

The DMV IS GUILTY of Non-Disclosure class action suit Join in an protect you born rights...pass on

County of \_\_\_\_\_  
OFFICE OF THE CLERIC

City of \_\_\_\_\_, in the County of \_\_\_\_\_, in the State of \_\_\_\_\_

COMMON LAW VEHICULAR JUDICIAL NOTICE  
CONSTITUTIONALITY of DRIVERS LICENSE

THE UNDERSIGNED UNINFRANCHISED Common Law freeman \_\_\_\_\_: hereby Certifies, by Rights Secured under provisions of the Constitution of the United States of America, the Constitution of the several states, Common Law, Nature and Laws of Natures CREATOR, that these Rights are retained in FEE SIMPLE ABSOLUTE, and held and protected with special regard to Rights designated and/or set forth as follows: ALSO NOTE Rights and Property are ONE AND THE SAME THING-by the Honorable Justice LOUIS BRANDIS U. S. SUPREME COURT.

NOTICE AND ADVISORY OF RIGHTS CLAIMED INVIOATE:

1) The Right to TRAVEL FREELY, UNENCUMBERED, and UNFETTERED is guaranteed as a RIGHT and not a mere privilege. That the Right to TRAVEL is such a BASIC RIGHT it does NOT even need to be mentioned for it is SELF-evident by Common Sense that the Right to TRAVEL is a BASIC CONCOMMITANT of a FREE Society to come and go from length and breath FREELY UNENCUMBERED and UNFETTERED distinguishes the characteristic required for a FREE PEOPLE TO EXIST IN FACT. Please See SHAPIRO vs. THOMSON, 394 U. S. 618 .including CASE #1: "The use of the highway for the purpose of travel and transportation is not a mere privilege, but a common fundamental right of which the public and individuals cannot rightfully be deprived." Chicago Motor Coach v. Chicago, 169 NE 221.CASE #2: "The right of the citizen to travel upon the public highways and to transport his property thereon, either by carriage or by automobile, is not a mere privilege which a city may prohibit or permit at will, but a common law right which he has under the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." Thompson v. Smith, 154 SE 579.CASE #3: "The right to travel is a part of the liberty of which the citizen cannot be deprived without due process of law under the Fifth Amendment." Kent v. Dulles, 357 US 116, 125.CASE #4: "The right to travel is a well-established common right that does not owe its existence to the federal government. It is recognized by the courts as a natural right." Schactman v. Dulles 96 App DC 287, 225 F2d 938, at

941.

Further, the Right to TRAVEL by private conveyance for private purposes upon the Common way can NOT BE INFRINGED. No license or permission is required for TRAVEL when such TRAVEL IS NOT for the purpose of [COMMERCIAL] PROFIT OR GAIN on the open highways operating under license IN COMMERCE. The above named Common Law unfranchised freeman listed IS NOT OPERATING IN COMMERCE and as such is thereby EXEMPTED FROM THE REQUIREMENT OF A LICENSE AS SUCH. Further, The city of \_\_\_\_\_ in the county of \_\_\_\_\_ in the state of \_\_\_\_\_, is FORBIDDEN BY LAW from converting a BASIC RIGHT into a PRIVILEGE and requiring a LICENSE and or a FEE CHARGED for the exercise of the BASIC RIGHT. Please SEE MURDOCK vs. PENNSYLVANIA, 319 U.S. 105, and if the city of \_\_\_\_\_ in the county of \_\_\_\_\_, in the state of \_\_\_\_\_ does ERRONIOUSLY convert BASIC RIGHTS into PRIVILEGES and require a License or FEE an unfranchised freeman may IGNORE THE LICENSE OR FEE WITH TOTAL IMMUNITY FOR SUCH EXERCISE OF A BASIC RIGHT. Please see Schuttlesworth vs. BIRMINGHAM, ALABAMA, 373 U.S. 262. Now if an unfranchised freeman exercises a BASIC RIGHT and a Law of ANY state is to the contrary of such exercise of that BASIC RIGHT, the said supposed Law of ANY state is a FICTION OF LAW and 100% TOTALLY UNCONSTITUTIONAL and NO COURTS ARE BOUND TO UPHOLD IT AND NO freeman is REQUIRED TO OBEY SUCH UNCONSTITUTIONAL LAW OR LICENSE REQUIREMENT. Please see MARBURY vs. MADISON, 5 U.S. 137 (1803), which has never been overturned in over 194 years, see Shephard's Citations. Now further, if a freeman relies in good faith on the advice of Counsel and or on the Decisions of the UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT that this unfranchised freeman has a PERFECT DEFENSE to the element of WILLFULNESS and since the burden of proof of said WILLFULNESS is on the Prosecution to prove beyond a REASONABLE DOUBT, said task or burden being totally impossible to specifically perform there is NO CAUSE OF ACTION FOR WHICH RELIEF MAY BE GRANTED BY A COURT OF LAW. Please see U.S. vs. Bishop 412 U.S. 346 . OBVIOUSLY THERE IS NO LAWFUL CHARGE AGAINST EXERCISING A BASIC Right to TRAVEL for a regular Common Law unfranchised freeman NOT IN COMMERCE on the common way Public HIGHWAY. THAT IS THE LAW!!! The above named unfranchised freeman IS IMMUNE FROM ANY CHARGE TO THE CONTRARY AND ANY PARTY MAKING SUCH CHARGE SHOULD BE DULY WARNED OF THE TORT OF TRESPASS!!! YOU ARE TRESPASSING ON THIS Common Law freeman !!!

2) The original and Judicial jurisdiction of the United States Supreme Court is ALL actions in which a State may be party, thru subdivision, political or trust. This includes ALL state approved subdivisions and/or INCORPORATED Cities, Townships, Municipalities, and Villages, Et Al . Please see Article 3, Section 2, Para. (1) and (2), U.S. Constitution. Sheriff for each county our the lawful Authority. <http://www.scribd.com/.../Sheriffs-Independence-Day-Letter-C>

e...

Sheriffs Independence Day Letter Certificate

[www.scribd.com](http://www.scribd.com), "Personal liberty, or the Right to enjoyment of life and liberty, is one of the fundamental or natural Rights, which has been protected by its inclusion as a guarantee in the various constitutions, which is not derived from, or dependent on, the U.S. Constitution, which may not be submitted to a vote and may not depend on the outcome of an election. It is one of the most sacred and valuable Rights, as sacred as the Right to private property... and is regarded as UNALIENABLE." 16 C. J. S., Constitutional Law, Sect. 202, p. 987.

Lawful,, Due proses is Constitutional the private American side 1866 civil rights act to protect lawful americans from there Elected and public Employees,, Judicial proses Fraud and treasonous Fraud appone the Court, Constitution law...

3) The undersigned has NEVER willingly and knowingly entered into ANY Contract or Contractual agreement giving up ANY Constitutional Rights which are secured by the CONSTITUTION, the SUPREME LAW OF THE LAND. This Common Law unfranchised freeman has NOT harmed any party, has NOT threatened any party, and that includes has NOT threatened or caused any endangerment to the safety or well being of any party and would leave any claimant otherwise to their strictest proofs otherwise IN A COURT OF LAW. The above named unfranchised freeman is merely exercising the BASIC RIGHT TO TRAVEL UNENCUMBERED and UNFETTERED on the Common public way or highway, which is their RIGHT TO SO DO!!! Please see Zobel vs. Williams, 457 U.S. 55, held the RIGHT TO TRAVEL is Constitutionally PROTECTED!! That an officer or employee of a state or one of its subdivisions is deemed to be acting under "color of law." Stringer v. Dilger, 1963, Ca. 10 Colo., 313 F. 2d 536. (Civil Rights) It has been stated that there is no convincing proof that the Congress is responsible for the Civil Rights Act ever intended to immunize any state or territorial officials or employees, and that it is more likely that the congress intended to do away with whatever common-law immunities existed. Congressional Globe, 42 D Congo 1st Sess., 365-6, 268, 385 (1871). Judges are not immune from criminal sanctions under the Civil Rights Act. ex parte Virginia (1879), 100 U.S. 339.

4) Conversion of the RIGHT TO TRAVEL into a PRIVILEGE and or CRIME is A FRAUD and is in clear and direct conflict with she UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION, THE SUPREME LAW OF THE LAND. LAWS made by any state, which are clearly in direct CONFLICT or REPUGNANCY are UNCONSTITUTIONAL and are NOT WITH STANDING IN LAW AND ARE BEING CHALLENGED AS SUCH HERE AND THEREBY ARE NULL AND VOID OF LAW ON THEIR FACE. NO COURTS ARE BOUND TO UPHOLD SUCH FICTIONS OF LAW AND NO unfranchised freeman is bound to obey such a

FICTION OF LAW. SUCH REGULATION OR LAW OPERATES AS A MERE NULLITY OR FICTION OF LAW AS IF IT NEVER EXISTED IN LAW. No freeman IS BOUND TO OBEY SUCH UNCONSTITUTIONAL LAW!!!!!!

5) The payment for a privilege requires a benefit to be received As the RIGHT TO TRAVEL is already secured it is clearly unlawful to cite any charges without direct damage to the specific party . Nor may a unfranchised freeman be charged with an offense for the exercise of a CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT, in this case the RIGHT TO TRAVEL. Please see Miller vs. UNITED STATES 230 F2d 486 . Nor may a unfranchised freeman under common law be denied DUE PROCESS OF LAW or EQUAL PROTECTION UNDER THE LAW.

6) The undersigned does hereby claim, declare, and certify ANY AND ALL their CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS INVIOLETE from our creator and secured in THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION and the CONSTITUTION OF THE state where in they abode as a SOVEREIGN, COMMON LAW unfranchised freeman existing and living entirely AT and under THE COMMON LAW, and retains ALL BASIC RIGHTS under the CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, NATURE AND NATURE'S creator AND UNDER THE LAWS OF our creator THE SUPREME LAW GIVER.

7) ANY VIOLATOR OF THE ABOVE CONSTRUCTIVE NOTICE AND CLAIM IS CRIMINALLY TRESPASSING UPON THIS ABOVE NAMED COMMON LAW Citizen and WILL BE PROSECUTED TO THE FULLEST EXTENT UNDER THE SUPREME LAW OF THE LAND. BE WARNED OF THE TRESPASS AND THE ATTACHED CAVEATS. ALSO TAKE CONSTRUCTIVE NOTICE, IGNORANCE OF THE LAW IS NOT AN EXCUSE!!

8)Every person who, under color of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage, of any state or territory, subjects or causes to be subjected, any citizen of the United States or other person to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the constitution and laws, shall be liable to the party injured in an action at law, equity, or other proper proceeding for redress. (Civil Rights) 42 U. S. C. 1963.

9)That an officer or employee of a state or one of its subdivisions is deemed to be acting under "color of law" as to those deprivations of right committed in the fulfillment of the tasks and obligations assigned to him. Monroe v. Pape, 1961, 365 U.S. 167. (Civil Rights)

10)By the great weight of authority it is acknowledged that generally "public officials" are not immune from suit when they allegedly violate the civil rights of citizens, and that a "public official's" defense of immunity is to be sparingly applied in these kinds of cases. James v. Ogilvie, 1970, DC Ill., 310 F. Sup. 661, 663. The Civil Rights Acts in

general, and 1963 in particular, are cast in terms so broad as to suggest that in suits brought under these sections, common law doctrines of immunity can never be a bar. It should be equally clear that both the language and the purpose of the Civil Rights Acts are inconsistent with the, application of common law notions of official immunity in all suits brought under these provisions. Jacobsen V. Henne, 1966, Ca. 2 NY 355, F. 2d 129, 133-4; Anderson v. Nossler, 1971, Ca. 5, Miss., 428 F.2d 183, 01 MCD on other grounds 456 F.2d 835.,,Further Civil rights laws at [http://www.oregontrackers.com/Civil\\_Rights.html](http://www.oregontrackers.com/Civil_Rights.html)

11)No Game Read all an pass on,,Police Departments are registered as NON-PROFIT CORPORATIONS, piracy  
<<http://occupycorporatism.com/illegal-police-department-act.../>>

ENFORCEMENT OF CITY/COUNTY CODES PROHIBITED. California Law prohibits Cities and Counties from enforcing City or County Codes and Ordinances upon property that is not ...

[www.usavsus.info/EnforcementNotAllowed.htm](http://www.usavsus.info/EnforcementNotAllowed.htm) - Cached

ConspiracyWatch> ENFORCEMENT OF CITY/COUNTY CODES PROHIBITED

ConspiracyWatch> ENFORCEMENT OF CITY/COUNTY CODES PROHIBITED Jack Bauer bowersecret at [gmail.com](mailto:jackbauersecret@gmail.com) Thu Jul 1 10:22:56 CDT 2010. Previous message: ConspiracyWatch> Kagan ...

[constitutionalgov.us/pipermail/conspiracywatch...](http://constitutionalgov.us/pipermail/conspiracywatch...) - Cached

Palazzolo v. Rhode Island | Casebriefs

[www.casebriefs.com/.../law/...law.../palazzolo-v-rhode-island/](http://www.casebriefs.com/.../law/...law.../palazzolo-v-rhode-island/)

Palazzolo v. Rhode Island. | More. View this case and other resources at: Bloomberg Law. Citation. 22 Ill.533 U. S. 606, 121 S. Ct. 2448, 150 L. Ed. 2d 592, ...

“It is not the duty of the police to protect you. Their job is to protect the Corporation, Elected and public employes and arrest code breakers.” (Sapp v. Tallahassee, 348 So. 2nd. 363, Reiff v. City of Philadelphia 477 F. Supp. 1262, Lynch v. N.C. Dept of Justice 376 S. E. 2nd. 247.)

SIGNATURE OF THE ABOVE NOTED Common Law unfranchised freeman is

Autograph by: \_\_\_\_\_

WITNESS by: \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

WITNESS by: \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

WITNESS by: \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

Stamp

Seal

NOTARY PUBLIC by: \_\_\_\_\_

MY COMMISSION EXPIRES \_\_\_\_\_

Form below use for County Clerk Filed in your county and posted on public notices.

state of \_\_\_\_\_

COUNTY OF \_\_\_\_\_

I, \_\_\_\_\_, CLERK of the County of

\_\_\_\_\_, thereof do hereby certify the

unfranchised freeman above named has sworn to the contents of this document and that

same is TRUE AND CORRECT. IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have

hereto set my hand and affixed the SEAL of said CIRCUIT COURT, at

the City of \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_  
this

\_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, AD. \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ Deputy County Clerk for

\_\_\_\_\_

\*Confidentiality Notice. \*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, Copyright © 2013 by originator\*\*. All Rights Reserved.