a unanimous decision, held that any actions of the Executive branch that Bon_Kranch accused of occuring, 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.

CASES ADJUDGED
IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF CASCADIA
AT
OLYMPIA, 2022–2026

THE FOLLOWING CASES WERE ADJUDGED
DURING THE TENURE OF

SAYERLEFT
CHIEF JUSTICE OF CASCADIA



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. Hersheylr, 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 Hersheylr'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.

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

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

OPINION OF THE COURT

Chief Justice SAYERLEFT 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.

Sayerleft, 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 SAYERLEFT 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 Hersheylr, 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.

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

Hersheylr argued the cause for petitioner.
Milgorn123 argued the cause for respondent.

OPINION OF THE COURT

Chief Justice SAYERLEFT 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.

Sayerleft, 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 SAYERLEFT 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.

Sayerleft, 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 SAYERLEFT 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.

Sayerleft, 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 SAYERLEFT 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.

Sayerleft, 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 SAYERLEFT 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.

Sayerleft, 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 SAYERLEFT 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.

Sayerleft, 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 SAYERLEFT 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 icerail 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.

Sayerleft, 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 SAYERLEFT 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 March 15, 2025—Decided April 6, 2025.

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 Sayerleft, 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 SAYERLEFT 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.

ZEROSPACE007 *v.* CHEESYTOMATOS

ORIGINAL ACTION IN THE SUPREME COURT OF CASCADIA
No. 0096. Argued April 10, 2025—Decided April 30, 2025.

SYLLABUS

The plaintiff, zerospace007, filed a civil suit challenging his alleged seizure, killing, and expulsion by Mayor CheesyTomatos of the City of Langley, the municipality in Cascadia in which he resided. He requested compensation by the Court and a correction of alleged wrongs.

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

Zerospace007 argued the cause for himself.
CheesyTomatos argued the cause for himself.

OPINION OF THE COURT

Chief Justice SAYERLEFT delivered the opinion of the Court, joined by Justices XBEST_NAME_EVERX and DRACNOIAN.

In the matter at hand, this Court, acting unanimously, renders its decision that the plaintiff is entitled to the return of any seized items and reiterates the court's decision in *Bunilky v. City of Fresno* R.C. 25 (2024/4) that while towns withhold the authority under Art. 3 §7 over the "composition of their populace," which grants a right of towns to kick residents without cause, the National Constitution in Art. 1 §4 still entitles all citizens under the jurisdiction of Cascadia to the right to preservation of property against seizure without just compensation. As was established in the 8th Amendment to the Constitution (2024), governments of both national and local levels may not deprive property without providing due process. A government, regardless of its level, thus, may not forcibly seize property without first obtaining a court order or a legal process that ensures due process and equal protection under the law. Any citizen, if their rights are to be infringed at all, must at the very minimum have a fair hearing or impartial tribunal to ensure the law is being equally applied to all.

In this case, the court finds that while there may have been reasonable cause for the city to remove the plaintiff's residency (as it is the mayor's constitutional prerogative), seizure of property without due process or just compensation was unlawful and a violation of the plaintiff's constitutional rights.

Due to the nature of the case, the court unanimously issues a writ of mandamus requiring the defendant, Mr. CheesyTomatos, to return seized items from the plaintiff; however, it does not require the restoration of his residency in the city.

It is so ordered.

AKEBOUN *v.* CASCADIA

ORIGINAL ACTION IN THE SUPREME COURT OF CASCADIA
No. 0109. Argued July 17, 2025—Decided July 21, 2025.

SYLLABUS

The petitioner, Akeboun, filed a suit challenging the constitutionality of Public Law 35-21, also known as An Act to Make Spoiling the Daily Wordle Illegal on the grounds that it violated his and his fellow citizens' right to free speech.

Justice TheeHawaiian delivered the opinion for the unanimous court.

Akeboun argued the cause for himself.
Flors argued the cause for Cascadia.

OPINION OF THE COURT

Justice THEEHAWAIIAN delivered the opinion of the Court, joined by Justices XBEST_NAME_EVERX, WRESTLINGWITHGOD, FAROSH_, and SAYERLEFT.

In the matter at hand, the Court unanimously agrees that Pub.L. 35-21 violates Article 1, Section 1 of the National Constitution.

The Court upholds that while the sharing of spoilers may be considered irritating and annoying, it remains constitutionally protected speech, that spoiling the daily Wordle does not endanger public safety or endanger national security, therefore not constituting a valid repression of free speech, making the law enacted by the Legislature unconstitutional.

It is so ordered.

RAPTORMM4 *v.* SETRUS

ORIGINAL ACTION IN THE SUPREME COURT OF CASCADIA
No. 0107. Argued July 16, 2025—Decided July 27, 2025.

SYLLABUS

The petitioner, Raptormm4, filed a civil suit against Setrus for allegedly violating his and others' free speech by removing reactions made by citizens who were not members of the House of Representatives on proposed bills in the House of Representatives. These reactions included emojis such as ✅ or ❌, which were used by the House of Representatives to record the voting of members.

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

Raptormm4 argued the cause for himself.
Akeboun argued the cause for Setrus.

OPINION OF THE COURT

Chief Justice SAYERLEFT delivered the opinion of the Court, joined by Justices THEEHAWAIIAN, WRESTLINGWITHGOD, and XBEST_NAME_EVERX.

In the matter at hand, the Court unanimously holds that the removal of reactions on introduced House proposals by an administrator who was not an officer of the Legislature duly authorized to do so was, in fact, an unconstitutional violation of the petitioner's and similarly affected individuals' free speech, as protected by Art. I Sec. 1 of the National Constitution.

The laws of Cascadia have consistently defined the role of administrators as that of a law enforcement officer. As Art. 4 Sec. 3 of the National Constitution grants the Legislature alone the power to "determine the rules of its proceedings," and since the House has not adopted a standing rule permitting administrators to silence the speech of non-members in the form of reactions on debates, an administrator, acting as a law enforcement officer, had no legal basis for removing these reactions. As such, since neither public safety nor national security was threatened by the reactions, they count as valid political speech. This would remain the case for any future incidents unless the House were to take action to regulate

and censor speech within the domain of the Legislature, as that channel would be considered.

It is so ordered.

CASES ADJUDGED
IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF CASCADIA
AT
OLYMPIA, 2022–2026

THE FOLLOWING CASES WERE ADJUDGED
DURING THE SECOND TENURE OF

WRESTLINGWITHGOD

CHIEF JUSTICE OF CASCADIA



THE PEOPLE *v.* EXPLOSIVEFIREWORK ET AL.

ORIGINAL CRIMINAL TRIAL IN THE SUPREME COURT OF CASCADIA
No. 0103. Argued July 15, 2025—Decided August 23, 2025.

SYLLABUS

Defendants Explosivefirewk, Setrus, and SergioTheCrafter drew images of a swastika on Wordle #1486. A subpoena was ordered by the House of Representatives to investigate potential collaboration, after which the Department of Justice brought forth charges against each for treachery as defined in the Major Crimes Act, Pub.L. 30-14, Section 5-1, for alleged refusal to comply with the subpoenas and the surrounding investigation.

Justice Ahea delivered the unanimous verdict, with a concurring opinion from Justice Farosh_.

SirMikieu argued the cause for the People.
Akeboun argued the cause for Explosivefirework, Setrus, and SergioTheCrafter.

OPINION OF THE COURT

Justice AHEA delivered the unanimous verdict, joined by Justices THEEHAWAIIAN, WRESTLINGWITHGOD, and XBEST_NAME_EVERX.

The court has unanimously determined that Explosivefirewk, Setrus, and SergioTheCrafter are not guilty of the charge of treachery defined in Pub.L. 30-14.

While the Court recognizes that using the Wordle platform to illustrate swastikas is absolutely distasteful and against the values and virtues of the Republic of Cascadia, this provocative joke is protected under the Constitution's freedom of speech guarantees.

The court is further in accordance that there was no legal requirement to comply with the subpoena on behalf of the defendants, as it was illegal in scope as the law stands, requesting private messages. Article 3 Section 5.8 of the Cascadian Constitution, which defines the powers of the Cascadian Legislature, grants it the

"authority within the constraints of law over the Discord server in which the Republic's institutions are housed". As the subpoenaed materials fall outside of this jurisdiction, there is no legal mandate to comply, thus rendering all defendants not guilty of the presented charge.

The court urges the legislature better define the rules, scope, and limits of subpoenas. At present, there exists nearly no mentions of them beyond the House Standing Rules, rendering them legally undefined and nebulous.

It is so ordered.

Justice FAROSH, concurring.

The Constitution is crystal clear on its guarantee of freedom of speech. That said, my fellow Justices agree the decision to draw swastikas on the daily Wordle was in poor taste. Nevertheless, evidence submitted to the Court does not suggest that such an expression was used to incite or direct hatred towards any individuals or groups in the Discord, despite the deeply offensive nature of the symbol.

I believe the swastikas were drawn with the intent to elicit or provoke a reaction. Some of the Defendants may contend they followed along with the 'joke', and indeed this is plausible, as there is no conclusive evidence suggesting the contrary. Despite this, the line drawn by the rules was crossed, eliciting a reaction that may have been anticipated, but a fallout that certainly nobody could have predicted, with a handful of individuals leaving the nation and EMC entirely.

Cascadia has been proud to set itself apart from the wider toxic communities on EMC, which contain egregious examples of hate and bigotry. While the Court has previously upheld Discord's TOS to be held higher than the Constitution in regard to moderation (*Flatvent_One v. WrestlingWithGod*), we must hold ourselves to better standards, along with moderation that maintains a friendly community, but does not abridge the basic right to freedom of speech.

CASCADIA *v.* CITY OF SEATTLE

ORIGINAL ACTION IN THE SUPREME COURT OF CASCADIA
No. 119. Argued August 27, 2025—Decided September 14, 2025.

SYLLABUS

The Attorney-General, Mikieu, filed a civil suit against the City of Seattle for issuing a proclamation on August 25, 2025, banning Texan and Vermont citizens and encouraging the killing of those who entered the city. The Petitioner also argued that the mayor of Seattle, Milgorn123, violated Section 5, Clause A of Pub.L. 30-14, the Major Crimes Act, claiming he knowingly obstructed or impeded constitutional and/or nationally mandated practices or procedures.

Justice Farosh_ delivered the opinion for the unanimous court, with a concurring opinion from xBest_Name_Everx.

Mikieu argued the cause for Cascadia.
Akeboun argued the cause for Seattle.

OPINION OF THE COURT

Justice FAROSH_ delivered the opinion of the Court, joined by Justices THEEHAWAIIAN, WRESTLINGWITHGOD, and AHEA.

The court has, in a unanimous decision, held that the City of Seattle's proclamation, issued on August 25, 2025, in response to the Treaty of Seattle, a mutual defence and friendship pact with the Republic of Vermont, was neither illegal nor unconstitutional.

It is not unconstitutional to issue statements in a proclamation; that right is protected by Article I, Section 1 of the National Constitution of Cascadia, guaranteeing freedom of speech. It is unconstitutional, and therefore unlawful, however, to deny and abridge the supreme Law of the Land, as outlined in Article VI, Section 1 of the National Constitution, which holds treaties as national law. Any attempt by the City of Seattle or its residents to enforce a Municipal Ordinance or local law in direct contradiction of national law is unconstitutional and void.

Additionally, the Petitioner, representing the Government of Cascadia, argues that the Mayor of Seattle, Milgorn123, violated Section 5, Clause A of Pub.L. 30-14, the Major Crimes Act, which provides: 'The Republic shall find a Citizen guilty if they knowingly obstruct or impede constitutional and/or nationally mandated practices or procedures.' The court finds that, as there was no attempt by the City of Seattle to enforce its proclamation, the respondent, Milgorn123, in his capacity as mayor, did not impede any such constitutional or legally mandated practices or procedures. Therefore, he is not liable under this charge.

It is so ordered.

Justice xBEST_NAME_EVERx, concurring.

While I concur with the rest of the Justices of the court that the city of Seattle's proclamation was not illegal or unconstitutional, I want to elaborate upon my reasoning for this conclusion, as it may be slightly different from theirs.

While this particular instance of a city issuing a proclamation in contradiction to national law was not illegal, this is the case because the city of Seattle did not issue the proclamation with intent, and neither the city or its agents (Milgorn) acted to fulfill the content of the proclamation.

However, to be abundantly clear, if a town were to issue a similar proclamation in contradiction to national law with intent and then act upon it, that could constitute a violation of Cascadian law.

LADYESQUIMALT *v.* MILGORN123

ORIGINAL ACTION IN THE SUPREME COURT OF CASCADIA
No. 138. Argued October 20, 2025—Decided November 12, 2025.

SYLLABUS

The petitioner, LadyEsquimalt, filed charges against the respondent, Milgorn123, for banning her on October 19, 2025, during the then-scheduled October general election, in which the petitioner was a candidate for President. The petitioner alleges that her constitutional rights to freedom of speech and to participate and vote in the election were violated, arguing that the respondent did not have the right to do so.

Justice Farosh_ delivered the opinion for the unanimous court.

KayP7 argued the cause for LadyEsquimalt.
Akeboun argued the cause for Milgorn123.

OPINION OF THE COURT

Justice FAROSH_ delivered the opinion of the Court, joined by Justices THEEHAWAIIAN, XBEST_NAME_EVERX, WRESTLINGWITHGOD,and AHEA.

The court, in a unanimous decision, rules that the respondent, Milgorn123, in his capacity as both a law enforcement officer and an Admin, is not liable for damages according to the laws and the National Constitution of Cascadia, citing *Flatvent_One v. WrestlingWithGod*.

The petitioner, LadyEsquimalt, contends that by banning her, the respondent violated Article I §1 of the National Constitution- "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", and Article 2 §1 of the National Constitution- “All citizens shall always retain the right to vote in free and fair elections pursuant to the Constitution and to law [...]”. The court finds that the respondent, in doing so, violated the petitioner’s right to freedom of speech and to vote in the October general election, in which the petitioner was a candidate for President, scheduled on the day the petitioner was banned.

Furthermore, *Flatvent_one v. WrestlingWithGod* establishes that a law enforcement officer's purview extends to enforcing Discord's Terms of Service. As the respondent could not demonstrate that the petitioner contradicted those terms, as such, the court finds that the actions of the petitioner did not constitute a violation of Discord's policy.

However, in citing the aforementioned case, the court upholds that Article I §1 of the National Constitution is to be understood as prohibiting the Legislature from creating any law that abridges any freedoms, rather than a law enforcement officer. Although the respondent's actions did contradict the Constitution, the court finds itself unable to impose a punishment, as there is no such statute on the books relating to the legality of his actions.

In addition, the Legislature, seeking to address the legal grey area surrounding moderation, passed Pub.L. 35-16, "The Administrator Accountability Act", and Pub.L. 36-16, "The Moderation Accountability Act of August 2025". The court finds both Acts unconstitutional, citing Article III §6, Clause 1 of the National Constitution- "No Bill of Attainder or ex post facto Law shall be passed." These Acts, by imposing 'strikes' on Admins for violations of their provisions, constitute a form of punishment on individuals without due process, contrary to Article I §5- "All citizens have the right to a free and fair trial for all offenses levied against an individual by an unbiased panel of judges ascertained by the Constitution and by law [...]'. Thus, while moderation remains a matter of pressing importance at the forefront of the Cascadian political debate, the court recommends that the Legislature assess the validity of amending the National Constitution to define more clearly the powers of Admins and their purview as law enforcement officers.

It is so ordered.

THE PEOPLE *v.* SETRUS

ORIGINAL CRIMINAL TRIAL IN THE SUPREME COURT OF CASCADIA
No. 139. Argued August 31, 2025—Decided January 13, 2026.

SYLLABUS

Setrus disclosed information about a classified covert intelligence operation that infiltrated foreign governments conducted by the Office of National Intelligence. He did so by leaking materials he had obtained during his tenure as president, vice president, and a high-level official in the Cascadian government to the independent newspaper known as *The Cascadian Independent*. He was charged by prosecutors with various counts of the illegal disclosure of classified information, treason, and prosecutors sought to ban Setrus from political office.

As a historically notable, high-profile, and lengthy trial, a transcript of proceedings can be found here.

Justice TheeHawaiian delivered the unanimous verdict.

Raptormm4 argued the cause for Cascadia.
Sayerleft argued the cause for Setrus.

OPINION OF THE COURT

Justice FAROSH_ delivered the unanimous verdict, joined by Justices THEEHAWAIIAN, XBEST_NAME_EVERX, WRESTLINGWITHGOD, and AHEA.

By a vote of three to zero, with two Justices recused, the Supreme Court of Cascadia finds the defendant, Mr. Setrus, guilty on all counts. follows are the findings, reasoning, and legal conclusions that lead this Court to its verdict.

I: The Legality of Executive Order 136

This Court has thoroughly deliberated on the status, scope, and legality of Executive Order 136. We find no fault, defect, or reasonable justification upon which to declare the Order unconstitutional.

Under the Classified Materials Act, the House of Representatives has expressly delegated authority to the Executive to classify and declassify information in furtherance of national security. That delegation vests the President with discretion to determine the classification status of materials, subject to statutory constraints. Executive Order 136 constitutes a lawful exercise of that delegated authority.

Accordingly, Executive Order 136 is legally binding, and classification determinations made pursuant to it are valid under Cascadian law. This conclusion is supported by the plain text, structure, and purpose of the Classified Materials Act, including, but not limited to, Sections 5, 6.2, 9.6, and 10.

The Court therefore rejects the argument that Executive Order 136 represents an unlawful expansion of executive power. Rather, it operates squarely within authority granted by the legislature.

II: Classification of the Leaked Materials

Having established the legality of Executive Order 136, the Court turns to whether the materials disclosed by the defendant were classified at the time of their release.

After review of the evidentiary record and extensive deliberation, this Court finds that the documents leaked by Mr. Setrus were classified under Cascadian law. These materials were not intended for public dissemination and were never meant to enter the public domain.

The remaining inquiry is by what legal mechanisms these materials were classified.

This Court has already determined that Executive Order 136 lawfully classified materials relating to the Great North American War. Independent of that finding, further examination of the Classified Materials Act establishes that Sections 6.2 and 9.6 apply directly to the materials at issue.

The defense argued that SCIO constitutes a foreign entity. On this point, the Court agrees. SCIO did not possess security clearance issued by the Republic of Cascadia, nor did it operate under any public treaty, agreement, or statutory framework granting it domestic status. Accordingly, this Court finds that SCIO

qualifies as a foreign government or foreign governmental entity for purposes of classification law.

Section 6.2 of the Classified Materials Act provides that information may be classified where its unauthorized disclosure could reasonably be expected to cause identifiable or describable damage to national security and where it pertains to enumerated subject matters, including:

- Military plans, equipment, or operations;
- Foreign government information;
- Intelligence activities, sources, or methods;
- Foreign relations of Cascadia;
- National security–related scientific, technological, or economic matters; or
- Vulnerabilities or capabilities of national security systems.

Section 9.6 further provides that foreign government information retaining its original classification markings need not be assigned Cascadian classification markings, provided those markings adequately serve the purposes of Cascadian classification.

This Court finds that Section 6.2 squarely applies. The unauthorized disclosure of the materials leaked by Mr. Setrus—forming the basis of four counts of unlawful disclosure—created a clear and present danger and caused grave and irreparable damage to national security.

SCIO provided intelligence using its own sources, methods, and classification systems. Information shared with the Republic of Cascadia during the Great North American War under those conditions therefore retained its classified status under Cascadian law, either directly or through incorporation pursuant to Sections 6.2 and 9.6.

The defendant's disclosure of these materials constitutes unlawful dissemination of classified information, and the Court finds him guilty on all counts arising therefrom.

III. Rejection of the Treason Theory

The Court briefly addressed the issue of treason, as it was raised in argument and discussion. While the defendant's conduct was serious and unlawful, this Court declines to expand the constitutional definition of treason beyond its established bounds.

Treason occupies a unique and deliberately narrow place in Cascadian constitutional law. To interpret "aid and comfort" as extending to peacetime disclosures would place extraordinary and dangerous discretion in the hands of the Executive, permitting treason to be charged whenever disclosure or dissent proves politically inconvenient.

Such an interpretation would be incompatible with constitutional structure and civil liberty. Accordingly, treason is inapplicable to the conduct at issue here, as the defendant was not charged with treason.

IV. Disclosure Through the Press, with Clear and Present Danger, that caused grave and irreparable damage

The Court further addresses the manner in which the classified materials were disclosed. The record establishes that Mr. Setrus leaked the materials through members of the press, rather than through any authorized governmental or oversight channel.

In *New York Times Co. v. United States*, the United States Supreme Court held that the government bears a heavy burden when seeking to impose prior restraint on the press itself.

Equally instructive is *Schenck v. United States*, in which the Court held that speech may be restricted where the words used create a clear and present danger of substantive evils that the government has a right to prevent. That principle applies with particular force in matters of national security and wartime intelligence. Even in systems recognizing constitutional speech protections, those protections have never been absolute.

Here, the unauthorized disclosure of classified intelligence materials—relating directly to military operations, foreign intelligence sources, and national security capabilities—created a clear and present danger. The harm was not speculative, hypothetical, or remote. It was immediate, identifiable, and severe.

Further, at the time of the defendant's actions, no constitutional guarantee of a free press existed under Cascadian law.

The Court therefore rejects outright any attempt to import foreign constitutional doctrines where no domestic constitutional right had been adopted. Even if such a guarantee had existed, it would not have extended to protect the defendant from criminal liability for the unauthorized disclosure of classified materials.

The press may publish; the leaker may not leak. The violation occurs at the moment classified information is knowingly transmitted without authorization, not at the moment it is printed.

The Court therefore finds that disclosure through the press does not mitigate the offense and, in fact, underscores its gravity. The defendant acted with full knowledge of the classified nature of the materials and with reckless disregard for the consequences of their release.

V. Application of the Third Amendment — Limits on Disqualification from Office

The Court next considers the implications of Amendment III to the National Constitution, which regulates candidate credentials and restricts the ability of any law, statute, or administrative action to bar a citizen from seeking public office, absent constitutionally specified circumstances.

Amendment III explicitly provides that no person shall be prohibited from candidacy for any office, except where they have:

- Been impeached, convicted, and barred as provided under constitutional procedures;
- Been convicted of Treason by the Supreme Court in a free and fair trial, with disqualification from office limited to no longer than five (5) months; or
- Been declared ineligible under specific House regulations relating to attendance.

This Court has previously found Mr. Setrus guilty of unlawful disclosure of classified information, but importantly, his conduct does not constitute treason under the law, nor does it implicate impeachment procedures. Accordingly, any statutory provision attempting to bar him from candidacy based on Section 11 of the Classified Materials Act is null and unenforceable, as it contravenes the explicit protections of Amendment III.

In other words, even if Section 11 had authorized disqualification from office, Amendment III supersedes and invalidates any such restriction, making it constitutionally impermissible to prevent Mr. Setrus from seeking office solely on the basis of his felony conviction for unlawful disclosure. The legislature or the executive branch may not circumvent Amendment III by imposing administrative penalties inconsistent with its clear text.

The Court emphasizes, however, that this constitutional protection in no way mitigates or excuses the defendant's criminal conduct. Mr. Setrus remains fully guilty on all counts of unlawful disclosure, and all legal consequences for that conviction—short of candidate disqualification—remain enforceable.

VI. Repeal of Amendment III and Ex Post Facto Considerations

It is acknowledged that Amendment III to the National Constitution, which formerly regulated candidate eligibility, has since been repealed. Notwithstanding, the Court must apply the law as it existed at the time of the defendant's conduct.

The principle of ex post facto law prohibits retroactively imposing punishment or disqualification for conduct that was not actionable under the law at the time it occurred. Accordingly:

Any attempt to charge or disqualify Mr. Setrus under the Sixteenth Amendment which repealed the Third Amendment would constitute an impermissible ex post facto application, and is therefore invalid.

Section 11's office-disqualification provision remains unenforceable, both on constitutional grounds (as previously noted under Amendment III) and in light of the defendant's temporal protections.

The Court reiterates that the unconstitutionality of Section 11 and the repeal of Amendment III do not affect the validity of the conviction itself. Mr. Setrus knowingly and willfully disclosed classified materials in violation of the Classified Materials Act and Executive Order 136. These acts were fully actionable and illegal at the time they were committed, independent of any subsequent legislative or constitutional changes.

In short, while Mr. Setrus retains full legal rights to seek public office, he remains guilty on all counts of unlawful disclosure of classified information, and all other consequences not barred by ex post facto principles are fully enforceable.

VII. Penalties and Enforcement

While this Court has found Section 11 of the Classified Materials Act unconstitutional in so far as it purports to bar the defendant from seeking public office, it is clear that the statute's financial penalty provision remains valid and enforceable.

The record demonstrates that the prosecution sought a fine of 400 gold (400G) against Mr. Setrus. The Court finds this fine unproportional to the severity

of the unlawful disclosure, but consistent with the legislative intent of Section 11, and legally permissible under Cascadian law.

Office disqualification provisions are unconstitutional, as they violate both the prior protections of Amendment III and fundamental principles of candidate eligibility. The Court therefore cannot, and does not, bar the defendant from seeking or holding office.

Monetary penalties are distinct from candidate eligibility restrictions. The statutory fine of 400G is a lawful, civil consequence of the defendant's knowing and willful disclosure of classified information.

The Court emphasizes that Mr. Setrus's guilt is fully independent of Section 11's unconstitutional provisions. He knowingly transmitted classified materials to unauthorized persons, creating a clear and present danger to national security, and thereby satisfies all statutory elements of unlawful disclosure under the Classified Materials Act and Executive Order 136.

Accordingly, while Mr. Setrus may not be barred from office, he is liable for the assessed fine of 400G, and this judgment remains enforceable.

VIII: Conclusion and lessons learned

Our legal system was constructed one law at a time over the course of three years, often in response to immediate circumstances rather than long-term coherence. As a result, newer statutes have not always accounted for older provisions, specific phrasing, or inherited terminology, producing a legal framework that is dense, layered, and at times internally strained. This case stands as a clear example of those structural realities.

Despite those challenges, the Court is unequivocal on one critical point: SCIO and all materials relating to it remain classified under Cascadian law. The classification of SCIO intelligence does not lapse through political debate, public controversy, or retrospective disagreement with the policy choices that produced it. Classification endures unless lawfully revoked by proper authority, and no such revocation occurred here.

SCIO intelligence was provided to Cascadia during the Great North American War, was classified by a foreign government, and was subsequently

protected under Sections 6.2 and 9.6 of the Classified Materials Act, as well as Executive Order 136. That classification survives both the end of the conflict and the passage of time. The Court explicitly rejects any interpretation that would allow classified intelligence to lose its protected status merely because it is politically inconvenient, controversial, or embarrassing.

The Court further emphasizes that the act of leaking classified material to the press does not transform that material into unclassified information. Publication does not cure illegality, nor does it retroactively legitimize unauthorized disclosure. To hold otherwise would render the entire classification regime unenforceable and reward unlawful conduct with legal absolution.

Mr. Setrus's conduct squarely falls into the latter category. He knowingly and willfully disclosed classified SCIO-related materials, creating a clear and present danger to the security interests of Cascadia. That conduct is criminal, punishable, and adjudicated as such. At the same time, constitutional safeguards prevent the expansion of punishment beyond what the law permits.

This case illustrates the delicate balance between executive authority, legislative intent, and judicial restraint. The Court has enforced the law as written, declined to stretch constitutional definitions beyond their intended bounds, and reaffirmed that classification regimes remain enforceable only when applied precisely and lawfully.

The law is a precise endeavor. Yet precision does not mean simplicity. It demands restraint, clarity, and an acceptance that justice sometimes lies not in maximal punishment, but in correct application.

It is so ordered.

TOMASSMP *v.* STARSLAYER0818

ORIGINAL ACTION IN THE SUPREME COURT OF CASCADIA
No. 140. Argued November 11, 2026—Decided January 15, 2026.

SYLLABUS

The petitioner, TomasSMP, sued the respondent, StarSlayer0818, for custody of the frog, Gobble. In Mid-november 2025, the petitioner found Gobble on an abandoned plot he claimed ownership of in Astoria. Concerned for the animal's welfare, however, the respondent made frequent visits to the frog's home and gave it the name Gobble minutes after discovery. The petitioner maintains that Gobble has been adequately cared for and contends that the respondent's allegations of mistreatment are not grounds for the respondent to claim custody.

Justice Farosh_ delivered the opinion for the unanimous court.

TomasSMP argued the cause for himself.
Bergenfly argued the cause for StarSlayer0818.

OPINION OF THE COURT

Justice FAROSH_ delivered the opinion of the Court, joined by Justices THEEHAWAIIAN, XBEST_NAME_EVERX, WRESTLINGWITHGOD, and AHEA.

The Court, in a unanimous decision, rules that the petitioner, TomasSMP, retains custody of his frog, Gobble.

The Court finds that the common law legal term of 'ferae naturae' (of a wild nature) applies to the circumstances in which Gobble was found; animals that are not tamed or domesticated through in-game mechanics are considered the property of no one until 'captured'. In this case, animals that are on a private entity or an individual's estate, consistent with the plot-ownership agreement with the town, the owner, if pursuing or attempting to apprehend ferae naturae, is likely to be deemed, by this court, the rightful possessor of the animal. Therefore, TomasSMP, the owner of the plots on which Gobble was found, can claim legal custody of the frog.

Furthermore, the Defence, representing defendant Starslayer0818, argued that the petitioner violated the Astorian Town Ordinances, namely, the rules on pages 4 and 6, which state: “do not damage or edit public roads or sidewalks [...]” and “if your plot is empty for your first 5 days and someone else is interested in that plot, they will gain ownership” respectively. The exclusive power to manage property remains a municipal matter and town right, according to Article III §7 of the National Constitution. Regulations for homes, habitats, and other buildings, and what constitutes a violation of such, remain a matter for the Astoria municipal government to decide and enforce, only within the limits of the National Constitution. The alleged violations of town ordinances, even if proven, do not, therefore, warrant lawful possession of Gobble should be forfeit.

It is so ordered.

CASES ADJUDGED
IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF CASCADIA
AT
OLYMPIA, 2022–2026

THE FOLLOWING CASES WERE ADJUDGED
DURING THE TENURE OF

FAROSH_

CHIEF JUSTICE OF CASCADIA



AKEBOUN *v.* BERGENFLY

ORIGINAL ACTION IN THE SUPREME COURT OF CASCADIA
No. 163. Argued August 25, 2025—Decided February 7, 2026.

SYLLABUS

The petitioner, Akeboun, sued the then-President, BergenFly, for deleting a message allegedly containing classified information, citing that his freedom of speech, guaranteed by Article I, §1 of the National Constitution, was violated.

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

Akeboun argued the cause for himself.
Bergenfly argued the cause for herself.

OPINION OF THE COURT

Chief Justice FAROSH_ delivered the opinion of the Court, joined by Justices THEEHAWAIIAN, XBEST_NAME_EVERX, and AHEA.

The court, acting unanimously, holds that the defendant, BergenFly, in her capacity as the then-President of Cascadia, is not liable for damages according to the laws and the National Constitution.

It is important to preface this opinion by mentioning that Cascadian law functions under common law, which is, by and large, the same as that of the United States. Large portions of the National Constitution borrow elements of the United States Constitution, so it is common practice for the Supreme Court of Cascadia to cite decisions made by its American counterpart, as they provide the most logical and legally consistent answers to difficult questions.

In *Marbury v. Madison*, therefore, the United States Supreme Court defined the difference between ministerial and discretionary acts; ministerial acts are related to duties expressly required to be performed by an official, whereas discretionary acts involve personal judgement, choice, or policy.

In this case, Pub.L. 20-5, the Classified Materials Act, imposes on the President the duty to classify materials and ensure the classification and protection of such, pursuant to Section 5, Clause 1, and Section 8, Clause 4. Since the Presidency of ViolentVampire, the second person to hold that office, the President of Cascadia has possessed limited moderation powers to ensure the laws requiring an interaction, alteration, or modification of the National Discord can be enforced. In this case, it was a leak pertaining to classified material that ran the risk of threatening national security, and the President had the authority to delete it, as compelled by the law in question.

The Court, therefore, finds that this power, although not enumerated in the National Constitution, can be taken as a power of the President, often used as a ministerial obligation to "take care that the laws be faithfully executed", citing Article IV, §6, Clause III of the National Constitution. Additionally, it is understood that this power may only be exercised within the bounds of the law, and not to infringe upon fundamental freedoms as guaranteed by the National Constitution. The duty is ministerial; the means are discretionary.

Citing *Mississippi v. Johnson*, it is true that any person or town may file a case in this court, and it may be true that such a case may be filed against the Republic of Cascadia. This court, however, is fully satisfied that this court has no jurisdiction of a case to enjoin the President in the performance of their official duties; and that no such case ought to be received by us.

It has been suggested that if the relief sought by the petitioner cannot be had against BergenFly, as President, it may be granted against BergenFly as a citizen of Cascadia. But it is plain that relief against the execution of an act of the Legislature by BergenFly is relief against its execution by the President. A case seeking an injunction against the execution of an act of the Legislature by the incumbent of the presidential office cannot be received, whether it describes them as President or as a citizen.

However, the President is not immune from the political process; allegations of misconduct can be brought forward through the mechanisms found in the National Constitution. Accordingly, when a petitioner seeks judicial relief from government officials, such relief must be sought against the Republic of Cascadia, and not the President personally.

In addition, during proceedings, the defendant, BergenFly, argued her case, citing *OhGizmo v. Milgorn123*, a case in which the petitioner sought relief from a moderation action taken by the then-President, Milgorn123. Upon review, the Court finds that the reasoning established by *OhGizmo v. Milgorn123* is inconsistent with the precedent established in this present ruling. Accordingly, *OhGizmo v. Milgorn123* is expressly overruled.

It is so ordered.

AKEBOUN *v.* CASCADIA

ORIGINAL ACTION IN THE SUPREME COURT OF CASCADIA
No. 164. Argued August 25, 2025—Decided February 7, 2026.

SYLLABUS

The petitioner, Akeboun, filed this suit against Cascadia, contending that then-President BergenFly deleted a message allegedly containing classified information on the House Floor, violating his freedom of speech, guaranteed by Article I, §1 of the National Constitution. The petitioner further claimed that the President's official act imposed legal responsibility on the entire government.

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

Akeboun argued the cause for himself.
SirMikieu and *Xeocas* argued the cause for Cascadia.

OPINION OF THE COURT

Chief Justice FAROSH_ delivered the opinion of the Court, joined by Justices THEEHAWAIIAN, XBEST_NAME_EVERX, MILGORN123, and AHEA.

In the matter at hand, the Court unanimously finds that the Republic of Cascadia is the proper defendant in actions seeking relief from official conduct, citing Akeboun v. BergenFly.

In this case, the petitioner, Akeboun, failed to establish an infringement of Article 1, §1 of the National Constitution or an unlawful exercise of the government's authority, prompting the Court's inquiry to focus on the proper party against whom relief shall be sought. The question of whether or not the President has the authority to delete classified information, as compelled by the Classified Materials Act, has been answered in *Akeboun v. BergenFly*, which the petitioner filed alongside this case.

The plaintiff argued that the President's political representation is synonymous with legal responsibility. The Court, however, holds that while the President represents the state politically and symbolically, their acts are exercised

through the office alone, and are attributable to the state solely through that office, not as a collective act of the entire government, nor as acts of a private citizen.

It is so ordered.

RAPTORMM4 *v.* CASCADIA

ORIGINAL ACTION IN THE SUPREME COURT OF CASCADIA
No. 165. Argued February 20, 2026—Decided February 25, 2026.

SYLLABUS

On February 19th, 2026, President Ahea signed Pub.L. 43-2, later amended by Pub.L. 43-3, providing the leaders of three planned Terra Nostra nations: Mexico, Acadia, and Cariboo, gold to purchase EarthMC Premium, allowing their nations to join the reset server earlier, and providing those nations an advantage over those whose members could not purchase the Premium rank.

On February 20th, Raptormm4, the leader of the Walt Disney Company, another planned Nostra nation, filed a suit against the Government of Cascadia, alleging his right to equal protection under the 8th Amendment was violated by the Acts, which he argued unfairly deprived him of gold, which he might use to purchase Premium for his own nation.

Justice Bergenfly delivered the opinion for the unanimous court.

Raptormm4 argued the cause for himself.
KayP7 argued the cause for Cascadia.

OPINION OF THE COURT

Justice BERGENflY delivered the opinion of the Court, joined by Justices FAROSH_, THEEHAWAIIAN, XBEST_NAME_EVERX, and MILGORN123.

In the matter at hand, the Court unanimously upholds Pub.L. 43-2 and Pub.L. 43-3, 'The Gold Fund for Premium Early Access Act', and 'An Amendment to the Gold Fund for Premium Early Access Act because prices are going up fast Act' as constitutional.

It is clear to the Court that in certain situations, the legislature is allowed to pick and choose where the nation's funds may be spent, provided they are able to give proper reasoning for such a decision. There is a long history of private laws being passed to reimburse individuals for actions which benefited the nation, as

well as laws which provided funding to select towns, decided by the Legislature. Article 3, §5, Clause I of the National Constitution states: 'The Legislature shall have power to lay and use collected donations, Indirect taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common defence and general welfare of Cascadia'. It is a political question, therefore, for the legislature to decide the best way to provide for the common defence and general welfare of Cascadia, and in most situations, there would be no standing to challenge such a decision.

Every appropriation necessarily prioritises something over others. For example, Acadia and Cariboo are two planned nations for Terra Nostra with an abundant population of active players within Cascadia; this prioritisation is a core legislative function. The 8th Amendment, the Cascadian equivalent of the Equal Protection Clause, may be applicable to this case if the Legislature had passed an act appropriating funds for every 'successor nation', and the Executive had chosen to distribute the gold in a way that benefits only a select few. In this case, the Legislature acted with a legitimate purpose and a rational connection to that purpose, and these acts plainly do so.In the matter at hand, the Court unanimously upholds Pub.L. 43-2 and Pub.L. 43-3, 'The Gold Fund for Premium Early Access Act', and 'An Amendment to the Gold Fund for Premium Early Access Act because prices are going up fast Act' as constitutional.

It is clear to the Court that in certain situations, the legislature is allowed to pick and choose where the nation's funds may be spent, provided they are able to give proper reasoning for such a decision. There is a long history of private laws being passed to reimburse individuals for actions which benefited the nation, as well as laws which provided funding to select towns, decided by the Legislature. Article 3, §5, Clause I of the National Constitution states: 'The Legislature shall have power to lay and use collected donations, Indirect taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common defence and general welfare of Cascadia'. It is a political question, therefore, for the legislature to decide the best way to provide for the common defence and general welfare of Cascadia, and in most situations, there would be no standing to challenge such a decision.

Every appropriation necessarily prioritises something over others. For example, Acadia and Cariboo are two planned nations for Terra Nostra with an abundant population of active players within Cascadia; this prioritisation is a core legislative function. The 8th Amendment, the Cascadian equivalent of the Equal Protection Clause, may be applicable to this case if the Legislature had passed an act appropriating funds for every 'successor nation', and the Executive had chosen

to distribute the gold in a way that benefits only a select few. In this case, the Legislature acted with a legitimate purpose and a rational connection to that purpose, and these acts plainly do so.

It is so ordered.

LOVELYFURBALL *v.* EMPRESSCORGO

ORIGINAL ACTION IN THE SUPREME COURT OF CASCADIA
No. 182. Argued March 21, 2026—Decided April 11, 2026.

SYLLABUS

The petitioner, Lovelyfurball, sued the town of Corgo's Pass and its Town Assessor and mayor, EmpressCorgo, for attempting to collect and enforce a tax on the yield of his beetroot farm, arguing that Town Ordinance No. 1, which levied the tax, violated Article III, §6, subsection II of the National Constitution of Cascadia, which prohibits direct taxation.

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

Sayerleft argued the cause for Lovelyfurball.
KayP7 argued the cause for EmpressCorgo.

OPINION OF THE COURT

Chief Justice FAROSH_ delivered the opinion of the Court, joined by Justices BERGENFLY, THEEHAWAIIAN, XBEST_NAME_EVERX, and MILGORN123.

In the matter at hand, the Court finds that the issuance and enforcement of Corgo's Pass Town Ordinance No.1 by the town of Corgo's Pass and its Town Assessor, EmpressCorgo, are unlawful and inconsistent with the National Constitution of Cascadia. The Court further finds that Article III, §6, subsection II of the National Constitution applies to towns.

Article III, §6, subsection II of the National Constitution, which provides that: 'No direct tax may be levied on the citizens of Cascadia', although framed as a limitation against the Legislature, a branch of the national government, is explicit in prohibiting all direct taxation of the citizens of Cascadia, rather than merely preventing the legislative branch from enacting a law to that effect. This prohibition acts as a constitutional protection, operating as a privilege and immunity enjoyed by Cascadians. This interpretation is given new meaning when considered alongside the precedent established by Bunikly v. Fresno and the 8th Amendment.

Citing Bunilky v. Fresno, this Court has previously held that towns fall under the meaning of the term 'government'. The Constitution elsewhere provides, in the 8th Amendment, that: '–No government entity, whether national or local, shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of any person–', thereby suggesting that the term of 'government' also refers to towns. Applying this same logic to the matter at hand, the Court sees no basis to exclude towns from the scope of constitutional prohibitions directed at the national government.

Article III, §7, Subsection II and III likewise fall within this scope; towns may only act within their lawful authority, and these clauses do not allow them to disregard other requirements within the Constitution. The exclusive power of towns to manage their property, granted by subsection III, does not authorise municipal authorities to evade the prohibition on direct taxation by asserting control over the yield of the land or property, insofar as such control operates, in substance, as a tax upon the producer, rather than a genuine exercise of regulatory or proprietary authority.

This ruling, however, would be of no consequence if the ordinance in question, Corgo's Pass Town Ordinance No.1: 'An Ordinance Establishing a Levy on Agricultural Output Within the Municipal Jurisdiction,' did not violate the National Constitution by imposing a direct tax upon the plaintiff's beetroot farm. The Court, however, finds that the ordinance does constitute a direct tax.

A direct tax, as recognised by the jurisprudence of the United States Supreme Court, upon which the Cascadian legal system draws, is generally characterised as a capitation or a tax upon land or other forms of property, rather than an indirect tax levied upon an event or transaction following the production of a good or service. The ordinance in question constitutes a direct tax because it is imposed directly on the producers themselves, set at a 25% rate of the 'Assessed Value of Output', which attaches itself to the ownership and use of the land and property for cultivation. In *Pollock v. Farmers Loan & Trust Co.*, the United States Supreme Court asserted that 'taxes on the rents or income of property are equally direct taxes'; the Cascadian Supreme Court finds that the same principle applies here.

It is so ordered.

FINAL WORDS

The *Republic of Cascadia Reports* was compiled by Sayerleft, who served as the 6th Chief Justice of the Republic of Cascadia for two years between August 2023 and August 2025.

I would like to express my gratitude to every judge who had the opportunity to serve on the Cascadian Supreme Court. It was my honor to create all of this with you, and serve the community we all helped create.

It is my hope that these decisions, their precedents, and their lessons can inform future courts, judges, and nations on this server, and not be in vain. While dwelling on the past creates nothing, the past does as a blueprint for how the present has been created. Let us all take the lessons and apply them to a future based in comradery, peace, and cooperation.

May Cascadia never perish.

Sayerleft