



COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE

SOVEREIGN STATE OF VERSMARK

Sovereign State of Versmark,
Plaintiff,

v.

Case No.: CFI 2 1/2026

Baraka Mtajiri,
Defendant.

JUDGEMENT

On the indictment presented by His Lordship Baron Flint, the Most Honorable Attorney General, on behalf of the People of the Sovereign State of Versmark (“Plaintiff”), on May 21, 2026 against Mr. Baraka Mtajiri, a citizen of the Sovereign State of Versmark (“Defendant”), the Court finds the following:

1. On **Count 1: Forgery in the Third Degree**, a Class D Felony per §56, Versmark Criminal Code, 3rd. Ed. Act, Q1 2026, the Court finds the Defendant, Mr. Mtajiri, **GUILTY**.
2. On **Count 2: Misdemeanor Harassment**, a Misdemeanor offense per §67, Versmark Criminal Code, 3rd Ed. Act, Q1 2026, the Court finds the Defendant, Mr. Mtajiri, **NOT GUILTY**.
3. On **Count 3: Attempted Misdemeanor Fraud**, the attempt (§85) to commit the Misdemeanor offense of Misdemeanor Fraud, per §59, Versmark Criminal

Code, 3rd Ed. Act, Q1 2026, the Court finds the Defendant, Mr. Mtajiri, **NOT GUILTY**.

4. The Court finds that the Defendant, Mr. Mtajiri, does not have any legitimate claim to diplomatic immunity under the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations of 1961, and is eligible for prosecution as a citizen of the Sovereign State of Versmark under the jurisdiction of its laws.

5. On additional charges levied by the Court as a result of Defendant's actions during court proceedings, as it relates to the charge of **Felony Perjury**, a Class D Felony per §39, Versmark Criminal Code, 3rd Ed. Act, Q1 2026, the Court finds the Defendant, Mr. Mtajiri, **GUILTY**. The matter shall be listed as Count 4.

STATEMENT OF REASONS

1. On the first count presented – Forgery in the Third Degree – the Court finds sufficient evidence to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the Defendant “unlawfully [and] falsely create[d] a written document to grant a legal right,” in this instance for him to attempt to gain authority for his government under the constitutive theory of statehood by producing a treaty of mutual recognition with the Sovereign State of Versmark, a nation with historical and cultural ties to the Empire of Lehmark.

2. On the second count presented – Misdemeanor Harassment – the Court does not find sufficient evidence that the Defendant “with the intent to scare, panic or distress, cause[d] a psychological injury to another person via [...] online messages or other methods of communication.” The Court finds that the intention of the Defendant to email the victim was not to scare, panic, or distress, even if psychological injury was incurred by the victim as a result of receiving an unsolicited email from the Defendant to an email address illicitly obtained by the Defendant outside of the jurisdiction of this Court.

3. On the third count presented – Attempted Misdemeanor Fraud – the Court does not find that the evidence presented by the Plaintiff was sufficient to justify prosecution under a strict reading of the statute. The clause within the section most applicable to the Plaintiff's indictment refers to “...caus[ing] an individual to perform an action they would not otherwise do under false pretenses...” It is the opinion of the Court that the Defendant's actions did not fulfil this definition, even in the attempted nature sought by the Plaintiff.

4. On the matter of diplomatic immunity claimed by the Defendant, the Court finds that:

- a. The Defendant is a citizen of the Sovereign State of Versmark;

- b. No legitimate Treaty of Mutual Recognition exists between Defendant's "Second Empire of Lehmark" that respects diplomatic immunity in its terms; and,
 - c. No active Treaty of Mutual Recognition exists between the Empire of Lehmark and the Sovereign State of Versmark, where Defendant was formerly head of government, and no agrément was had by letters credence nor demande d'agrément for the Defendant's status at the time he was an officeholder in the Empire of Lehmark.
5. On the charge of Felony Perjury as raised by this Court, listed as Count 4, the Court finds that the Defendant has remarkable contempt for the sovereignty and jurisdiction of the laws of the Sovereign State of Versmark that he, as a citizen, was subject to. Defendant falsely claimed he was the "the legitimate Emperor and Autocrat of [the Empire of] Lehmark," a provably false statement as determined by:
 - a. The contents of an inactive Treaty of Mutual Recognition between the Governments of the Sovereign State of Versmark and the Empire of Lehmark;
 - b. Tacit recognition and informal diplomatic communications between Mr. William Lehman, Emperor of Lehmark, and representatives of His Sovereign Majesty's Government; and,
 - c. Email correspondence between His Grace Archduke Brandywine, the Most Honorable Minister of Foreign Affairs, and the Defendant, submitted as Plaintiff's Exhibit B, reiterating the falsehood of the claims of Lehmarkian ownership and reign made by the Defendant.

SENTANCING

1. The Court finds that the status of the Defendant as a minor is a mitigating factor in this sentencing, per §89, Versmark Criminal Code, 3rd Ed. Act, Q1 2026.
2. The Court finds the demeanor and written statements made by the Defendant, including the count of Felony Perjury during the proceedings as a severe aggregating factor.
3. The Defendant pleaded not guilty to Count 1, Forgery in the Third Degree, a Class D Felony, and was found guilty by this Court.
4. The Defendant pleaded not guilty to Count 2, Misdemeanor Harassment, and was found not guilty by this Court. Count 2 is dismissed.
5. The Defendant pleaded not guilty to Count 3, Attempted Misdemeanor Fraud, and was found not guilty by this Court. Count 3 is dismissed.

6. The Defendant is entered into a plea of *nolo contendere* on Count 4, Felony Perjury, a Class D Felony, and was found guilty by this Court.
7. Having been found guilty by this Court of two Class D Felonies, I sentence the Defendant, Mr. Baraka Mtajiri, to the following, to be served consecutively:
 - a. On Count 1: a Suspension from Government Office for Three Hundred Sixty-Five (365) days;
 - b. On Count 1: a Prohibition from Standing for Public Office for Ninety (90) days;
 - c. On Count 4: a Suspension from Government Office for Three Hundred Sixty-Five (365) days; and,
 - d. On Count 4: a Prohibition from Standing for Public Office for Ninety (90) days.
8. It is ordered by this Court that no government agency be permitted to employ the Defendant for Seven Hundred Thirty (730) Days.
9. It is ordered by this Court that the Ministry of the Interior prohibit the Defendant from standing for public office for One Hundred Eighty (180) days.

DATED this 4th day of June, 2026

Sarah Nolan

Hon. Sarah Nolan^{KOS}
Chief Magistrate, CFI