

--- On Sun, 3/5/17, <postmaster@ftc.gov> wrote:

> From: <postmaster@ftc.gov>
> Subject: Undeliverable: Fwd:my filing this in to record is being block
by Lincoln county postal employees covering up for family and friends name
in this fact including being threaten to be kidnap and held for ransom
by the local post masters As I have sever medical including heart and
lung , spinal cord conditions, ,By the injurers by elected and
public servants, Fwd:prof rape robbery kidnapping is excepted for
finical gain to elected and public servants religions gains “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:

> To: edjohnston2003@yahoo.com

> Date: Sunday, March 5, 2017, 3:57 PM

>

> Delivery

> has failed to these recipients or distribution

> lists:

> antitrust@ftc.gov

>

> The recipient’s mailbox is full and can’t accept

> messages now. Microsoft Exchange will not try to redeliver

> this message for you. Please try resending this message

> later, or contact the recipient directly.

>

> Sent by

> Microsoft Exchange Server 2007

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

> Diagnostic information for

> administrators:

> dkim=pass (signature verified) header.i=@yahoo.com
> X-IronPort-AV: E=Sophos;i="5.35,250,1484024400";
>
> d="pdf'?scan'208";a="50449896"
> Received: from sonic314-23.consmr.mail.bf2.yahoo.com
> ([74.6.132.197]) by
> bark.ftc.gov with ESMTTP/TLS/AES128-GCM-SHA256; 05 Mar 2017
> 17:57:33 -0500
> DKIM-Signature: v=1; a=rsa-sha256; c=relaxed/relaxed;
> d=yahoo.com; s=s2048; t=1488754651;
> bh=vpBcBX65vYJcCentN/hLwMYE914GzKhVnJnXXcV508M=;
> h=Date:From:Reply-To:To:Cc:Subject:References:From:Subject;
>
b=jVYPKfs1/ROFDH/wmiofYvaDvanqyavVPaZNPmRXHY490zbxRC9FM9vqcAEZAGtPpKk
c8AoXHsao9U1oXvW7ZkpfNOXXrvNzoQ0UcVPsTtYrYHoft5BHKuaPk11Tex/Cs4kENLs1
eMUT5r1/1sRNLX66/ObLOS5igc7Ufd1R0/vSxhcqZ68SOGT9xxneVNuEluII74JXyae6m
D/Ji7ekNmRih4x124Z4Z7ia/RxdhRUGob9XTMwioo2uZn1jKj08G2kxo5LNRMyAuqCC16
Kj/NbjG9uxvgfLQvaPC1YitBPH3d3DWuBnUewmM1kw19Wx99FW9+HrNVMV/BM+vII1JQ=
=
> X-YMail-OSG:
> ZebmkqkVRDsxsSUUG.5SncfhokeK2Q1mbxQDMutCtPj7j6f3yGV.
> Received: from sonic.gate.mail.nel.yahoo.com by
> sonic314.consmr.mail.bf2.yahoo.com with HTTP; Sun, 5 Mar
> 2017 22:57:31 +0000
> Date: Sun, 5 Mar 2017 22:57:30 +0000
> From: ed johnston <edjohnston2003@yahoo.com>
> Reply-To: ed johnston <edjohnston2003@yahoo.com>
> To: <opa@ftc.gov>, <antitrust@ftc.gov>
> CC: <webmaster@ftc.gov>,
> <websitehelp@uspsoig.gov>, <foia@uspsoig.gov>
> Message-ID:
> <620270869.2400818.1488754650418@mail.yahoo.com>
> Subject: =?UTF-8?Q?Fwd:my_filing_this_in_to_record_is_?=
> =?UTF-8?Q?being_block_by_Lincoln_county_posta?=
> =?UTF-8?Q?1_employees_covering_up_for_family_?=
> =?UTF-8?Q?and_friends_name_in_this_fact_includ?=
> =?UTF-8?Q?ing_being_threaten_to_be_kidnap_and?=
> =?UTF-8?Q?held_for_ransom_by_the_local_post_m?=
> =?UTF-8?Q?asters_As_I_have_sever_medical_incl?=
> =?UTF-8?Q?uding_heart_and_lung,_spinal_cord_c?=
> =?UTF-8?Q?onditions,__,By_the_injurers_by_e?=
> =?UTF-8?Q?lected_and_public_servants,___Fwd:pr?=
> =?UTF-8?Q?of_rape_robbery_kidnapping_is_excep?=
> =?UTF-8?Q?ted_for_finical_gain_to_elected_and_?=

> =?UTF-8?Q?public_servants_religions_gains___=E2=80=9C?=
> =?UTF-8?Q?Every_State_law_must_conform_in_the_?=
> =?UTF-8?Q?first_place_to_the_Constitution_of_?=
> =?UTF-8?Q?the_United_States,_and_then_to_the_s?=
> =?UTF-8?Q?ubordinate_constitutions_of_the_par?=
> =?UTF-8?Q?ticular_state;_and_if_it_infringes_u?=
> =?UTF-8?Q?pon_the_provisions_of_either,_it_is?=
> =?UTF-8?Q?_so_far_void.=E2=80=9D_Houston_v._Moore,_18_?=
> =?UTF-8?Q?US_1,_5_L.Ed_19_(1840)._It_is_abidi?=
> =?UTF-8?Q?ng_truth_that_=E2=80=9Cnothing_can_destroy_a?=
> =?UTF-8?Q?_government_more_quickly_than_its_f?=
> =?UTF-8?Q?ailure_to_observe_its_own_laws,_or_w?=
> =?UTF-8?Q?orse,_its_disregard_of_the_charter_?=
> =?UTF-8?Q?of_its_own_existence.=E2=80=9D_Mapp_v._Ohio,?=
> =?UTF-8?Q?367_U.S._643,_659_(1961)._HARRIS_V.?=
> =?UTF-8?Q?_NEW_YORK_U.S._Supreme_Court=C2=B7401_U.S?=
> =?UTF-8?Q?._222_(1971).A_”public_official=E2=80=9D_ha?=
> =?UTF-8?Q?s_no_rights_in_relation_to_their_emp?=
> =?UTF-8?Q?loyer_lawful_bloodline_Americans_18?=
> =?UTF-8?Q?84,_the_state_or_federal_government:?=
> MIME-Version: 1.0
> Content-Type: multipart/mixed;
> boundary="-----_Part_2400817_2038012653.1488754650418"
> References:
> <620270869.2400818.1488754650418.ref@mail.yahoo.com>
> Content-Length: 2677760
> Return-Path: edjohnston2003@yahoo.com
>
>
> Reference number ,,79312576 ,, Fwd:my
> filing this in to record including ssi mailings is being
> block by Lincoln county us postal employees appearing to
> cover up for family and friends name in this fact including
> being threaten and have been on more then one occasion
> been kidnap and held for ransom by the local post masters As
> I have sever medical including heart and lung , spinal cord
> conditions, ,,By the injurers by elected and public
> servants,
>
>
> <https://www.identitytheft.gov/Information>
> OMB Control Number: 3084-0047
>
>

> 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 foriegn 1871
> government contracted elected and public servants service of
> employment . <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MFG1IvY6oTw&t=629s>
> ,,,,,,,Gov’ t employee brags about stealing land.
> <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7jeLil4p-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 REGISTERED. 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 JURISDICTRION "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=HTXTZOI80qg>
- > 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. Balistrieri*, 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." Balistrieri, 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:
> 105-13. "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.Sup. 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 Mcshane 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=HTXTZOI80qg>
> 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>