Salinas v. United States, 118 S.Ct. 469 (1997): [I]nterprative canon is not license for judiciary to rewrite language enacted by legislature. Predominant elements in substantive Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act (RICO) violations are (1) conduct (2) of enterprise (3) through pattern of racketeering activity. 18 U.S.C. SS1962(c). Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act. 18 U.S.C. SS1962(d)Ö. (RICO) conspiracy conviction does not require overt or specific act. If conspirators have plan which calls for some conspirators to perpetrate crime and others to provide support, supporters are as guilty as perpetrators. Conspiracy may exist and be punished whether or not substantive crime ensues, for conspiracy is a distinct evil, dangerous to the public, and punishable in itself. Judges and cities are forbidden to rewrite language enacted by legislature. They are forbidden to even think about using the courts to uphold bogus, fabricated charges for hot pursuit of revenue. By their conduct of falsely representing the character, amount, or legal status of any debt, participants violate 15 U.S.C. Sections 1681s-2 and 1692(e), and become principles in a pattern of racketeering by putting false liens or debts on court or credit records without verifying that the liens or debts were legally valid as the result of having the matter determined by a jury prior to having an abstract of judgment entered. The fraud continues when these bogus judgments are used for collection of unlawful debt. The language of 15 U.S.C. Section 1681s-2 is particularly clear: a person shall not furnish any information relating to a consumer to any consumer reporting agency if the person knows or consciously avoids knowing that the information is inaccurate.

A sovereign is someone who is not subject to statutes. A person is someone who voluntarily submits himself to statutes. In the United States the people are sovereign over their civil servants: UCC , Law merchant, Admiralty , Statutory , Administrative color of law is NOT LAW! It's all fraud, treason and Null and void of Law.....“The entire taxing and monetary system are hereby, placed under the UCC.” [The Federal Tax Lien Act of 1966]
“At common law there was no tax lien.” [Cassidy v. Aroostock, 134 ME. 34]
Erie Railroad v. Tompkins, 1938 Supreme Court of the United States had decided on the basis of Commercial (Negotiable Instruments) Law: that Tompkins was not under any contract with the Erie Railroad, and therefore he had no standing to sue the company. Under the Common Law, he was damaged and he would have had the right to sue.
Hence, all courts since 1938 are operating in an Admiralty Jurisdiction and not Common Law courts because lawful money (silver or gold coin) does not exist.
Marbury v. Madison, 5 US 137,(1803) “The Constitution of these United States is the supreme law of the land. Any law that is repugnant to the Constitution is null and void of law.”
Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S. (2 Cranch) 137, 180 (1803) “... the particular phraseology of the constitution of the United States confirms and strengthens the principle, supposed to be essential to all written constitutions, that a law repugnant to the constitution is void, and that courts, as well as other departments, are bound by that instrument.”
“In declaring what shall be the supreme law of the land, the Constitution itself is first mentioned; and not the laws of the United States generally, but those only which shall be made in pursuance of the Constitution, have that rank”.
“All law (rules and practices) which are repugnant to the Constitution are VOID”.
Miranda v. Arizona, 384 U.S. 436, (1966) “Where rights secured by the Constitution

are involved, there can be no rule making or legislation, which would abrogate them." Murdock v. Penn., 319 US 105, (1943) "No state shall convert a liberty into a privilege, license it, and attach a fee to it."

Shuttlesworth v. Birmingham, 373 US 262, (1969) "If the state converts a liberty into a privilege, the citizen can engage in the right with impunity."
I am including the following as both caveat with respect to the use of the term "citizen" in the above cite and as additional corroborative evidence establishing the fact that the present Government (U.S. Inc. dba/aka Federal D.C. Corporation) is a for profit Corporation, a Criminal enterprise controlled by private International Bankers and BAR association agents and is in fact defacto, Illegitimate, unconstitutional and unlawful. A foreign power with respect to the dejure constitutional Republic Government and the Several States and repugnant in every sense of the word to the original organic Constitution and therefore NULL and VOID of law!
State v. Manuel, 20 NC 122: "the term 'citizen' in the United States, is analogous to the term `subject' in common law; the change of phrase has resulted from the change in government."
Legitimate United States Notes and Federal Reserve Notes did not contain superfluous commentary. "IN GOD WE TRUST" appeared on illegitimate, non-redeemable, non notes. The Federal Reserve Note is worthless as a valid legitimate, promise to pay money, credit instrument. The people of the United States of American, through their state legislatures, granted the United States government Article 1, section 8 of the United States Constitution. "The Congress shall have the power…to coin money, regulate the value thereof." This power granted by the people was vested only in the United States Congress. Congress delegated this power in violation of the United States Constitution. "Congress cannot delegate or sign over its authority to any individual, corporation or foreign nation." 16th Corpus Juris Secundum, § 141. "The powers of the legislature are defined, and limited; and that those limits may not be mistaken, or forgotten, the constitution is written. To what purpose are powers limited, and to what purpose is that limitation committed to writing, if these limits may, at any time, be passed by those intended to be restrained? The distinction, between a government with limited and unlimited powers is abolished, if those limits do not confine the persons on whom they are imposed, and if acts prohibited and acts allowed, are of equal obligation. It is a proposition too plain to be contested, that the constitution controls any legislative act repugnant to it; or, that the legislature may alter the constitution by an ordinary act." U.S. Supreme Court in Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S. 368 "The general rule is that an unconstitutional statute, whether federal or state, though having the form and name of law, is in reality no law, but is wholly void, and ineffective for any purpose, since unconstitutionality dates from the time of its enactment, and not merely from the date of the decision so branding it. No one is bound to obey an unconstitutional law and no courts are bound to enforce it." 16th American Jurisprudence, § 256, 2nd Ed. Whenever one of these so called Judges is dealing with statutes (Statutory, Adminisrative, Admiralty, UCC/law merchant like the Texas Code, or the Texas Penal Code, or the Texas Code of Civil Procedure, he becomes a Clerk working for the prosecutor
"…judges who become involved in enforcement of mere statutes (civil or criminal in nature and otherwise), act as mere "clerks" of the involved agency…"K.C. Davis, ADMIN.LAW, Ch. 1 (CTP. West's 1965 Ed.)

"It is the accepted rule, not only in state courts, but, of the federal courts as well, that

when a judge is enforcing administrative law they are described as mere ‘extensions of the administrative agency for superior reviewing purposes’ as a ministerial clerk for an agency…”30 Cal 596; 167 Cal 762

“”When acting to enforce a statute and its subsequent amendments to the present date, the judge of the municipal court is acting as an administrative officer and not in a judicial capacity; courts administrating or enforcing statutes do not act judicially, but merely ministerially….but merely act as an extension as an agent for the involved agency— but only in a “ministerial” and not a “discretionary capacity…”Thompson v. Smith, 154 S.E. 579, 583; Keller v. P.E., 261 US 428; F.R.C. v. G.E., 281, U.S. 464 [emphasis added]

When a Judge is operating as a Clerk masquerading as a Judge, he cannot do anything judicial, and if he attempts to do anything judicial, it is a nullity
“Ministerial officers are incompetent to receive grants of judicial power from the legislature, their acts in attempting to exercise such powers are necessarily nullities”Burns v. Sup., Ct., SF, 140 Cal. 1

Once jurisdiction is challenged, it must be proven
“Where a court failed to observe safeguards, it amounts to denial of due process of law, court is deprived of juris.”Merritt v. Hunter, C.A. Kansas 170 F2d 739

The Federal Tax Lien Act of 1966