

In my opinion the Minnesota Probate Court should file this motion for reconsideration seal due to an unnecessary public outcry against ("STG") which will cause a high volume of traffic around my apartment building in Aurora, IL 60506-5191

**In the State of Minnesota in the County Carver District Court
First Judicial District Probate Division**

)	District Court: 10-PR-16-46
In the matter of the Estate of:)	
Prince Rogers Nelson, Decedent)	Honorable Judge Kevin W. Eide
)	Case type: Special Administration

**Motion for Reconsideration to be part of this probate case as sole owner &
Heir and to Strike the Nelson's Family as Heirs** **Filed in District Court**

JAN 06 2020

I. Authority: **State of Minnesota**

Minnesota General Rules of Practice for District Court: Title V Probate Rule 411 or any other Minnesota District Probate Authority.

Valid Will: *Minnesota Statues 524*

Minnesota Statues 524.2-602: Will May Pass: property & After-ACQUIRED Property

Court Appointed Special Administration: A Special Administrator is a temporary fiduciary appointed by the probate court in many states to marshal and preserve the assets when a delay... foreseen in appointing a permanent fiduciary.

Community Property with Right of Survivorship: *it is not a probate issue...*
When Husband dies, Wife will ... take husbands interest, and Wife will own the entire house.

Direct Application to the United States Supreme Court: *Supreme Court Rule 22:*

Amendment 1: ...freedom to petition the government for redress grievances.

Amendment 6: Right to a fair trial in criminal prosecutions,. This is a probate court. This is a civil issue **Amendment 7:** Right in civil cases. A value exceed twenty dollars. (This is a large Estate) you have the right of a trial by jury ...according to the rule of common law.

Amendment 14: ...nor shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws...

United States Constitution: Amendment V: Due Process of the law **5th Amendment** further protects property, by stating, "NO person shall be

deprived of life liberty or property without due process of law nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.

United Nation Human Rights: Universal Declaration of Human Rights Article 17 (1) everyone has the right to own property alone as well as in association with other (2) No one shall be arbitrarily deprive of his or her property. (Petition)

World Court of Justice: Rules Procedure of the World Court: Purpose of the World Court of Justice (A-C) (See: Website using internet Explore)

World Court Causes or Action: Interference with the person, freedom or property of another without his consent...toward a single person (S.T.G.). Inflicting physical or mental harm...forcing a person to performing some action against her will preventing a person from performing an action against her will. Inference with the property means any damage, destruction, use causation of change, taking of possession, or prevention of access or use by the owner. (See: Website using internet Explore) (Petition)

Manifest Error: An error that is obvious and disputable, that warrants reversal on appeal.

II. Introduction

This petitioner ("STG") has filed a charge with the United Nations and has reported an Estate Robbery. In addition, this petitioner ("STG") has contacted the World Court of Justice. The Nelson Family has been appoint by the court the Heirs of the Late Prince Rogers Nelson Estate and this family do not have the funds to secure any Estate Taxes. This legal procedure by the Nelson's Family to enforce their ownership rights of the Estate has caused a legal hold up. Therefore, this has open the door to excessive use of funds from the Estate. If the proper legal research has been truthfully presented during any probate legal discovery, everything

such as any ownership titles and property deeds etc... Has my name ("STG") on it as the owner. Since, I am still alive it is not a probate issue. Therefore, any relatives or court appointed heirs of The Late Prince Rogers Nelson's Estate should deal with me directly and privately, and not waste the time of the probate court nor appeal courts.

Anything I request should be deliver to me at my convenience. An Estate Bond was post to secure the cost of estate taxation payments and legal defense payments on the behalf of the Estate. This probate case has been running too long. Due to a manifest error, of an order dated: December 22, 2017 which is an order restricting submission and it removed me from the case caption. (See: Exhibit 1) This petitioner ("STG") would like to have reconsideration and be the sole heir and have funding as soon as possible. All ownership rights and privileging should have been granted to "STG" like the following case: In Re Estate of Ralph M. Fults, Supreme Court of Minnesota, April 26, 1929, No. 27. 306. Ralph M. Fults appealed from a judgment of the District Court of Hennepin County order of the Probate Court, which awarded the residue of the Estate to Johanna Fults, widow of the decedent. The concerns was distributing according to the laws of the State of Washington or distributing according to the Laws of the State of Minnesota. Washington was the State at time of death of Ralph M. Fults. The Supreme Court of Minnesota affirmed the Judgement of the trial court, which awarded the residue of the estate to the widow Johanna

Fults. Johanna Fults was a resident of California. It is 2019 and a few months it will be 2020, and this case should be a standard. The Estate cash and property value in this 1929 probate case In re Estate of Ralph M. Fults, is not as rich as the Late Prince Rogers Nelson Estate. However, the case legal theory are similar. I am sure probate court has changed since 1929 due to the recovery of the United States Great Depression Era and economical inflation. Now, in In re Estate of O' Connor, which is a case, which was review by the Supreme Court of Minnesota on February 23, 1934. The decedent died with a duly executed Will, due to the change in the estate case the Minnesota Probate Court revoked the Will of the decedent's Richard T. O'Conner. The Late Prince Rogers Nelson had an executed Will and for some reason he died interstate which means without a Will. Elvis Presley died with a duly executed Will and Graceland belongs to his daughter Lisa Maria Presley. Paisley Park belongs to "STG", but it a legal hold on the Estate and all musical rights. The Late Prince Rogers Nelson is the blood of the Late Jimi Hendrix who dead interstate, with no spouse, and no children. I promise that this would not happen again to this Rock-Roll Family. Therefore, I mandated Estate Planning for myself ("STG") and the Late Prince Roger Nelson. Whatever I could read independently on the subject Estate Planning, I read it with comprehension. I made sure I was the beneficiary and the owner of the Estate. The Late Richard T. O'Connor Estate beneficiaries were Nellie H.

O'Connor, the widow. Catherine A Carrington, the daughter, and Frist Trust Company of St. Paul. The Will in this 1934 Case had been revoke by the probate court judge and the judge ordered an appointment of an administrator; this is like the case of the Late Prince Rogers Nelson. In re of the Estate of O'Conner; the Will was not entitled to probate in the case; due to the validity of the Living Trusts, which was develop by the decedent at the end of his life. The outcome of this case was that the court reversed the district court's decision and remanded the case for further proceeding. The only change that occurred in case 10-PR-16-46 is that other distant family members, non-family members, and strangers started to file claims for heirship and claims for past business obligation. When reading the probate case; In Re of the Estate of O'Connor; it clearly states Under 2 Minn State 8775 the surviving spouse or the next of kin or both as the court determinate, unless disqualified, are entitled to administration upon the estate of the deceased. The probate court, in assessing an inheritance tax, may determine the fact of ownership in the decedent at the time of the death. The Nelson's Family should be disqualified due to the fact they did nothing during the Late Prince Rogers Nelson to build his musical and celebrity career, at the beginning or at the end. The first time I physical stood in the same room with my Late Prince Rogers Nelson I was eight years old and he had one pair of pants and big dreams and owe his Late Mother \$1,000.000 due to the fact she invested in her son by financing his

musical and dance education. I became my half-brother Prince manager and the Late Prince's first production was in the first stage play and the original production of Cats. The Late Prince Rogers Nelson, garments become museum items under my knowledge of museum science and fashion design. The Late Prince living arrangements and other expenses were finance by "STG". Any District Court can reverse their own errors, to prevent a costly appeal. The Minnesota Probate Court needs to reverse and remanded that the owner is "STG" and the Estate Bond that was posted for inheritance tax prevail over the Nelson's Family due to the fact that the Nelson family does not have the Estate Tax Payments. Furthermore, if every think was Will to "STG" and "STG" have ownership rights in property accordingly to deeds and property titles, therefore there is nothing to Probate.

III. Conclusion

When reviewing the reply from a direct application of Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court, it has been determined that the High Court will not hear any case due to the fact the case has not been properly presented in the lower court or the highest state court. (See: Exhibit 2- Supreme Court of the United State reply letter; September 11, 2019 & November 20, 2019)

This petitioner ("STG") is requesting a fair review from the presiding Judge Kevin W. Eide. This Motion for Reconsideration should be allow at

no cost to this petitioner (“STG”). “STG” has paid her court fee in 2017. This petitioner (“STG”) is requesting the presiding Judge Kevin W. Eide to remove any submission restriction due to the fact it is a matter of right to be a voice in the recovery of your own property & funds. Typing and legal research is a lot of work; so, it will be a great deal of help to squash this matter at this level for all involved parties in this probate case. Lets’ make “STG” whole in this probate case. Who is “STG”? The half-sister of the Late Prince Rogers Nelson who was his spouse. This was the agreement between us then and it is still the agreement. “STG” styled the Late Prince Rogers Nelson’s hair for his Controversy Album. An angle cut with a shag in the front and a shag in the back and cut low in the middle. In this Controversy Album Photo, The Late Prince started to show the man in him. The Nelson’s Family did nothing to defend ownership rights for this probate case. If there are unclaimed property or funds in this probate case, it belongs to “STG”.

IV. Certificate of Services and Sworn Notary Statement

In the State of Illinois and in the County of Kane

(A) Certificated of Service

This motion was compose in The State of Illinois and in the County of Kane. Everything in this Motion for Reconsideration is true and correct. & any errors in this Motion for Reconsideration should be review as a Harmless Error. (See; Black Law Dictionary) This Motion for

Reconsideration was e-mail to the following on December 30, 2019 before the hours of 9:00 p.m.: Mark Greiner at mgreiner@fredlaw.com & The World Court of Justice at info@worldjustice.org. This Motion for Reconsideration was mail to the following before or close to December 31, 2019 before the hours of 9:00 p.m. using the United States Standard Postal Mail: United Nation Headquarter 405 East 42nd St., 1st. Avenue, New York City, NY 10017-3507 & Judge Kevin W. Eide at the following address: Carver County Justice Center: 604 East 4th Street, Chaska, MN 55318 The court on-line certificate of service for this probate case has been attached and should be electronically forward to all listed parties on the court docket. The order of filing is from the docket entry of November 27, 2019 or close to this date.

(B) Notary Statement

In the State of Illinois and the County of Kane

Under oath I Shawnetta T. Graham ("STG") swoly sworn that this Motion For Reconsideration and the certificate of service is true and correct UNDER ILLINOIS PENAL CODE: 720-5-32-2 & UNDER OATH I BELIEVE THIS STATEMEN IS TURE AND CORRECT TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWDEGE. This Notarization was present to Illinois Notary and "STG" presented a valid State Identification.

Sworn Notary Statement

In the month of December and on the 30 day and in the year 2019, and under oath this statement is true and correct.

Signature: Shawnetta T. Graham Date: 12-30-19

Shawnetta T. Graham, 77 South Stolp Ave. Apt. # 209, Aurora, IL 60506-5191 E-mail: gShawnetta@hotmail.com

NOTARY SEAL

NOTARY SIGNATURE: Misty Jump



State of Minnesota
Carver County

District Court
First Judicial District

Court File Number: **10-PR-16-46**

Case Type: Special Administration

In re the Estate of Prince Rogers Nelson, Deceased. This case consists of additional volumes.

CC LIST:

Notice transmitted to the following service contacts by means of eFile and Serve.
Lommen Abdo, P.A. by: Barry A. O'Neil
American Public Media Group et al by: Mary Walker
Omarr Baker: Jonas E. Herbsman
Bremer Trust, National Association by: Laura E. Halferty; Julian C. Zebot
Comerica Bank & Trust N.A. by: Mark W. Greiner
Phaedra Ellis-Lamkins by: Marnie E. Fearon
Larson King, LLP by: Peter Gleekel
Alfred Frank Alonzo Jackson by: pro se
John R. Nelson by: L. Londell McMillan
Norraine P. Nelson by: L. Londell McMillan
Sharon L. Nelson by: L. Londell McMillan
Tyka Nelson by: pro se
Michael Lythcott by: pro se
Primary Wave IP Fund 1, LP by: Eric Magnuson

STATE OF MINNESOTA
COUNTY OF CARVER

DISTRICT COURT
FIRST JUDICIAL DISTRICT
PROBATE DIVISION

In Re: Estate of:

Court File No. 10-PR-16-46

Prince Rogers Nelson,
Deceased.

**FINDINGS OF FACT,
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW &
ORDER RESTRICTING
SUBMISSIONS**

The above entitled matter came on before the Honorable Kevin W. Eide without a hearing after the Court's receipt of various submissions filed by Shawnetta T. Graham. Under prior Court orders, and determinations by the Personal Representative pursuant to Court-approved or statutory procedures, any creditor claims and heirship claim by Ms. Graham against the Estate of Prince Rogers Nelson have been disallowed and denied. In an Order Regarding Submissions filed November 22, 2017, the Court invited Ms. Graham and any other parties to submit written argument regarding (a) whether Ms. Graham currently has standing to submit further claims, motions or requests to the district court; (b) whether the continued submission of claims, motions or requests by Ms. Graham should be considered frivolous litigation; and (c) whether the Court should deem Ms. Graham a frivolous litigant and impose preconditions on her service or filing of any new claims, motions or requests pursuant to Rule 9 of the Minnesota Rules of General Practice for the District Court. Ms. Graham and the parties were given until December 22, 2017 to submit their written arguments.

In response to the Court's Order Regarding Submissions, the Court received and has reviewed the following submissions: (1) Comerica Bank & Trust, N.A.'s Memorandum in Support of Order Imposing Preconditions on Submissions by Shawnetta T. Graham filed December 20, 2017; and (2) Affidavit in Basic Briefing Format: Objecting to Frivolous Litigation and attached Exhibits filed December 21, 2017.

Now, based on the file and proceedings herein, the Court makes the following:

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. The period for submitting creditor claims in this matter expired on September 12, 2016. See Minn. Stat. § 524.3-803(a).

2. On June 5, 2017, Ms. Graham filed a "Notice of Objection of Closing of Case 10-PR-16-46 & Notice for consideration to be including in the Probate Process of PRINCE RODER NELSON'S ESTATE." It is difficult to decipher the precise claims or requests made therein. On June 21, 2017, Ms. Graham filed a "Pro-Se Notice to Request a Hearing & distribution of available Funds," in which she requested a meeting with the Court or the Personal Representative, a distribution of funds from the Estate, and a visit to Paisley Park.

3. To the extent Ms. Graham's filings asserted a creditor claim or heirship claim, the Personal Representative responded pursuant to applicable Court-approved and statutory procedures to disallow and deny the claims. On June 28, 2017, the Personal Representative filed and served on Ms. Graham a Notice of Disallowance of Claim, stating that Ms. Graham's claim in an undisclosed amount, presented on June 5, 2017 and/or June 21, 2017, was disallowed because the claim had no basis in law or fact and was presented after the expiration of the creditors' claim period. In addition, following receipt of an heirship affidavit by Ms. Graham, the Personal Representative informed Ms. Graham, by letter dated July 11, 2017, that it had determined that she was precluded from being an heir as a matter of law.

4. Within the next two months, Ms. Graham filed the following four documents:

- i. A "Demand for Notice," including "A statement for late filing with Proof of Service" filed on July 11, 2017;
- ii. A "Pro-Se Notice of Objections to Order file July 29, 2016" filed on August 1, 2017;
- iii. A "Notice to request that Pro-Se (STG) documents are including in the Records on Appeal & have access to seal legal documents" filed on August 1, 2017; and
- iv. "A notice to request a fair determination for funds & privilege to Paisley Park property which is title the Prince Rogers Nelson Estate's without a motion hearing & this is a request to filed this notice under SEAL" filed on September 11, 2017.

5. None of these filings appear to timely or specifically challenge the disallowance of any creditor claim by Ms. Graham or the denial of Ms. Graham's heirship claim.

6. On September 12, 2017, the Court issued an Order Denying Graham Motions, which addressed Ms. Graham's August 1 and September 11 filings. The Court stated that it was denying Ms. Graham's requests because the time for appealing or seeking reconsideration of the July 29, 2016 order had long since passed, and that there was no basis for granting the requests for access

to documents filed under seal, disbursement of funds, access to Paisley Park, or for filing her submissions under seal.

7. Despite the disallowance of her claims and the denial of her motions, Ms. Graham filed additional documents, including:

- i. A "Notice of Appeal to District Court" along with a "Notice for Discovery: For the Use of Foreign Military Force," which included a request to file documents under seal, filed on October 3, 2017;
- ii. A "Notice of Objections for the Sale of Gaplin Property" filed November 8, 2017; and
- iii. A "Notice to Request to be the Estate Administrator or be a part of a team" filed November 22, 2017.

8. On October 3, 2017, the Court entered an Order Denying Motion for Filing Under Seal, denying that request in Ms. Graham's October 3, 2017 filing because it failed to comply with the Court's previous Order Regarding the Filing of Certain Documents Under Seal.

9. On November 22, 2017, following Ms. Graham's additional submissions, the Court entered the Order Regarding Submissions, inviting Ms. Graham and other interested parties to provide submissions regarding the issues addressed herein. Even after the Order for Submissions was filed, Ms. Graham continued to file documents with the court, including, on December 1, 2017, an amended exhibit to the "Notice to Request to be the Estate Administrator or be a part of a team."

10. None of Ms. Graham's numerous submissions provide any legal basis to establish a valid and enforceable creditor claim or heirship claim against the Estate at this time.

11. Ms. Graham's continuing submissions create unnecessary expense in the administration of the Estate in processing, reviewing and responding to unsubstantiated claims.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. Having been excluded as a claimant or heir of the Prince Rogers Nelson Estate, Ms. Graham lacks standing to submit further claims, motions or requests in this matter.

2. Ms. Graham's continuing submissions are frivolous and it is appropriate that the Court impose restrictions on her service or filing of any new claims, motions or requests in order to protect the rights of the other parties and the Estate.

ORDER

1. Future submissions by Ms. Graham shall be deemed frivolous, and need not be addressed by the parties and shall not be addressed by the Court.

BY THE COURT:

Kevin W. Eide Eide, Kevin
2017.12.22 12:15:42 -06'00'

Dated: December 22, 2017

Kevin W. Eide
Judge of District Court

NOTICE: A true and correct copy of this Order/Notice has been served by EFS upon the parties. Please be advised that orders/notices sent to attorneys are sent to the lead attorney only.

**In the State of Minnesota in the County Carver District Court
First Judicial District Probate Division**

In the matter of the Estate of:) **District Court: 10-PR-16-46**
Prince Rogers Nelson, Decedent) **Honorable Judge Kevin W. Eide**
) **Case type: Special Administration**

**Motion for Reconsideration to be part of this probate case as sole owner &
Heir and to Strike the Nelson's Family as Heirs**

EXHIBIT 2

Reply letter from a direct application to Supreme Court Chief Justice

John G. Roberts Jr.

**SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
WASHINGTON, DC 20543-0001**

September 11, 2019

Shawnetta T. Graham
77 South Stolp Avenue
Apt. #209
Aurora, IL 60506-5191

RE: Shawnetta T. Graham

Dear Ms. Graham:


In reply to your letter or submission referred to this office by the Chief Justice on September 10, 2019, I regret to inform you that the Court is unable to assist you in the matter you present.

Under Article III of the Constitution, the jurisdiction of this Court extends only to the consideration of cases or controversies properly brought before it from lower courts in accordance with federal law and filed pursuant to the Rules of this Court.

Your papers are herewith returned.

Sincerely,
Scott S. Harris, Clerk

By:


Clayton R. Higgins, Jr.
(202) 479-3019

Enclosures

IDA

**SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
WASHINGTON, DC 20543-0001**

November 20, 2019

Shawnetta T. Graham
77 South Stolp Avenue
Apt. #209
Aurora, IL 60506-5191

RE: Shawnetta T. Graham

Dear Ms. Graham:


The notice of appeal received November 12, 2019 is herewith returned.

You may seek review of a decision only by filing a timely petition for a writ of certiorari. The filing of a notice of appeal is not a prerequisite for filing a petition for writ of certiorari and does not preserve the time for filing a petition for writ of certiorari. You must submit a petition for writ of certiorari within the 90 day time limit pursuant to Rule 13. A copy of the Rules of this Court and a sample petition are enclosed.

Your case must first be reviewed by a United States court of appeals or by the highest state court in which a decision could be had. 28 USC 1254 and 1257.

Sincerely,
Scott S. Harris, Clerk

By:


Clayton R. Higgins, Jr.

(202) 479-3019

Enclosures