

Deron Brunson  
138 East 12300 South #C-196  
Draper, UT 84020  
385-492-4898  
Email: atlas05@aol.com  
Pro Se

---

THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF UTAH

---

DERON BRUNSON,  
Petitioner,

v.

SPENCER COX, in his personal and official  
capacity as Governor Of Utah, and DEIDRE  
HENDERSON, in her personal and official  
capacity of Lieutenant Governor of Utah,  
Respondents.

**RULE 23C  
MOTION FOR EXPEDITED REVIEW  
OF THE PETITION FOR  
WRIT OF QUO WARRANTO  
AND TO INVOKE  
THE OBJECT PRINCIPLE OF JUSTICE**

Case No. 20250135

---

Petitioner Deron Brunson (“Brunson”) in pro se moves this court with his *Rule 23C Motion For Expedited Review of the Petition for Writ of Quo Warranto* and states:

Rule 23C of the Utah Rules of Appellate Procedure states in part “(a) A party may request expedited review on any pending motion, petition, or appeal by filing a motion with the appellate court.”

PETITION FOR WRIT OF QUO WARRANTO

This case was opened up with the filing of a petition for a writ of quo warranto (“Quo Warranto”) on February 7, 2025.

RELIEF SOUGHT

Petitioner seeks that both Respondents, Spencer Cox and Deidre Henderson (“Cox & Henderson”), are to be immediately removed from office of Governor and Lt. Governor of the State of Utah, in addition to other reliefs sought per the Quo Warranto.

## GROUND JUSTIFYING EXPEDITED REVIEW

If a purpose of war is to put into power its victor, and if a rigged election seeks to do the same thing, to put into power its victor, then a rigged election is an act of war.

The Quo Warranto factually provides the evidence that Cox & Henderson participated in an act of war during the last election in order that they may become the Governor and Lt. Governor. Therefor they are both guilty of committing acts of war that allowed them to obtain the offices of Governor and Lt. Governor where they now sit.

Cox & Henderson, as riggers of the last election that put themselves into office, now set in office as traitors. And as such, this is a continual attack against Brunson's liberties, his life, and his pursuit of happiness, which are protected by the Constitution of the United States and the Constitution of the State of Utah, which produces continual irreparable harm against Brunson. This harm includes but it is not limited to the trust in the sanctity of free and fair elections, and the "loss of First Amendment right freedoms..." which "...for even minimal periods of time, unquestionably constitutes irreparable injury." *Garbett v. Herbert*, 458 F. Supp. 3d 1328, 1349, 2020 BL 160572, at \*18 (D. Utah 2020).

Expediting the review of this case will remove Cox & Henderson from office, thus stopping further irreparable harm against Brunson (and consequently all Utah residents and possibly others), which is an "... experience harm that cannot be compensated after the fact by monetary damages." *Greater Yellow-stone Coal v. Flowers*, 321 F.3d 1250, 1258 (10th Cir. 2003) (quoting *Adams v. Freedom Forge Corp.*, 204 F.3d 475, 484-85 (3d Cir. 2000)) (emphasis omitted).

## THE OBJECT PRINCIPLE OF JUSTICE

Under the strict enforcement of the doctrine of The Object Principle of Justice our courts would be the most just, limited, highly effective, respected and dearly admired court system in the world. Parties in court would have a strong concept of how the court will rule before it rules, the courts would never be precarious. And it would forever end the temperature bearing the decree that our courts are corrupt.

This doctrine of The Object Principle of Justice is of first impression, and is developed from the United States Constitution, the Declaration of Independence and supportive case law.

Amendment IX of the Constitution states “The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.” The Constitution cannot be construed by any means, by any law, by any power, by any court of law on earth to deny or disparage our rights. These rights that cannot be violated are identified in the second clause of the Declaration Of Independence, it states: “We hold these truths to be self evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness, — That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. . .” Our God-given rights are not only self evident, but they are unalienable which means you cannot give them away and nobody can take them from you. People may have the means to violate your rights, but this does not mean they took away your rights.

Knowing that God is the author of our unalienable rights, not man, then it would presuppose that no Constitution or any kind of agency erected by man, including courts of law, can ever be construed as being the giver of our unalienable rights. But we can erect agencies to

protect these rights “That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. . .” *Id.* This court has already recognizes that this is true as found in the case of *American Bush v. City Of South Salt Lake*, 2006 Ut 40 140 P.3d.1235 stating that “In considering State constitutions we must not commit the mistake of supposing that, because individual rights are guarded and protected by them, they must also be considered as owing their origin to them. These instruments measure the powers of the rulers, but they do not measure the rights of the governed. . . . [A state constitution] is not the beginning of a community, nor the origin of private rights; it is not the fountain of law, nor the incipient state of government; it is not the cause, but consequence, of personal and political freedom; **it grants no rights to the people**, but is the creature of their power, the instrument of their convenience. Designed for their protection in the enjoyment of the **rights and powers which they possessed before the constitution was made**, it is but the framework of the political government . . . It presupposes an organized society, law, order, property, personal freedom, a love of political liberty, and enough of cultivated intelligence to know how to guard it against the encroachments of tyranny.” (Bold emphasis added)

Courts of law are governed by and subject to the consent of the people pursuant to Amendment IX, and judges are bound by Article VI of the Constitution which states “This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made Pursuance thereof; . . .shall be the supreme Law of the land; and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby.” And Article III states “The Judges, both of the supreme and inferior Courts, shall hold their Offices during good Behavior”. This is known as the “Good Behavior Clause”.

What is to be understood here is that the Constitution recognizes that it is not the giver of your rights nor can it be because it is self-evident that only God is the giver of our rights, not

man. Therefore, no man has any right to set up any kind of agency that would act as the giver of your rights. This means that because Judges are bound by the Constitution they cannot ever at any time esteem themselves as being the giver of your rights. If a Judge ever acts as the giver of your rights it may be said that he is blaspheming God—acting as though he is the giver of rights and not God, thus violating and trampling on your rights. This would no longer be in compliance with the “Good Behavior Clause” of the U.S. Constitution.

A Judge is never in any position to help one party over another because that would make him the giver of your rights. A judge should never control, affect or guide the outcome of the case, if he does, this puts him in the position of being the one who gives us our rights which fuels statements alluring that the Judge is not God (hence the saying to a judge “you’re not God”).

The case of *State v. Walker*, 267 P.3d 210, 217-218 (Utah 2011) comes close to identify that a judge is not the lawgiver, it states “For the most part, the role of modern judges is to interpret the law, not to repeal or amend it, and then to apply it to the facts of the cases that come before them. The process of interpretation, moreover, involves the judge in an exercise that implicates not the judge’s own view of what the law should be, but instead a determination of what the law is as handed down by the legislature or framers of the constitution. The judge, in other words, is not a primary lawgiver but instead an agent for the legislature or framer that played that role. This allocation of power again is deliberate. The more politically accountable bodies of government make new laws; judges, who are more insulated from political processes, simply interpret them and attempt to apply them in an objective, evenhanded manner.” This case identifies that the judge is not the primary lawgiver, however, allowing the judge to make any kind of interpretation of the law does make the Judge a lawgiver on that point.

A judge is not the giver or the interpreter of your rights, his job is to protect your rights and he does this by recognizing the law a party invokes in court. Canon 2.2 of the Code Of Judicial Conduct states that “A judge shall uphold and apply the law, and shall perform all duties of judicial office fairly and impartially.” However the Canon continues by stating that “ [1]. . .a judge must interpret and apply the law without regard to whether the judge approves or disapproves of the law in question. [2] When applying and interpreting the law, a judge may make good-faith errors of fact or law. Errors of this kind do not violate this Rule”.

The question of a judge’s power to interpret the law may appear as a requirement, but is this correct? It is not. It is the party in court who must declare unto the court their interpretation of the law and how it protects or violates their rights.

Let’s say a Defendant in court has found a law that unjustly enriches him and he uses it to protect his wrongdoing, and the Plaintiff’s argument fails in convincing the court of this wrong doing. If the court were to create its own argument to punish the wrongdoer, that would be wholly unjust because in that moment it has helped one party over the other, it prejudices one of the parties and favors the other, it also sets up the wrong doer to argue against the court, it places the court to be involved in the arguments which makes the court the giver of our rights instead of the protector of them. Furthermore, the moment the court produces an argument for a party in court it is now protecting that party, that party is now protected by the court by the court’s own volition. A court that forces the opposing party to argue with the court becomes unjust because the court and the opposing party are not on the same ground unless the court agrees to share in the liability of the case while becoming equal to the party that it protects which it cannot do and still be a judge. Under The Object Principle of Justice the court must base its decision on the most convincing argument and explain why.

Again, the last part of Canon 2.2 of the Code Of Judicial Conduct as quoted above violates the supreme law of the land including the doctrine of The Object Principle of Justice. The moment the judge makes any kind of interpretation of the law that helps one party to the demise of the other party, it has prejudiced the party it demised. It has put the party it demised in a situation that it must now argue with the court which you cannot do on equal grounds with the court because the court holds the power for the final outcome of the argument. Again, the court should not want to place itself as a contender in any court action by invoking it's own findings or arguments that is not found within the pleadings or arguments before the court. When the court invokes its own legal theory or judicial determination it favors one party over the other forcing the losing party to argue with the court if it wants to win. Where is the justice in that? Again, a direct argument with the court is not fair nor can it be because the court holds the final decision as to the outcome of the argument. As stated above, the supreme law of the law dictates that the court must act only as a referee.

If at any time the pleadings/arguments before the court are both ambiguous upon which the court cannot make a decision, the court would then have the power to make a decision of status quo without prejudice (allowing the case to remain the same as it was before it entered the court with a chance of the parties to re-invoke their arguments). This would promote the parties to produce a better interpretation of the law for the court to understand and rule on.

The object principle of justice rests on the axiom that judges cannot interpret the law, produce their own arguments to the other parties demise, and they are to referee civil cases as explained above, and allow the parties to give their interpretation of the law. Again, when both arguments fail in the eyes of the Judge, the Judge has the power to deny both arguments while

requesting that either party come back with a convincing argument or leave the case as it was found before the case was opened up. This would promote justice like never before seen.

Brunson moves this court to invoke the doctrine of The Object Principle of Justice to guide its ruling for the reasons stated above.

### CONCLUSION

Wherefore, for the above reasons given above, Brunson moves this court to review the petition for writ of quo warranto in an expedited way, and to do so under the guise of the doctrine of The Object Principle of Justice.

Humbly Submitted this the 17day of February, 2025

/s/ Deron Brunson  
Deron Brunson, pro se

### CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on the 17<sup>th</sup> day of February, 2025 I caused to be emailed to the parties named below a true and correct copy of the **RULE 23C MOTION FOR EXPEDITED REVIEW OF THE PETITION FOR WRIT OF QUO WARRANTO AND TO INVOKE THE OBJECT PRINCIPLE OF JUSTICE.**

Gov. Spencer J. Cox  
skinnerj@ballardspahr.com  
Spencercox@utah.gov

Lt. Gov. Diedre Henderson  
dmh@utah.gov

elections@utah.gov

Julia Pappas  
Deputy Director of Communications  
juliapappas@utah.gov

/s/ Deron Brunson