

prof rape robbery kidnapping is excepted for finical gain to elected and public servants religions gains for democratic and republican democracy destroying lawful bloodline and or state and forty eight united states., not trump . "Every State law must conform in the first place to the Constitution of the United States, and then to the subordinate constitutions of the particular state; and if it infringes upon the provisions of either, it is so far void." Houston v. Moore, 18 US 1, 5 L.Ed 19 (1840). It is abiding truth that "nothing can destroy a government more quickly than its failure to observe its own laws, or worse, its disregard of the charter of its own existence." Mapp v. Ohio, 367 U.S. 643, 659 (1961). HARRIS V. NEW YORK U.S. Supreme Court-401 U.S. 222 (1971).

A "public official" has no rights in relation to their employer lawful bloodline Americans 1884, the state or federal government:

"The restrictions that the Constitution places upon the government in its capacity as lawmaker, i.e., as the regulator of private conduct, are not the same as the restrictions that it places upon the government in its capacity as employer. We have recognized this in many contexts, with respect to many different constitutional guarantees. Private citizens perhaps cannot be prevented from wearing long hair, but policemen can. Kelley v. Johnson, 425 U.S. 238, 247 (1976). Private citizens cannot have their property searched without probable cause, but in many circumstances government employees can. O'Connor v. Ortega, 480 U.S. 709, 723 (1987) (plurality opinion); id., at 732 (SCALIA, J., concurring in judgment). Private citizens cannot be punished for refusing to provide the government information that may incriminate them, but government employees can be dismissed when the incriminating information that they refuse to provide relates to the performance of their job. Gardner v. Broderick, [497 U.S. 62, 95] 392 U.S. 273, 277 -278 (1968). With regard to freedom of speech in particular: Private citizens cannot be punished for speech of merely private concern, but government employees can be fired for that reason. Connick v. Myers, 461 U.S. 138, 147 (1983). Private citizens cannot be punished for partisan political activity, but federal and state employees can be dismissed and otherwise punished for that reason. Public Workers v. Mitchell, 330 U.S. 75, 101 (1947); Civil Service Comm'n v. Letter Carriers, 413 U.S. 548, 556 (1973); Broadrick v. Oklahoma, 413 U.S. 601, 616 -617 (1973)." [Rutan v. Republican Party of Illinois, 497 U.S. 62 (1990)]

The Oath of office is a quid pro quo contract of [U.S. Const. Art. 6, Clauses 2 and 3, Davis Vs. Lawyers Surety Corporation., 459 S.W. 2nd. 655, 657., Tex. Civ. App.] in which clerks, officials, or officers of the government pledge to perform (Support and uphold the United States and state Constitutions) in return for substance (wages, perks, benefits). Proponents are subjected to the penalties and remedies for Breach of Contract, Conspiracy of [Title 18 U.S.C., Sections 241, 242]. Treason under the Constitution at Article 3, Section 3., and Intrinsic Fraud of [Auerbach v Samuels, 10 Utah 2nd. 152, 349 P. 2nd. 1112,1114. Alleghany Corp v Kirby., D.C.N.Y. 218 F. Supp. 164, 183., and Keeton Packing Co. v State., 437 S.W. 20, 28]. Refusing to live by their oath places them in direct violation of their oath, in every case. Violating their oath is not just cause for immediate dismissal and removal from office, it is a federal crime. Federal law regulating oath of office by government officials is divided into four parts along with an executive order which further defines the law for purposes of enforcement. 5 U.S.C. 3331, provides the text of the actual oath of office members of Congress are required to take before assuming office. 5 U.S.C. 3333 requires members of Congress sign an affidavit that they have taken the oath of office required by 5 U.S.C. 3331 and have not or will not violate that oath of office during their tenure of office as defined by the third part of the law, 5 U.S.C. 7311 which explicitly makes it a federal criminal offense (and a violation of oath of office) for anyone employed in the United States Government (including members of Congress) to "advocate the overthrow of our constitutional form of government"

PERMANENT ALLEGIANCE TO A STATE:

If we were to examine the term national in the US Codes we would see a national owing their allegiance to a State and further see a distinction concerning a "national of the United States". "Title 8" USC § 1101(a)(21) The term "national" means a person owing permanent allegiance to a state.

(22) The term "national of the United States" means (A) a citizen of the United States, or (B) a person who, though not a citizen of the United States, owes permanent allegiance to the United States.

(23) The term "naturalization" means the conferring of nationality of a state upon a person after birth, by any means whatsoever.

Can one be a national in America with a right to live, work and travel in America without being a national of the United States?

Yes. If they will be a part of another governing body.

Until the people become a party to the constitution they were not citizens subject.

" For when the revolution took place, the people of each state became themselves sovereign; and in that character hold the absolute right to all their navigable waters, and the soils under them, for their own common use, subject only to the rights since surrendered by the constitution to the general government."

Martin vs Waddell, 41 US (16 Pet) 367, 410 (1842)

The following rules are propaganda to bamboozle people into belief that attorneys are accountable to somebody. Upon my personal experience, they are unaccountable. If a reader of this post has a different experience, please, contact me with information. However, we, the people, must enforce accountability and demand compliance through the following rules shown below. Violation of any of these rules is cause for suing them.

Restatement (Third) of Law Governing Lawyers (2000).

§ 116: Interviewing and Preparing a Prospective Witness: A lawyer can interview a witness for the purpose of preparing the witness to testify, but the lawyer cannot unlawfully obstruct another party's access to the witness, unlawfully induce or assist a witness to evade or ignore process obligating the witness to testify, or request a person refrain from voluntarily giving relevant testimony.

§120. False Testimony or Evidence

(1) A lawyer may not:

(a) knowingly counsel or assist a witness to testify falsely or otherwise to offer false evidence;

(b) knowingly make a false statement of fact to the tribunal;

(c) offer testimony or other evidence as to an issue of fact known by the lawyer to be false.

(2) If a lawyer has offered testimony or other evidence as to a material issue of fact and comes to know of its falsity, the lawyer must take reasonable remedial measures and may disclose confidential client information when necessary to take such a measure.

(3) A lawyer may refuse to offer testimony or other evidence that the lawyer reasonably believes is false, even if the lawyer does not know it to be false.

"Merely being native born within the territorial boundaries of the United States of America does not make such an inhabitant a Citizen of the United States subject to the jurisdiction of the Fourteenth Amendment."

Elk v. Wilkins, Neb (1884), 5s.ct.41,112 U.S. 99, 28 L. Ed. 643.

"The state" acts in two capacities: governmental and proprietary. The distinction between the two is best stated in Cincinnati v. Cameron, 33 Ohio St. 336, approved by this court in Seattle v. Stirrat, 55 Wash. 560, 104 Pac. 834, 30 L.R.A. (N.S.) 1275:

"In its governmental or public character, it represents the state, while in the other it is a mere private corporation. As a political institution, the municipality occupies a different position, and is subject to different liabilities from those which are imposed upon the private corporation. But because these two characters are united in the same legal entity, it does not follow that the shield which covers the political equally protects the private corporation." STRAND v. STATE., 16 Wn.(2d) 107, 116 (January 6, 1943)

US GOV Elected and public servants aka employees laughing about stealing land also raping and robbing, kidnapping holding woman man and children for ransom as filed destroying family's for personal gain and British foreign 1871 government contracted elected and public servants service of employment .

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MFGllvY6oTw&t=629s> ,,,,,,,,,,Gov't employee brags about stealing land.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7jeLi14p-KU>

It is the duty of every lawful Bloodline American to oppose all enemies of this Nation, foreign and DOMESTIC. (Note added: Every Lawful and recognized American Citizen including all Elected, Appointed, hired public servant(s), Children's Protection Services, Police, Sheriff's, Martials, CIA, FBI, Capital Police, Secret Service, City Council, County Commissioners, Board of Commissioners, et al, Religious Organizations, Associations, Schools, Colleges, Universities, Schools of Law, Corporations, LLC's, Doctors, Nurses, Health Care Providers, Unions, et al, to preform they of Oath of Office, in compliance to the 1776 Constitution for the United States of America, to all matters herein related thereof.) Please help pass this information to other professionals in your area – and honor thy 1776 Constitutional oath of office in your area of expertise it is after all as Lawful Americans' right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness that 'GOD' promised mine and your bloodline of this United States of America for all mankind thereof. Please read read title 18 all of it" The Original Thirteenth Article of Amendment To The Constitution For The United States

"If any citizen of the United States shall accept, claim, receive, or retain any title of nobility or honour, or shall without the consent of Congress, accept and retain any present, pension, office, or emolument of any kind whatever, from any emperor, king, prince, or foreign power, such person shall cease to be a citizen of the United States, and shall be incapable of holding any office of trust or profit under them, or either of them." [Journal of the Senate]

Citizens(Federal) and Persons vs. People

CITIZENS. Citizens are members of a political community who, in their associated capacity, have established or submitted themselves to the dominion of a government for the promotion of their general welfare and the protection of their individual as well as collective rights.---U.S. v Cruikshank, 92 U.S. 542---

If one is established as a "people", individually or collectively, then one is entitled to all the rights, which formerly belonged to the King by his prerogative. Lansing v. Smith, 4 Wend. 9 (N.Y.) (1829), 21 Am.Dec. 89 10C Const. Law Sec. 298; 18 C Em.Dom. Sec. 3, 228; 37 C Nav.Wat. Sec. 219; Nuls Sec. 167; 48 C Wharves Sec. 3, 7.

A people may do anything he or she wishes to do so long as it does not damage, injure, or impair the same Right or property of another individual. 10 Pick. 9; United States Exp. Co. v. Henderson, 69 Iowa, 40, 28 N. W. 426; Greenl. Ev. 469a quoted in Hale v. Henkel, 201 U.S. 43 (1906). A people owes no duty to the state or the public as long as he does not trespass.

Lansing v. Smith 21 D. 89. people of a state are entitled to all rights which formerly belonged to the king by his prerogative.....2. Citizens - United States citizenship does not entitle citizen to rights and privileges of state citizenship. Citizenship of the United States does not entitle citizen to privileges and immunities of citizen of the state,since privileges and immunities of one are not the same as the other. Tashiro v. Jordan S.F.1234G. S.C.C. 5-20-1927

"Both before and after the Fourteenth Amendment to the federal Constitution, it has not been necessary for a person to be a citizen of the United States in order to be a citizen of his state." Crosse v. Board of Supervisors of Elections (1966) 221 A.2d 431 p.4

"The Fourteenth Amendment of the Constitution of the United States, ratified[1] in 1868, CREATES or at least recognizes for THE FIRST TIME a [federal] citizenship of the United States, AS DISTINCT FROM THAT OF THE STATES..."
Black's Law Dictionary, 6th Edition

Travelers Red lights flashing behind you. When a cop turns on 'emergency' lights to stop someone and asks for license and REGISTRATION, and then writes a summons-ticket, executes it and demands one's bond in the form of an agreement to appear, and then serves the summons, the cop is breaking the laws:

1) The turning on of lights means an 'emergency' is in effect. The cop wants people to think he is stopping traffic and that the one being stopped is the 'emergency.' Where was the emergency? Nowhere, of course. The cop just wanted to perform a "traffic stop." By doing so, the cop perpetuated several fraudulent actions. a) The cop deceived the one being stopped into thinking there was an emergency. b) Impersonated a government official on emergency business. The cop in reality is a Corpora Ficta employee and not a government employee. He has no authority of a government official at all. There are TWO lawfully excusable conditions for seizing property or People: 1) A warrant of the law. 2) First-hand observation of a crime being committed. This is not just the law. This is constitutionally mandated. The cop needs the DRIVERS License and REGISTRATION as prima facie evidence to support the claim of trafficking instead of traveling, if indeed one is not transporting people or property for hire or profit.

2) Cops are only authorized to enforce statute and ordinance, not LAW. Statutes are passed by STATE of Corpora Fictas. Ordinances are passed by City/County of Corpora Fictas. LAW is only the Natural Law, Common Law. DMV is only a corporate Dept. in State of Oregon, Ohio, CA. Corpora Ficta. License and REGISTRATION are commercial agreements and not contracts. IFF one of us is not involved in commercial activity then there is no exercise of a privilege that must be licensed and REGISTRATION. Licenses and REGISTRATIONS are ONLY required for commercial activity; that means business ONLY. In LAW, people have the right to travel as a part of one's right to liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

3) IFF the cop perceives that one of us may have broken the law or actually infringed a statute and writes a ticket with a summons, the cop is now impersonating an officer of the court, which the cop is clearly not. The cop is thereby impersonating a Judicial Officer. Who in all of America can write a summons to a court unless they are actually authorized to serve in a judicial capacity? Answer: No one else may.

18 U.S. Code section 31----- The term "motor vehicle" means every description of carriage or other contrivance propelled or drawn by mechanical power and used for commercial purposes on the highways in the transportation of passengers, passengers and property, or property or cargo.that means unless you are in commerce(making money to transport people or cargo).Most of us are not commercial or in commerce,most of us just go from point A to point B.Most of us who are not Corporate Government employees or on Federal Jurisdiction.

NO COP CAN DRAG U INTO JURISDICTION "No officer can acquire jurisdiction by deciding he has it. The officer, whether judicial or ministerial, decides at his own peril." Middleton v. Low (1866), 30 C. 596, citing Prosser v. Secor (1849), 5 Barb.(N.Y) 607, 608. "The innocent individual who is harmed by an abuse of governmental authority is assured that he will be compensated for his injury." Owens v. City of Independence, 100

S.Ct 1398 (1980) " ...If one individual does not possess such a right over the conduct of another [Good and Lawful Christian Man], no number of individuals [in a deliberative body] can possess such a right. All combinations, therefore, to effect such an object, are injurious, not only to the individuals particularly oppressed, but to the public at large". *People v. Fisher*, 14Wend.(N.Y.) 9, 28 Am.Dec. 501

When you been kidnap and held for ransom aka arrested did they take you immediately before a magistrate like the law says???? NO they took you to book you...well guess what that's not proper and you were falsely imprisoned... Check this out...

Go immediately to a magistrate (no photographs, no fingerprinting)

"The one arresting has "a duty to immediately seek a magistrate," and failure to do so "makes a case of false imprisonment." *Heath v. Boyd*, 175 S.W.2d. 217 (1943); *Brock v. Stimson*, 108 Mass. 520 (1871).

"To detain the person arrested in custody for any purpose other than that of taking him before a magistrate is illegal." *Kominsky v. Durand*, 12 Atl.2d. 654 (1940).

"Any undue delay is unlawful and wrongful, and renders the officer himself and all persons aiding and abetting therein wrongdoers from the beginning." *Ulvestad v. Dolphin*, 278 Pac. 684 (1929).

"The taking of the plaintiff's picture before conviction was an illegal act." *Hawkins v. Kuhne*, 137 NY Supp 1090, 153 App Div 216 (1912).

"The power to arrest does not confer upon the arresting officer the power to detain a prisoner for other purposes." *Geldon v. Finnegan*, 252 N.W. 372 (1934).

"Compulsory fingerprinting before conviction is an unlawful encroachment...[and] involves prohibited compulsory self-incrimination." *People v. Helvern*, 215 N.Y. Supp. 417 (1926)

Summary

Attorney Bruce L McCrum and Ed Johnston lawful bloodline American as Filed

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vTJy1JdRrsI>

Further harassment from City of Toledo Chief of Police David Enyeart

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HTXTZOI8Oqg>

Ed's unlawful kidnapping by Ruark's camera part 1

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3UrR7PTqIpc>

State Senator Arnie Roblan on the Rights to travel and Uninsured Motorist fund 05/13/2013

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4i_3XWfkZ2g

"Fraud On The Court By An Officer Of The Court"

And "Disqualification Of Judges, State and Federal"

1. Who is an "officer of the court"?
2. What is "fraud on the court"?
3. What effect does an act of "fraud upon the court" have upon the court proceeding?
4. What causes the "Disqualification of Judges?"

1. Who is an "officer of the court"?

A judge is an officer of the court, as well as are all attorneys. A state judge is a state judicial officer, paid by the State to act impartially and lawfully. A federal judge is a federal judicial officer, paid by the federal government to act impartially and lawfully. State and federal attorneys fall into the same general category and must meet the same requirements. A judge is not the court.

People v. Zajic, 88 Ill.App.3d 477, 410 N.E.2d 626 (1980).

2. What is "fraud on the court"?

Whenever any officer of the court commits fraud during a proceeding in the court, he/she is engaged in "fraud upon the court". In *Bulloch v. United States*, 763 F.2d 1115, 1121 (10th Cir. 1985), the court stated "Fraud upon the court is fraud which is directed to the judicial machinery itself and is not fraud between the parties or fraudulent documents, false statements or perjury. ... It is where the court or a member is corrupted or influenced or influence is attempted or where the judge has not performed his judicial function --- thus where the impartial functions of the court have been directly corrupted."

"Fraud upon the court" has been defined by the 7th Circuit Court of Appeals to "embrace that species of fraud which does, or attempts to, defile the court itself, or is a fraud perpetrated by officers of the court so that the judicial machinery can not perform in the usual manner its impartial task of adjudging cases that are presented for adjudication." *Kenner v. C.I.R.*, 387 F.3d 689 (1968); 7 Moore's Federal Practice, 2d ed., p. 512, ¶ 60.23. The 7th Circuit further stated "a decision produced by fraud upon the court is not in essence a decision at all, and never becomes final."

3. What effect does an act of "fraud upon the court" have upon the court proceeding?

"Fraud upon the court" makes void the orders and judgments of that court.

It is also clear and well-settled Illinois law that any attempt to commit "fraud upon the court" vitiates the entire proceeding. *The People of the State of Illinois v. Fred E. Sterling*, 357 Ill. 354; 192 N.E. 229 (1934) ("The maxim that fraud vitiates every transaction into which it enters applies to judgments as well as to contracts and other transactions."); *Allen F. Moore v. Stanley F. Sievers*, 336 Ill. 316; 168 N.E. 259 (1929) ("The maxim that fraud vitiates every transaction into

which it enters ..."); In re Village of Willowbrook, 37 Ill.App.2d 393 (1962) ("It is axiomatic that fraud vitiates everything."); Dunham v. Dunham, 57 Ill.App. 475 (1894), affirmed 162 Ill. 589 (1896); Skelly Oil Co. v. Universal Oil Products Co., 338 Ill.App. 79, 86 N.E.2d 875, 883-4 (1949); Thomas Stasel v. The American Home Security Corporation, 362 Ill. 350; 199 N.E. 798 (1935). Under Illinois and Federal law, when any officer of the court has committed "fraud upon the court", the orders and judgment of that court are void, of no legal force or effect.

4. What causes the "Disqualification of Judges?"

Federal law requires the automatic disqualification of a Federal judge under certain circumstances.

In 1994, the U.S. Supreme Court held that "Disqualification is required if an objective observer would entertain reasonable questions about the judge's impartiality. If a judge's attitude or state of mind leads a detached observer to conclude that a fair and impartial hearing is unlikely, the judge must be disqualified." [Emphasis added]. *Liteky v. U.S.*, 114 S.Ct. 1147, 1162 (1994).

Courts have repeatedly held that positive proof of the partiality of a judge is not a requirement, only the appearance of partiality. *Liljeberg v. Health Services Acquisition Corp.*, 486 U.S. 847, 108 S.Ct. 2194 (1988) (what matters is not the reality of bias or prejudice but its appearance); *United States v. Balistreri*, 779 F.2d 1191 (7th Cir. 1985) (Section 455(a) "is directed against the appearance of partiality, whether or not the judge is actually biased.") ("Section 455(a) of the Judicial Code, 28 U.S.C. §455(a), is not intended to protect litigants from actual bias in their judge but rather to promote public confidence in the impartiality of the judicial process.").

That Court also stated that Section 455(a) "requires a judge to recuse himself in any proceeding in which her impartiality might reasonably be questioned." *Taylor v. O'Grady*, 888 F.2d 1189 (7th Cir. 1989). In *Pfizer Inc. v. Lord*, 456 F.2d 532 (8th Cir. 1972), the Court stated that "It is important that the litigant not only actually receive justice, but that he believes that he has received justice."

The Supreme Court has ruled and has reaffirmed the principle that "justice must satisfy the appearance of justice", *Levine v. United States*, 362 U.S. 610, 80 S.Ct. 1038 (1960), citing *Offutt v. United States*, 348 U.S. 11, 14, 75 S.Ct. 11, 13 (1954). A judge receiving a bribe from an interested party over which he is presiding, does not give the appearance of justice.

"Recusal under Section 455 is self-executing; a party need not file affidavits in support of recusal and the judge is obligated to recuse herself sua sponte under the stated circumstances." *Taylor v. O'Grady*, 888 F.2d 1189 (7th Cir. 1989).

Further, the judge has a legal duty to disqualify himself even if there is no motion asking for his disqualification. The Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals further stated that "We think that this language [455(a)] imposes a duty on the judge to act sua sponte, even if no motion or affidavit is filed." *Balistreri*, at 1202.

Judges do not have discretion not to disqualify themselves. By law, they are bound to follow the law. Should a judge not disqualify himself as required by law, then the judge has given another example of his "appearance of partiality" which, possibly, further disqualifies the judge. Should another judge not accept the disqualification of the judge, then the second judge has evidenced an "appearance of partiality" and has possibly disqualified himself/herself. None of the orders issued by any judge who has been disqualified by law would appear to be valid. It would appear that they are void as a matter of law, and are of no legal force or effect.

Should a judge not disqualify himself, then the judge is violation of the Due Process Clause of the U.S. Constitution. *United States v. Sciuto*, 521 F.2d 842, 845 (7th Cir. 1996) ("The right to a tribunal free from bias or prejudice is based, not on section 144, but on the Due Process Clause.").

Should a judge issue any order after he has been disqualified by law, and if the party has been denied of any of his / her property, then the judge may have been engaged in the Federal Crime of "interference with interstate commerce". The judge has acted in the judge's personal capacity and not in the judge's judicial capacity. It has been said that this judge, acting in this manner, has no more lawful authority than someone's next-door neighbor (provided that he is not a judge). However some judges may not follow the law.

If you were a non-represented litigant, and should the court not follow the law as to non-represented litigants, then the judge has expressed an "appearance of partiality" and, under the law, it would seem that he/she has disqualified him/herself.

However, since not all judges keep up to date in the law, and since not all judges follow the law, it is possible that a judge may not know the ruling of the U.S. Supreme Court and the other courts on this subject. Notice that it states "disqualification is required" and that a judge "must be disqualified" under certain circumstances.

The Supreme Court has also held that if a judge wars against the Constitution, or if he acts without jurisdiction, he has engaged in treason to the Constitution. If a judge acts after he has been automatically disqualified by law, then he is acting without jurisdiction, and that suggest that he is then engaging in criminal acts of treason, and may be engaged in extortion and the interference with interstate commerce.

Courts have repeatedly ruled that judges have no immunity for their criminal acts. Since both treason and the interference with interstate commerce are criminal acts, no judge has immunity to engage in such acts.

"If money is wanted by rulers who have in any manner oppressed the People, they may retain it until their grievances are redressed, and thus peaceably procure relief, without trusting to despised petitions or disturbing the public tranquility." Journals of the Continental Congress. 26 October, 1774-1789. Journals 1: 105-113. "Government immunity violates the common law maxim that everyone shall have a remedy for an injury done to his person or property." (Civil Rights) (Firemens Ins Co of Newark, N.J. vs Washington County. 2 Wisc 2d 214; 85 N.W.2d 840 1957.) CORPS and Engineers AKA Corporation and company's LLC , City county states Federal 501 C-3-9s are Black ink On White Paper the term AKA Black ans White, Mostly the have no Blood or bloodline Soul or heart beat. Thereof. Only CORPS And Including corporation Can Be liable of Suit under Color of Law Fraud Scam.

CORPS AKA Corporation Company's LLC City county states Federal are DEAD entity And only Exit in the minds of Men

As to the Civil War Grace the Lawful bloodline American's Elected and public servants to honor thy OATH of Services Know as the 1776 1778 Ratified Constitution Law of Theseus Forty eight now fifty union States of Constitution oath of public servitude

All government officials and agencies, including all State legislatures, are bound by the Constitution and must NOT create any defacto laws which counter the Constitution: The U.S. Supreme Court, in 1895, ruled unconstitutional a federal law containing income taxes, Bills, statutes and codes with arguments concerning class warfare and the definition of a direct tax. "Herein...Ohio's Doctrine of Governmental Immunity was held unconstitutional and others to numerous to mention." (Civil Rights) (Krause vs Ohio, app 2d 1 L.N.W. 2d 321 1971.) Reich vs State Highway Dept. 336, Mich 617: 194 N.W. 2d 700 197" Employees of a city or state are not immune from suit under statute relating civil rights for deprivations of rights on ground that officials were acting within the scope of their ground that officials were acting within the Scope of their responsibilities of performing a discretionary act." (Bunch vs Barnett 376 F.Supp. 23.) "Title 28 Section 1391, this section makes it possible to bring actions against government officials and agencies in district court outside D.C." (Civil Rights) (Norton vs Meshane 14 L.Ed. 2d 274.) A suit in detinue or replevin in personam should lie to gain possession of property seized by the state. (Civil Rights) Stephen, Pleading (3rd Am ed) p. 47, 52, 69, 74; Ames Lectures on legal history, p. 64, 71; Wilkins v. Despard, 5 Term Rep- 112; Roberts v. Withered, % Mod. 193, 12 Mod. 92.

Whereas the IMF/IRS are unregistered foreign agents as is the 28 U.S.C. @ 3002 definition 15) United States means A) FEDERAL CORPORATION This corporation is de facto without standing in law as it was and remains to this day Treason against the 1776, ratified 1778, Constitution for the United States of America, violation of Oath of Office, Misprision's, Collusion, Hones Service Fraud, Extortion, R.I.C.O., land theft, Identity Theft, Personage whereas No Constitutional Amendment authorized our elected, appointed and hired employees to create this Corporation

Attorney Bruce L McCrum and Ed Johnston lawful bloodline American as Filed

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vTJy1JdRrsI>

Further harassment from City of Toledo Chief of Police David Enyeart

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HTXTZOI8Oqg>

Ed's unlawful kidnapping by Ruark's camera part 1

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3UrR7PTqIpc>

State Senator Arnie Roblan on the Rights to travel and Uninsured Motorist fund 05/13/2013

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4i_3XWfkZ2g

"If money is wanted by rulers who have in any manner oppressed the People, they may retain it until their grievances are redressed, and thus peaceably procure relief, without trusting to despised petitions or disturbing the public tranquility." Journals of the Continental Congress. 26 October, 1774-1789. Journals 1: 105-113.

Notice: All Rights Reserved. Permission to distribute for non-commercial purposes is hereby granted, in whole or part, provided attribution and a link to this article is included. Commercial distribution without the written permission of the author is prohibited. This Public email message, including any attachment(s) is limited to the sole use of the intended recipient and may contain Privileged and/or Confidential Information. Any and All Political, Private or Public Entities, Federal, State, or Local Corporate Government(s), Municipality(ies), International Organizations, Corporation(s), agent(s), investigator(s), or informant(s), et. al., and/or Third Party(ies) working in collusion by collecting and/or monitoring My email(s), and any other means of spying and collecting these Communications Without my Exclusive Permission are Barred from Any and All Unauthorized Review, Use, Disclosure or Distribution. With Explicit Reservation of All My Rights, Without Prejudice and Without Recourse to Me. Any omission does not constitute a waiver of any and/or ALL Intellectual Property Rights or Reserved Rights Notice. Copy right lawful bloodline Americans , lawful Americans 2013*The Electronic Communications

Privacy Act, 18 U.S.C. 119 Sections 2510-2521 et seq., governs distribution of this "Message," including attachments. The originator intended this Message for the specified recipients only; it may contain the originator's confidential and proprietary information. The originator hereby notifies unintended recipients that they have received this Message in error, and strictly proscribes their Message review, dissemination, copying, and content-based actions. Recipients-in-error shall notify the originator immediately by e-mail, and delete the original message. Authorized carriers of this message shall expeditiously deliver this Message to intended recipients. See: Quon v. Arch. Anything stated in this email may be limited in the content and is not to be taken out of context. ****Wireless Copyright Notice****. Federal and State laws govern copyrights to this Message. You must have the originator's full written consent to alter, copy, or use this Message. Originator acknowledges others' copyrighted content in this Message. Otherwise Without Prejudice and Without Recourse to Me. Any omission does not constitute a waiver of any and/or ALL Intellectual Property Rights or Reserved Rights U.C.C, 1-207.1-308. NOTICE TO AGENTS IS NOTICE TO PRINCIPALS. NOTICE TO PRINCIPALS IS NOTICE TO AGENTS>