

IN THE CLARK COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT NO. 2  
STATE OF INDIANA

CONSTANCE MILLS (now HAESELEY)  
Petitioner

V. Cause Number 10D02-0508-OR-132

DALE WAYNE MILLS,  
Respondent

---

**RESPONDENT'S MEMORADUM OF LAW TO SHOW THIS COURT  
LACKS JURISDICTION**

Comes now the Respondent, *pro se*, to offer this memorandum of law to show this court is without jurisdiction to entertain motions and proceed in any fashion in this case.

28 U.S.C § 1446 (d) unambiguously states this court was divested of all jurisdictions after a proper removal was effected. 28 U.S.C. § 1446 (d),

"Promptly after the filing of such petition for the removal of a civil action and bond the defendant or defendants shall give written notice thereof to all adverse parties and shall file a copy of the petition with the clerk of such State court, which shall effect the removal and **the State court shall proceed no further unless and until the case is remanded.**"

Furthermore, 28 U.S.C. § 1446 governs the procedure for Removal of a state action to a federal court. The facts in the accompanying motion demonstrate full compliance with the federal statute. (See attached Notice of Notice of Removal and Notice of Removal cover page with date time stamp.)

A defendant seeking removal must "file in the district court of the United States for the district and division within which such action is pending a notice of removal..." 28 U.S.C. § 1446(a) (2004). In a civil action, the filing of the notice "shall effect the removal and the State court shall proceed no further unless and until the case is

remanded.” Id. at § 1446(d). In fact, a state court has a "duty ... to proceed no further in the cause.” Steamship Co. v. Tugman, 106 U.S. 118, 122 (1882); Hyde Park Partners, L.P. v. Connolly, 839 F.2d 837, 842 (1st Cir. 1988).

Since 1882, courts have consistently held that upon the filing of the petition for removal, the jurisdiction of the state court absolutely ceases, and that of the federal court immediately attaches. Steamship, 106 U.S., at 122-23. Accordingly, upon the filing of the notice of removal, unless and until remand, all further proceedings in state court are void *ab initio* because they are in fact *coram non judice*. Id.; see Hyde Park Partners, 839 F.2d, at 842 (hearing and temporary restraining order issued by state court void *ab initio* where entered following removal to federal court); Polyplastics, Inc. v. Transconex, Inc., 713 F.2d 875, 880 (1st Cir. 1983) (citing E.D. Systems Corp. v. Southwestern Bell Telephone, 674 F.2d 453, 458 (5th Cir. 1982) and Arango v. Guzman Travel Advisers Corp., 621 F.2d 1371, 1374, 1375 (5th Cir. 1980) for the proposition that post-removal Civil No. 04-2288(DRD) 3 proceedings in state court are void *ab initio* once the case is removed); Sweeney v. Resolution Trust Corp., 16 F.3d 1, 4 (1st Cir. 1994) (“purported judgment” entered by state court void *ab initio* where entered following removal to federal court); Hernandez-Lopez v. Com. of Puerto Rico, 30 F.Supp.2d 205, 211 (D. P.R. 1998); accord In re Diet Drugs, 282 F.3d 220, 231-232 (3d Cir. 2002); State of South Carolina v. Moore, 447 F.2d 1067, 1073 (4th Cir. 1971); Lowe v. Jacobs, 243 F.2d 432, 433 (5th Cir. 1957); Ward v. Resolution Trust Corp., 972 F.2d 196, 198 (8th Cir. 1992); California ex rel. Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management Dist., v. United States, 215 F.3d 1005, 1011 (9th Cir. 2000).

The removal of a case from state court to federal court effects a transfer of the entire action, including all the parties and all the claims, to the federal court. City of Gainesville v. Brown-Crummer Investment Co., 277 U.S. 54, 60 (1928); Arango v. Guzman Travel Advisors Corp., 621 F.2d 1371, 1376 (5th Cir. 1980); Murphy v. Kodz, 351 F.2d 163, 167 (9th Cir. 1965); Hartlein v. Illinois Power Co., 601 N.E.2d 720, 726 (Ill. 1992). A defendant, upon filing a notice of removal, “shall give written notice thereof to all adverse parties and shall file a copy of the notice with the clerk” of the state court, which effects the removal, 28 U.S.C. § 1446(d). At that point, “the [s]tate court shall proceed no further unless and until the case is remanded.” *Id.*

“After compliance with the removal statute[,] the jurisdiction of the [s]tate court is suspended until there has been a remand.” Levine v. Lacy, 204 Va. 297, 300, 130 S.E.2d 443, 445 (1963); accord Yarnevic v. Brink’s, Inc., 102 F.3d 753, 754 (4th Cir. 1996); Maseda v. Honda Motor Co., 861 F.2d 1248, 1254 (11th Cir. 1988); Allman v. Hanley, 302 F.2d 559, 562 (5th Cir. 1962). “Any subsequent proceedings in state court on the case are void ab initio.” Maseda, 861 F.2d at 1254-55 (citing Steamship Co. v. Tugman, 106 U.S. 118, 122 (1882)); accord South Carolina v. Moore, 447 F.2d 1067, 1073 (4th Cir. 1971). A later determination that the removal petition was not proper does not change that outcome. See Maseda, 861 F.2d at 1254 n.11; Moore, 447 F.2d at 1073; United States v. Silberglitt, 441 F.2d 225, 227 (2d Cir. 1971); Lowe v. Jacobs, 243 F.2d 432, 433 (5th Cir. 1957).

A proper filing of a notice of removal immediately strips the state court of its jurisdiction 28 U.S.C. § 1446(d), State of South Carolina v. Moore, 447 F.2d 1067, 1073 (4th Cir. 1971).

### **CONCLUSION**

Removal was procedurally correct and the clerk of the state court was properly noticed. All terms of 28 U.S.C. § 1446 were met. For the above reasons this court lacks jurisdiction to proceed in any fashion until remand. All actions by this court since removal are void ab initio.

### **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

Wherefore the Defendant requests this court rescind its order on the Hearing to Shoe Cause and proceed absolutely no further until remand. Declare all proceedings in this case in this court void ab initio since removal.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Dale Wayne Mills  
701 Summit Parkway  
Borden, IN. 47106  
Telephone: 812-246-0651  
Fax: 812-246-0652  
Email: terratrq@aol.com

DATED this 31st day of August, 2005

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

This is to certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing motion has been served via U.S. mail this 31<sup>st</sup> day of August, 2005 to

The Honorable Henry McMaster,  
Attorney General South Carolina  
P.O. Box 11549,  
Columbia, S.C. 29211,

Steven A. James, Esq.  
Attorney for Constance Mills Haeseley  
792 Folly Road - Suite 9  
Charleston, South Carolina 29412

Jonie L. Grayson, Esq.  
Attorney For Constance Mills Haeseley  
505 East Seventh Street  
Jeffersonville, IN. 47131

The Honorable Steve Carter  
Attorney General of Indiana  
Office of the Indiana Attorney General  
Indiana Government Center South  
302 W. Washington St.  
Indianapolis, IN 46204

---

Dale Wayne Mills  
701 Summit Parkway  
Borden, IN. 47106  
Telephone: 812-246-0651  
Fax: 812-246-0652  
Email: terratrq@aol.com

DATED this 31st day of August, 2005