

COURTS ARE FREE IF YOU DON'T READ AND LEARN THIS YOU WILL END UP PAYING BETWEEN 300 AND 600 DOLLARS TO FILE A FOREIGN COURT CASE!

Plaintiffs, think the easiest way to show the facts, are we the sovereign people, first show what a person is not; in the law. So we have our basis of the claim considering 28 U.S.C. 1914 - (District court; filing and miscellaneous fees; rules of court) which requires a person, or persons, to pay a filing fee. Since a person, or persons, must pay the filing fee; one should denote what a person, is according to law in the second to properly show both sides of the coin. Starting with the Supreme Court decisions which denote the sovereign American people are not a person. Please see the following

'' in common usage, the term 'person' does not include the sovereign people, and statutes employing the (word person) are normally construed to exclude the sovereign people.' Wilson v Omaha Tribe, 442 US 653 667, 61 L Ed 2d 153, 99 S Ct 2529 (1979) (quoting United States v Cooper Corp. 312 US 600, 604, 85 L Ed 1071, 61 S Ct 742 (1941). See also United States v Mine Workers, 330 US 258, 275, 91 L Ed 884, 67 S Ct 677 (1947)'' Will v Michigan State Police, 491 US 58, 105 L. Ed. 2d 45, 109 S.Ct. 2304 b)

The sovereign people are not a person in a legal sense'' In re Fox, 52 N. Y. 535, 11 Am. Rep. 751; U.S.v. Fox, 94 U.S. 315, 24 L. Ed. 192.

A corporation is not a citizen within the meaning of that provision of the Constitution, which declares that the citizens of each State shall be entitled to all the privileges and immunities of citizens of the several States. Special privileges enjoyed by citizens in their own States are not secured in other States by this provision such as grants of corporate existence and powers. States may exclude a foreign corporation entirely or they may exact such security for the performance of its contracts with their citizens as, in their judgment, will best promote the public interest.

[Paul v. Virginia, 8 Wall (U.S.) 168; 19 L.Ed 357 (1868)]

We now know what a person is not, so let us see what a person is, the following definition of person was found in BLACKS LAW DICTIONARY 5TH EDITION PG 1028

Person. In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include a firm, labor organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers. National Labor Relations Act, § 2(1). Bankruptcy Act. "Person" includes individual, partnership, and corporation, but not governmental unit. Sec. 101(30). Corporation. A corporation is a "person" within meaning of equal protection and due process provisions of United States Constitution. Allen v. Pavach, Ind., 335 N.E. 2d 219, 221; Borreca v. Fasi, D.C.Hawaii, 369 F.Supp. 906, 911.

The term "persons" in statute relating to conspiracy to commit offense against United States, or to defraud United States, or any agency, includes corporation. *Alamo Fence Co. of Houston v. U. S.*, C.A.Tex., 240 F.2d 179, 181. Foreign government. Foreign governments otherwise eligible to sue in U.S.

courts are "persons" entitled to bring treble-damage suit for alleged anti-trust violations under Clayton Act, Section 4. *Pfizer, Inc. v. Government of India*, C.A.Minn., 550 F.2d 396. Illegitimate child. Illegitimate children are "persons" within meaning of the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, *Levy v. Louisiana*, 391 U.S. 68, 88 S.Ct. 1509, 1511, 20 L.Ed.2d 436; and scope of wrongful death statute, *Jordan v. Delta Drilling Co.*, Wyo., 541 P.2d 39, 48. Interested person. Includes heirs, devisees, children, spouses, creditors, beneficiaries and any others having a property right in or claim against a trust estate or the estate of a decedent, ward or protected person which may be affected by the proceeding. It also includes persons having priority for appointment as personal representative, and other fiduciaries

representing interested persons. The meaning as it relates to particular persons may vary from time to time and must be determined according to the particular purposes of, and matter involved in, any proceeding. Uniform Probate Code, § 1-201(20). Municipalities. Municipalities and other government units are "persons" within meaning of 42 U.S.C.A. § 1983. Local government officials sued in their official capacities are "persons" for purposes of Section 1983 in those cases in which a local government would be sue able in its own name. *Monell v. N.Y. City Department of Social Services*, 436 U.S. 658, 98 S.Ct. 2018, 56 L.Ed.2d 611. See Color of law. Protected person. One for whom a conservator has been appointed or other protective order has been made Uniform, Probate Code § 5-101(3).

Now we must examine Supreme Court decisions, to get a definitive answer. Do the sovereign people have to pay filing fees; or are they entitled to free, access of the courts?

The courts must realize the sovereign people, are not bound to pay filing fees as the sovereign people, are not a person, or persons. The use of the word person the reason the sovereign; people have been paying for filing fees. It is the use of the word person in law, and the confusion, the word person creates for the average sovereign people, when used in law. A person is a corporation that is why the courts are not to be charging, the sovereign people to pay filing fees falsely. They state the under Title 28 sec 1914 that persons or a person must pay, so when the sovereign people, point out that only apply s to person or persons which is a corporation, and the sovereign people need the law, that says the people or a natural person, is required to pay filing fees, or receive free

access as ordered by the Supreme Court. Take Mandatory Judicial Notice and Cognizance under (Federal Rules of Evidence 201 (d) that “plaintiff” ie Libellant has a lawful right to proceed without cost, based upon the following case law:

The US Supreme Court has ruled that a natural individual entitled to relief is “entitled to free access to the natural peoples judicial tribunals and public offices in every State of the Union(2 Black 620, see also Crandell v Nevada, 6 Wall 35]. Plaintiff (libellant) should not be charged fees or costs for the lawful and Constitutional Right to petition this court in this matter in which he/she is entitled to relief, as it appears that the filing fee rule was originally implemented for fictions and subjects of the State and should not be applied to the Plaintiff who is a natural individual and entitled to relief (Hale v Hinkel, 201 US 43, NAACP v Button, 371 US 415); United Mineworkers v Gibbs, 383 US 715; and Johnson v Avery, 89 S.Ct. 747 (1969).

Petitioner (libellant) cannot be charged a fee as no charge can be placed upon a citizen as a condition precedent to exercise his/her Constitutional Rights, his/her rights secured by the Constitution. A fee is a charge “fixed by law for services fixed by public officers or for use of a privilege under control of government.” Fort Smith Gas Co. v Wisemen” 189 Ark.675 74 SW.2d 789,790, from Black’ s Law Dictionary 5th Ed.

The US Supreme Court has ruled that a natural person entitled to relief is “entitled to free access to its judicial tribunals and public offices in every State of the Union(2 Black 620, see also Crandell v Nevada, 6 Wall 35].

Plaintiff (libellant) should not be charged fees or costs for the lawful and Constitutional Right to petition this court in this matter in which he/she is entitled to relief, as it appears that the filing fee rule was originally implemented for fictions and subjects of the State and should not be applied to the Plaintiff who is a natural individual and entitled to relief (Hale v Hinkel, 201 US 43,

#### NOTICE AND CONCLUSION IN LAW

So in closing it is clear petitioners /plaintiffs must have their funds, refunded if PLAINTIFFS have paid under Title 28 U.S.C. 1914 - (District court; filing and miscellaneous fees; rules of court) or not be charged at all, as the sovereign people are entitled to free access of the courts. Plaintiffs believe this is proper, in any form, as the people’ s tax dollars fund these courts. If the people are not, to have free access then the tax dollars should stop flowing, for this purpose. Because it would mean the courts, are receiving enumeration twice. Once by taxes then paid, again by the people paying for a use of the courts, when, their tax dollars had already paid. Petitioners also respectfully demands the Magistrate takes judicial notice of all herein under RULE 201 (d) which is adjudicated facts.

Petitioners also gives notice to the Magistrate, that the Magistrate is bound by US Supreme Court rulings please see the following. Howlett V. Rose, 496 U.S. 356 (1990) Federal Law and Supreme Court cases apply to State court cases. (Cooper v. Aaron, 358 U.S. 1) (1958)--States are bound by United States Supreme Court Case decisions.

I/We declare swear and affirm under penalty of perjury that, to the best of my knowledge and belief, the information herein is true, correct, and complete & pursuant to 28 U.S. Code § 1746 - Unsworn declarations under penalty of perjury