

Affidavit for public record,- Notice of treaty of Indian nations Rights - Notice of Dishonor - Without Prejudice and Without Recourse to Me living man Nii Nee. 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 Identity thief for Corporations aka CORPS gain for employment

Presented by Native Nii Nee Injured Living man Non-corporation, Bloodline Native American, Sovereign;
Crime Victim, Corpus Delicti (~18 U.S.C. § 3771)

exhibit One and evidence , Citizen v Lawful Bloodline Native

Whereas : PEOPLE HAVE RIGHTS, PERSONS HAVE PRIVILEGES.

And that's because once a MAN signs up for a privilege, he becomes a PERSON. Take health club membership for example. If you're a member, you're a PERSON subject to club rules. It's the private CONTRACT that makes you a person. Without that contract, you have inalienable rights. In the contract, that contract over-rules those rights. I.e. you've become a PERSON with privileges and can't call on the Public Law (Constitution) to defend yourself, since you're in a PRIVATE contract.

Here are some such contracts: Birth Certificate, Residency status, and even engaging in COMMERCE makes you a person subject to State's Public Policy (Statutes and codes).

Back in the dejure Republic, all you needed to prove AMERICAN Citizenship (of a state of the Union) was a BIRTH RECORD, which could be recorded in a family bible or come from a hospital. But as the default citizenship became FEDERAL (not State) citizenship, i.e. the 14th Amendment citizenship, for which one HAS TO be REGISTERED with the corporate STATE, via a Birth Certificate.

Hope you realize that a Birth Certificate is a CERTIFICATE, while a Certified Record of Birth is a RECORD OF BIRTH, which just happens to be certified. See how the banksters and their gov't minions fool the people, in order to deprive them of their Unalienable rights in a Republic, and suck them into their limited-liability scheme, known as Democracy?

I hope you realize that a BIRTH CERTIFICATE is EVIDENCE of TITLE to your body/person, just as a "Certificate of Title" is evidence of title to a car. And just as the "Certificate of Title" is NOT a full title, just evidence that a title exists, the BC also is

51 NOT a FULL title to your person, just evidence that a title exists, and that the State
52 HOLDS IT....

53
54
55 Federal gov't is running its own private 'nation'. It's VOLUNTARY, and you sign up
56 via a Birth Certificate. And when you joined their corporate nation, you gotta get SSN
57 if you want employment. And that entitles you to protection of federal labor laws, but
58 also makes you liable to obey federal laws. So you then are an employee in the federal
59 nation, a 'federal employee' for short.

60
61 And if you want out, just tell the IRS that you're a non-resident alien (State citizen or
62 inhabitant) and ask them for a form to change status of your SSN into an ITIN. Then
63 you can file W8 form with your employer and mark EXEMPT on line 7 of the W4
64 form.

65
66 BTW, there are about 100 boundary stones around District of Columbia. And on the
67 inside of the stones it says "Jurisdiction of the United States". That's a proof positive
68 that jurisdiction of US is limited to District of Columbia. SOO you now know what is
69 the territorial United States that form W8-BEN talks about.

70
71 Federal gov't is running its own private 'nation'. It's VOLUNTARY, and you sign up
72 via a Birth Certificate. And when you joined their corporate nation, you gotta get SSN
73 if you want employment. And that entitles you to protection of federal labor laws, but
74 also makes you liable to obey federal laws. So you then are an employee in the federal
75 nation, a 'federal employee' for short.

76
77 And if you want out, just tell the IRS that you're a non-resident alien (State citizen or
78 inhabitant) and ask them for a form to change status of your SSN into an ITIN. Then
79 you can file W8 form with your employer and mark EXEMPT on line 7 of the W4
80 form.

81
82 BTW, there are about 100 boundary stones around District of Columbia. And on the
83 inside of the stones it says "Jurisdiction of the United States". That's a proof positive
84 that jurisdiction of US is limited to District of Columbia. SOO you now know what is
85 the territorial United States that form W8-BEN talks about.

86
87 "United States" is the "District of Columbia" incorporated.

88
89 "The United States government is a foreign corporation with respect to a State"
90 Volume 20: Corpus Juris Sec. § 1785,
91 Also: NY re: Merriam 36 N.E. 505 1441 S. 0.1973, 14 L. Ed. 287

92
93 Federal Immigration and Nationality Act Section 8 USC 1324(a)(1)(A)(iv)(b)(iii)
94 "Any person who . . . encourages or induces an alien to . . . reside . . . knowing or in
95 reckless disregard of the fact that such . . . residence is . . . in violation of law, shall be
96 punished as provided . . . for each alien in respect to whom such a violation occurs . . .
97 fined under title 18 . . . imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both."

98
99 Merely being native born within the territorial boundaries of the United States of
100 America does not make such an inhabitant a Citizen of the United States, unless an

American Indian original to this land, subject to the jurisdiction of the Fourteenth Amendment "...Elk v. Wilkins, Neb (1884) 5 s.ct.41,112 U.S. 99,28 L.Ed. 643.

Citizens(Federal) and Persons vs. Lawful bloodline american People Non Corporation

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

[1] This is a BOLD LIE, it was never ratified per Article V of the U.S. Constitution (Congressional Record House, June 13, 1967, pg 15641-15646 and Dyett v Turner (1968) are VERY CLEAR about this)

trust no man or woman who claims to be a national

this new group of of folks appries to conspired and pirated to steal David and Edwards Book for their own gain wont to call them selves lawful American solution , to heed of mine and David work and education for the last sever years . I recognize

the set up by men and woman attempting to claim a title of nobility in a contract
 violation of the Constitution of the untied State of forty eight states lawful American
 bloodline , lawful Americans lawful native rights rights
<https://lookaside.fbsbx.com/.../A%20Constitutional%20Affidavi...>
 Look at the fraud folks Gibbons v Ogden 1824 supreme court “Persons are not the
 subjects of commerce...”
 “There is a distinction between a debt discharged and one paid. When discharged, the
 debt still exists, though divested of its character as a legal obligation during the
 operation of the discharge.” Stanek v. White (1927), 172 Minn. 390, 215 N.W. 781.
 Ballentines Law Dictionary, 3rd Edition: Dollar. The legal currency of the United
 States; State v Downs, 148 Ind 324, 327; the unit of money consisting of one hundred
 cents. The aggregate of specific coins which add up to one dollar. 36 Am J1st Money
 § 8. In the absence of qualifying words, it cannot mean promissory notes, bonds, or
 other evidences of debt. 36 AM J 1st Money § 8. 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, unless an American Indian original to this
 land, subject to the jurisdiction of the Fourteenth Amendment “...Elk v. Wilkins, Neb
 (1884) 5 s.ct.41,112 U.S. 99,28 L.Ed. 643.
 8 U.S. Code § 1401 - Nationals and citizens of United States at birth
 1978—Subsec. (a). Pub. L. 95–432, § 3, struck out “(a)” before “The following” and
 redesignated pars. (1) to (7) as (a) to (g), respectively.
 wake to the truth nationals and U.S. citizens are declared enemies of the U.S. by
 F.D.R. by Executive Order No. 2040 and ratified by Congress on March 9, 1933
 FDR changed the meaning of The Trading with the Enemy Act of December 6, 1917
 by changing the word "without" to citizens "within" the United States
 To cover the debt in 1933 and future debt, the corporate government determined and
 established the value of the future labor of each incorporated individual in its
 jurisdiction to be \$630,000. A bond of \$630,000 is set on each Certificate of Live
 Birth. The certificates are bundled together into sets and then placed as securities on
 the open market. These certificates are then purchased by the Federal Reserve and/or
 foreign bankers. The purchaser is the "holder" of "Title." This process made each and
 every person in this jurisdiction a bond servant.
 U.S. citizens were declared enemies of the U.S. by F.D.R. by Executive Order No.
 2040 and ratified
 WHAT IS HJR 192? Can we Discharge our Debts to
 the...<http://understandcontractlawandyouwin.com/hjr-192-discharg>
 .../ Jun 7, 2014 ... House Joint Resolution 192 was then passed by Congress on June 5,
 1933. This law was passed to do away with the gold clause For lawful Bloodline
 American ...
 House Joint Resolution 192, 1933 - ****Redemption - tribe.net
tribes.tribe.net/redemption101/thread/07f05122-0090-408b

...

House Joint Resolution 192 ... this Article does not contain an absolute prohibition against the States making something else a tender in transfer of debt. HJR-192 ...

.Background- 1933 The Bankruptcy of the UNITED...www.youhavetheright.com/tour3

randy was on a lot of on talk shows Joseph F. Bataillon; Impersonating a Judge? DEMAND FOR CERTIFIED COPIES OF REQUIRED CONSTITUTIONAL OATHS AND BONDING AND/OR PUBLIC OFFICIAL LIABILITY INSURANCE POLICIES<https://scannedretina.com/2013/06/04/joseph-f-bataillon-impersonating-a-judge/>

exhibit two and evidence , Kidnap and held for ransom including human trafficking

In *Bounds v. Smith*, 430 U.S. 817 (1977), we held that "the fundamental constitutional right of access to the courts requires prison authorities to assist inmates in the preparation and filing of meaningful legal papers by providing prisoners with adequate law libraries or adequate assistance from persons trained in the law."

Lewis v. Casey, 518 U.S. 343, 346 (U.S. 1996)

Whereas :

Title 42 § 408(a)(8) Title 42 § 408

(a) In general Whoever -

(8) discloses, uses, or compels the disclosure of the social security number of any person in violation of the laws of the United States; shall be guilty of a felony and upon conviction thereof shall be fined under title 18 or imprisoned for not more than five years, or both.

Whereas : I Giving public notice on filing

Criminal Section Civil Rights Division
U.S. Department of Justice
P.O. Box 66018
Washington, D.C. 20035-6018
Civil Actions for False Imprisonment

Title 42, U.S.C., Section 14141, makes it unlawful for state or local law enforcement agencies to allow officers to engage in a pattern or practice of conduct that deprives persons of rights protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States. This law is commonly referred to as the Police Misconduct Statute. This law gives DOJ the authority to seek civil remedies in cases where it is determined that law enforcement agencies have policies or practices which foster a pattern of misconduct by employees. This action is directed against an agency, not against individual officers. The types of issues which may initiate a Pattern and Practice investigation include:

Lack of supervision/monitoring of officers' actions.
Officers not providing justification or reporting incidents involving the use of force.
Lack of, or improper training of officers.
A department having a citizen complaint process which treats complainants as adversaries.

Under Title 42, U.S.C., Section 1997, DOJ has the ability to initiate civil actions against mental hospitals, retardation facilities, jails, prisons, nursing homes, and juvenile detention facilities, when there are allegations of systemic derivations of the constitutional rights of institutionalized persons.

Also see Department of Justice 8-1.000 CIVIL RIGHTS DIVISION

False imprisonment is the unlawful restraint of a person without consent or legal justification. False imprisonment can be committed by words, acts, or by both[i]. The common law tort of false imprisonment is defined as an unlawful restraint of an individual's personal liberty or freedom of movement[ii]. In order to constitute the wrong it is not necessary that the individual be actually confined or assaulted[iii].

It is to be noted that, there is no necessity in a false imprisonment case to prove that a person used physical violence or laid hands on another person. It is sufficient to show that at any time or place the person in any manner deprived another person of his/her liberty without sufficient legal authority[iv].

False arrest is sometimes used interchangeably with false imprisonment. False arrest is the unlawful violation of the personal liberty of another consisting of detention without sufficient legal authority. In order to establish a false arrest claim, the person detained must prove that the arrest is unlawful and such unlawful arrest resulted in injury. An arrest is unlawful when the police officers in question did not have probable cause to make the arrest[v].

An arresting officer who fails to take the arrested person before a court or magistrate within a reasonable time or without unnecessary delay is guilty of false imprisonment. Similarly, an officer who arrests a person without a warrant is liable for false imprisonment by detaining the prisoner an unreasonable time[vi].

Generally, false arrest is one of several means of committing false imprisonment. False arrest describes the setting for false imprisonment when it is committed by a peace officer or by one who claims the power to make an arrest. Thus, a tort action for false imprisonment based on false arrest against a person who is not a peace officer implies that the detention or restraint to support the tort was done by one who claims the power of arrest[vii].

However, false arrest is almost indistinguishable from false imprisonment[viii]. The only distinction lies in the manner in which they arise. False arrest is merely one means of committing a false imprisonment. Whereas, false imprisonment is committed without any thought of attempting arrest[ix].

The principal element of damages in an action for false imprisonment is the loss of freedom. Sometimes, a court also takes into account the fear and nervousness suffered

as a result of the detention[x]. The tort of false imprisonment involves an unlawful restraint on freedom of movement or personal liberty. Therefore, two essential elements to constitute false imprisonment are[xi]:

Detention or restraint against a person's will,
Unlawfulness of the detention or restraint.

Whereas, after liability is established for false arrest, the person who suffered may recover nominal damages as well as compensation for mental suffering, including fright, shame, and mortification from the indignity and disgrace, consequent upon an illegal detention[xii]. However, in a suit for false arrest and false imprisonment, a person cannot recover attorney's fees incurred or loss of earnings suffered while defending an underlying criminal action[xiii].

The elements to be considered by the jury in awarding compensatory damages in a false imprisonment case are physical suffering, mental suffering and humiliation, loss of time and interruption of business, reasonable and necessary expenses incurred, and injury to reputation[xiv]. However, it is to be noted that a mere loss of freedom will not constitute false imprisonment[xv].

In a suit for false imprisonment, the damages award may include compensation for loss of earnings while imprisoned, for bodily and mental suffering caused by the imprisonment, and for expenses incurred in securing discharge from restraint including a reasonable attorney fee[xvi].

The measure of damages for false imprisonment is a sum that will fairly and reasonably compensate the injured person for the injuries caused by the wrongful act including any special pecuniary loss which is a direct result of the false imprisonment[xvii]. A jury can award punitive damages in a false arrest or imprisonment case, if the requisite level of malice or other requisite mental state is established.

All persons who personally participate or cause an unlawful detention are held to be liable. Similarly, persons other than those who actually cause an imprisonment may be held jointly liable with others, as instigators or participants. However, passive knowledge or consent to the acts of another, or acting on a superior's order, is not sufficient to make a person liable for false imprisonment.

It is to be noted that the jail officials are also held liable for false imprisonment for holding a person for an unreasonable time. A jail official is liable for false imprisonment if s/he knows that an arrest was illegal and that there is no right to imprison the person so arrested.

The liability of a principal for the act of an agent in causing a false arrest or imprisonment depends upon whether the principal previously authorized the act, or subsequently ratified it, or whether the act was within the scope of the employee's or agent's employment[xviii]. However, an employer will not be held liable for false imprisonment for the actions of an employee which are outside the scope of employment.

In order to avoid liability in an action for false imprisonment, a person must establish that s/he did not imprison the other person or s/he must justify the imprisonment. The presence of probable cause for imprisonment is a defense if it constitutes reasonable grounds for acting in defense of property or making an arrest without a warrant. A person is not liable for false imprisonment, if the person restrained is a child under the age of seventeen upon certain conditions. However, contributory negligence is not considered a defense if the wrong is something more than mere negligence[xix].

A false imprisonment action cannot be maintained if a person is properly arrested by lawful authority without a warrant. In order to justify an arrest without a warrant, the arrestor must proceed as soon as may be to make the arrest. Therefore, a private person can arrest another for a public offense committed or attempted in his/her presence[xx].

Certain officials and professionals are exempted from civil liability for false imprisonment under certain circumstances. They are:

- Judicial officers;
- Government officials entrusted with judicial functions;
- Attorneys;
- Physicians.

A judicial officer who has jurisdiction of the person and of the subject matter is exempted from civil liability for false imprisonment so long as the judge acts within that jurisdiction and in a judicial capacity[xxi]. Similarly, officers in other government departments are also exempted from liability for false imprisonment whenever they are entrusted with the judicial exercise of discretionary power. Likewise, an attorney is also protected from personal liability for false imprisonment if s/he acts in good faith on behalf of his/her client. It is to be noted that physicians who give evidence in proceedings to determine sanity are also immune from liability for false imprisonment.

In the case of false imprisonment, the plaintiff has the burden of proving the false arrest. The plaintiff in a false imprisonment action must prove that the defendant proximately caused the injuries for which the plaintiff seeks damages[xxii].

[i] Dietz v. Finlay Fine Jewelry Corp., 754 N.E.2d 958 (Ind. Ct. App. 2001).

[ii] Pechulis v. City of Chicago, 1997 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 11856 (N.D. Ill. Aug. 7, 1997).

[iii] Whitman v. Atchison, T. & S. F. R. Co., 85 Kan. 150 (Kan. 1911).

[iv] Pechulis v. City of Chicago, 1997 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 11856 (N.D. Ill. Aug. 7, 1997).

[v] Landry v. Duncan, 902 So. 2d 1098 (La.App. 5 Cir. Apr. 26, 2005).

[vi] Dragna v. White, 45 Cal. 2d 469 (Cal. 1955).

- [vii] Rife v. D.T. Corner, Inc., 641 N.W.2d 761 (Iowa 2002).
- [viii] Kraft v. Bettendorf, 359 N.W.2d 466 (Iowa 1984).
- [ix] Harrer v. Montgomery Ward & Co., 124 Mont. 295 (Mont. 1950).
- [x] Pitts v. State, 51 Ill. Ct. Cl. 29 (Ill. Ct. Cl. 1999).
- [xi] Ette v. Linn-Mar Cmty. Sch. Dist., 656 N.W.2d 62 (Iowa 2002).
- [xii] Barnes v. District of Columbia, 452 A.2d 1198 (D.C. 1982).
- [xiii] Id.
- [xiv] Jenkins v. Pic-n-Pay Shoes, Inc., 1985 Tenn. LEXIS 536 (Tenn. July 15, 1985).
- [xv] Gee v. State, 21 Ill. Ct. Cl. 573 (Ill. Ct. Cl. 1954).
- [xvi] Phillips v. District of Columbia, 458 A.2d 722 (D.C. 1983).
- [xvii] Sindle v. New York City Transit Authority, 64 Misc. 2d 995 (N.Y. Sup. Ct. 1970).
- [xviii] Sears, Roebuck & Co. v. Steele, 23 Tenn. App. 275 (Tenn. Ct. App. 1939).
- [xix] Aiken v. Holyoke S. R. Co., 184 Mass. 269, 271 (Mass. 1903).
- [xx] Hill v. Levy, 117 Cal. App. 2d 667 (Cal. App. 1953).
- [xxi] Bahakel v. Tate, 503 So. 2d 837 (Ala. 1987).
- [xxii] Fischer v. Famous-Barr Co., 618 S.W.2d 446 (Mo. Ct. App. 1981)

Whereas :

PRISONER MAY NOT BE COMPEL TO STAND TRIAL BEFORE JURY IN
PRISION CLOTHES

“Holding that it is unconstitutional for a state to compel a defendant to stand trial before a jury while dressed in prison clothes because this "furthers no essential state policy" and presents an unacceptable risk of affecting jurors' judgment”
Padgett v. Sexton, No. 11-6276 (6th Cir. Jul. 2, 2013)

“Holding that a state cannot compel a criminal defendant to stand trial while dressed in identifiable prison clothes”
U.S. v. FUERTES, 10-12111 (11th Cir. 2-22-2011), No. 10-12111 Non-Argument Calendar. (11th Cir. Feb. 22, 2011)

“Holding that "the failure to make an objection to the court as to being tried in such

clothes . . . is sufficient to negate the presence of compulsion necessary to establish a constitutional violation”

U.S. v. COOPER, 591 F.3d 582 (7th Cir. 2010)

“Holding that an accused may not be compelled to stand trial before a jury while dressed in identifiable prison clothes”

U.S. v. RODRÍGUEZ-DURÁN, 507 F.3d 749 (1st Cir. 2007)

“Holding that forcing defendant to wear prison clothing violated his right to presumption of innocence”

CHAVEZ v. COCKRELL, 310 F.3d 805 (5th Cir. 2002)

“Holding unconstitutional a requirement that defendant appear in prison garb at trial”

U.S. v. CHILDRESS, 58 F.3d 693 (D.C. Cir. 1995)

“Holding that both due process and equal protection rights are violated when a defendant is forced to appear in prison garb simply because he cannot afford bail”

Hyatt v. Gelb, 142 F.Supp.3d 198 (D. Mass. 2015)

“Holding that compelling a defendant to appear at trial in jail uniform violates due process”

Throop v. Diaz, CASE NO. 12cv1870-LAB (NLS) (S.D. Cal. Feb. 26, 2015)

“Holding that state cannot, consistent with due process and equal protection, require an accused to stand trial while wearing identifiable prison clothes”

Nelson v. McDaniel, 3:09-cv-00742-RCJ-VPC (D. Nev. Oct. 17, 2013)

“Holding that the 14th Amendment forbids a requirement that a criminal defendant stand trial in identifiable prison clothes” Chavez v. Yates, No. CIV S-09-1876 KJM CHS (E.D. Cal. Dec. 15, 2011)

“Holding that defendants may not be presented to the jury in prison-issue clothing so that "an unacceptable risk is presented of impermissible factors coming into play" where to do so "furthers no essential state policy"” EVANS v. VOORHIES, Case No. 1:06cv746. (S.D. Ohio Aug. 30, 2007)

“Holding that defendants may not be presented to the jury in prison issue clothing so that "an unacceptable risk is presented of impermissible factors coming into play" where to do so "furthers no essential state policy"” EARHART v. KONTEH, C-1-06-62. (S.D. Ohio Aug. 29, 2007)

“Holding that, because criminal defendants sometimes choose to appear in jail clothes in hopes of eliciting sympathy from the jury, an objection must be made when non-jail clothes are not made available” KING v. WHITE, (C.D.Cal. 1993), 839 F. Supp. 718 (C.D. Cal. 1993)

“Holding that the presumption of innocence is a basic component of a fair trial”

Gates v. State, 381 P.3d 614 (Nev. 2012)

“Holding that defendant who appeared before jury in prison uniform had received fair

trial because he was not compelled to appear in that manner and noting that "it is not an uncommon defense tactic to produce the defendant in jail clothes in the hope of eliciting sympathy from the jury""

RYAN v. PALMATEER, 338 Or. 278 (Or. 2005)

"Holding that criminal defendants have a constitutional right not to be compelled to appear before a jury in jail attire" State v. Cunningham, No. 1 CA-CR 15-0831 (Ariz. Ct. App. Jun. 29, 2017)

"Holding that threat to the "fairness of the factfinding process" created by forcing a defendant to appear in prison garb must be justified by an "essential state policy""

State v. Davidson, No. E2013-00394-CCA-R3-DD (Tenn. Crim. App. Mar. 10, 2015)

"Holding the jury's continuous exposure to the defendant in jail attire amounted to prejudice and impaired the presumption of innocence" Cunningham v. State, 992 N.E.2d 235 (Ind. App. 2013)

"Holding that the State cannot, consistently with the Fourteenth Amendment, compel an accused to stand trial before a jury while dressed in identifiable prison clothes, but that the absence of objection negates the compulsion." STATE v. SIMPSON, 202 N.C. App. 586 (N.C. Ct. App. 2010)

"Holding that although a defendant cannot be compelled to stand trial in prison garb, failure to object negates the presence of any compulsion that would give rise to a due process violation"

WATLEY v. DEPT. OF REHAB. CORR., 06AP-1128 (4-19-2007), No. 06AP-1128. (Ohio Ct. App. Apr. 19, 2007)

"Holding that identifiable prison garb bears an unmistakable mark of guilt"

STATE v. MAKKA, W2001-00414-CCA-R3-CD (Tenn.Crim.App. 12-28-2001), No. W2001-00414-CCA-R3-CD. (Tenn. Crim. App. Dec. 28, 2001)

"Holding violation of due process to compel defendant to wear prison attire in front of jury because attire may affect fact-finding process" STATE v. REMUS, W1999-01448-CCA-R3-CD (Tenn.Crim.App. 3-8-2000), No. W1999-01448-CCA-R3-CD. (Tenn. Crim. App. Mar. 8, 2000)

"Holding that although the State cannot compel an accused to stand trial while dressed in identifiable prison clothes, the failure to make an objection is sufficient to negate the presence of compulsion necessary to establish a constitutional violation"

DICKENS v. STATE, 0112001247 (Del.Super. 7-11-2003), I.D.# 0112001247. (Del. Super. Ct. Jul. 11, 2003)

"Finding that an inflammatory photograph of a defendant in a prison jumpsuit "constant[ly] remind[ed]" the jury of past criminality and "undermine[d] the fairness of the fact-finding process""

U.S. v. ORTIZ, 474 F.3d 976 (7th Cir. 2007)

"Finding that a "constant reminder of the accused's condition implicit in such distinctive, identifiable attire [prison clothes] may affect a juror's judgment," and

thereby unacceptably "undermine the fairness of the fact-finding process" U.S. v. OWENS, 424 F.3d 649 (7th Cir. 2005)

Whereas: The first amendment of the Constitution of the United States says:

Quote:

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

It was written by Thomas Jefferson, who became President in 1801. In 1802 he wrote a letter to the Danbury Baptist Association saying that its purpose was to build "a wall of separation between Church and State", because they were asking him what the first amendment was really all about.

Jefferson also wrote in his Inagural address:

Quote:

Still one thing more, fellow-citizens -- a wise and frugal Government, which shall restrain men from injuring one another, shall leave them otherwise free to regulate their own pursuits of industry and improvement, and shall not take from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned. This is the sum of good government, and this is necessary to close the circle of our felicities.

In other words, unless the government can show that people are injuring each other, it has no business restricting their activities.

I agree with Jefferson that "No victim, no crime" is not just a catchy slogan, but should be the foundation of all law, because the purpose of the law is to protect people (and other innocent parties such as animals and the environment) from the actions of others. If the law does anything else it becomes a set of meaningless rules that has no real basis.

The the ninth and tenth amendments of the Constitution also state:

Quote:

Amendment 9 - Construction of Constitution. Ratified 12/15/1791.

The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

Amendment 10 - Powers of the States and People. Ratified 12/15/1791.

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

"Color of law"

From FBI website at <http://www.fbi.gov/hq/cid/civilrights/color.htm>

It is a crime for one or more persons acting under color of law willfully to deprive or conspire to deprive another person of any right protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States.

"Color of law" simply means that the person doing the act is using power given to him or her by a governmental agency (local, state or federal).

Criminal acts under color of law include acts not only done by local, state, or federal officials within the bounds or limits of their lawful authority, but also acts done beyond the bounds of their lawful authority. Off-duty conduct may also be covered under color of law, if the perpetrator asserted their official status in some manner.

Color of law may include public officials who are not law enforcement officers, for

example, judges and prosecutors, as well as, in some circumstances, non governmental employees who are asserting state authority, such as private security guards. While the federal authority to investigate color of law type violations extends to any official acting under "color of law", the vast majority of the allegations are against the law enforcement community. The average number of all federal civil rights cases initiated by the FBI from 1997 -2000 was 3513. Of those cases initiated, about 73% were allegations of color of law violations. Within the color of law allegations, about 82% were allegations of abuse of force with violence (59% of the total number of civil rights cases initiated).

"PEOPLE COMPELLED TO FILE INCOME TAXES VIOLATES THE 5TH AMENDMENT" Supreme Court ruled that income taxes constitute the compelled testimony of a witness: "The information revealed in the preparation and filing of an income tax return is, for the purposes of Fifth Amendment analysis, the testimony of a witness." "Government compels the filing of a return much as it compels, for example, the appearance of a 'witness' before a grand jury." *Garner v. United States*, 424 U.S. 648 (1975). ∴ Established that wages and income are NOT equivalent as far as taxes on income are concerned. "Decided cases have made the distinction between wages and income and have refused to equate the two in withholding or similar controversies. *Central Illinois Public Service Co. v. United States*, 435 U.S. 21(1978); *Peoples Life Ins. Co. v. United States*, 179 Ct. Cl. 318, 332, 373 F.2d 924, 932 (1967); *Humble Pipe Line Co. v. United States*, 194 Ct. Cl. 944, 950, 442 F.2d 1353, 1356 (1971); *Humble Oil & Refining Co. v. United States*, 194 Ct. Cl. 920, 442 F.2d 1362 (1971); *Stubbs, Overbeck & Associates v. United States*, 445 F.2d 1142 (CA5 1971); *Royster Co. v. United States*, 479 F.2d, at 390; (4th Cir. 1973); *Acacia Mutual Life Ins. Co. v. United States*, 272 F. Supp. 188 (Md. 1967). Supreme Court ruled that: "Waivers of Constitutional Rights not only must be voluntary, they must be knowingly intelligent acts, done with sufficient awareness of the relevant circumstances and consequences.": *Brady v. U.S.*, 397 U.S. 742 at 748 (1970) (a) not effectively connected with the conduct of a "trade or business" (public office per 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(26)) in the United States (government), (b) not earned from sources within the geographical federal 5 territory. See *Newman-Green v. Alfonso Larrain*, 490 U.S. 826 (1989) "United States" defined in 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(9) and (a)(10), (c) not subject to reporting per 26 U.S.C. §6041 because not connected to a statutory "trade or business" (public office) (d) not subject to withholding because not statutory "income" per 26 U.S.C. §643(b) and earned by a "non-resident non-person non-taxpayer" <http://new.oregontrackers.com/home.html>

COURTS ARE FREE IF YOU DON'T READ AND LEARN THIS YOU WILL END UP PAYING BETWEEN 300 AND 600 DOLLARS TO FILE A 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; *Borrec 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 able to sue 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 applies 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

lawful bloodline Americans only.....Federal Immigration and Nationality Act Section 8 USC 1324(a)(1)(A)(iv)(b)(iii) original 1774 do you research <http://www.americanpatrol.com/.../AidAbetUnlawfulSec8USC1324....>

TITLE 7. OFFENSES AGAINST PROPERTY CHAPTER 31. THEFT Sec. 31.01. DEFINITIONS. In this chapter:

exhibit three and evidence Treaties Rights

The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a Republican Form of Government, and shall protect each of them against Invasion; and on Application of the Legislature, or of the Executive (when the legislature cannot be convened) against domestic Violence.

The Oath of office is a quid pro quo contract cf [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 cf [Title 18 U.S.C., Sections 241, 242]. Treason under the Constitution at Article 3, Section 3., and Intrinsic Fraud cf [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”

Treaties as Law of the Land

289 2 M. FARRAND, THE RECORDS OF THE FEDERAL CONVENTION OF 1787 392-394 (rev. ed. 1937).

290 Supra, “Treaties as Law of the Land”.

291 27 U.S. (2 Pet.) 253, 314 (1829).

292 Cf. *Whitney v. Robertson*, 124 U.S. 190, 194 (1888): “When the stipulations are not self-executing they can only be enforced pursuant to legislation to carry them into effect If the treaty contains stipulations which are self-executing that is, require no legislation to make them operative, to that extent they have the force and effect of a legislative enactment.” S. Crandall, supra, chs. 11-15.

293 See infra, “When Is a Treaty Self-Executing”.

294 8 Stat. 116 (1794).

295 The story is told in numerous sources. E.g., S. Crandall, supra, at 165-171. For Washington’s message refusing to submit papers relating to the treaty to the House, see J. Richardson, supra at 123.

296 Debate in the House ran for more than a month. It was excerpted from the ANNALS separately published as DEBATES IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES, DURING THE FIRST SESSION OF THE FOURTH CONGRESS UPON THE CONSTITUTIONAL POWERS OF THE HOUSE WITH RESPECT TO TREATIES (1796). A source of much valuable information on the views of the Framers and those who came after them on the treaty power, the debates are analyzed in detail in E. BYRD, TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS IN THE UNITED STATES 35-59 (1960).

297 5 ANNALS OF CONGRESS 771, 782 (1796). A resolution similar in language was adopted by the House in 1871. CONG. GLOBE, 42d Congress, 1st sess. (1871), 835.

298 S. Crandall, supra, at 171-182; 1 W. WILLOUGHBY, THE CONSTITUTIONAL LAW OF THE UNITED STATES 549-552 (2d ed. 1929); but see RESTATEMENT, FOREIGN RELATIONS, supra, § 111, Reporters’ Note 7, p. 57. See also H. Rep. 4177, 49th Congress, 2d Sess. (1887). Cf. *De Lima v. Bidwell*, 182 U.S. 1, 198 (1901).

299 S. Crandall, *supra*, at 183-199.

300 8 Stat. 228.

301 3 Stat. 255 (1816). See S. Crandall, *supra*, at 184-188.

302 *Id.* at 188-195; 1 W. Willoughby, *supra*, at 555-560.

303 S. Crandall, *supra*, at 189-190.

304 Anderson, The Extent and Limitations of the Treaty-Making Power, 1 AM. J. INT'L L. 636, 641 (1907).

305 At the conclusion of the 1815 debate, the Senate conferees noted in their report that some treaties might need legislative implementation, which Congress was bound to provide, but did not indicate what in their opinion made some treaties self-executing and others not. 29 ANNALS OF CONGRESS 160 (1816). The House conferees observed that they thought, and that in their opinion the Senate conferees agreed, that legislative implementation was necessary to carry into effect all treaties which contained "stipulations requiring appropriations, or which might bind the nation to lay taxes, to raise armies, to support navies, to grant subsidies, to create States, or to cede territory..." *Id.* at 1019. Much the same language was included in a later report, H. Rep. No. 37, 40th Congress, 2d Sess. (1868). Controversy with respect to the sufficiency of Senate ratification of the Panama Canal treaties to dispose of United States property therein to Panama was extensive. A divided Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia reached the question and held that Senate approval of the treaty alone was sufficient. *Edwards v. Carter*, 580 F.2d 1055 (D.C. Cir.), cert. denied, 436 U. S. 907 (1978).

306 T. COOLEY, GENERAL PRINCIPLES OF CONSTITUTIONAL LAW 175 (3d ed. 1898); Q. WRIGHT, THE CONTROL OF AMERICAN FOREIGN RELATIONS 353-356 (1922).

307 *Head Money Cases*, 112 U.S. 580, 598-599 (1884). The repeatability of treaties by act of Congress was first asserted in an opinion of the Attorney General in 1854. 6 Ops. Atty. Gen. 291. The year following the doctrine was adopted judicially in a lengthy and cogently argued opinion of Justice Curtis, speaking for a United States circuit court in *Taylor v. Morton*, 23 Fed. Cas. 784 (No. 13,799) (C.C.D. Mass 1855). See also *The Cherokee Tobacco*, 78 U.S. (11 Wall.) 616 (1871); *United States v. Forty-Three Gallons of Whiskey*, 108 U.S. 491, 496 (1883); *Botiller v. Dominguez*, 130 U.S. 238 (1889); *The Chinese Exclusion Case*, 130 U.S. 581, 600 (1889); *Whitney v. Robertson*, 124 U.S. 190, 194 (1888); *Fong Yue Ting v. United States*, 149 U.S. 698, 721 (1893). "Congress by legislation, and so far as the people and authorities of the United States are concerned, could abrogate a treaty made between

this country and another country which had been negotiated by the President and approved by the Senate.” *La Abra Silver Mining Co. v. United States*, 175 U.S. 423, 460 (1899). Cf. *Reichart v. Felps*, 73 U.S. (6 Wall.) 160, 165-166 (1868), wherein it is stated obiter that “Congress is bound to regard the public treaties, and it had no power . . . to nullify [Indian] titles confirmed many years before... .”

308 *Foster v. Neilson*, 27 U.S. (2 Pet.) 253, 314-315 (1829). In a later case, it was determined in a different situation that by its terms the treaty in issue, which had been assumed to be executory in the earlier case, was self-executing. *United States v. Percheman*, 32 U.S. (7 Pet.) 51 (1833).

309 E.g., *United States v. Lee Yen Tai*, 185 U.S. 213, 220-221 (1902); *The Cherokee Tobacco*, 78 U.S. (11 Wall.) 616, 621 (1871); *Johnson v. Browne*, 205 U.S. 309, 320-321 (1907); *Whitney v. Roberston*, 124 U.S. 190, 194 (1888).

310 1 W. Willoughby, *supra*, at 555.

311 Other cases, which are cited in some sources, appear distinguishable. *United States v. Schooner Peggy*, 5 U.S. (1 Cr.) 103 (1801), applied a treaty entered into subsequent to enactment of a statute abrogating all treaties then in effect between the United States and France, so that it is inaccurate to refer to the treaty as superseding a prior statute. In *United States v. Forty-Three Gallons of Whiskey*, 93 U.S. 188 (1876), the treaty with an Indian tribe in which the tribe ceded certain territory, later included in a State, provided that a federal law restricting the sale of liquor on the reservation would continue in effect in the territory ceded; the Court found the stipulation an appropriate subject for settlement by treaty and the provision binding. And see *Charlton v. Kelly*, 229 U.S. 447 (1913).

312 288 U.S. 102 (1933).

313 42 Stat. 858, 979, § 581.

314 46 Stat. 590, 747, § 581.

23 *Medellin v. Texas*, 128 S. Ct. 1346, 1356 (2008), quoting *Whitney v. Robertson*, 124 U.S. 190, 194 (1888).

315 *United States v. Schooner Peggy*, 5 U.S. (1 Cr.) 103 (1801).

316 27 U.S. (2 Pet.) 253, 314-15 (1829).

25 *Medellin v. Texas*, 128 S. Ct. 1346, 1356 (2008), quoting *Ingartua-De La Rosa v. United States*, 417 F.3d 145, 150 (1st Cir. 2005) (en banc).

26 E.g., *United States v. One Bag of Paradise Feathers*, 256 F. 301, 306 (2d Cir. 1919); 1 W. WILLOUGHBY, *supra*, at 589. The State Department held the same view. G. HACKWORTH, 5 DIGEST OF INTERNATIONAL LAW 426 (1944).

951
952
953
954 319 Q. Wright, *supra*, at 207-208. See also L. HENKIN, *FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND*
955 *THE CONSTITUTION* 156-162 (1972).
956
957 320 Thus, compare *Foster v. Neilson*, 27 U.S. (2 Pet.) 253, 314-315 (1829), with
958 *Cook v. United States*, 288 U.S. 102, 118-19 (1933).
959
960
961
962 321 Acts of March 2, 1829, 4 Stat. 359 and of February 24, 1855, 10 Stat. 614.
963
964 322 See *In re Ross*, 140 U.S. 453 (1891), where the treaty provisions involved are
965 given. The supplementary legislation, later reenacted at Rev. Stat. 4083-4091, was
966 repealed by the Joint Res. of August 1, 1956, 70 Stat. 774. The validity of the Ross
967 case was subsequently questioned. See *Reid v. Covert*, 354 U.S. 1, 12, 64, 75 (1957).
968
969 323 18 U.S.C. §§ 3181-3195.
970
971 324 *Baldwin v. Franks*, 120 U.S. 678, 683 (1887).
972
973 325 *Neely v. Henkel*, 180 U.S. 109, 121 (1901). A different theory is offered by
974 Justice Story in his opinion for the court in *Prigg v. Pennsylvania*, 41 U.S. (16 Pet.)
975 539 (1842), in the following words: "Treaties made between the United States and
976 foreign powers, often contain special provisions, which do not execute themselves,
977 but require the interposition of Congress to carry them into effect, and Congress has
978 constantly, in such cases, legislated on the subject; yet, although the power is given to
979 the executive, with the consent of the senate, to make treaties, the power is nowhere in
980 positive terms conferred upon Congress to make laws to carry the stipulations of
981 treaties into effect. It has been supposed to result from the duty of the national
982 government to fulfill all the obligations of treaties." *Id.* at 619. Story was here in quest
983 of arguments to prove that Congress had power to enact a fugitive slave law, which he
984 based on its power "to carry into effect rights expressly given and duties expressly
985 enjoined" by the Constitution. *Id.* at 618-19. However, the treaty-making power is
986 neither a right nor a duty, but one of the powers "vested by this Constitution in the
987 Government of the United States." Art. I, § 8, cl. 18.
988
989
990
991
992 326 252 U.S. 416 (1920).
993
994 327 39 Stat. 1702 (1916).
995
996 328 40 Stat. 755 (1918).
997
998 329 *United States v. Shauver*, 214 F. 154 (E.D. Ark. 1914); *United States v.*
999 *McCullagh*, 221 F. 288 (D. Kan. 1915). The Court did not purport to decide whether
1000 those cases were correctly decided. *Missouri v. Holland*, 252 U.S. 416, 433 (1920).

Today, there seems no doubt that Congress' power under the commerce clause would be deemed more than adequate, but at that time a majority of the Court had a very restrictive view of the commerce power. Cf. *Hammer v. Dagenhart*, 247 U.S. 251 (1918).

330 *Missouri v. Holland*, 252 U.S. 416, 432 (1920).

331 252 U.S. at 433. The internal quotation is from *Andrews v. Andrews*, 188 U.S. 14, 33 (1903).

Treaty commitments of the United States are of two kinds. In the language of Chief Justice Marshall in 1829: "A treaty is, in its nature, a contract between two nations, not a legislative act. It does not generally effect, of itself, the object to be accomplished; especially, so far as its operation is intraterritorial; but is carried into execution by the sovereign power of the respective parties to the instrument."

"In the United States, a different principle is established. Our constitution declares a treaty to be the law of the land. It is, consequently, to be regarded in courts of justice as equivalent to an act of the legislature, whenever it operates of itself, without the aid of any legislative provision. But when the terms of the stipulation import a contract—when either of the parties engages to perform a particular act, the treaty addresses itself to the political, not the judicial department; and the legislature must execute the contract, before it can become a rule for the Court."²⁷⁰ To the same effect, but more accurate, is Justice Miller's language for the Court a half century later, in the *Head Money Cases*: "A treaty is primarily a compact between independent nations. It depends for the enforcement of its provisions on the interest and the honor of the governments which are parties of it.... But a treaty may also contain provisions which confer certain rights upon the citizens or subjects of one of the nations residing in the territorial limits of the other, which partake of the nature of municipal law, and which are capable of enforcement as between private parties in the courts of the country."²⁷¹

²⁷⁰ *Foster v. Neilson*, 27 U.S. (2 Pet.) 253, 314 (1829). See *THE FEDERALIST* No. 75 (J. Cooke ed. 1961), 504-505.

²⁷¹ 112 U.S. 580, 598 (1884). (quoted with approval in *Medellin v. Texas*, 128 S. Ct. 1346, 1357, 1358-59 (2008)) For treaty provisions operative as "law of the land" (self-executing), see *S. Crandall*, *supra*, at 36-42, 49-62, 151, 153-163, 179, 238-239, 286, 321, 338, 345-346. For treaty provisions of an "executory" character, see *id.* at 162-63, 232, 236, 238, 493, 497, 532, 570, 589. See also CRS Study, *supra*, at 41-68; Restatement, Foreign Relations, *supra*, §§ 111-115.

Tribal Historical Overview - The 1868 Fort Laramie Treaty
www.ndstudies.org/resources/IndianStudies/standingrock/1868treaty.html

Fort Laramie Treaty, 1868. ARTICLES OF A TREATY MADE AND CONCLUDED BY AND BETWEEN. Lieutenant General William T. Sherman, General William ...
Sioux Treaty of 1868 | National Archives

www.archives.gov/education/lessons/sioux-treaty

Sep 23, 2016 ... In the spring of 1868 a conference was held at Fort Laramie, in present day Wyoming, that resulted in a treaty with the Sioux. This treaty was to ...
Section 3: The Treaties of Fort Laramie, 1851 & 1868 | North...

ndstudies.gov/gr8/content/unit-iii-waves-development-1861-1920/lesson-4-alliances-and-conflicts/topic-2-sitting-bulls-people/section-3-treaties-fort-laramie-1851-1868

Map 1: Fort Laramie Treaty of 1851. This treaty was the first effort to define the territory of the Great Sioux Nation of Lakotas, Dakotas, and Nakotas. The treaty ...

“HEREBY

The Lawful GOVERNED, BY WE THE PEOPLE Lawful 1866 Civil rights act
Treaty's with 1871 treaty The British .Government treaty of 1213 Vatican

“THE CLAIM AND EXERCISE OF A CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT CANNOT BE CONVERTED INTO A CRIME.” – Miller v U.S., 230 F 2d 486. 489.

"governments are but trustees acting under derived authority and have no power to delegate what is not delegated to them, But the people, as the original fountain, might take away what they have delegated and entrust to whom they please. ... The sovereignty on every state resided in the people of the state and they may alter or change their form of government at their own pleasure."

Luther v Borden, 48 U.S. 1, 12 Led 581

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.”

Supreme Court: Jones v. Temmer, 89 F. Supp 1226: "The privileges and immunities clause of the 14th Amendment protects very few rights because it neither incorporates the Bill of Rights, nor protects all rights of individual citizens. Instead this provision protects only those rights peculiar to being a citizen of the federal government; it does not protect those rights which relate to state citizenship." Supreme Court: US vs. Valentine 288 F. Supp. 957: "The only absolute and unqualified right of a United States citizen is to residence within the territorial boundaries of the United States." Supreme Court 1795 a.“Inasmuch as every government is an artificial person, an abstraction, and a creature of the mind only, a government can interface only with other artificial persons. The imaginary, having neither actuality nor substance, is foreclosed from creating and attaining parity with the tangible. The legal manifestation of this is that no government, as well as any law, agency, aspect, court, etc. can concern itself with anything other than corporate, artificial persons and the contracts between them.” S.C.R. 1795, Penhallow v. Doane’s Administrators 3 U.S. 54; 1 L.Ed. 57; 3 Dall. 54; and,

b. "the contracts between them" involve U.S. Citizens, which are deemed as Corporate Entities:

c. "Therefore, the U.S. Citizens residing in one of the states of the union, are classified as property and franchises of the federal government as an "individual entity"', Wheeling Steel Corp. v. Fox, 298 U.S. 193, 80 L.Ed. 1143, 56 S.Ct. 773OUR rights" are such as "existed" by the Law of the Land (Common Law) "long antecedent" to the organization of the State", and can only be taken from him by "due process of law", and "in accordance with the Constitution." (the original organic Constitution not the Second Secret fake FEDERAL D.C. Corporate CONstitution charter version)

SOVEREIGNTY RULINGS & DEFENITIONS

1. As a natural right, men may do anything their inclinations may suggest if it be not evil in its self, and in no way impairs the rights of others. In Re Newman 9 C, 502 (1858)

2. The judicial power is the power to hear those matters that affect the life, liberty, or property of a citizen of the state. Sapulpa v Land 101 Okla. 22, 223 Pac. 640, 35 A.L.R. 872

3. The common law right of the jury to determine the law, as well as the facts remains unimpaired. State v Croteau 23 Vt. 14, 54 AM DEC 90 (1849)

4. The very meaning of sovereignty is that the decree of the sovereign makes law. American Banana Co. v United Fruit Co. 29 S. Ct. 511, 513 213 U.S. 347 53 L.Ed 826, 19 Ann. Cas. 1047.

5. Sovereign = A chief ruler with supreme power; a king or other ruler with limited power, an action against a foreign sovereign is not maintainable 44 L. Rep. N.S. 199.

6. The people of the state are entitled to all rights which formerly belong to the king, by his prerogatives. Lansing v Smith 4 Wendell 9,20 (N.Y.) (1829)

7 It will be admitted on all hands that with the exceptions of the powers granted through the constitution to the states and Federal Government the people of the several states are unconditionally sovereign within their respective states Ohio L. Inns & T. Co. v Debolt 16 How. 416, 14 L.Ed. 997.

8 A sovereign is exempt from suit, not because of any formal conception or obsolete theory, but on the logical and practical ground that there can be no legal right as against the authority that makes the law on which the right depends. Kawanakoa v Polyblank 205 U.S. 349, 353 27 S. Ct. 526, 527, 51 L. Ed. 834 (1907)

9 It is a general rule that the sovereign cannot be sued in his own court without consent and hence no direct judgment can be rendered against him therein for cost, except in the manner and on the condition he has proscribed. 40 La. Ann. 856," Bouvier's Law Dictionary Vol. 1(1897)

10 No action can be taken against the sovereign in non-constitutional courts of either the United States or the state courts & any such action is considered the crime of barratry. (Barratry is an offense at common law)

State v Batson 17 S.E. 2d 511, 512, 513

11 COURT = The person and the suit of the sovereign the place where the sovereign
sojourns with his regal retinue, where ever that may be Black's law dictionary 5th
edition page 318

12 A court of general jurisdiction is presumed to be acting within its jurisdiction till
the contrary is shown
Brown jur section 202 Wright v Douglas 10 Barb (N.Y.) 97; Town of Huntington Hall
v Town of Charlotte 15 Vt. 46.

13 Sovereignty its self is of course not subject to law, for it is the author and source of
law, but in our system, while sovereign authority is delegated to agencies of
Government, sovereignty itself remains with the people by whom and for whom all
Government exist and acts.
Yick Wo v Hopkins 118 U.S. 356, at pg 370

14 Every citizen & freeman is endowed with certain rights & privileges which no
written law or statute is required. These are the fundamental or natural rights among
all free people. U.S. v Morris 125 F 322 325

15 An indictment is required in any case where a person is being charged with an
infamous crime. Any crime for which the punishment is imprisonment is an infamous
crime. Supreme Court Makin v United states 117 U.S. 348

18 U.S. Code § 2381 - defines Treason as - "Whoever, owing allegiance to the United
States, levies war against them or adheres to their enemies, giving them aid and
comfort within the United States or elsewhere, is guilty of treason..." and the law
states that those convicted of treason - "shall suffer death, or shall be imprisoned not
less than five years and fined under this title but not less than \$10,000; and shall be
incapable of holding any office under the United States."

17 Sanchez-Llamas v. Oregon, 548 U.S. 331, 353-54 (2006), quoting Marbury v.
Madison, 5 U.S. (1 Cr.) 137, 177 (1803). In Sanchez-Llamas, two foreign nationals
were arrested in the United States, and, in violation of Article 36 of the Vienna
Convention on Consular Relations, their nations' consuls were not notified that they
had been detained by authorities in a foreign country (the U.S.). The foreign nationals
were convicted in Oregon and Virginia state courts, respectively, and cited the
violations of Article 36 in challenging their convictions. The Court did not decide
whether Article 36 grants rights that may be invoked by individuals in a judicial
proceeding (four justices would have held that it did grant such rights). The reason
that the Court did not decide whether Article 36 grants rights to defendants was that it
held, by a 6-to-3 vote, that, even if Article 36 does grant rights, the defendants in the
two cases before it were not entitled to relief on their claims. It found, specifically,
that "suppression of evidence is [not] a proper remedy for a violation of Article 36,"
and that "an Article 36 claim may be deemed forfeited under state procedural rules
because a defendant failed to raise the claim at trial." Id. at 342.

1201 18 *Sanchez-Llamas v. Oregon*, 548 U.S. at 355, quoting *Kolovrat v. Oregon*, 366 U.S.
1202 187, 194 (1961).

1203
1204 19 *Sanchez-Llamas v. Oregon*, 548 U.S. at 354, quoting Statute of the International
1205 Court of Justice, Art. 59, 59 Stat. 1062, T.S. No. 933 (1945) (emphasis added by the
1206 Court).

1207
1208 20 *Sanchez-Llamas v. Oregon*, 548 U.S. at 355, quoting *Breard v. Greene*, 523 U.S.
1209 371, 375 (1998) (per curiam).

1210
1211 21 *Medellin v. Texas*, 128 S. Ct. 1346, 1356 (2008) (emphasis in the original, internal
1212 quotation marks omitted). As in the case of the foreign nationals in *Sanchez-Llamas*,
1213 *Medellin's* nation's consul had not been notified that he had been detained in the
1214 United States. Unlike the foreign nationals in *Sanchez-Llamas*, however, *Medellin*
1215 was named in an ICJ decision that found a violation of Article 36 of the Vienna
1216 Convention.

1217
1218 22 *Medellin v. Texas*, 128 S. Ct. 1346, 1353 (2008). “[T]he non-self-executing
1219 character of a treaty constrains the President’s ability to comply with treaty
1220 commitments by unilaterally making the treaty binding on domestic courts.” *Id.* at
1221 1371. The majority opinion in *Medellin* was written by Chief Justice Roberts. Justice
1222 Stevens, concurring, noted that, even though the ICJ decision “is not ‘the supreme
1223 Law of the Land,’ U.S. Const., Art. VI, cl. 2,” it constitutes an international law
1224 obligation not only on the part of the United States, but on the part of the State of
1225 Texas. *Id.* at 1374. This, of course, does not make it enforceable against Texas, but
1226 Justice Stevens found that “[t]he cost to Texas of complying with [the ICJ decision]
1227 would be minimal.” *Id.* at 1375. Justice Breyer, joined by Justices Souter and
1228 Ginsburg, dissented, writing that “the consent of the United States to the ICJ’s
1229 jurisdiction[] bind[s] the courts no less than would ‘an act of the [federal]
1230 legislature.’” *Id.* at 1376. The dissent believed that, to find treaties non-self-executing
1231 “can threaten the application of provisions in many existing commercial and other
1232 treaties and make it more difficult to negotiate new ones.” *Id.* at 1381-82. Moreover,
1233 Justice Breyer wrote, the Court’s decision “place[s] the fate of an international
1234 promise made by the United States in the hands of a single State... And that is
1235 precisely the situation that the Framers sought to prevent by enacting the Supremacy
1236 Clause.” *Id.* at 1384. On August 5, 2008, the U.S. Supreme Court denied *Medellin* a
1237 stay of execution. *Medellin v. Texas*, 129 S. Ct. 360 (2008) (Justices Stevens, Souter,
1238 Ginsburg, and Breyer dissenting), and Texas executed him the same day.

1239
1240
1241
1242
1243 272 S. CRANDALL, TREATIES, THEIR MAKING AND ENFORCEMENT ch. 3.
1244 (2d ed. 1916)

1245
1246 273 *Id.* at 30-32. For the text of the Treaty, see 1 *Treaties, Conventions, International*
1247 *Acts, Protocols and Agreements Between the United States of America and Other*
1248 *Powers (1776-1909)*, 586 S. DOC. NO. 357, 61st Congress, 2d sess. (W. Malloy ed.,
1249 1910).

274 *Id.* at 588.

275 R. MORRIS, JOHN JAY, THE NATION, AND THE COURT 73-84 (1967).

276 S. Crandall, *supra*, at 36-40.

277 The Convention at first leaned toward giving Congress a negative over state laws which were contrary to federal statutes or treaties, 1 M. Farrand, *supra*, at 47, 54, and then adopted the Paterson Plan which made treaties the supreme law of the land, binding on state judges, and authorized the Executive to use force to compel observance when such treaties were resisted. *Id.* at 245, 316, 2 *id.* at 27-29. In the draft reported by the Committee on Detail, the language thus adopted was close to the present supremacy clause; the draft omitted the authorization of force from the clause, *id.* at 183, but in another clause the legislative branch was authorized to call out the militia to, *inter alia*, “enforce treaties”. *Id.* at 182. The two words were struck subsequently “as being superfluous” in view of the supremacy clause. *Id.* at 389-90.

278 9 W. HENING, STATUTES OF VIRGINIA 377-380 (1821).

279 3 U.S. (3 Dall.) 199 (1796).

280 3 U.S. at 236-37 (emphasis by Court).

281 7 U.S. (3 Cr.) 454 (1806).

282 See the discussion and cases cited in *Hauenstein v. Lynham*, 100 U.S. 483, 489-90 (1880).

283 100 U.S. 483 (1880). In *Kolovrat v. Oregon*, 366 U.S. 187, 197-98 (1961), the International Monetary Fund (Bretton Woods) Agreement of 1945, to which the United States and Yugoslavia were parties, and an Agreement of 1948 between these two nations, coupled with continued American observance of an 1881 treaty granting reciprocal rights of inheritance to Yugoslavian and American nations, were held to preclude Oregon from denying Yugoslavian aliens their treaty rights because of a fear that Yugoslavian currency laws implementing such Agreements prevented American nationals from withdrawing the proceeds from the sale of property inherited in the latter country.

284 See also *Geofroy v. Riggs*, 133 U.S. 258 (1890); *Sullivan v. Kidd*, 254 U.S. 433 (1921); *Nielsen v. Johnson*, 279 U.S. 47 (1929); *Kolovrat v. Oregon*, 366 U.S. 187 (1961). But a right under treaty to acquire and dispose of property does not except aliens from the operation of a state statute prohibiting conveyances of homestead property by any instrument not executed by both husband and wife. *Todok v. Union State Bank*, 281 U.S. 449 (1930). Nor was a treaty stipulation guaranteeing to the citizens of each country, in the territory of the other, equality with the natives of rights and privileges in respect to protection and security of person and property, violated by a state statute which denied to a non-resident alien wife of a person killed within the State, the right to sue for wrongful death. Such right was afforded to native resident

relatives. *Maiorano v. Baltimore & Ohio R.R.*, 213 U.S. 268 (1909). The treaty in question having been amended in view of this decision, the question arose whether the new provision covered the case of death without fault or negligence in which, by the Pennsylvania Workmen's Compensation Act, compensation was expressly limited to resident parents; the Supreme Court held that it did not. *Liberato v. Royer*, 270 U.S. 535 (1926).

285 Terrace v. Thompson, 263 U.S. 197 (1923).

286 332 U.S. 633 (1948). See also *Takahashi v. Fish Comm'n*, 334 U.S. 410 (1948), in which a California statute prohibiting the issuance of fishing licenses to persons ineligible to citizenship was disallowed, both on the basis of the Fourteenth Amendment and on the ground that the statute invaded a field of power reserved to the National Government, namely, the determination of the conditions on which aliens may be admitted, naturalized, and permitted to reside in the United States. For the latter proposition, *Hines v. Davidowitz*, 312 U.S. 52, 66 (1941), was relied upon.

287 This occurred in the much advertised case of Sei Fujii v. State, 38 Cal. 2d 718, 242 P. 2d 617 (1952). A lower California court had held that the legislation involved was void under the United Nations Charter, but the California Supreme Court was unanimous in rejecting this view. The Charter provisions invoked in this connection [Arts. 1, 55 and 56], said Chief Justice Gibson, "[w]e are satisfied . . . were not intended to supersede domestic legislation." That is, the Charter provisions were not self-executing. *Restatement, Foreign Relations*, supra, § 701, Reporters' Note 5, pp. 155-56.

288 Clark v. Allen, 331 U.S. 503 (1947). See also *Kolovrat v. Oregon*, 366 U.S. 187 (1961).

exhibit Four and evidence Judicial Foreign agents Responsibilities

Whereas :

I Living Native Man Nii Nee corpus delicti 18 usc 3771 request Certified copy's all of your Registration forms with the 1938 FARA

Because artificial entities cannot take oaths, they cannot make affidavits. See, e.g., *In re Empire Refining Co.*, 1 F. Supp. 548, 549 (SD Cal. 1932) ("It is, of course, conceded that a corporation cannot make an affidavit in its corporate name. It is an inanimate thing incapable of voicing an oath"); *Moya Enterprises, Inc. v. Harry Anderson Trucking, Inc.*, 162 Ga. App. 39, 290 S.E.2d 145 (1982); *Strand Restaurant Co. v. Parks Engineering Co.*, 91 A.2d 711 (D.C. 1952); 9A T. Bjur C. Slezak, *Fletcher Cyclopedia of Law of Private Corporations* § 4629 (Perm. ed. 1992) ("A document purporting to be the affidavit of a corporation is void, since a corporation

cannot make a sworn statement") (footnote omitted). ROWLAND v. CALIFORNIA
MEN'S COLONY • 506 U.S. 194, 203 (1993) PENAL CODE

A BAR Attorney has several "Capacities" for instance a Prosecutor is a BAR
Attorney. If you are a "Defendant" and there is no Injured Party, you should know the
TAX I.D. Number of the Court and the Prosecutor's Office and the Dunn and
Bradstreet Trading Number.

26 CFR 601.503 - Requirements of power of attorney, signatures, fiduciaries and
Commissioner's authority to substitute other requirements.

CFR › Title 26 › Chapter I › Subchapter H › Part 601 › Subpart E › Section 601.503
§ 601.503 Requirements of power of attorney, signatures, fiduciaries and
Commissioner's authority to substitute other requirements.

...the US Foreign agents and all states are 100% Illegally controlled by judicial and
political prostitutes and the BAR is the entity that has taken over:

THE BAR CONTROLS ALL THREE BRANCHES OF GOVERNMENT. ""Except
the First Branch of Government We the L awful Bloodline Americans""..(See
Below)

1.) The ABA/BAR has a 100% racketeering monopoly on Justice.....they control
every court every law; they control the entire Judicial Branch

2) Up to 70% of all members of every congress are BAR members.....So the BAR has
infiltrated the Legislative Branch..up to 70%

3.) Barack Obama a former BAR member, Hillary a BAR member so they have a lock
on the Executive Branch

4.) Many Governors are BAR members.....(Are you starting to see a pattern ...the
evidence is blatant!)

5) Adding icing to their mafia racketeering cake is the kicker of allthe BAR
controls the FBI, the US marshals, the ATF, the DEA the ENTIRE Department of
Justice via BAR member Loretta Lynch and Barack Obama

6.) And the final nail in our coffin is that the BAR controls every Sheriff in almost
every Country via a BAR members called the DA.....

Title 8 USC 1481 stated once an oath of office is taken citizenship is relinquished,
thus you become a foreign entity, agency, or state. That means every public office is a
foreign state, including all political subdivisions. (i.e. every single court and that
courts personnel is considered a separate foreign entity)

The Foreign Agents Registration Act (FARA) was enacted in 1938. FARA is a
disclosure statute that requires persons acting as agents of foreign principals in a
political or quasi-political capacity to make periodic public disclosure of their
relationship with the foreign principal, as well as activities, receipts and
disbursements in support of those activities. Disclosure of the required information
facilitates evaluation by the government and the American people of the statements
and activities of such persons in light of their function as foreign agents. The FARA
Registration Unit of the Counterintelligence and Export Control Section (CES) in the
National Security Division (NSD) is responsible for the administration and
enforcement of the Act. <http://www.fara.gov/>

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

“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 administering 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

When one takes a birds eye view of their insidious work they will realize such
 infiltration started in 1783 at the Signing of the Treaty of Paris.

“It is a clearly established principle of law that an attorney must represent a
 corporation, it being incorporeal and a creature of the law. An attorney representing
 an artificial entity must appear with the corporate charter and law in his hand. A
 person acting as an attorney for a foreign principal must be registered to act on the
 principal’s behalf.” See, Foreign Agents Registration Act” (22 USC § 612 et seq.);
 Victor Rabinowitz et. at. v. Robert F. Kennedy, 376 US 605. “Failure to file the
 “Foreign Agents Registrations Statement” goes directly to the jurisdiction and lack of
 standing to be before the court, and is a felony pursuant to 18 USC §§ 219, 951. The
 conflict of law, interest and allegiance is obvious.

JUDICIAL IMMUNITY IS A FICTION

“When a judge knows that he lacks jurisdiction, or acts in the face of clearly valid
 statutes expressly depriving him of jurisdiction, judicial immunity is lost¹.” ... “A
 judge is not immune for tortious² acts committed in a purely Administrative,
 non-judicial capacity³.” ... “There is no such thing as a power of inherent sovereignty
 in the government of the United States. It is a government of delegated powers,
 supreme within its prescribed sphere, but powerless outside of it. In this country
 sovereignty resides in the people, and Congress can exercise no power which they
 have not, by their Constitution, entrusted to it; all else is withheld⁴. ... “There is a

general rule that a ministerial officer who acts wrongfully, although in good faith, is never-the-less liable in a civil action and cannot claim the immunity of the sovereign⁵. ... "Where there is no jurisdiction, there can be no discretion, for discretion is incident to jurisdiction⁶." ... "A judge must be acting within his jurisdiction as to subject matter and person, to be entitled to immunity from civil action for his acts⁷." "When a judicial officer acts entirely without jurisdiction or without compliance with jurisdiction requisites he may be held civilly liable for abuse of process even though his act involved a decision made in good faith, that he had jurisdiction⁸." ... "No judicial process, whatever form it may assume, can have any lawful authority outside of the limits of the jurisdiction of the court or judge by whom it is issued; and an attempt to enforce it beyond these boundaries is nothing less than lawless violence⁹." ... "No man in this country is so high that he is above the law. No officer of the law may set that law at defiance with impunity. All the officers of the government, from the highest to the lowest, are creatures of the law and are bound to obey it... It is the only supreme power in our system of government, and every man who, by accepting office participates in its functions, is only the more strongly bound to submit to that supremacy, and to observe the limitations which it imposes on the exercise of the authority which it gives¹⁰." "All law (rules and practices) which are repugnant to the Constitution are VOID. ... NO State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the rights, privileges, or immunities of citizens of the United States nor deprive any citizens of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law, ... or equal protection under the law", this renders judicial immunity unconstitutional¹¹." ... "Any judge who does not comply with his oath to the Constitution of the United States wars against that Constitution and engages in acts in violation of the supreme law of the land. The judge is engaged in acts of treason¹²." ... "no state legislator or executive or judicial officer can war against the Constitution without violating his undertaking to support it¹³".

1 Zeller v. Rankin, 101 S.Ct. 2020, 451 U.S. 939, 68 L.Ed 2d 326
 2 TORTIOUS. Wrongful; of the nature of a tort. TORT (from Lat. torquere, to twist, tortus, twisted, wrested aside). A private or civil wrong or injury.
 3 Stump v. Sparkman, id., 435 U.S. 349
 4 Juliard v. Greeman, 110 U.S. 421 (1884)
 5 Cooper v. O'Conner, 99 F.2d 133;
 6 Piper v. Pearson, 2 Gray 120, cited in Bradley v. Fisher, 13 Wall. 335, 20 L.Ed. 646 (1872)
 7 Davis v. Burris, 51 Ariz. 220, 75 P.2d 689 (1938)
 8 U.S. Fidelity & Guaranty Co. (State use of), 217 Miss. 576, 64 So. 2d 697
 9 Ableman v. Booth, 21 Howard 506 (1859)
 10 U.S. v. Lee, 106 U.S. 196, 220 1 S. Ct. 240, 261, 27 L. Ed 171 (1882)
 11 Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S. (2 Cranch) 137, 180 (1803)
 12 Cooper v. Aaron, 358 U.S. 1, 78 S. Ct. 1401 (1958)
 13 Sawyer, 124 U.S. 200 (188); U.S. v. Will, 449 U.S. 200, 216, 101 S. Ct. 471, 66 L. Ed. 2d 392, 406 (1980); Cohens v. Virginia, 19 U.S. (6 Wheat) 264, 404, 5 L. Ed 257 (1821)

Whereas :Power of the Grand Jury - In a stunning 6 to 3 decision Justice Antonin Scalia, writing for the majority, confirmed that the American grand jury is neither part

of the judicial, executive nor legislative branches of government, but instead belongs to the people. It is in effect a fourth branch of government "governed" and administered to directly by and on behalf of the American people, and its authority emanates from the Bill of Rights, see United States -v- Williams

Title 42 USC Section 1983 Information

Title 42, U.S.C., Section 14141
Pattern and Practice

Laws: Cases and Codes : U.S. Code : Title 42 : Section 14141

This civil statute was a provision within the Crime Control Act of 1994 and makes it unlawful for any governmental authority, or agent thereof, or any person acting on behalf of a governmental authority, to engage in a pattern or practice of conduct by law enforcement officers or by officials or employees of any governmental agency with responsibility for the administration of juvenile justice or the incarceration of juveniles that deprives persons of rights, privileges, or immunities secured or protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States.

Whenever the Attorney General has reasonable cause to believe that a violation has occurred, the Attorney General, for or in the name of the United States, may in a civil action obtain appropriate equitable and declaratory relief to eliminate the pattern or practice.

Types of misconduct covered include, among other things:

1. Excessive Force
2. Discriminatory Harassment
3. False Arrest
4. Coercive Sexual Conduct
5. Unlawful Stops, Searches, or Arrests

In *Hurtado v. People of the State of California*, 110 US 516, the U.S Supreme Court states very plainly: "The state cannot diminish rights of the people."
And in *Bennett v. Boggs*, 1 Baldw 60, "Statutes that violate the plain and obvious principles of common right and common reason are null and void."

"The assertion of federal rights, when plainly and reasonably made, is not to be defeated under the name of local practice." *Davis v. Wechsler*, 263 US 22, at 24.
"Where rights secured by the Constitution are involved, there can be no rule making or legislation which would abrogate them." *Miranda v. Arizona*, 384 US 436, 491.

"The claim and exercise of a constitutional right cannot be converted into a crime."
Miller v. US, 230 F 486, at 489.

"There can be no sanction or penalty imposed upon one because of this exercise of constitutional rights." *Sherer v. Cullen*, 481 F 946

"CONTEMPT FOR ENFORCING RIGHTS" ?

Title 42 USC § 12203 Prohibition against retaliation and coercion

(a) Retaliation

No person shall discriminate against any individual because such individual has opposed any act or practice made unlawful by this chapter or because such individual made a charge, testified, assisted, or participated in any manner in an investigation, proceeding, or hearing under this chapter.

(b) Interference, coercion, or intimidation

It shall be unlawful to coerce, intimidate, threaten, or interfere with any individual in the exercise or enjoyment of, or on account of his or her having exercised or enjoyed, or on account of his or her having aided or encouraged any other individual in the exercise or enjoyment of, any right granted or protected by this chapter.

(c) Remedies and procedures

The remedies and procedures available under sections 12117, 12133, and 12188 of this title shall be available to aggrieved persons for violations of subsections (a) and (b) of this section, with respect to subchapter I, subchapter II and subchapter III, respectively. (Pub. L. 101–336, title V, § 503, July 26, 1990, 104 Stat. 370.).

Title 42 US Code Sec. 1983, Sec. 1985, & Sec. 1986:

"Clearly established the right to sue anyone who violates your constitutional rights.

The Constitution guarantees: he who would unlawfully jeopardize your property loses property to you, and that's what justice is all about."

The 6th Amendment is very SPECIFIC, that the accused ONLY has the right to the ASSISTANCE of counsel and this ASSISTANCE of counsel CAN BE ANYONE THE ACCUSED CHOOSES WITHOUT LIMITATION.

LAWYERS and LAWYER-JUDGES: Created unconstitutional "lawyer system" pre-trial "motions" and "Hearings" to have eternal EXTORTIONISTIC litigation's, which is BARRATRY and also is in violation of the U.S. Constitution, and Article 1, as this places defendants in DOUBLE JEOPARDY a hundred times over. Defendants only have a right to A TRIAL, NOT TRIALS.

When a criminal is freed on a TECHNICALITY, HE IS FREED BECAUSE OF A FIX and a PAY-OFF, as a defendant can only be freed if found innocent BY A JURY NOT BY ANY "TECHNICALITY." Whenever a lawyer is involved in a case directly or indirectly, as a litigant or assisting in counsel, ALL LAWYER-JUDGES HAVE TO DISQUALIFY THEMSELVES, AS THERE CANNOT BE A CONSTITUTIONAL TRIAL and also there would be a violation of the conflict of interest laws, along with the violation of separation of powers and checks and balances, because "OFFICERS" OF THE COURT ARE ON BOTH SIDES OF THE BENCH. These same LAWYER-JUDGES are awarding or approving LAWYER FEES, directly and indirectly, amounting to BILLIONS OF DOLLARS annually, all in violation of conflict of interest laws. As long as there are lawyers, there will never be any law, constitution or justice. There will only be MOB RULE, RULE BY A MOB OF LAWYERS.

CASE "LAW" IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL: As CASE "LAW" IS ENACTED BY THE JUDICIAL BRANCH OF GOVERNMENT.

When a lawyer-judge instructs, directs, or gives orders to a jury, the lawyer-judge is TAMPERING WITH THE JURY. He also tampers with testimony when he orders the answers to be either "Yes" or "No." The lawyer-judge also tampers, fixes, and rigs

the trial when he orders anything stricken from the record, or when he "rules" certain evidence and the truth to be inadmissible. This makes the trial and transcript FIXED and RIGGED, because the jury does not hear the REAL TRUTH and ALL THE FACTS. Juries are made into puppets by the lawyers and lawyer-judges. All lawyers are automatically in the judicial branch of government, as they have the unconstitutional TITLE OF NOBILITY (Article 1, Section 9 and 10), "Officer of the court." Citizens have to be elected or hired to be in any branch of government but non-lawyer Citizens are limited to only 2 of the 3 branches of government. Lawyers as 1st class citizens can be hired or elected to any of the three branches of government. Lawyers, "Officers of the Court," in the Judicial Branch, are unconstitutionally in 2 branches of government AT THE SAME TIME whenever they are hired or elected to the executive or legislative branches. This is a violation of the separation of powers, checks and balances, and the conflict of interest laws.

District attorneys and State's attorneys have taken over the Grand Juries FROM the people, where the people are DENIED ACCESS to the grand juries when they attempt to present evidence of crimes committed in the courtrooms by the lawyers and lawyer-judges. The U.S. Constitution, being the Supreme Fundamental Law, is not and CANNOT be ambiguous as to be interpreted, or it would be a worthless piece of paper (as recently stated by President Bush), and we would have millions of interpretations (unconstitutional amendments) instead of the few we have now. That is why all judges and public servants are SWORN TO SUPPORT the U.S. Constitution, NOT interpret it.

Under INTERNATIONAL ORDERS: ALL LAWYERS, whether they left law school yesterday or 50 years ago, are EXACTLY THE SAME. All lawyers have to file the same motions and follow the same procedures in using the same unconstitutional "lawyer system". In probate, the lawyers place themselves in everyone's will and estate. When there are minor children as heirs, the lawyer-judges appoint a lawyer (a child molesting Fagin) for EACH CHILD and, at times, the lawyer fees EXCEED the total amount of the estate. An OUTRAGEOUS amount of TAX "MONEY" is directly and indirectly STOLEN BY LAWYERS. Money that is budgeted to County Boards, School Boards and other local and federal agencies eventually finds its way into the pockets of lawyers, as ALL of these agencies are "TRICKED" and "FORCED" into ETERNAL EXTORTIONISTIC LITIGATION.

Who Owns Private Prison Stock? . City county states , unlawful probation agency police,Judges , lawyers , attorney the Foreign country England Queen and Vatican

According to the state government of California, the average cost to house an individual prisoner for one year is a whopping \$47,102. By comparison, the average income for an American individual is \$47,200, according to the CIA(GDP per capita purchasing power parity).

The prison industry could be nearing a turning point. Millions of inmates, a very large portion of the total prison population, are serving time for non-violent drug crimes – a group that could decrease in size with looser drug enforcement laws, like the recent decriminalization of marijuana use in Connecticut where Gov. Malloy said that he would prefer to use the criminal justice resources for more serious and violent crime.

“... in a time of declining crime rates and tight state budgets, smart reforms are gaining ground, and most aim to reduce the prison population,” writes The Economist.

Interested in conducting your own research into the private prison industry? To help you out, here is a list of the two largest companies in the industry. Where do you think these stocks are heading?

Analyze These Ideas (Tools Will Open In A New Window)

1. Access a thorough description of all companies mentioned
2. Compare analyst ratings for all stocks mentioned below
3. Visualize annual returns for all stocks mentioned

List sorted by market cap

1. Corrections Corporation of America (CXW): Property Management industry with a market cap of \$2.4B. It specializes in owning, operating, and managing prisons and other correctional facilities and providing inmate residential and prisoner transportation services for governmental agencies. As of December 31, 2010, it operated 66 correctional and detention facilities, including 45 facilities that it owns, with a total design capacity of approximately 90,000 beds in 19 states and the District of Columbia.

As of December 31, 2010, it was also constructing an additional 1,124-bed correctional facility in Millen, Georgia. It also owns two additional correctional facilities that it leases to third-party operators. Its facilities offer a range of rehabilitation and educational programs, including basic education, religious services, life skills and employment training, and substance abuse treatment. It also provides healthcare (including medical, dental, and psychiatric services), food services, and work and recreational programs.

2. The GEO Group, Inc. (GEO): Security & Protection Services industry with a market cap of \$1.45B. It is a provider of government-outsourced services specializing in the management of correctional, detention, mental health, residential treatment and re-entry facilities, and the provision of community-based services and youth services in the United States, Australia, South Africa, the United Kingdom and Canada.

It operates a range of correctional and detention facilities, including maximum, medium and minimum security prisons, immigration detention centers, minimum security detention centers, mental health, residential treatment and community-based, re-entry facilities. It offers counseling, education and/or treatment to inmates with alcohol and drug abuse problems at most of the domestic facilities, which it manages. It also provides secure transportation services for offender and detainee populations as contracted.

Interactive Chart: Press Play to see how analyst ratings have changed for the stocks mentioned above. Analyst ratings sourced from Zacks Investment Research.

IT IS ALL ABOUT BONDS

What they're doing in these courts is all about Bonds. When you go into the courtroom after you're arrested, they use two different sets of Bonds. What they do when your arrested they fill out a "Bid Bond". The United States District Court uses 273, 274 & 275. SF = "Standard Form". Standard Form 273, Standard Form 274 & Standard Form 275. This is the United States District Court.

A violation of an Indian treaty is a violation of FEDERAL LAW.

NO FEDERAL TREATY NATION WAS EVER NOTIFIED - WHEN THE UNITED STATES WENT BANKRUPT..

4 TIME DE FACTO UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT IS NOT A NATION.. IS A CORPORATION. AND THE TPP Trans-Pacific Partnership ARE AGAINST FEDERAL TREATY TRIBAL NATIONS ,

THIS IS TREASON..

It is an established fact that the United States Federal Government has been Dissolved by the "Emergency Banking Act, March 9, 1933, 48 Stat. 1, Public Law 89-719; declared by President Roosevelt, being bankrupt and insolvent. H.J.R. 192, 73rd Congress, M Session June 5, 1933—because of the Bankruptcy of the United States Congressional Record, March 17, 1993, Vol. 33 where all of Congress was forced to adjourn

"Without Day" in 1861 March 3, "sin die."

------(MEANING NEVER TO MEET AGAIN.)!!-----

TREASON and Fraud by Trickery – and the Congress refuses to produce any Documentation as to exactly who formed this Federal Corporation now known as "THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, dba, A 4 TIME BANKRUPT CORPORATION" a fraud scheme their Charter and Bonding necessary for a lawfully established corporation.

Legal Max: "To conceal a fraud is to commit a fraud" BLACKS LAW. McNally vs. United States 483 U.S. 350 (1987) also United States vs. Dial, 757 F 2d 163, 168 (7th Circuit 1985)

Proof United States is NOT a country under this 2 court cases. Caha v. United States and US v Bond--you cannot contradiction in law or it now becomes Null and void, ab inito

Quoting from the Congressional Record 87th Congress April 4, 1962 Vol. 108 Congressman Berry/BERRY admits the Federal Government has gone to every extreme in attempting to prove that the Indians are wrong; "that the white man owes no one for lands and property that has been taken from the Indian, that the Federal Government is not under obligation to keep its treaties with the Indian People." (Congress admits to "Taking Land" IE Land Theft: Where is original Bills of Sale, Deeds, Land Transfer from Indians to British, French, Spain, Portugal or UNITED STATES, al et al.?)

Marbury v. Madison, arguably the most important case in Supreme Court history, was the first U.S. Supreme Court case to apply the principle of "judicial review" -- the power of federal courts to void acts of Congress in conflict with the Constitution.

As his soul has been filed on for the treaty foreign argents of England and the Vatican
1213 and the 1215 magna carta by a good Native man
By order of Pope Francis: All Bar Association licenses are extinguished
Posted on April 8, 2015

9.1 – Bonding Jail Procedure

A government, or an official, officer or clerk of a government, will lose its/his bond,
will not be bonded and will not be bondable if a person, hereinafter referred to as the
“prisoner,” which it/he handles, who has been charged and arrested but who has not
been convicted:

1. has been denied or delayed anything, or any right, or the equal protection of the law
necessary for the prisoner’s defense which an uncharged and unarrested citizen would
have at his use, service and disposal,
2. has been denied or delayed legal paper work in the prisoner’s case, including but
not limited to affidavits of accusation, police reports, arrest warrants, mailing
addresses for the delivery of all legal paperwork, etc.,
3. has been denied or delayed the assistant counsel of, or communication with any
lawyer, attorney, spouse, relative, friend, non-union paralegal, non-union lawyer, etc.,
needed for his personal safety and legal defense,
4. Has been denied or delayed necessary appearances and opportunity to speak before
a judge in court and on the court record (“necessary” as defined by the prisoner, not as
defined by the jail, the judge, or the court), and/or consideration from the jailer, the
judge of the court, and/or a hand-signed record of the proceedings before the judge
and court,
5. has been denied or delayed a copy of anything: (such as a valid warrant)
(A) the prisoner has signed while entering or dwelling in the jail, or
(B) the prisoner has been required to sign while entering or dwelling in the jail,
10. has been denied or delayed medical needs. NOTE: the county shall provide all of
the above services immediately to the un-convicted prisoner at no cost to the prisoner.
Any county which fails to meet the above criteria will itself be totally liable for its
own acts. It is not inconceivable that a county violating the above criteria could
accumulate over one hundred million dollars worth of civil damages in one day’s time
involving only one prisoner, and no credible bonding company wants anything to do
with that kind of obligation.

Conclusion

All judges of the lower courts are required to take two Oaths, (one being 28 USC 453,
to do equal justice to all) before assuming Office and to file such Oaths in places
designated by law and to abide by such Oaths during occupancy of such Offices and
failure to take and file such Oaths constitutes de jure vacancies of Offices. All judges
of the lower courts are required to uphold and defend the United States Constitution.
All judges of the lower courts are required to follow all directives and rules issued by
the United States Supreme Court for the conduct and procedures of such lower courts.
All judges of the lower courts are required to abide by the Judicial Code of Conduct.
All judges of the lower courts are required to abide by precedence law that has been
set as the existing law of the land. All judges are directed by the United States

Supreme Court that justice is the object and goal of the cases. All judges of the lower courts are required to avoid even the appearance of partiality or favoritism or cronyism. All judges of the lower courts injure and damage the United States, the laws thereof, and the United States District Courts when they violate the Judicial Code of Conduct. All judges of the lower courts damage the integrity of the courts and the confidence of the people in the judicial process when such judges violate Constitutional rights of parties, violate court rules, violate the Judicial Code of Conduct, accede to fraud, favor one party over the other, or fail to uphold the Constitution and laws of the United States. Thus judges acting outside their jurisdiction are committing criminal acts and are either incompetent, if they really had no idea, OR they are malfeasant because they really knew and didn't care. The Court in *Yates Vs. Village of Hoffman Estates, Illinois*, 209 F. Supp. 757 (N.D. Ill. 1962) held that, "Not every action by any judge is in exercise of his judicial function. It is not a judicial function for a judge to commit an intentional tort even though the tort occurs in the Courthouse. When a judge acts as a Trespasser of the Law, when a judge does not follow the law, the judge loses subject matter jurisdiction and the judge's orders are void, of no legal force or effect." The United States Supreme Court has stated that "No State legislator, or executive, or judicial officer can war against the Constitution without violating his undertaking to support it." *Cooper Vs. Aaron*. 358 U.S. 178 S.Ct. 1401 (1958) If a judge does not fully comply with the Constitution, then his orders are void. In *re Sawyer*, 124 U.S. 200 (1888), he/she is without jurisdiction, and he/she has engaged in an act or acts of TREASON! It is also Contempt of Constitution, Discrimination against the People. Every time public officials violate their Oath of Office, they are guilty of Contempt of Constitution which includes: General Contempt, Malicious Contempt, Tyrannical Malicious Contempt, Noble Contempt, Noble Malicious Contempt, Noble Tyrannical Malicious Contempt, Contempt By Perjury, Contempt By Omission, Contemptuous Corruption of Contempt, Conspiracy to Commit Contempt of Constitution, Seditious Contempt, Contempt by Accessory After the Fact, Obstruction of Constitutional Justice, and Order of Enforceability of Contempt of Constitution. All Contempt of Constitution is a Breach of the Oath of Office, and Discrimination Against the People. The right of the very people to enforce Contempt of Constitution as a matter of final judgment shall not be denied; the principle of the Eighth Amendment is the controlling standard for governing punishments for the Sovereign Crime, at any degree, of Contempt of Constitution. A Breach of the Oath of Office removes all immunity from the public servant.

The signer of this document speaks in truth and will so testify under Oath and present all evidence and other witnesses as may be necessary to establish the truth of this document, and if any wish to oppose or controvert these proclaimed truths, then let them come forth, with signed affidavits and verifiable evidence and let them oppose the truths as this signer knows them. I further Declare and Affirm that I am a live man, American Sovereign as stated in the original Constitution for the united States of America, of which all public servants/public officials are sworn by their Oaths of Office to protect and defend, both State and National, in which is also enumerated the type and size of bonds required by both elected and appointed positions, in order to assure the Sovereign public that their trust and faith in those public servants/public officials are well founded and that their duties will be discharged in the most Honorable means until completion of their term of office.

Write something...Please Pass on We the People have Servants All government

1851 offices are empty"?

1852 "All government offices are empty"?

1853

1854

1855 Whereas ;Violations of oath of office Capital Treason Under Title 18 USC 2381

1856

1857 Criminal Negligence Debtors slavery is modern day Slavery Peonage was outlawed

1858 by an Act of Congress

1859

1860 5 U.S.C. 3331 - Oath of office - US Government Publishing Office

1861 [www.gpo.gov/fdsys/granule/USCODE-2010-title5/USCODE-2010-title5-partIII-subp](http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/granule/USCODE-2010-title5/USCODE-2010-title5-partIII-subpartB-chap33-subchapII-sec3331)

1862 [artB-chap33-subchapII-sec3331](http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/granule/USCODE-2010-title5/USCODE-2010-title5-partIII-subpartB-chap33-subchapII-sec3331)

1863

1864 Jan 7, 2011 ... Title 5 - GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION AND EMPLOYEES

1865 PART III - EMPLOYEES Subpart B - Employment and Retention CHAPTER 33 ...

1866

1867 (a) Except as provided by subsection (b) of this section, an individual who accepts

1868 office or employment in the Government of the United States or in the government of

1869 the District of Columbia shall execute an affidavit within 60 days after accepting the

1870 office or employment that his acceptance and holding of the office or employment

1871 does not or will not violate section 7311 of this title. The affidavit is prima facie

1872 evidence that the acceptance and holding of office or employment by the affiant does

1873 not or will not violate section 7311 of this title.

1874 (b) An affidavit is not required from an individual employed by the Government of

1875 the United States or the government of the District of Columbia for less than 60 days

1876 for sudden emergency work involving the loss of human life or the destruction of

1877 property. This subsection does not relieve an individual from liability for violation of

1878 section 7311 of this title.

1879 (Pub. L. 89-554, Sept. 6, 1966, 80 Stat. 424.)

1880

1881 Whereas : the demand of prof of your filing ,, One of the reason why Former FBI

1882 Director Comey was fired, Foreign Agents Registration Act - Wikipedia

1883 en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Foreign_Agents_Registration_Act

1884

1885 The Foreign Agents Registration Act (FARA) is a United States law passed in 1938

1886 requiring ... However, a civil injunctive remedy also was added to allow the

1887 Department of ... Organizations under such foreign control can include political

1888 agents, public relations counsel, publicity agents, information-service employees, ...

1889

1890 Whenever one of these so called Foreign agent that has to be register with 1938

1891 FARA elected and or public paid servants including Judges is dealing with statutes

1892 (statutory = Adminisrativ law, like the Texas Code, or the Texas Penal Code, or the

1893 Texas Code of Civil Procedure, he becomes a Clerk working for the prosecutor

1894 "...judges who become involved in enforcement of mere statutes (civil or criminal in

1895 nature and otherwise), act as mere "clerks" of the involved agency..."K.C. Davis,

1896 ADMIN.LAW, Ch. 1 (CTP. West's 1965 Ed.)

1897

1898

1899

1900

Whereas : "For a crime to exist, there must be an injured party. There can be no sanction or penalty imposed upon one because of this exercise of Constitutional rights."- Sherar v. Cullen, 481 F. 945.

AT LAW. "This phrase is used to point out that a thing is to be done according to the course of the common law; it is distinguished from a proceeding in equity."

"All laws, rules and practices which are repugnant to the Constitution are null and void" [Marbury v. Madison, 5th US (2 Cranch) 137, 180]

The common law is the real law, the Supreme Law of the land, the code, rules, regulations, policy and statutes are "not the law", [Self v. Rhay, 61 Wn (2d) 261]

"The general rule is that an unconstitutional statute, though having the form and name of law, is in reality no law, but is wholly void and ineffective for any purpose, since its unconstitutionality dates from the time of its enactment... In legal contemplation, it is as inoperative as if it had never been passed... Since an unconstitutional law is void, the general principles follow that it imposes no duties, confers no right, creates no office, bestows no power or authority on anyone, affords no protection and justifies no acts performed under it... A void act cannot be legally consistent with a valid one. An unconstitutional law cannot operate to supersede any existing law. Indeed insofar as a statute runs counter to the fundamental law of the land, (the Constitution) it is superseded thereby. No one is bound to obey an unconstitutional law and no courts are bound to enforce it." [Bonnett v. Vallier, 116 N.W. 885, 136 Wis. 193 (1908); NORTON v. SHELBY COUNTY, 118 U.S. 425 (1886)]

Whereas : MOST PEOPLE FAIL TO REALIZE that Birth Certificates are commercial paper, and the way they collect on that instrument, is that they drag you to court on some statutory violation, while SILENTLY asserting to be the holder in due course.

Which means that commercial (UCC) defenses can be used, such as a COUNTER-DEMAND.

BTW, in the "rule" below, YOU are the ISSUER, since you (or your guardian) SIGNED the Birth Certificate, and the United States is the POSSESSOR.

THE FUNDAMENTAL "RULE" OF COMMERCIAL PAPER

The possessor of a piece of commercial paper has an unconditional right to be paid, as long as:

- (1)the paper is negotiable;
- (2)it has been negotiated to the possessor;
- (3)the possessor is a holder in due course; and
- (4) the issuer cannot claim a valid defense.

Aiding, abetting, harboring, encouraging illegals a felony

"Any person who . . . encourages or induces an alien to . . . reside . . . knowing or in reckless disregard of the fact that such . . . residence is . . . in violation of law, shall be punished as provided . . . for each alien in respect to whom such a violation occurs . . . fined under title 18

The first amendment of the Constitution of the United States says:

1951 Quote:
 1952 Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the
 1953 free exercise thereof."
 1954 It was written by Thomas Jefferson, who became President in 1801. In 1802 he wrote
 1955 a letter to the Danbury Baptist Association saying that its purpose was to build "a wall
 1956 of separation between Church and State", because they were asking him what the first
 1957 amendment was really all about.
 1958 Jefferson also wrote in his Inagural address:
 1959 Quote:
 1960 Still one thing more, fellow-citizens -- a wise and frugal Government, which shall
 1961 restrain men from injuring one another, shall leave them otherwise free to regulate
 1962 their own pursuits of industry and improvement, and shall not take from the mouth of
 1963 labor the bread it has earned. This is the sum of good government, and this is
 1964 necessary to close the circle of our felicities.
 1965 In other words, unless the government can show that people are injuring each other, it
 1966 has no business restricting their activities.
 1967 I agree with Jefferson that "No victim, no crime" is not just a catchy slogan, but
 1968 should be the foundation of all law, because the purpose of the law is to protect
 1969 people (and other innocent parties such as animals and the environment) from the
 1970 actions of others. If the law does anything else it becomes a set of meaningless rules
 1971 that has no real basis.
 1972 The the ninth and tenth amendments of the Constitution also state:
 1973 Quote:
 1974 Amendment 9 - Construction of Constitution. Ratified 12/15/1791.
 1975 The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny
 1976 or disparage others retained by the people.
 1977 Amendment 10 - Powers of the States and People. Ratified 12/15/1791.
 1978 The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it
 1979 to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.
 1980
 1981 See Supremacy Clauses 2 & 3 of Article VI of The Constitution:
 1982
 1983 =====
 1984 ARTICLE VI Supremacy clauses 2 & 3:
 1985
 1986 "This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which -->shall be<-- made
 1987 -->IN PURSUANCE thereof<--(including ARTICLE I Section 8 clause 17, pursuant
 1988 to our Ninth and TENTH Amendment supreme Constitutional laws of the land,
 1989 subsequent to THE EQUAL FOOTING DOCTRINE --> which EXPRESSLY
 1990 PROHIBITS the U.S. Government from owning or managing ANY LAND within the
 1991 Continental united States of America, outside of THE LAST REMAINING
 1992 "Territory" of Washington D.C. and "Places purchased by the Consent of the
 1993 Legislature of the State in which the Same -->shall be<--, for the Erection of Forts,
 1994 Magazines, Arsenal, dock-Yards, and other needful Buildings;"); and all Treaties
 1995 made, or which shall be made, under the Authority of the United States, --->shall be
 1996 the supreme Law of the Land<---; and --->the Judges in every State<--- shall be
 1997 bound thereby, --->any Thing in the Constitution or Laws of any State to the Contrary
 1998 notwithstanding <---."
 1999
 2000 "The Senators and Representatives before mentioned, and the Members of the several

State Legislatures, and all executive and judicial Officers, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by Oath or Affirmation, to support this Constitution"

Furthermore See Marbury v Madison:

Marbury v. Madison : 5 US 137 (1803)

“No provision of the Constitution is designed to be without effect,” “Anything that is in conflict (with ARTICLE I Section 8 clause 17 pursuant to the Ninth and especially the TENTH Amendment laws) is null and void of law”, “clearly, for a secondary law to come in conflict with the supreme Law was illogical, for certainly, the supreme Law would prevail over all other laws and certainly our forefathers had intended that the supreme Law would be the bases of all law and for any law to come in conflict would be null and void of law, in would bare no obligation to obey, it would purport to settle as if it had never existed, for unconstitutionality, would date for the enactment of such a law, not from the date so branded in an open court of law, no courts are bound to uphold it, and no Citizens are bound to obey it. It operates as a near nullity or a fiction of law.”

If any statement, within any law, which is passed, is unconstitutional, (such as the 'so called' Enabling Act) the whole law is unconstitutional by Marbury v. Madison.

Shepard’s Citations:

A group of reporters that go through and keep track of all court cases that have come before the courts, especially the Supreme Court and they clarify, before the court, all the cases. All cases which have cited Marbury v. Madison case, to the Supreme Court has not ever been overturned. (854 cases at last count) See Shepard’s Citation of Marbury v. Madison.

=====

According to "THE LAW", which DOES NOT MEAN Codes or Statutes, but "THE LAW" MEANS ONLY The Declaration of Independence and its two dovetail documents of "supreme laws of the land" (See Supremacy clauses 2 & 3 of Article VI and Marbury v Madison, above) any law made, by any Congressmen or any President, or ruled in ANY Court, in violation of ARTICLE I Section 8 clause 17, subsequent to THE EQUAL FOOTING DOCTRINE, (and/or exceeds the eighteen "delegated" powers and SPENDING privileges granted to The President of The United States of America, to both Houses of Congress and to The Supreme Court of The United States) both pursuant to our Ninth and TENTH Amendment supreme laws of the land, AS ENUMERATED UNDER ARTICLE I Section 8, is pure unadulterated Title 18 U.S. Code 2381 Capital Felony Treason and thus anybody who makes a law in violation of, repugnant to, and/or against these supreme laws of the land, without an Article V Amendment to The Constitution, is subject to hanging:

The right to a fair trial, guaranteed to state criminal defendants by the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, imposes on States certain duties consistent with their sovereign obligation to ensure “that ‘justice shall be done’ ” in all criminal prosecutions. United States v. Agurs, 427 U.S. 97, 111, 96 S.Ct. 2392, 49 L.Ed.2d

342 (1976) (quoting *Berger v. United States*, 295 U.S. 78, 88, 55 S.Ct. 629, 79 L.Ed. 1314 (1935)). In *Brady v. Maryland*, 373 U.S. 83, 83 S.Ct. 1194, 10 L.Ed.2d 215 (1963), we held that when a State suppresses evidence favorable to an accused that is material to guilt or to punishment, the State violates the defendant's right to due process, "irrespective of the good faith or bad faith of the prosecution." *Id.*, at 87, 83 S.Ct. 1194.

Cone v. Bell, 556 U.S. 449, 451 (U.S. 2009)

Whereas ; The State.....according to law.....has to use gold as a payment for debts.

Article 1 sec. 10 No State shall coin money on anything but gold and silver(exodus 3:22, 12:14) for the payment of debts....

Now...."the State" no longer uses gold.....rather....it uses fiat currency which is borrowed from the Federal Reserve bank which is the international bankers and Mystery Babylon. So what jurisdiction are they in if they no longer follow the law???

The bible says that God is going to lay waste the earth for the earth had forsaken the everlasting covenant and have removed the ordinance. The ordinance is the gold standard with the passover as the lamb for the sacrifice. Now the nations are fallen which is the great falling away in II thessalilonians 2:3 and the son of perdition is also the see of transgression in Isaiah 57:3 and their nativityor birth is in the land of Canaan or merchants described in Ezekiel 16:3

Whereas ; The Federal Employees Liability Reform and Tort Compensation Act of 1988 (Liability Reform Act or Act) limits the relief available to persons injured by Government employees acting within the scope of their employment. For persons so injured, the Act provides that "[t]he remedy against the United States" under the Federal Tort Claims Act (FTCA) "is exclusive of any other civil action or proceeding for money damages." 28 U.S.C. § 2679(b)(1). Subject to certain exceptions, the FTCA permits a person injured by a Government employee acting within the scope of his or her employment to seek tort damages against the Government. *United States v. Smith*, 499 U.S. 160, 161-62 (U.S. 1991)

Whereas: Fabrication of Evidence

"Involving a coerced false confession that resulted in what we described as one of the "worse miscarriage[s] of justice" we had ever seen"

Boseman v. Upper Providence Twp., No. 16-1338 (3d Cir. Feb. 27, 2017)

"Explaining that police officers can be liable for § 1983 claims for malicious prosecution when they "misrepresent material facts" to the prosecuting authorities"
Dress v. Falls Twp., CIVIL ACTION No. 16-4918 (E.D. Pa. May. 18, 2017)

"Noting "[i]n the future ... we might be required to decide precisely when an unlawful seizure ends and [a] due process ... [violation] begins" (alterations in original)"
Bocchino v. City of Atl. City, 179 F.Supp.3d 387 (D.N.J. 2016)

"Discussing fabrication of evidence"

Sanchez v. Town of Morristown, DOCKET NO. A-2076-13T3 (N.J. Super. App. Div. Aug. 7, 2015)

"Inasmuch as every government is an artificial person, an abstraction, and a creature of the mind only, a government can interface only with other artificial persons. The imaginary, having neither actuality nor substance, is foreclosed from creating and attaining parity with the tangible. The legal manifestation of this is that no government, as well as any law, agency, aspect, court, etc. can concern itself with anything other than corporate, artificial persons and the contracts between them." S.C.R. 1795, Penhallow v. Doane's Administrators (3 U.S. 54; 1 L.Ed. 57; 3 Dall. 54)

Since in common usage, the term 'person' does not include the sovereign, statutes employing the phrase are ordinarily construed to exclude it." U.S. v. General Motors Corporation, D.C. Ill, 2 F.R.D. 528, 530: In "common usage the word 'person' does not include the sovereign, and statutes employing the word are generally construed to exclude the sovereign." Church of Scientology v. US Department of Justice, 612 F.2d 417 @425 (1979): "the word 'person' in legal terminology is perceived as a general word which normally includes in its scope a variety of entities other than human beings., see e.g. 1, U.S.C. § para 1." In the 1935 Supreme Court case of Perry v. US (294 US 330) the Supreme Court found that: "In United States, sovereignty resides in people... the Congress cannot invoke the sovereign power of the People to override their will as thus declared.",

"It is a clearly established principle of law that an attorney must represent a corporation, it being incorporeal and a creature of the law.

An attorney representing an artificial entity must appear with the corporate charter and law in his hand. A person acting as an attorney for a foreign principal must be registered to act on the principal's behalf." See, Foreign Agents Registration Act" (22 USC § 612 et seq.);

Victor Rabinowitz et. al. v. Robert F. Kennedy, 376 US 605. "Failure to file the "Foreign Agents Registrations Statement" goes directly to the jurisdiction and lack of standing to be before the court, and is a felony pursuant to 18 USC §§ 219, 951. The conflict of law, interest and allegiance is obvious. A Lawyer can not make a claim to your rights ,

Only you can . Federal District Court Judge James Alger Fee's mind blowing assertion in United States v. Johnson, 76 F. Supp. 538 (M.D. Pa. 1947)

U.S. District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania - 76 F. Supp. 538 (M.D. Pa. 1947) February 26, 1947 , Congress cannot by legislation enlarge the federal jurisdiction, and it cannot be enlarged under the treaty making power." Mayor, Alderman and Inhabitants of City of New Orleans v. U.S., 35 U.S. 662, 10 Pet. 662, 9 L.Ed. 573 (1836).And; 18 U.S. Code § 661 - Within special maritime and territorial jurisdiction Current through Pub. L. 114-38. (See Public Laws for the current Congress.)

Whoever, within the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States, takes and carries away, with intent to steal or purloin, any personal property of another shall be punished as follows:

If the property taken is of a value exceeding \$1,000, or is taken from the person of

2151 another, by a fine under this title, or imprisonment for not more than five years, or
 2152 both; in all other cases, by a fine under this title or by imprisonment not more than
 2153 one year, or both.
 2154
 2155 18 U.S. Code § 1341 - Frauds and swindles
 2156 Current through Pub. L. 114-38. (See Public Laws for the current Congress.)
 2157
 2158 Whoever, having devised or intending to devise any scheme or artifice to defraud, or
 2159 for obtaining money or property by means of false or fraudulent pretenses,
 2160 representations, or promises, or to sell, dispose of, loan, exchange, alter, give away,
 2161 distribute, supply, or furnish or procure for unlawful use any counterfeit or spurious
 2162 coin, obligation, security, or other article, or anything represented to be or intimated
 2163 or held out to be such "COUNTERFEIT" or spurious article..... et seq.
 2164
 2165
 2166
 2167 Whereas : Sedition by Syntax" "BAR Sedition"
 2168
 2169 1. Perpetrate (third-person singular simple present perpetrates, present participle
 2170 perpetrating, simple past and past participle perpetrated) (transitive) To be guilty of, or
 2171 responsible for a deception, crime, etc) ; to carry out or commit (a harmful, illegal, or
 2172 immoral action).
 2173 "a crime has been perpetrated against the Sovereign People
 2174
 2175 2. Crime
 2176 n. a violation of a law in which there is injury to the public or a member of the public
 2177 and a term in jail or prison, and/or a fine as possible penalties.
 2178 "Corpus delicti consists of a showing of "1) the occurrence of the specific kind of
 2179 injury and 2) someone's criminal act as the cause of the injury." Johnson v. State, 653
 2180 N.E.2d 478, 479 (Ind. 1995).
 2181 "State must produce corroborating evidence of "corpus delicti," showing that injury
 2182 or harm constituting crime occurred and that injury or harm was caused by someone's
 2183 criminal activity." Jorgensen v. State, 567 N.E.2d 113, 121.
 2184 "To establish the corpus delicti, independent evidence must be presented showing the
 2185 occurrence of a specific kind of injury and that a criminal act was the cause of the
 2186 injury." Porter v. State, 391 N.E.2d 801, 808-809.
 2187 3. Fraud
 2188 wrongful or criminal deception intended to result in financial or personal gain. a
 2189 person or thing intended to deceive others, typically by unjustifiably claiming or
 2190 being credited with accomplishments or qualities.
 2191 4. Treason
 2192
 2193 the crime of betraying one's country, especially by attempting to kill the sovereign (s)
 2194 or overthrow the government.
 2195 The action of betraying someone or something.
 2196 the offense of attempting to overthrow the government of one's country or of assisting
 2197 its enemies in war; specifically : the act of levying war against the United States or
 2198 adhering to or giving aid and comfort to its enemies by one who owes it allegiance.
 2199 18 U.S. Code § 2381 - Treason
 2200 Whoever, owing allegiance to the United States, levies war against them or adheres to

their enemies, giving them aid and comfort within the United States or elsewhere, is guilty of treason and shall suffer death, or shall be imprisoned not less than five years and fined under this title but not less than \$10,000; and shall be incapable of holding any office under the United States.

(June 25, 1948, ch. 645, 62 Stat. 807; Pub. L. 103-322, title XXXIII, § 330016(2)(J), Sept. 13, 1994, 108 Stat. 2148.)

5. Sedition Espionage

The Espionage Act of 1917 was passed, along with the Trading with the Enemy Act, just after the United States entered World War I in April 1917. It was based on the Defense Secrets Act of 1911, especially the notions of obtaining or delivering information relating to "national defense" to a person who was not "entitled to have it", itself based on an earlier British Official Secrets Act. The Espionage Act law imposed much stiffer penalties than the 1911 law, including the death penalty.[3]

Use of semantics: There are some immature people with mental imbalances, such as the craving to dominate other people, who masquerade as "government," and call the noises and scribbles that emanate from their mouths and pens "the law" which "must be obeyed." Just because they alter definitions of words in their "law" books to their supposed advantage, doesn't mean I accept those definitions. The fact that they define the words "person," "address," "mail," "resident," "motor vehicle," "driving," "passenger," "employee," "income," and many others, in ways different from the common usage, so as to be associated with a subject or slave status, means nothing in real life.

Because the "courts" have become entangled in the game of semantics, be it known to all "courts" and all parties, that if I have ever signed any document or spoken any words on record, using words defined by twists in any "law" books different from the common usage, there can be no effect whatsoever on my sovereign status in society thereby, nor can there be created any "obligation" to perform in any manner, by the mere use of such words. Where the definition in the common dictionary differs from the definition in the "law" dictionary, it is the definition in the common dictionary that prevails, because it is more trustworthy. Such compelled and supposed "benefits" include, but are not limited to, the aforementioned typical examples. My use of such alleged "benefits" is under duress only, and is with full reservation of all my natural inherent rights. I have waived none of my intrinsic rights and freedoms by my use thereof. Furthermore, my use of such compelled "benefits" may be temporary, until alternatives become available, practical, and widely recognized.

"Sedition by Syntax"

Are you a National or citizen of the United States INC Be careful! I'll tell you something that the United States Government will never want to tell you: That's a "trick" question. The federal

(feudal?) government will ask you that trick question quite often.

It would be better to put the question like this: Are you a National or citizen of the United States INC, or a Citizen of one of the United States of America? Do you think the two are one and the same thing? Your education via government schools serves you poorly.

Recall some fourth grade grammar, then check the Constitution for the United States of America, particularly the Preamble in that important document. Hereafter, we will refer to this

Constitution as the "U.S. Constitution".for more

2251
 2252
 2253 exhibit Four and evidence , Citizen v Lawful Bloodline Native Right to travel in
 2254 fourty eight states
 2255
 2256
 2257 41 CFR 302-9.1 - What is a Authorities (U.S. Code)
 2258 § 302-9.1 What is a “privately owned vehicle (POV)”?
 2259 A “privately owned vehicle (POV)” is a motor vehicle not owned by the Government
 2260 and used by the employee or his/her immediate family for the primary purpose of
 2261 providing personal transportation
 2262
 2263
 2264 In Bounds v. Smith, 430 U.S. 817 (1977), we held that "the fundamental
 2265 constitutional right of access to the courts requires prison authorities to assist inmates
 2266 in the preparation and filing of meaningful legal papers by providing prisoners with
 2267 adequate law libraries or adequate assistance from persons trained in the law."
 2268
 2269 Lewis v. Casey, 518 U.S. 343, 346 (U.S. 1996)
 2270
 2271 Driver's license is for DRIVING, which is a COMMERCIAL activity. And use of a
 2272 car purchased with lawful money, which is NOT for profit, is NOT commercial
 2273 activity, and thus does NOT require any license.
 2274
 2275 The difference between a car bought with CREDIT from Federal Reserve (FRNs),
 2276 and a car bought with REAL, lawful money (gold and silver coins), is that the car
 2277 bought with FRNs is BY DEFAULT in commerce and so justly regulated by the State.
 2278 While a car bought with LM, is in no way in commerce, and it truly is PRIVATE
 2279 property protected by Public (common) Law, and so NOT subject to State regulation
 2280 on public roads.
 2281
 2282 PEOPLE HAVE RIGHTS, PERSONS HAVE PRIVILEGES.
 2283
 2284 And that's because once a MAN signs up for a privilege, he becomes a PERSON.
 2285 Take health club membership for example. If you're a member, you're a PERSON
 2286 subject to club rules. It's the private CONTRACT that makes you a person. Without
 2287 that contract, you have inalienable rights. In the contract, that contract over-rules
 2288 those rights. I.e. you've become a PERSON with privileges and can't call on the
 2289 Public Law (Constitution) to defend yourself, since you're in a PRIVATE contract.
 2290
 2291 Here are some such contracts: Birth Certificate, Residency status, and even engaging
 2292 in COMMERCE makes you a person subject to State's Public Policy (Statutes and
 2293 codes).
 2294
 2295
 2296 Federal gov't is running its own private 'nation'. It's VOLUNTARY, and you signup
 2297 via a Birth Certificate. And when you joined their corporate nation, you gotta get SSN
 2298 if you want employment. And that entitles you to protection of federal labor laws, but
 2299 also makes you liable to obey federal laws. So you then are an employee in the federal
 2300 nation, a 'federal employee' for short.

And if you want out, just tell the IRS that you're a non-resident alien (State citizen or inhabitant) and ask them for a form to change status of your SSN into an ITIN. Then you can file W8 form with your employer and mark EXEMPT on line 7 of the W4 form.

BTW, there are about 100 boundary stones around District of Columbia. And on the inside of the stones it says "Jurisdiction of the United States". That's a proof positive that jurisdiction of US is limited to District of Columbia. SOO you now know what is the territorial United States that form W8-BEN talks about.

NO Law requires you to record / pledge your private automobile

Private automobile is not required by any law, code or statute to be recorded. Any recording (pledge) of Private automobile to any agency is strictly voluntary. Any recordation / contract you or a Dealership has done was a fraudulently conveyed act as the recording agency/automobile Dealer told you that you must record your Private Property. This voluntary pledge was done without compensation and was done through fraud, deceit, coercion including the withholding of facts, which can only be construed as fraud and unjust enrichment by the agency as well as a willful malicious act to unjustly enrich the recording agency and its public servants.

If men, through fear, fraud or mistake, should in terms renounce or give up any natural right, the eternal law of reason and the grand end of society would absolutely vacate such renunciation. The right to freedom being the gift of Almighty God, it is not in the power of man to alienate this gift and voluntarily become a slave. Samuel Adams, our great president.

“Men are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, -‘life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness;’ and to ‘secure,’ not grant or create, these rights, governments are instituted. That property which a man has honestly acquired he retains full control of, subject to these limitations: first, that he shall not use it to his neighbor’s injury, and that does not mean that he must use it for his neighbor’s benefit: second, that if he devotes it to a public use, he gives to the public a right to control that use; and third, that whenever the public needs require, the public may take it upon payment of due compensation.” *Budd v. People of State of New York*, 143 U.S. 517 (1892).

There should be no arbitrary deprivation of life or liberty, or arbitrary spoilation of property. (Police power, Due Process) *Barber v. Connolly*, 113 U.S. 27, 31; *Yick Yo v. Hopkins*, 118 U.S. 356.

But whenever the operation and effect of any general regulation is to extinguish or destroy that which by law of the land is the property of any person, so far as it has that effect, it is unconstitutional and void. Thus, a law is considered as being a deprivation of property within the meaning of this constitutional guaranty if it deprives an owner of one of its essential attributes, destroys its value, restricts or interrupts its common, necessary, or profitable use, hampers the owner in the application of it to the purposes of trade, or imposes conditions upon the right to hold or use it and thereby seriously

2351 impairs its value. (Statute) 167 Am. Jur. 2d, Constitutional Law, Section 369.
2352
2353 Justice Brandeis eloquently affirmed his condemnation of abuses practiced by
2354 Government officials, who were defendants, acting as Government officials. In the
2355 case of *Olmstead vs. U.S.* 277 US 438, 48 S.Ct. 564, 575; 72 L ED 944 (1928) he
2356 declared:
2357
2358 NO Law requires you to record / pledge your private automobile...
2359
2360 "Decency, security, and liberty alike demand that Government officials shall be
2361 subjected to the same rules of conduct that are commands to the Citizen. In a
2362 Government of laws, existence of the Government will be imperiled if it fails to
2363 observe the law scrupulously. Our Government is the potent, the omnipresent teacher.
2364
2365 For good or for ill, it teaches the whole people by its example. Crime is contagious. If
2366 the Government becomes a law-breaker, it breeds contempt for law; it invites every
2367 man to become a law unto himself. It invites anarchy. To declare that, in the
2368 administration of the law, the end justifies the means would bring a terrible retribution.
2369 Against that pernicious doctrine, this Court should resolutely set its face."
2370
2371 The Duty of the Licenser / DMV Commissioner
2372
2373 The information created and surrounding the stricti juris doctrine regarding a
2374 particular license which may, or may not, be represented by and revealed within the
2375 contents and control of a license agreement -- "but must be revealed upon demand,
2376 and failure to do so is concealment, a withholding of material facts (the enducing,
2377 contractual consideration) known by those who have a duty and are bound to reveal."
2378 *Dolcater v. Manufacturers & Traders Trust Co., D.C.N.Y., 2F.Supp. 637, 641.*
2379
2380 Is an automobile always a vehicle (or motor vehicle)?
2381
2382 ARGUMENT:
2383
2384 Federal;
2385 "'Motor vehicle'" means every description of carriage or other contrivance propelled
2386 or drawn by mechanical power and used for commercial purposes on the highways in
2387 transportation of passengers, passengers and property, or property and cargo; ...
2388 "'Used for commercial purposes" means the carriage of persons or property for any
2389 fare, fee, rate, charge or other consideration, or directly or indirectly in connection
2390 with any business, or other undertaking intended for profit[.]" 18 U.S.C. 31.
2391
2392 "A carriage is peculiarly a family or household article. It contributes in a large degree
2393 to the health, convenience, comfort, and welfare of the householder or of the family."
2394 *Arthur v Morgan*, 113 U.S. 495, 500, 5 S.Ct. 241, 243 S.D. NY 1884).
2395
2396 NO Law requires you to record / pledge your private automobile "The Supreme Court,
2397 in *Arthur v. Morgan*, 112 U.S. 495, 5 S.Ct. 241, 28 L.Ed. 825, held that carriages
2398 were properly classified as household effects, and we see no reason that automobiles
2399 should not be similarly disposed of." *Hillhouse v United States*, 152 F. 163, 164 (2nd
2400 Cir. 1907).

"A soldier's personal automobile is part of his ``household goods[.]" U.S. v Bomar, C.A.5(Tex.), 8 F.3d 226, 235" 19A Words and Phrases - Permanent Edition (West) pocket part 94.

"[I]t is a jury question whether ... an automobile ... is a motor vehicle[.]" United States v Johnson, 718 F.2d 1317, 1324 (5th Cir. 1983).

State:
Use determines classification

"In determining whether or not a motor boat was included in the expression household effects, Matter of Winburn's Will, supra [139 Misc. 5, 247 N.Y.S. 592], stated the test to be ``whether the articles are or are not used in or by the household, or for the benefit or comfort of the family"." In re Bloomingdale's Estate, 142 N.Y.S.2d 781, 785 (1955).

"The use to which an item is put, rather than its physical characteristics, determine whether it should be classified as ``consumer goods" under UCC 9-109(1) or ``equipment" under UCC 9-109(2)." Grimes v Massey Ferguson, Inc., 23 UCC Rep Serv 655; 355 So.2d 338 (Ala., 1978).

"Under UCC 9-109 there is a real distinction between goods purchased for personal use and those purchased for business use. The two are mutually exclusive and the principal use to which the property is put should be considered as determinative." James Talcott, Inc. v Gee, 5 UCC Rep Serv 1028; 266 Cal.App.2d 384, 72 Cal.Rptr. 168 (1968).

"The classification of goods in UCC 9-109 are mutually exclusive." McFadden v Mercantile-Safe Deposit & Trust Co., 8 UCC Rep Serv 766; 260 Md 601, 273 A.2d 198 (1971).

"The classification of ``goods" under [UCC] 9-109 is a question of fact." Morgan County Feeders, Inc. v McCormick, 18 UCC Rep Serv 2d 632; 836 P.2d 1051 (Colo. App., 1992).

"The definition of ``goods" includes an automobile." Henson v Government Employees Finance & Industrial Loan Corp., 15 UCC Rep Serv 1137; 257 Ark 273, 516 S.W.2d 1 (1974).

Household goods

"The term ``household goods" ... includes everything about the house that is usually held and enjoyed therewith and that tends to the comfort and accommodation of the household. Lawwill v. Lawwill, 515 P.2d 900, 903, 21 Ariz.App. 75" 19A Words and Phrases – Permanent Edition (West) pocket part 94. Cites Mitchell's Will below. NO Law requires you to record / pledge your private automobile "Bequest ... of such ``household goods and effects" ... included not only household furniture, but everything else in the house that is usually held and used by the occupants of a house to lead to the comfort and accommodation of the household. State ex rel. Mueller v Probate Court of Ramsey County, 32 N.W.2d 863, 867, 226 Minn. 346." 19A Words and Phrases - Permanent Edition (West) 514.

"All household goods owned by the user thereof and used solely for noncommercial purposes shall be exempt from taxation, and such person entitled to such exemption shall not be required to take any affirmative action to receive the benefit from such exemption." Ariz. Const. Art. 9, 2.

Automobiles classified as vehicles

""[H]ousehold goods"...did not [include] an automobile...used by the testator, who was a practicing physician, in going from his residence to his office and vice versa, and in making visits to his patients." Mathis v Causey, et al., 159 S.E. 240 (Ga. 1931).

"Debtors could not avoid lien on motor vehicle, as motor vehicles are not ``household goods" within the meaning of Bankruptcy Code lien avoidance provision. In re Martinez, Bkrty.N.M., 22 B.R. 7, 8." 19A Words and Phrases - Permanent Edition (West) pocket part 94.

Automobiles NOT classified as vehicles

"Automobile purchased for the purpose of transporting buyer to and from his place of employment was ``consumer goods" as defined in UCC 9-109." Mallicoat v Volunteer Finance & Loan Corp., 3 UCC Rep Serv 1035; 415 S.W.2d 347 (Tenn. App., 1966).

"The provisions of UCC 2-316 of the Maryland UCC do not apply to sales of consumer goods (a term which includes automobiles, whether new or used, that are bought primarily for personal, family, or household use)." Maryland Independent Automobile Dealers Assoc., Inc. v Administrator, Motor Vehicle Admin., 25 UCC Rep Serv 699; 394 A.2d 820, 41 Md App 7 (1978).

"An automobile was part of testatrix' ``household goods" within codicil. In re Mitchell's Will, 38 N.Y.S.2d 673, 674, 675 [1942]." 19A Words and Phrases – Permanent Edition (West) 512. Cites Arthur v Morgan, supra.

"[T]he expression ``personal effects" clearly includes an automobile[.]" In re Burnside's Will, 59 N.Y.S.2d 829, 831 (1945). Cites Hillhouse, Arthur, and Mitchell's Will, supra. "[A] yacht and six automobiles were ``personal belongings" and ``household effects[.]"" In re Bloomingdale's Estate, 142 N.Y.S.2d 781, 782 (1955). NO Law requires you to record / pledge your private automobile

CONCLUSION

Is an automobile always a vehicle (or motor vehicle)? No.

This is a question of fact that turns on the use to which the automobile in question is put (i.e., either personal or commercial). While the presumption of an automobile being a vehicle (or motor vehicle) is created by the owner of said automobile registering same with the state as a vehicle, this presumption may be overcome by an affirmative defense to the allegation of the automobile being a vehicle, barring any evidence to the contrary indicating commercial use.

NO Law requires you to record / pledge your private automobile

2501 Use defines Classification
 2502
 2503 Private Automobile is NOT required to be registered by Law
 2504
 2505 The California Motor Vehical Code, section 260: Private cars/vans etc. not in
 2506 commerce / for profit are immune to registration fees:
 2507
 2508 REQUIRED to be REGISTERED under this code "Passenger vehicles which are not
 2509 used for the transportation of persons for hire, compensation or profit, and house-cars,
 2510 are not commercial vehicles""a vanpool vehicle is not a commercial vehicle."
 2511 and;
 2512
 2513 N type of vehicle required to be registered and "use tax" paid of which the tab is
 2514 evidence of receipt of the tax." Bank of Boston vs Jones, 4 UCC Rep. Serv. 1021, 236
 2515 A2d 484, UCC PP 9-109.14. And;
 2516 ...reasonable classification, and does not involve any unconstitutional discrimination,
 2517 although it does not apply to private vehicles, or those used the owner in his own
 2518 business, and not for hire." Desser v. Wichita, (1915) 96 Kan. 820; Iowa Motor
 2519 Vehicle Asso. v. Railroad Comrs., 75 A.L.R. 22.
 2520 "
 2521 according to the means by which they are propelled." Ex Parte Hoffert, 148 NW 20.
 2522 And;
 2523
 2524 ...not such persons when the transportation is not on a commercial basis means that
 2525 they "must" exempt them." State v. Johnson, 243 P. 1073; 6C.J.S. section 94 page
 2526 581.
 2527
 2528 Exepted from chapter which reads: "Automobile, fire engines and such self propelling
 2529 vehicles as are used neither for the conveyance of persons for hirpleasure or business,
 2530 nor for the transportation of freights, such as steam road rollertraction engines are
 2531 excepted from the provisions of this chapter."
 2532 Se
 2533 y 21, 1909, ALBANY NEW YORK, pages 322-323 which reads: "There is NO
 2534 requirement that the owner of a motor vehicle shall procure a license to run the same,
 2535 nor is there any requirement that any other person shall do so, unless he proposes to
 2536 become a chauffeur or a person conducting an automobile as an employee for hire or
 2537 wages. Yours very truly, EDWARD R. O'MALLEY Attor
 2538 NO Law requires you to record / pledge your private automobile See La
 2539 See also Laws of Wyoming 2002, Motor Vehicle Code, page 142, Sect
 2540 "Privately owned Buses
 2541 Chapter 20****" 58 N.C.A.G. 1 (It follows that those Citizens not engaged in
 2542 extraordinary use of the highway for profit or gain are likewise outside the
 2543 jurisdiction of the Division of Motor Vehicles.) "Since a sale of personal property is
 2544 not reqw
 2545 there may be a transfer of title to an automobile without complying with the
 2546 registration statute which requires a transfer and delivery of a certificate of title." N.C.
 2547 Law Review Vol. 32 page 545, Carolina Discount Corp. v. Landis Motor Co., 190
 2548 N.C. 157. "The following shall be
 2549 ce
 2550 conformance with the provisions of this Article relating to manufacturers, dealers, or

nonresidents.” 2.) Any such vehicle which is driven or moved upon a highway other purpose of crossing such highway from one property to another. ****20-51(1)(2) (comment: not driven or moved upon the highway for transporting persons or property for profit.) (Case note to North Carolina G.S. 12-3 “Statutory Construction”) The California Constitution in Article I, Section 8 (and dates that no one “be compelled to be a witness against himself,” is in agreement with the Supreme Court ruling in *Haynes v. U.S.*, 390 U.S. 85, 88 S.Ct. 722, wherein the ruling was that to force anyone to register anything is communication and such communicative evidence is precluded by the 5th Amendment. “No Statute passage on the highways, byways, nor waterways... transporting his vehicles and personal property for either recreation or business, but by being subject only to local regulation i.e., safety, caution, traffic lights, speed limits, etc. Travel is not a privilege requiring, licensing, vehicle registration, or forced insurances.” *Chicago Coach Co. v. City of Chicago*, 337 Ill. 200, 169 N.E. 22.

NO Law requires you to record / pledge your private automobile granted by your Maker, and restated by our founding fathers as or color of law known as a private Code (secret) or a Statute, To Wit: be not ev

impairs the rights of others.” In *Re Newman* (1858), 9 C. 502. “Traveling is passing from place to place--act of performing journey an “Right of transit through each state, with every species of property paramount law, is secured by that instrument to each citizen, and does not depend upon uncertain and changeable ground of mere comity.” In *Re Archy* (1858), 9 C. 47. “Traffic infractions are 3,39. “First, it is well established law that the purposes, and that their use for purposes of gain is special and extraordinary which, generally at least, the legislature may prohibit or condition as it sees fit.” *Stephenson vs. Rinford*, 287 US 251; *Pachard vs. Banton*, 264 US 140, and cases cited; *Frost and F. Trucking Co. vs. Railroad Commission*, 271 US 592; *Railroad commission vs. Inter-City Forwarding Co.*, 57 SW.2d 290; *Parlett Cooperative vs. Tidewater Lines*, 164 A. 313. F” Congress has authorized its curtailment. (Road) *Kent v. Dulles*, 35 U.S. 116, 127. The right to travel So much is conceded by the solicitor general. In Anglo Saxon law that right was emerging at least as early as Magna Carta. *Kent v. Dulles*, 357 U.S. 116, 125. “The use of the highway

NO Law requires you to record / pledge your private automobile 154 SE 579. “The public and individuals cannot rightfully be deprived.” *Chicago Motor Coach v. Chicago*, 337 Ill. 200, 169 NE 22, 66 ALR 834. *Ligare v. Chicago*, 139 Ill. 46, 28 NE 934. *Boone v. Clark*, 214 SW 607; 25 AJUR (1st) Highways, Sec. 163. “Travel is not a mere privilege which a City may prohibit or permit at will, but a common right which he has under the right to Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness.” *Thompson v. Smith* the course of his business or pleasure, though this right may be regulated in accordance with public interest and convenience. *Chicago Coach Co. v. City of Chicago*, 337 Ill. 200, 169 N.E. 22, 206.

“.

power when using the public highways for the transaction of their business] with respect to common carriers using the public highways for the transaction of their business in the transportation of persons or property for hire. That rule is stated as follows by the supreme court of the United States: ‘A citizen may have, under the fourteenth amendment, the right to travel and transport his property upon them (the public highways) by auto vehicle, but he has no right to make the highways his place of business by using them as a common carrier for hire. Such use is a privilege which

may be granted or withheld by the state in its discretion, without violating either the due process clause or the equal protection clause.' (Buck v. Kuykendall, 267 U. S. 307 [38 A. L. R. 286, 69 L. Ed. 623, 45 Sup. Ct. Rep. 324].) "Tpro radically an obviously from that of one who makes the highway his place of business and uses it for private gain, in the running of a stage coach or omnibus. The former is the usual and ordinary right of a citizen, a right common to all; while the latter is special, unusual and extraordinary. As to the former, the extent of legislative power is that of regulation; but as to the latter its power is broader; the right may be wholly denied, or it may be permitted to some and denied to others, because of its extraordinary nature. This distinction, elementary and fundamental in character, is recognized by all the authorities."

NO Law requires you to record / pledge your private automobile In Thompson v. Smith, Chief of Police. Supreme Court of Appeals of Virginia. 155 Va. 367, 154 S.E. 579, 71 A.L.R. 604. Sept. 12, 1930 it states:

Constitutional law: Citizen's right to travel upon public highways and transport his property thereon in ordinary course of life and business is common right. The right of a citizen so to do is that which he has under his right to enjoy life and liberty, to acquire property, and to pursue happiness and safety. Automobiles, Highways: Citizen's right to travel upon public highways includes right to use usual conveyances of time, including horse-drawn carriage, or automobile, for ordinary purposes of life and business. Injunction: Injunction lies against enforcement of void statute or ordinance, where legal remedy is not as complete or adequate as injunction, or where threatened or attempted enforcement will do irreparable injury to person in interfering with exercise of common fundamental personal right. By "irreparable injury" is meant an injury of such a nature that fair and reasonable redress may not be had in a court of law and that to refuse the injunction would be a denial of justice. Constitutional Law § 101 – right to travel – 5. The nature of the Federal Union and constitutional concepts of personal liberty unite to require that all citizens be free to travel throughout the length and breadth of the United States uninhibited by statutes, rules, or regulations which unreasonably burden or restrict this movement. 6. Although not explicitly mentioned in the Federal Constitution, the right freely to travel from one state to another is a basic right under the constitution.

Constitutional Law § 101 – law chilling assertion of rights – 7. If a law has no other purpose than to chill the assertion of constitutional rights by penalizing those who choose to exercise them, then it is patently unconstitutional. Shapiro v Thompson, 394 US 618, 22 L Ed 2d 600, 89 S Ct 1322.

So with all of that in mind, cite/deliver the cases above and you have given the agency, etc. knowledge!

Under USC Title 42 §1986. Action for neglect to prevent ..., it states: Every person who, having knowledge that any wrongs conspired or to be done... and having power to prevent or aid in preventing ... Neglects or refuses so to do ... shall be liable to the party injured... and; The means of "knowledge", especially where it consists of public record is deemed in law to be "knowledge of the facts". As the means of "knowledge" if it appears that the individual had notice or information of circumstances which would put him on inquiry, which, if followed, would lead to "knowledge", or that the facts were presumptively within his

NO Law requires you to record / pledge your private automobile knowledge, he will have deemed to have had actual knowledge of the facts and may be subsequently liable for any damage or injury. You, therefore, have been given "knowledge of the facts" as it pertains to this conspiracy to commit a fraud against me.

2651 I state now that I will NOT waive any fundamental Rights as:
 2652 "waivers of fundamental Rights must be knowing, intentional, and voluntary acts,
 2653 done with sufficient awareness of the relevant circumstances and likely consequences.
 2654 U.S. v. Brady, 397 U.S. 742 at 748 (1970); U.S.v. O'Dell, 160 F.2d 304 (6th Cir.
 2655 1947)".
 2656 And that the agency committed fraud, deceit, coercion, willful intent to injure another,
 2657 malicious acts, RICO activity and conspired by;
 2658 Unconscionable "contract" - "One which no sensible man not under delusion, or
 2659 duress, or in distress would make, and such as no honest and fair man would accept.";
 2660 Franklin Fire Ins. Co. v. Noll, 115 Ind. App. 289, 58 N.E.2d 947, 949, 950. and;
 2661 "Party cannot be bound by contract that he has not made or authorized." Alexander v.
 2662 Bosworth (1915), 26 C.A. 589, 599, 147 P.607.
 2663 And therefore;
 2664 "Failure to reveal the material facts of a license or any agreement is immediate
 2665 grounds for estoppel." Lo Bue v. Porazzo, 48 Cal.App.2d 82, 119, p.2d 346, 348.
 2666 The fraudulently "presumed" quasi-contractus that binds the Declarant with the
 2667 CITY/STATE agency, is void for fraud ab initio, since the de facto CITY/STATE
 2668 cannot produce the material fact (consideration inducement) or the jurisdictional
 2669 clause (who is subject to said statute). (SEE: Master / Servant [Employee]
 2670 Relationship -- C.J.S.) -- "Personal, Private, Liberty"-
 2671 Since the "consideration" is the "life blood" of any agreement or quasi-agreement,
 2672 (contractus) "...the absence of such from the record is a major manifestation of want
 2673 of jurisdiction, since without evidence of consideration there can be no presumption
 2674 of even a quasi-contractus. Such is the importance of a "consideration." Reading R.R.
 2675 Co. v. Johnson, 7 W & S (Pa.) 317
 2676 So without a Contract (no recording of the M.C.O.) or consideration there is no DMV
 2677 / government etc. jurisdiction as
 2678 NO Law requires you to record / pledge your private automobile the property does not
 2679 "reside" in the colorable fictitious territory as evidenced in Supreme Court cite below:
 2680 In Wheeling Steel Corp v. Fox , 298 U.S. 193 (1936) it states: Property taxes can be
 2681 on tangibles or intangibles. In order to have a situs for taxation (a basis for imposing
 2682 the tax), tangible property (physical property) must reside within the territorial
 2683 jurisdiction of the taxing authority, and intangibles...
 2684 Under USC Title 42 §1982. Property rights of citizens ..., further evidences the above
 2685 position that the City or State cannot take land because they DO NOT have
 2686 Jurisdiction. It states that federal or state governments / agencies MUST have a
 2687 monetary or proprietary interest in your real private property in order to have
 2688 jurisdiction over it (if your land has no government grant/funding or is not a
 2689 subsidized government project, then agencies have neither). DEMAND any public
 2690 servant/said agencies to provide the legal document that allows any federal or state
 2691 agency to supercede and/or bypass Title 42 USC §1982 and/or §1441. Title 42 §1983.
 2692 Civil action for deprivation of rights ..., further protects Declarant's private property.
 2693 The State cannot diminish rights of the people. Hurtado v. California, 110 U.S. 516.
 2694 "To say that one may not defend his own property is usurpation of power by
 2695 legislature." O'Connell v. Judnich (1925), 71 C.A.386, 235 P. 664.
 2696 "A state MAY NOT impose a charge for the enjoyment of a right granted (sic) by the
 2697 Federal Constitution." MURDOCK v PENNSYLVANIA, 319 US 105.
 2698 "... THE POWER TO TAX INVOLVES THE POWER TO DESTROY".
 2699 McCULLOUGH v MARYLAND, 4 Wheat 316.
 2700 "All subjects over which the sovereign power of the state extends are objects of

taxation, but those over which it does not extend are exempt from taxation. This proposition may almost be pronounced as self-evident. The sovereignty of the state extends to everything which exists by its authority or its permission." *McCullough v Maryland*, 17 U.S. [4 Wheat] 316 (1819).

NO Law requires you to record / pledge your private automobile U.S. adopted Common laws of England with the Constitution. *Caldwell vs. Hill*, 178 SE 383 (1934). To be that statutes which would deprive a citizen of the rights of person or property without a regular trial, according to the course and usage of common law, would not be the law of the land. (Jury) *Hoke v. Henderson*, 15, N.C. 15 25 AM Dec 677.

"The phrase 'common law' found in this clause, is used in contradistinction to equity, and admiralty, and maritime jurisprudence." *Parsons v. Bedford, et al*, 3 Pet 433, 478-9.

"If the common law can try the cause, and give full redress, that alone takes away the admiralty jurisdiction." *Ramsey v. Allegrie*, supra, p. 411.

Inferior Courts - The term may denote any court subordinate to the chief tribunal in the particular judicial system; but it is commonly used as the designation of a court of special, limited, or statutory jurisdiction, whose record must show the existence and attaching of jurisdiction in any given case, in order to give presumptive validity to its judgment. *In re Heard's Guardianship*, 174 Miss. 37, 163, So. 685.

The high Courts have further decreed, that Want of Jurisdiction makes "...all acts of judges, magistrates, U.S. Marshals, sheriffs, local police, all void and not just voidable." *Nestor v. Hershey*, 425 F2d 504.

Void Judgment - "One which has no legal force or effect, invalidity of which may be asserted by any person whose rights are affected at any time and at any place directly or collaterally. *Reynolds v. Volunteer State Life Ins. Co.*, Tex.Civ.App., 80 S.W.2d 1087, 1092.

Voidable Judgment - "One apparently valid, but in truth wanting in some material respect." *City of Lufkin v. McVicker*, Tex.Civ.App., 510 S.W. 2d 141, 144.

Property MUST be devoted / pledged to the public with your consent and being fully compensated for such

"... In one of the so-called elevator cases, that of *Munn v. Illinois*, 94 U. S. 113, [24 L. Ed. 77], it is said: 'When, therefore, one devotes his property to a use in which the public have an interest, he in effect grants to the public an interest in that use, and must submit to be controlled by the public for the common good, to the extent of the interest he has thus created.' But so long as he uses his property for private use, and in the absence of devoting it to public use, the public has no interest therein which entitles it to a voice in its control. Other case to the same effect are *Budd v. New York*, 143 U. S.

NO Law requires you to record / pledge your private automobile 517, [36 L. Ed. 247, 12 Sup. Ct. Rep. 468]; *Weems Steamboat Co. v. People's Co.*, 214 U. S. 345, [16 Ann. Cas. 1222, 53 L. Ed. 1024, 29 Sup. Ct. Rep. 661]; *Monongahela Nav. Co. v. United States*, 148 U. S. 336, [37 L. Ed. 463, 13 Sup. Ct. Rep. 622]; and *Del Mar Water Co. v. Eshleman*, 167 Cal. 666, [140 Pac. 591, 948]. Indeed, our attention is directed to no authority in this state or elsewhere holding otherwise." *Associated etc. Co. v. Railroad Commission* (1917) 176 Cal. 518, 526.

"... That subjecting petitioners' property to the use of the public as common carriers constitutes a taking of the same, admits of no controversy. 'Whenever a law deprives the owner of the beneficial use and free enjoyment of his property, or imposes restraints upon such use and enjoyment that materially affect its value, without legal process or compensation, it deprives him of his property within the meaning of the

constitution. ... It is not necessary, in order to render the statute obnoxious to the restraints of the constitution, that it must in terms or effect authorize the actual physical taking of the property or the thing itself, so long as it affects its free use and enjoyment, or the power of disposition at the will of the owner.' (Forster v. Scott, 136 N. Y. 577, [18 L. R. A. 543, 32 N. E. 976]; Monongahela Nav. Co. v. United States, 148 U. S. 312, 336, [37 L. Ed. 463, 13 Sup. Ct. Rep. 622]. ... Mr. Lewis in his work on Eminent Domain, third edition, section 11, says: 'A law which authorizes the taking of private property without compensation, ... cannot be considered as due process of law in a free government.' (Chicago etc, R. R. Co. v. Chicago, 166 U. S. 226, [41 L. Ed. 979, 17 Sup. Ct. Rep. 581]." Associated etc. Co. v. Railroad Commission (1917) 176 Cal. 518, 528-530.

It is beyond the power of a State by legislation fiat to convert property used exclusively in the business of a private carrier, into a public utility, or to make the owner a public carrier, for that would be taking private property for public use without just compensation which no State can do consistently with the due process of law clause of the 14th Amendment. (See police power) Producers Transportation Co. v. RR Commission, 251 U.S. 228, 230; Wolff Co. v. Duke, 266 U.S. 570, 578.

The binding shackles of Government is the Constitution, to wit:
The laws of nature are the laws of God, whose authority can be superseded by no power on earth. A legislature must not obstruct our obedience to him from whose punishments they cannot protect us. All human constitutions which contradict his cannot protect us. All human constitutions which contradict his (God's) laws, we are in conscience bound to disobey. 1772, Robin v. Hardaway, 1 Jefferson 109.

If the state were to be given the power to destroy rights through
NO Law requires you to record / pledge your private automobile taxation, then the framers of our constitutions wrote said documents in vain.

A republic is not an easy form of government to live under, and when the responsibility of citizenship is evaded, democracy decays and authoritarianism takes over. Earl Warren, "A Republic, If You Can Keep It", p 13.

It is a fundamental principle in our institutions, indispensable to the preservation of public liberty, that one of the separate departments of government shall not usurp powers committed by the Constitution to another department. Mugler v. Kansas, 123 U.S. 623, 662.

An unconstitutional law is not a law, it confers no rights, imposes no duties, and affords no protection. Norton vs. Shelby County, 118 US 425.

"Primacy of position in our state constitution is accorded the Declaration of Rights; thus emphasizing the importance of those basic and inalienable rights of personal liberty and private property which are thereby reserved and guaranteed to the people and protected from arbitrary invasion or impairment from any governmental quarter. The Declaration of Rights constitutes a limitation upon the powers of every department of the state government. State ex rel. Davis v. Stuart. 64 A.L.R. 1307, 97 Fla. 69, 120 So. 335.

"The rights of the individual are not derived from governmental agencies, either municipal, state, or federal, or even from the Constitution. They exist inherently in every man, by endowment of the Creator, and are merely reaffirmed in the Constitution, and restricted only to the extent that they have been voluntarily surrendered by the citizenship to the agencies of government. The people's rights are not derived from the government, but the government's authority comes from the people. The Constitution but states again these rights already existing, and when legislative encroachment by the nation, state, or municipality invade these original

2801 and permanent rights, it is the duty of the courts to so declare, and to afford the
 2802 necessary relief. *City of Dallas, et al. v. Mitchell*, 245 S. W. 944, 945-46 (1922).
 2803 A constitution is designated as a supreme enactment, a fundamental act of legislation
 2804 by the people of the state. A constitution is legislation direct from the people acting in
 2805 their sovereign capacity, while a statute is legislation from their representatives,
 2806 subject to limitations prescribed by the superior authority. *Ellingham v. Dye*, 178
 2807 NO Law requires you to record / pledge your private automobile Ind. 336; NE 1; 231
 2808 U.S. 250; 58 L. Ed. 206; 34 S. Ct. 92; *Sage v. New York*, 154 NY 61; 47 NE 1096.
 2809 "Owner has constitutional right to use and enjoyment of his property." *Simpson v.*
 2810 *Los Angeles* (1935), 4 C.2d 60, 47 P.2d 474.
 2811 "We find it intolerable that one constitutional right should have to be surrendered in
 2812 order to assert another". *SIMMONS v US*, supra.
 2813 "When rights secured by the Constitution are involved, there can be no rule making or
 2814 legislation which would abrogate them." *Miranda vs. Arizona*, 384 US 436 p. 491.
 2815 "The claim and exercise of a Constitutional right cannot be converted into a crime."
 2816 *Miller v. U.S.* 230 F 2d 486, 489.
 2817 History is clear that the first ten amendments to the Constitution were adopted to
 2818 secure certain common law rights of the people, against invasion by the Federal
 2819 Government." *Bell v. Hood*, 71 F.Supp., 813, 816 (1947) U.S.D.C. -- So. Dist. CA.
 2820 Economic necessity cannot justify a disregard of cardinal constitutional guarantee.
 2821 *Riley v. Certer*, 165 Okal. 262; 25 P.2d 666; 79 ALR 1018.
 2822 When any court violates the clean and unambiguous language of the Constitution, a
 2823 fraud is perpetrated and no one is bound to obey it. (See 16 Ma. Jur. 2d 177, 178)
 2824 *State v. Sutton*, 63 Minn. 147, 65 NW 262, 30 L.R.A. 630 Am. 459.
 2825 "The 'liberty' guaranteed by the constitution must be interpreted in the light of the
 2826 common law, the principles and history of which were familiar and known to the
 2827 framers of the constitution. This liberty denotes the right of the individual to engage
 2828 in any of the common occupations of life, to locomote, and generally enjoy those
 2829 rights long recognized at common law as essential to the orderly pursuit of happiness
 2830 by free men." *Myer v. Nebraska*, 262 U .S. 390, 399; *United States v. Kim Ark*, 169
 2831 U.S. 649, 654.
 2832 "An unconstitutional act is not law; it confers no rights; it imposes no duties; affords
 2833 no protection; it creates no office; it is in legal contemplation, as inoperative as
 2834 though it had never been passed." *Norton vs. Shelby County*, 118 US 425 p. 442.
 2835 NO Law requires you to record / pledge your private automobile "The general rule is
 2836 that an unconstitutional statute, though having the form and name of law, is in reality
 2837 no law, but is wholly void, and ineffective for any purpose; since unconstitutionality
 2838 dates from the time of its enactment, and not merely from the date of the decision so
 2839 branding it.
 2840 "No one is bound to obey an unconstitutional law and no courts are bound to enforce
 2841 it." 16 Am Jur 2nd, Sec 177 late 2d, Sec 256.
 2842 All laws which are repugnant to the Constitution are null and void. Chief Justice
 2843 Marshall, *Marbury vs Madison*, 5, U.S. (Cranch) 137, 174, 176 (1803).
 2844 It cannot be assumed that the framers of the constitution and the people who adopted
 2845 it, did not intend that which is the plain import of the language used. When the
 2846 language of the constitution is positive and free of all ambiguity, all courts are not at
 2847 liberty, by a resort to the refinements of legal learning, to restrict its obvious meaning
 2848 to avoid the hardships of particular cases. We must accept the constitution as it reads
 2849 when its language is unambiguous, for it is the mandate of the sovereign power. *Cook*
 2850 *vs Iverson*, 122, N.M. 251. "Right of protecting property, declared inalienable by

2851 constitution, is not mere right to protect it by individual force, but right to protect it by
 2852 law of land, and force of body politic." *Billings v. Hall* (1857), 7 C. 1.
 2853 "Constitution of this state declares, among inalienable rights of each citizen, that of
 2854 acquiring, possessing and protecting property. This is one of primary objects of
 2855 government, is guaranteed by constitution, and cannot be impaired by legislation."
 2856 *Billings v. Hall* (1857), 7 C. 1.
 2857 State Constitution - "The state constitution is the mandate of a sovereign people to its
 2858 servants and representatives. Not one of them has a right to ignore or disregard these
 2859 mandates..." *John F. Jelko Co. vs. Emery*, 193 Wisc. 311; 214 N.W. 369, 53 A.L.R.,
 2860 463; *Lemon vs. Langlin*, 45 Wash. 2d 82, 273 P.2d 464.
 2861 NO Law requires you to record / pledge your private automobile The People are the
 2862 Sovereign!
 2863 People are supreme, not the state. *Waring vs. the Mayor of Savannah*, 60 Georgia at
 2864 93.
 2865 The people of the State do not yield their sovereignty to the agencies which serve
 2866 them. The people, in delegating authority, do not give their public servants the right to
 2867 decide what is good for the people to know and what is not good for them to know.
 2868 The people insist on remaining informed so that they may retain control over the
 2869 instruments they have created. (Added Stats. 1953, c. 1588, p.3270, sec. 1.)
 2870 The people are the recognized source of all authority, state or municipal, and to this
 2871 authority it must come at last, whether immediately or by circuitous route. *Barnes v.*
 2872 *District of Columbia*, 91 U.S. 540, 545 [23: 440, 441]. p 234.
 2873 "the government is but an agency to the state," -- the state being the sovereign people.
 2874 *State v. Chase*, 175 Minn, 259, 220 N.W. 951, 953.
 2875 Sovereignty itself is, of course, not subject to law, for it is the author and source of
 2876 law; but in our system, while sovereign powers are delegated to the agencies of
 2877 government, sovereignty itself remains with the people, by whom and for whom all
 2878 government exists and acts. And the law is the definition and limitation of power.
 2879 "...The Congress cannot revoke the Sovereign power of the people to override their
 2880 will as thus declared." *Perry v. United States*, 294 U.S. 330, 353 (1935).
 2881 "The Doctrine of Sovereign Immunity is one of the Common-Law immunities and
 2882 defenses that are available to the Sovereign..." *Citizen of Minnesota. Will v. Michigan*
 2883 *Dept. of State Police*, (1988) 491 U.S. 58, 105 L.Ed. 2d. 45, 109 S.Ct. 2304.
 2884 "The people of the state, as the successors of its former sovereign, are entitled to all
 2885 the rights which formerly belonged to the king by his own prerogative." *Lansing v.*
 2886 *Smith*, (1829) 4 Wendell 9, (NY).
 2887 NO Law requires you to record / pledge your private automobile Private Corporate
 2888 State / Municipality Policy Enforcement Officer a.k.a Police Officer Duties and
 2889 limitations of power
 2890 "Nothing is gained in the argument by calling it 'police power.'" *Henderson v. City of*
 2891 *New York*, 92 U.S. 259, 2771 (1875); *Nebbia v. New York*, 291 U.S. 501 (1934). "An
 2892 officer who acts in violation of the Constitution ceases to represent the government."
 2893 *Brookfield Const. Co. v. Stewart*, 284 F.Supp. 94. Failure to obey the command of a
 2894 police officer constitutes a traditional form of breach of the peace. Obviously,
 2895 however, one cannot be punished for failing to obey the command of an officer if that
 2896 command is itself violative of the constitution. *Wright v. Georgia*, 373 U.S. 284,
 2897 291-2.
 2898 That an officer or employee of a state or one of its subdivisions is deemed to be acting
 2899 under "color of law" as to those deprivations of right committed in the fulfillment of
 2900 the tasks and obligations assigned to him. *Monroe v. Page*, 1961, 365 U.S. 167. (Civil

2901 law)

2902 Actions by state officers and employees, even if unauthorized or in excess of authority,

2903 can be actions under "color of law." *Stringer v. Dilger*, 1963, Ca. 10 Colo., 313 F.2d

2904 536. (Civil law)

2905 "The police power of the state must be exercised in subordination to the provisions of

2906 the U.S. Constitution." *Bacahanan vs. Wanley*, 245 US 60; *Panhandle Eastern*

2907 *Pipeline Co. vs. State Highway Commission*, 294 US 613. "With regard particularly

2908 to the U.S. Constitution, it is elementary that a Right secured or protected by that

2909 document cannot be overthrown or impaired by any state police authority." *Donnolly*

2910 *vs. Union Sewer Pipe Co.*, 184 US 540; *Lafarier vs. Grand Trunk R.R. Co.*, 24 A. 848;

2911 *O'Neil vs. Providence Amusement Co.*, 108 A. 887. When officers detained appellant

2912 for the purpose of requiring him to identify himself, they performed a seizure of his

2913 person subject to the requirements of the Fourth Amendment... The Fourth

2914 Amendment, of course, applies to all seizures of the person, including seizures that

2915 involve only a brief detention short of traditional arrest... Whenever a police officer

2916 accosts an individual and restrains his freedom to walk away, he has 'seized' that

2917 person, and the Fourth Amendment requires that the seizure be 'reasonable'.

2918 NO Law requires you to record / pledge your private automobile * "But even

2919 assuming that purpose (prevention of crime) is served to some degree by stopping and

2920 demanding identification from an individual without any specific basis for believing

2921 he is involved in criminal activity, the guarantees of the Fourth Amendment do not

2922 allow it."

2923 * "The application of...(a code)...to detain appellant and require him to identify

2924 himself violated the Fourth Amendment because the officers lacked any reasonable

2925 suspicion to believe appellant was engaged, or had engaged, in criminal conduct.

2926 Accordingly, appellant may not be punished for refusing to identify himself, and the

2927 conviction is reversed." (Probable cause) *Brown v. Texas*, 443 U.S. 47, (1979) *

2928 "Traffic infractions are not a crime." *People v. Battle*

2929 "To this end, the Fourth Amendment requires that a seizure must be based on specific

2930 objective facts indicating that society's legitimate interests require the seizure of the

2931 particular individual, or that the seizure must be carried out pursuant to a plan

2932 embodying explicit, neutral limitations on the conduct of individual officers.

2933 "The officers of the law, in the execution of process, are required to know the

2934 requirements of the law, and if they mistake them, whether through ignorance or

2935 design, and anyone is harmed by their error, they must respond in damages." *Roger v.*

2936 *Marshall* (United States use of *Rogers v. Conklin*), 1 Wall. (US) 644, 17 Led 714.

2937 "It is a general rule that an officer, executive, administrative, quasi-judicial,

2938 ministerial, or otherwise, who acts outside the scope of his jurisdiction, and without

2939 authorization of law may thereby render himself amenable to personal liability in a

2940 civil suit." *Cooper v. O'Conner*, 69 App DC 100, 99 F (2d) "Public officials are not

2941 immune from suit when they transcend their lawful authority by invading

2942 constitutional rights." *AFLCIO v. Woodard*, 406 F 2d 137 t.

2943 NO Law requires you to record / pledge your private automobile Government / Public

2944 Servants / Officers / Judges Not Immune from suit!

2945 "Immunity fosters neglect and breeds irresponsibility while liability promotes care

2946 and caution, which caution and care is owed by the government to its people." (Civil

2947 Rights) *Rabon vs Rowen Memorial Hospital, Inc.* 269 N.S. 1, 13, 152 SE 1 d 485, 493.

2948 Government Immunity - "In *Land v. Dollar*, 338 US 731 (1947), the court noted, "that

2949 when the government entered into a commercial field of activity, it left immunity

2950 behind." *Brady v. Roosevelt*, 317 US 575 (1943); *FHA v. Burr*, 309 US 242 (1940);

2951 Kiefer v. RFC, 306 US 381 (1939).
 2952 The high Courts, through their citations of authority, have frequently declared, that
 2953 "...where any state proceeds against a private individual in a judicial forum it is well
 2954 settled that the state, county, municipality, etc. waives any immunity to counters,
 2955 cross claims and complaints, by direct or collateral means regarding the matters
 2956 involved." Luckenback v. The Thekla, 295 F 1020, 226 Us 328; Lyders v. Lund, 32
 2957 F2d 308;
 2958 "When enforcing mere statutes, judges of all courts do not act judicially (and thus are
 2959 not protected by "qualified" or "limited immunity," - SEE: Owen v. City, 445 U.S.
 2960 662; Bothke v. Terry, 713 F2d 1404) - - "but merely act as an extension as an agent
 2961 for the involved agency -- but only in a "ministerial" and not a "discretionary
 2962 capacity..." Thompson v. Smith, 154 S.E. 579, 583; Keller v. P.E., 261 US 428; F.R.C.
 2963 v. G.E., 281, U.S. 464.
 2964 Immunity for judges does not extend to acts which are clearly outside of their
 2965 jurisdiction. Bauers v. Heisel, C.A. N.J. 1966, 361 F.2d 581, Cert. Den. 87 S.Ct. 1367,
 2966 386 U.S. 1021, 18 L.Ed. 2d 457 (see also Muller v. Wachtel, D.C.N.Y. 1972, 345
 2967 F.Supp. 160; Rhodes v. Houston, D.C. Nebr. 1962, 202 F.Supp. 624 affirmed 309
 2968 F.2d 959, Cert. den 83 St. 724, 372 U.S. 909, 9 L.Ed. 719, Cert. Den 83 S.Ct. 1282,
 2969 383 U.S. 971, 16 L.Ed. 2nd 311, Motion denied 285 F.Supp. 546).
 2970 "Judges not only can be sued over their official acts, but could be held liable for
 2971 injunctive and declaratory relief and attorney's fees." Lezama v. Justice Court,
 2972 A025829.
 2973 "The immunity of judges for acts within their judicial role is beyond cavil." Pierson v.
 2974 Ray, 386 U.S. 547 (1957). "There is no common law judicial immunity." Pulliam v.
 2975 Allen, 104S.Ct.
 2976 NO Law requires you to record / pledge your private automobile 1970; cited in
 2977 Lezama v. Justice Court, A025829. "Judges, members of city council, and police
 2978 officers as well as other public officials, may utilize good faith defense of action for
 2979 damages under 42-1983, but no public official has absolute immunity from suit under
 2980 the 1871 civil rights statute." (Samuel vs University of Pittsburg, 375 F.Supp. 1119,
 2981 'see also, White vs Fleming 374 Supp. 267.)
 2982
 2983 TAKE DUE NOTICE ALL GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS, SERVANTS, JUDGES,
 2984 LAYERS, CLERKS, EMPLOYEES:
 2985 "Ignorance of the law does not excuse misconduct in anyone, least of all in a sworn
 2986 officer of the law." In re McCowan (1917), 177 C. 93, 170 P. 1100. "All are presumed
 2987 to know the law." San Francisco Gas Co. v. Brickwedel (1882), 62 C. 641; Dore v.
 2988 Southern Pacific Co. (1912), 163 C. 182, 124 P. 817; People v. Flanagan (1924), 65
 2989 C.A. 268, 223 P. 1014; Lincoln v. Superior Court (1928), 95 C.A. 35, 271 P. 1107;
 2990 San Francisco Realty Co. v. Linnard (1929), 98 C.A. 33, 276 P. 368. "It is one of the
 2991 fundamental maxims of the common law that ignorance of the law excuses no one."
 2992 Daniels v. Dean (1905), 2 C.A. 421, 84 P. 332.
 2993 Jurisdiction challenged to all, at any and all times
 2994 "Judge acted in the face of clearly valid statutes or case law expressly depriving him
 2995 of (personal) jurisdiction would be liable." Dykes v. Hosemann, 743 F.2d 1488 (1984).
 2996 "In such case the judge has lost his judicial function, has become a mere private
 2997 person, and is liable as a trespasser for damages resulting from his unauthorized acts."
 2998 "Where there is no jurisdiction there is no judge; the proceeding is as nothing. Such
 2999 has been the law from the days of the Marshalsea, 10 Coke 68; also Bradley v. Fisher,
 3000 13 Wall 335,351." Manning v. Ketcham, 58 F.2d 948. "A distinction must be here

observed between excess of jurisdiction and the clear absence of all jurisdiction over the subject-matter any authority exercised is a usurped authority and for the exercise of

NO Law requires you to record / pledge your private automobile such authority, when the want of jurisdiction is known to the judge, no excuse is permissible." Bradley v. Fisher, 13 Wall 335, 351, 352.

AT LAST

"But, in fact and in law, such statutes are intended to be applied to those who are here as "residents" in this State under the Interstate Commerce Clause of the Federal Constitution and the so- called Fourteenth Amendment." United States v United Mine Workers of America, (1947) 67 S.Ct. 677, 686, 330 U.S. 258.

NOTICE: Information served herein is for educational purposes only, no liability assumed for use. The information you obtain in this presentation is not, nor is it intended to be, legal advice. Author does not consent to unlawful action. Author advocates and encourages one and all to adhere to, support and defend all law which is particularly applicable. If anything in this presentation is found to be in error a good faith effort will be made to correct it in timely fashion upon notification. VOID where prohibited by law. NO Law requires you to record / pledge your private automobile

Notice to all whom these presents may come: "If I am here at all I am so as a man; I am NOT here as a resident of any State (Nation), nor am I of or "in this state", nor am I a [statutory] "citizen of the United States" (in Congress assembled) as ALL are fictions/creations of government and therefore and as such no statutes apply to Me as evidenced in above cases. I am a Creature of Nature (the Creator) and therefore I am a transient foreigner by Nature while traveling through Life I am here as a in itinere, as a neutral, for a short time, on my way to the greater beyond, a steward of my father's land and wishes. My documents of "in itinere" standing are recorded for all to see." See: Dred Scott v. Sanford, 60 US (19 How.) 393, 595 (1857) Justice Curtis, S.Ct. and the Congress may by general Laws prescribe the Manner in which such Acts, Records and Proceedings shall be proved, and the Effect thereof.

Note: Emphasis added to cites, mine! NO Law requires you to record / pledge your private automobile

Page 24 of 24 Notice of Full Faith and Credit (I, Me, Myself am a "state", with standing, standing in "original jurisdiction" know as the common law, Gods Law, a neutral traveling in itinere, demanding all of my rights under God's Natural Law, recorded in part in the Bible, which law is recognized in US Public Law 97-280 as "the word of God and all men are admonished to learn and apply it" so I demand anyone and everyone to notice God's Laws, which are My Makers Laws and therefore My Laws!)

– Article 1 of the Bill of Rights – guarantees freedom of religion-Constitution for the United States of America ARTICLE IV, sect. 1, Full faith and credit among states. (Self-executing constitutional provisions) Section 1. Full faith and Credit shall be given in each state to the public Acts, Records, and judicial Proceedings of every other state. And the Congress may by general Laws prescribe the Manner in which such Acts, Records and Proceedings shall be proved, and the Effect thereof.

Note: Emphasis added to cites, mine! NO Law requires you to record / pledge your private automobile Page 24 of 24

3051 NOTICE

3052
3053 It is unlawful for the Elected and public servant government or anyone else to make
3054 you disclose your Social Security number. See...

3055
3056 42 U.S. Code 408 a-8 - Penalties Whoever- (8) discloses, uses, or compels the
3057 disclosure of the social security number of any person in violation of the laws of the
3058 United States; shall be guilty of a felony and upon conviction thereof shall be fined
3059 under title 18 or imprisoned for not more than five years, or both.

3060
3061 18 USC Sec. 242 and 42 USC Sec. 1983 provides that:

3062
3063 "Whoever, under color of any law, statute, ordinance, regulation, or custom willfully
3064 subjects any person in any State, Territory, or District to the deprivation of any rights,
3065 privileges, or immunities secured or protected by the Constitution or laws of the
3066 United States, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than ten years, or
3067 both;" 42 USC Sec. 1983 further provides that a violator "shall be liable to the party
3068 injured in an action at law, suit in equity, or other proper proceeding for redress."

3069
3070 Section 7 of Public Law 93-579 provides that:

3071
3072 (aX I) It shall be unlawful for any Federal, State or local government agency to deny
3073 to any individual any right, benefit, or privilege provided by law because of such
3074 individual's refusal to disclose his social security account number.

3075
3076 WHAT IS HJR 192? Can we Discharge our Debts to
3077 the...<http://understandcontractlawandyouwin.com/hjr-192-discharg>

3078
3079 .../ Jun 7, 2014 ... House Joint Resolution 192 was then passed by Congress on June 5,
3080 1933. This law was passed to do away with the gold clause For lawful Bloodline
3081 American ... House Joint Resolution 192, 1933 - *****Redemption - tribe.net
3082 tribes.tribe.net/redemption101/thread/07f05122-0090-408b

3083 ...
3084
3085 House Joint Resolution 192 ... this Article does not contain an absolute prohibition
3086 against the States making something else a tender in transfer of debt. HJR-192 ...

3087
3088 PAYMENT vs DISCHARGE

3089 In short, real money like silver and gold coins PAY OFF debts, while Debt notes such
3090 as Federal Reserve Notes, merely DISCHARGE debts. And what is PAID by a free
3091 man, is NOT subject to State regulation (i.e. drugs, guns, etc.). ONLY when you
3092 DISCHARGE a debt instead of paying it off, the State REGULATES the thing that
3093 "bought" with DEBT NOTES.

3094
3095 In the case of Stanek v. White, 172 Minn. 390, 215 H.W. 784, the court explained the
3096 legal distinction between the words "payment" and "discharge": "There is a
3097 distinction between a 'debt discharged' and a 'debt paid.' When discharged the debt
3098 still exists though divested of its character as a legal obligation during the operation of
3099 the discharge. Something of the original vitality of the debt continues to exist, which
3100 may be transferred, even though the transferee takes it subject to its disability incident

to the discharge. The fact that it carries something which may be a consideration for a new promise to pay, so as to make an otherwise worthless promise a legal obligation, makes it the subject of transfer by assignment."

Driver license is a tax on lawful bloodline American

Exhibit #05.051: Former IRS Commissioner Steven Miller says the income tax is "voluntary" <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MG2mcjAuLo4>

9 TRILLION Dollars Missing from Federal Reserve!
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GYNVNHb-m0o>

[1] This is a BOLD LIE, the 16th Amendment it was never ratified per Article V of the U.S. Constitution (Congressional Record House, June 13, 1967, pg 15641-15646 and Dyett v Turner (1968) are VERY CLEAR about this)

The lawful bloodline Americans right to travel in the forty eight states, U.S. Supreme Court Says No License Necessary To Drive Automobile On Public Roads
<https://wearechange.org/u-s-supreme-court-says-no-license-necessary-to-drive-automobile-on-public-highwaysstreets/>

Whereas : The right to travel "Complete freedom of the highways is so old and WELL ESTABLISHED a blessing that we have forgotten the days of the robber barons and toll roads, and yet, under an act such as this, arbitrarily administered, the highways may become completely monopolized. If, through LACK OF INTEREST, the people submit, THEY MAY LOOK TO SEE THE MOST SACRED OF LIBERTIES TAKEN FROM THEM, ONE BY ONE, BY MORE OR LESS RAPID ENCROACHMENT."

(emph. added)
ROBERTSON v DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS,
180 Wn 133, 147 (1934) Dissenting Op.

Also : A policy or custom for which a municipality may be held liable can arise in four ways: (1) through an express policy, such as a written ordinance or regulation; (2) through the decisions of a person with final policymaking authority; (3) through an omission, such as a failure to properly train officers, that "manifest [s] deliberate indifference to the rights of citizens"; or (4) through a practice that is so "persistent and widespread" as to constitute a "custom or usage with the force of law."

Lytle v. Doyle, 326 F.3d 463, 471 (4th Cir. 2003)

"A License, ... is no more than 'a temporary permit to do that which would otherwise be unlawful," RAWSON v. DEPT. OF LICENSES, 15 Wn. (2d) 364-372 (Nov.

1942). And;

“The information against appellant fails to allege that appellant had been issued either an operator’s or chauffeur’s license, or that he drove a motor vehicle while such a license was suspended. In *Hassell v. State*, 149 Tex. Crim. 333, 194 S.W. 2d 400, an information alleging that the defendant operated a motor vehicle upon a public highway without a “drivers license” was held insufficient to charge an offense since a drivers license is not known to the law. In *Barber v. State*, 149 Tex. Crim. 18, 191 S.W.2d 879, a complaint charging the operation of an automobile and failure to display operator’s license, on demand of a peace officer, was held insufficient to charge an offense in the absence of an allegation that the accused was on the date of the alleged offense, a licensee. The information being insufficient to charge an offense, the judgement is reversed and the prosecution ordered dismissed.” TED HOLLOWAY v. STATE, No. 25192 BLUE BOOK CITATION FORM: 1951.TX.188 COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS OF TEXAS (March 7, 1951). And;“Privilege” . . . is synonymous with license The possession of a . . . license is a prerequisite to violation of this statute. . . . On appeal the Superior court dismissed the charges against Cole on the ground that since he had no . . . license, he had no privilege . . . [2] the statute refers to those whose "privilege" . . . is suspended. Cole never had any type of privilege . . . License is synonymous with privilege, since Cole did not have a license, and that state did not grant Cole a license, THE STATE CANNOT SUSPEND WHAT HE DOES NOT HAVE." *Aberdeen v. Cole*, 13 Wn. App. 617, 537 P.2d 1073 (June 10, 1975). And;PROVES THAT LICENSE IS SYNONYMOUS WITH PRIVILEGE , PROVES THAT THE STATE CANNOT SUSPEND OR REVOKE A DRIVERS LICENSE OR DRIVING PRIVILEGE UNLESS YOU HAVE A CURRENT AND VALID DRIVERS LICENSE THAT HAS NOT LEGALLY EXPIRED!

Is traveling a right or a privilege?

Thompson v. Smith, 154 SE 579, 11 American Jurisprudence, Constitutional Law, section 329, page 1135 "The right of the Citizen to travel upon the public highways and to transport his property thereon, in the ordinary course of life and business, is a common right which he has under the right to enjoy life and liberty, to acquire and possess property, and to pursue happiness and safety. It includes the right, in so doing, to use the ordinary and usual conveyances of the day, and under the existing modes of travel, includes the right to drive a horse drawn carriage or wagon thereon or to operate an automobile thereon, for the usual and ordinary purpose of life and business."

exhibit Five and evidence Grand theft Auto for personal gain for elected and public servants

Grand thief Auto

The state, county and city, do not own anything. Article 1 Section 8. That they only land owned by the state, county and city just be within the 10 square miles or is a Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-Yards and other needful Buildings.

The 16th Amendment was never ratified, it is illegal to tax our labor. The illegal taxation on our land, homes, cars, enforced by acts of WAR is illegal. The equally illegal licensing fees, bills for water and other municipal goods and services are criminal. Just because you've always committed these crimes doesn't make them lawful.

<http://openjurist.org/593/f2d/109/united-states-v-friedman>

48 It was not necessary for the Government to show that either Garrity or Johnson directly participated in the two transactions in question. Each conspirator is liable for the acts of his co-conspirators in furtherance of the conspiracy, even if he is unaware of some of the acts or actors. *Pinkerton v. United States*, 328 U.S. 640, 645-48, 66 S.Ct. 1180, 90 L.Ed. 1489 (1946); *Oropeza*, 564 F.2d at 322.

49 The evidence supports a finding that Johnson and Garrity were members of the continuing conspiracy and that neither engaged in affirmative action constituting a withdrawal from the conspiracy. As members of the conspiracy, Garrity and Johnson are liable for these acts.

Each conspirator is liable for the acts of his co-conspirators in furtherance of the conspiracy, even if he is unaware of some of the acts or actors. If you don't see a name on here, it may be because, they have already written affidavits.

FRAUDULENT CONVERSION: Receiving into possession money or property of another and fraudulently withholding, converting, or applying the same to or for one's own use and benefit, or to use and benefit of any person other than the one to whom the money or property belongs.

Article. I. Section. 10. No State shall enter into any Treaty, Alliance, or Confederation; grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal; coin Money; emit Bills of Credit; make any Thing but gold and silver Coin a Tender in Payment of Debts; pass any Bill of Attainder, ex post facto Law, or Law impairing the Obligation of Contracts, or grant any Title of Nobility.

No State shall, without the Consent of the Congress, lay any Imposts or Duties on Imports or Exports, except what may be absolutely necessary for executing it's inspection Laws: and the net Produce of all Duties and Imposts, laid by any State on Imports or Exports, shall be for the Use of the Treasury of the United States; and all such Laws shall be subject to the Revision and Controul of the Congress.

If your property is stolen or seized under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedures, Supplemental Rules of Admiralty for certain asset and forfeiture claims, Rules A - G: - See the U.S. Code › Title 28 › Part IV › Chapter 85 › § 1333, Title 28 U.S. Code § 1333 - Admiralty, maritime and prize cases. Current through Pub. L. 113-86, except 113-79. (See Public Laws for the current Congress.)

- See also, U.S. Code › Title 18 › Part I › Chapter 31 › § 661 US Code › Theft Within the Special Maritime Jurisdiction of the United States:

"Whoever, within the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States, takes and carries away, with intent to steal or purloin, any personal property of another shall be punished as follows..."

If it were me, I would bill them. Bill the foreign AGENTS for failure of consideration. "Here's what you've done, here's what you can do to correct it and here's what I'm

going to do to you if you don't correct it". Bill the individuals (\$500.00 - \$1000.00 per day) involved in the theft of your property with an itemized list of the value. Invoice them via CERTIFIED MAIL, 30-60-90 days and then state a claim upon which relief can be granted for "triple damages". The bible says if you take your neighbor's cow without his permission, you must replace it plus three more. This is the origin of treble damages.

Wait 90+ days until the debt matures to an accounts receivables under the UCC and then draw out a certified copy to place behind an IRS FORM 1099-C and mail to Austin Texas, Atlanta, Fresno, Andover, etc. Tell the IRS people to go and get their money and that the debtors 'agree' to pay the tax on the unpaid debt on public record and that you are cancelling this debt because the debtors (to you) did not pay the amount they agreed that they owed you by their silence. Silence in admiralty is fatal and all commerce moves by CONTRACTS!!

If it were me, I would put up signs that read: "Private Property for private use". The commercial term TRESPASSING throws it into "commerce" where the AGENTS for the oppressive State have jurisdiction.

Techically, men and women in the fifty states cannot own property under the current system of allodium. "Slaves" can't own property. Read carefully the Deed to the property you think is yours. You are listed as a TENANT. (Senate Document 43, 73rd Congress 1st Session).

Kansas ,,,, Article 58. - CRIMES INVOLVING PROPERTY Next

21-5801. Theft. (a) Theft is any of the following acts done with intent to permanently deprive the owner of the possession, use or benefit of the owner's property or services:

- (1) Obtaining or exerting unauthorized control over property or services;
- (2) obtaining control over property or services, by deception;
- (3) obtaining control over property or services, by threat;
- (4) obtaining control over stolen property or services knowing the property or services to have been stolen by another; or
- (5) knowingly dispensing motor fuel into a storage container or the fuel tank of a motor vehicle at an establishment in which motor fuel is offered for retail sale and leaving the premises of the establishment without making payment for the motor fuel.

(b) Except as provided in subsection (c), theft of:

- (1) Property or services of the value of \$100,000 or more is a severity level 5, nonperson felony;

(2) property or services of the value of at least \$25,000 but less than \$100,000 is a severity level 7, nonperson felony;

(3) property or services of the value of at least \$1,000 but less than \$25,000 is a severity level 9, nonperson felony;

(4) property or services of the value of less than \$1,000 is a class A nonperson misdemeanor, except as provided in subsection (b)(5) or (b)(6);

(5) property regardless of the value from three separate mercantile establishments within a period of 72 hours as part of the same act or transaction or in two or more acts or transactions connected together or constituting parts of a common scheme or course of conduct is a severity level 9, nonperson felony; and

(6) property of the value of less than \$1,000 is a severity level 9, nonperson felony if committed by a person who has been convicted of theft two or more times.

(c) As used in this section:

(1) "Conviction" or "convicted" includes being convicted of a violation of K.S.A. 21-3701, prior to its repeal, this section or a municipal ordinance which prohibits the acts that this section prohibits;

(2) "regulated scrap metal" means the same as in K.S.A. 2012 Supp. 50-6,109, and amendments thereto; and

(3) "value" means the value of the property or, if the property is regulated scrap metal, the cost to restore the site of the theft of such regulated scrap metal to its condition at the time immediately prior to the theft of such regulated scrap metal, whichever is greater.

History: L. 2010, ch. 136, § 87; L. 2011, ch. 86, § 4; July 1.

exhibit Six and evidence Police AKA Rent a Cop For tax Collection

Whereas: legal fraud to the lawful bloodline American, the treason and terrorist Birth certificate You are a Fictitious Corporation Created by the British Accreditation ... the BAR (British Accredited Regency or British Accredited Registry)

What branch of the government is a cop, part of the Legislative Branch, Executive Branch or the Judicial Branch? IF the cop is not part of the three branches of lawful bloodline american own 1871 two Constitution one is the contracted Elected and public servitude of the forty eight states union government, then he is a Corpora Ficta employee, committing crimes , for examples , assaulting , kidnapping , attempting murder , at times murdering woman man child, for profits for the CORPS he or she is

3351 working for of the birth certificate bounds including embezzlement of public funds in
 3352 the name of religion belief and feelings hurt by religious people , ,, for his
 3353 employment and high crimes under PRETENDED authority of We the People
 3354 government. The cop has no power of government and uses gang like tactics for force
 3355 compliance of religious belief , statues , codes and CORPS State , County and city
 3356 administration rules,with his or her will alone.
 3357 Any other law, besides 1778 Ratified Constitutional law, is foreign law such as ,
 3358 Roman ,Napoleonic law, Uniform Commercial Code, Civil Law, color of any State
 3359 law, any State statute, any State ordinance, any State regulation, or any State custom
 3360 or any State usage. The officer is striking against the constitutional form of
 3361 government by using foreign law! Under the 11th Amendment, other states cannot
 3362 participate in out of state violations of the law, driver's license searches without a
 3363 warrant, or even credit checks without a lawful grand jury warrant!
 3364 5 USC § 3331 Oath of office: "I, AB, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I the Elected
 3365 and pubic servant ,police fbi, cia, us Marshall or ant othe public or private contractor ,
 3366 will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies,
 3367 foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take
 3368 this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I
 3369 will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter.
 3370 So help me the Greatspirit and mother earth the creator some may say God' is a
 3371 foreign bible book the invaded the us."
 3372 US Constitution Article. II. Section. 4. The President, Vice President and all civil
 3373 Officers of the United States, shall be removed from Office on Impeachment for, and
 3374 Conviction of, Treason, Bribery, or other high Crimes and Misdemeanors.
 3375 Westin, The Wire-Tapping Problem, 52 Col. L. Rev. 165 (1952).What is perhaps even
 3376 more noteworthy is its pervasive disregard in practice by those who as law officers
 3377 owe special obedience to law. What is true of the federal Act against wiretapping and
 3378 its violations is widely true of related state legislation and its disobedience. Few
 3379 sociological generalizations are more valid than that lawlessness begets lawlessness.
 3380 18 USC 1918 1) advocates the overthrow of our constitutional form of government;
 3381 If the cop writes a ticket he's impersonating a grand jury, as they are the only ones
 3382 who can summons you to answer. Amendment V. No person shall be held to answer
 3383 for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a
 3384 Grand Jury.
 3385 When the cop serves the summons, an impersonation of a Sheriff is taking place. The
 3386 Sheriff is a member of the executive branch of government. The day-to-day
 3387 enforcement and administration of federal laws is permitted, NOT STATE CODES,
 3388 REGULATIONS OR STATUTES. Therefore the cop is only enforcing statutes in
 3389 violation of the law, as vigilantes.
 3390 When the cop forces you to sign the ticket, he's impersonating a Bailiff. The Bailiff is
 3391 a member of the judicial branch of the government. The cop is not a part of the
 3392 government at all and the demand to appear does not come from the government at all.
 3393 The cop is not a civil officer of the judiciary and the summons did not come from any
 3394 court. The ticket under threat of torture is pure fraud.
 3395 When the cop commits any crime he is a trespasser ab initio. The cop owes special
 3396 duty to the law and when he becomes the "LAW", not the servant of the law, he
 3397 becomes a trespasser ab initio.
 3398 It is a felony for the cop to turn on emergency lights when there is no (LIFE OR
 3399 DEATH) emergency.
 3400 It is perjury to make a statement that you are driving when you are not a Taxi

3401 DRIVER, Limo DRIVER, Truck Driver or Shuttle DRIVER, as licenses and
3402 registrations are only required for commercial activity; that means business ONLY. In
3403 the LAW, people have the right to travel as a part of one's right to liberty and the
3404 pursuit of happiness.
3405 When the cop then asks for your "PAPERS PLEASE" he becomes a communist,
3406 wherein only a Grand Jury can demand you to answer.
3407 When the cop acts on behalf of a private bank or private county treasury, he is in fact
3408 demanding a bribe.
3409 When the cop holds you for even one minute, it is a fact of law that is arrest without a
3410 Grand Jury Indictment.
3411 The Cop can only hold you to answer if you are a public servant and subject to
3412 impeachment for high crimes and misdemeanors, without a Grand Jury summons.
3413 When the cop works as a Corpora Ficta employee, the cop must carry a license for the
3414 firearm they have on their person.
3415 When the cop without an injured party, is now acting as an injured party wherein
3416 there is a conflict of interest as the cop is only there to write a illegal writ of attainder,
3417 not protect the public from all enemies foreign and domestic.
3418 The cop is an agent for the Corporation of the City, County, or State, he is not a
3419 member of the government at all, while his pay must be from the US Treasury and all
3420 bills issued by a Grand Jury must be made to the US Treasury.
3421 The very demand that you pay a private treasury is a demand for a bribe. The cop in
3422 reality is a Corpora Ficta employee and not a government employee at all. He has no
3423 powers of a government official whatsoever.
3424 License and registration produces commercial connection/nexus to Corporate City,
3425 County or State. License and registration are commercial agreements and not
3426 contracts. If one is not involved in commercial activity then there is no exercise of a
3427 privilege that must be licensed and registered.
3428 When the Cop writes you a ticket for infracting a code, regulation or statute with a
3429 summons to Court, the cop is now impersonating an officer of the court. He is then
3430 not part of any of the branches of the government, as an employee of the Pretend
3431 Government Corporation, a Corpora Ficta employee.
3432 When the Cop writes you a ticket for infracting a code, regulation or statute with a
3433 summons to Court, the cop is giving you a bill of exchange. You cannot lawfully sign
3434 a bill of exchange, because you are not receiving the original copy.
3435 When the Cop writes you a ticket for infracting a code, regulation or statute with a
3436 summons to Court, the cop is giving you a bill of attainder unlawfully, as you are not
3437 a public servant and there is a jury required to convict you to make it lawful.
3438 No one person can serve in two branches of the government at the same time. Only a
3439 sheriff can execute (serve) a summons, or compulsory legal process, and the cop is
3440 clearly not a member of the executive branch of the government and the ticket is pure
3441 fraud.
3442 In summary, cops in traffic stops are impersonating government officials on an
3443 emergency and the one being stopped is the emergency. Cops try to get people to
3444 validate their fraud. Cops impersonate judicial officers, impersonate being a Sheriff
3445 who is an executive officer, violate the principal of separation of powers, and
3446 impersonate a court bailiff by signing the false summons thereby impersonating a
3447 judicial officer a second time. The entire summons is a total fraud because it is not a
3448 government document at all; it is a corporate document being forced upon private
3449 People.
3450

Questions for a public Servant:

- 1) Do you understand that under Trezevant v. City of Tampa that I will be charging you 1000 per minute?
- 2) Where is the emergency? how can I help the injured party
- 3) Do you understand under Macias V. Ihde, if you are obstructing my rights, you may be liable, in both your personal and public capacity?
- 4) Are you aware that all of your individual assets can and will be lawfully subject to seizure by lien(s) which cannot be removed by any court of law, but only by me, for high crimes and misdemeanors?
- 5) Are you aware that anything you do or say can be used against you?
- 6) Do you consider yourself to be above the law?
- 7) Are you aware that you are contracting with me?
- 8) Whom do you work for, the state, county or city?
- 9) Can you state for the record which branch of the government you work for- Judicial, or Executive ,Elective, or religious ?
- 10) Do you have a valid oath of office filed and faithful performance bond on file with the Secretary of State of the state corps one is in.
- 11) Do you have your valid DBA validly registered with the Secretary of State ?
- 12) Are you aware that impersonating a government employee is a high crime and misdemeanor?
- 13) Do you believe that you are the injured party?
- 14) Where is the strict-proof of assessment of damages from the injured party?
- 15) Have you sworn to uphold the ratified 1778 Constitution of the forty eight united states united ??? ?
- 16) Were you solely representing your CORPS agency for personal profits and gain or were there others with you?
- 17) Do you understand that the US 1778 Ratified Constitution Law trumps all Statues , codes and administration rules including and all religions have no right in the forty eight state untied , The Constitution

Whereas:

What branch of the government is a cop, part of the Legislative Branch, Executive Branch or the Judicial Branch? IF the cop is not part of the three branches of lawful bloodline american own 1871 contracted Elecetd and public servitude of government, then he is a Corpora Ficta employee, committing crimes , for examples , assaulting , kidnapping ,attempting murder , at times murdering woman man child, for profits for the CORPS he or she is working for of the birth certificate bounds including embezzlement of public funds in the name of religion belief and feelings hurt by religious people , , for his employment and high crimes under PRETENDED authority of We the People government. The cop has no power of government and uses gang like tactics for force compliance of religious belief , statues , codes and CORPS State , County and city administration rules,with his or her will alone. Any other law, besides 1778 Ratified Constitutional law, is foreign law such as , Roman ,Napoleonic law, Uniform Commercial Code, Civil Law, color of any State law, any State statute, any State ordinance, any State regulation, or any State custom or any State usage. The officer is striking against the constitutional form of government by using foreign law! Under the 11th Amendment, other states cannot participate in out of state violations of the law, driver's license searches without a

3501 warrant, or even credit checks without a grand jury warrant!
 3502 5 USC § 3331 Oath of office: “I, AB, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will
 3503 support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign
 3504 and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this
 3505 obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will
 3506 well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So
 3507 help me God.”
 3508 US Constitution Article. II. Section. 4. The President, Vice President and all civil
 3509 Officers of the United States, shall be removed from Office on Impeachment for, and
 3510 Conviction of, Treason, Bribery, or other high Crimes and Misdemeanors.
 3511 Westin, The Wire-Tapping Problem, 52 Col. L. Rev. 165 (1952). What is perhaps even
 3512 more noteworthy is its pervasive disregard in practice by those who as law officers
 3513 owe special obedience to law. What is true of the federal Act against wiretapping and
 3514 its violations is widely true of related state legislation and its disobedience. Few
 3515 sociological generalizations are more valid than that lawlessness begets lawlessness.
 3516 18 USC 1918 1) advocates the overthrow of our constitutional form of government;
 3517 If the cop writes a ticket he’s impersonating a grand jury, as they are the only ones
 3518 who can summons you to answer. Amendment V. No person shall be held to answer
 3519 for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a
 3520 Grand Jury.
 3521 When the cop serves the summons, an impersonation of a Sheriff is taking place. The
 3522 Sheriff is a member of the executive branch of government. The day-to-day
 3523 enforcement and administration of federal laws is permitted, NOT STATE CODES,
 3524 REGULATIONS OR STATUTES. Therefore the cop is only enforcing statutes in
 3525 violation of the law, as vigilantes.
 3526 When the cop forces you to sign the ticket, he’s impersonating a Bailiff. The Bailiff is
 3527 a member of the judicial branch of the government. The cop is not a part of the
 3528 government at all and the demand to appear does not come from the government at all.
 3529 The cop is not a civil officer of the judiciary and the summons did not come from any
 3530 court. The ticket under threat of torture is pure fraud.
 3531 When the cop commits any crime he is a trespasser ab initio. The cop owes special
 3532 duty to the law and when he becomes the “LAW”, not the servant of the law, he
 3533 becomes a trespasser ab initio.
 3534 It is a felony for the cop to turn on emergency lights when there is no (LIFE OR
 3535 DEATH) emergency.
 3536 It is perjury to make a statement that you are driving when you are not a Taxi
 3537 DRIVER, Limo DRIVER, Truck Driver or Shuttle DRIVER, as licenses and
 3538 registrations are only required for commercial activity; that means business ONLY. In
 3539 the LAW, people have the right to travel as a part of one’s right to liberty and the
 3540 pursuit of happiness.
 3541 When the cop then asks for your “PAPERS PLEASE” he becomes a communist,
 3542 wherein only a Grand Jury can demand you to answer.
 3543 When the cop acts on behalf of a private bank or private county treasury, he is in fact
 3544 demanding a bribe.
 3545 When the cop holds you for even one minute, it is a fact of law that is arrest without a
 3546 Grand Jury Indictment.
 3547 The Cop can only hold you to answer if you are a public servant and subject to
 3548 impeachment for high crimes and misdemeanors, without a Grand Jury summons.
 3549 When the cop works as a Corpora Ficta employee, the cop must carry a license for the
 3550 firearm they have on their person.

3551 When the cop without an injured party, is now acting as an injured party wherein
3552 there is a conflict of interest as the cop is only there to write a illegal writ of attainder,
3553 not protect the public from all enemies foreign and domestic.
3554 The cop is an agent for the Corporation of the City, County, or State, he is not a
3555 member of the government at all, while his pay must be from the US Treasury and all
3556 bills issued by a Grand Jury must be made to the US Treasury.
3557 The very demand that you pay a private treasury is a demand for a bribe. The cop in
3558 reality is a Corpora Ficta employee and not a government employee at all. He has no
3559 powers of a government official whatsoever.
3560 License and registration produces commercial connection/nexus to Corporate City,
3561 County or State. License and registration are commercial agreements and not
3562 contracts. If one is not involved in commercial activity then there is no exercise of a
3563 privilege that must be licensed and registered.
3564 When the Cop writes you a ticket for infracting a code, regulation or statute with a
3565 summons to Court, the cop is now impersonating an officer of the court. He is then
3566 not part of any of the branches of the government, as an employee of the Pretend
3567 Government Corporation, a Corpora Ficta employee.
3568 When the Cop writes you a ticket for infracting a code, regulation or statute with a
3569 summons to Court, the cop is giving you a bill of exchange. You cannot lawfully sign
3570 a bill of exchange, because you are not receiving the original copy.
3571 When the Cop writes you a ticket for infracting a code, regulation or statute with a
3572 summons to Court, the cop is giving you a bill of attainder unlawfully, as you are not
3573 a public servant and there is a jury required to convict you to make it lawful.
3574 No one person can serve in two branches of the government at the same time. Only a
3575 sheriff can execute (serve) a summons, or compulsory legal process, and the cop is
3576 clearly not a member of the executive branch of the government and the ticket is pure
3577 fraud.
3578 In summary, cops in traffic stops are impersonating government officials on an
3579 emergency and the one being stopped is the emergency. Cops try to get people to
3580 validate their fraud. Cops impersonate judicial officers, impersonate being a Sheriff
3581 who is an executive officer, violate the principal of separation of powers, and
3582 impersonate a court bailiff by signing the false summons thereby impersonating a
3583 judicial officer a second time. The entire summons is a total fraud because it is not a
3584 government document at all; it is a corporate document being forced upon private
3585 People.
3586
3587 Questions for a public Servant:
3588 1) Do you understand that under Trezevant v. City of Tampa that I will be charging
3589 you 1000 per minute?
3590 2) Where is the emergency? how can I help the injured party
3591 3) Do you understand under Macias V. Ihde, if you are obstructing my rights, you
3592 may be liable, in both your personal and public capacity?
3593 4) Are you aware that all of your individual assets can and will be lawfully subject to
3594 seizure by lien(s) which cannot be removed by any court of law, but only by me, for
3595 high crimes and misdemeanors?
3596 5) Are you aware that anything you do or say can be used against you?
3597 6) Do you consider yourself to be above the law?
3598 7) Are you aware that you are contracting with me?
3599 8) Whom do you work for, the state, county or city?
3600 9) Can you state for the record which branch of the government you work for-

Judicial, or Executive ,Elective, or religious ?
10) Do you have a valid oath of office filed and faithful performance bond on file with the Secretary of State of the state corps one is in.
11) Do you have your valid DBA validly registered with the Secretary of State ?
12) Are you aware that impersonating a government employee is a high crime and misdemeanor?
13) Do you believe that you are the injured party?
14) Where is the strict-proof of assessment of damages from the injured party?
15) Have you sworn to uphold the ratified 1778 Constitution of the forty eight united states united ??? ?
16) Were you solely representing your CORPS agency for personal profits and gain or were there others with you?
17) Do you understand that the US 1778 Ratified Constitution Law trumps all Statues , codes and administration rules including and all religions have no right in the forty eight state untied , The Constitution

Whereas:

In *Bounds v. Smith*, 430 U.S. 817 (1977), we held that "the fundamental constitutional right of access to the courts requires prison authorities to assist inmates in the preparation and filing of meaningful legal papers by providing prisoners with adequate law libraries or adequate assistance from persons trained in the law." *Lewis v. Casey*, 518 U.S. 343, 346 (U.S. 1996)

Law enforcement OUR SWORN DUTY

An area of serious consideration for every police officer, is to understand that the most important law in our land he has taken an oath to protect, defend, AND ENFORCE, is not state laws, nor city or county ordinances, but, that law that supersede all other laws in our nation, – the U.S. Constitution. If laws in a particular police officer's state, or local community are in conflict with the SUPREME LAW of our nation, there Is no question that the officer's duty is to "uphold the U.S. Constitution."

What does this mean to the "patrol officer" who will be the only sworn "Executive Officer" on the scene, when knowledgeable Citizens raise serious objections over possession of insurance, drivers licenses and other restrictions? It definitely means these officers will be faced with a hard decision. (Most certainly if that decision effects state, city or county revenues, such as the issuing of citations do.)

Example: If a state legislator, judge or a superior tells a police officer to proceed and enforce a contradictory, (illegal), state law rather than the Supreme Law of this country, what is that "sworn officer" to do? Although we may not want to hear it, there is but one right answer, – "the officer is duty bound to uphold his oath of office" and obey the highest laws of the nation. THIS IS OUR SWORN DUTY AND IT'S THE LAW!

Such a strong honest stand taken by a police officer, upholding his or her oath of office, takes moral strength of character. It will, without question, "SEPARATE THE

MEN FROM THE BOYS.” Such honest and straight forward decisions on behalf of a government official have often caused pressure to be applied to force such officers to set aside, or compromise their morals or convictions.

As a solace for those brave souls in uniform that will stand up for law and justice, even when it’s unpopular, or uncomfortable to do so...let me say this. In any legal stand-off over a sworn official “violating” or “upholding” their oath of office, those that would side with the “violation” should inevitable lose.

Our Founding Fathers assured us, on many occasions, the following: Defending our freedoms in the face of people that would for “expedients sake,” or behind the guise, “for the safety and welfare of the masses,” ignore peoples rights, would forever demand sacrifice andvigilance from those that desired to remain free. That sounds a little like – “Freedom is not free!”

Every police officer should keep the following court ruling, that was covered earlier, in mind before issuing citations in regard to “mandatory licensing, registration and insurance” – verses – “the right of the people to travel unencumbered”:

“THE CLAIM AND EXERCISE OF A CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT CANNOT BE CONVERTED INTO A CRIME.” – Miller v U.S., 230 F 2d 486. 489

Whereas:

Local police departments (LPDs) across the nation are incorporated as specialized non-profits. Most LPDs are known to the Secretary of State in their respective state as an association which gives the impression to the average citizen that this is a union. However this is not the case.

The LPDs are contracted by the City Council to perform police services and securitize the city they are hired in. This is the exchange of a local foreign government hiring a private security firm to stabilize the local population and generate revenue for the private city CORPS Non for profits through tickets, arrests aka Kidnapping and unlawful recording infractions. However, this does not include upholding unlawful administration local laws, as the County Sheriff's Office is elected to take charge of.1778 ratified Constitution law of real crimes

The problem with this system is that the LPDs, being corporations, are subject to corporate law. And corporations fall into dissolution (i.e. the termination of the corporation) for various reasons quite often. When it is the LPD that dissolves; this becomes a question of legal authority over the citizens by the hired private security firm known as the LPD.

Corporations that dissolve are not allowed by law to conduct business. These same rules apply to the LPD that is actually a corporation hired by the foreign local government or city council to preform police services. That all by law have to elected and public servants and all immigration have to registrar with the 1938 FARA can help detect foreign influence on American politics. ... election cycle, you may have heard pundits talk about FARA, or the Foreign ... In 1938, Congress passed the

Foreign Agents Registration Act, ... many other “influence” activities, like public relations and tourism. Read our terms of service. This was pass from WWII To protect the lawful bloodline Americans

For example, in the State of Oregon, over 12 LPDs are in dissolution. On the Secretary of State website, when a LPD is dissolved it is classified as "INA" or inactive. This includes LPDs in the following cities:

• Beaverton • Canby • Charleston • Eugene • Gresham • King County • Lake Oswego • Lebanon • Portland • Sherwood • Weston including your state county and city

According to corporate law, if a corporation dissolves, it must withdraw as a business entity. This means that once the LPD is dissolved, they cannot continue to perform police services for the city in which they were hired.

And in fact, should this be brought to the public, it might be common place (as it is in the State of Oregon) that LPDs are in dissolution and not legally allowed to conduct police services because they lack legal authority as a dissolved corporation.

It also stands that the local governments that are privy to this information would be involved in not only egregious corruption but are knowingly misleading the citizens of their towns and cities. Once the LPD is dissolved, from the date of dissolution, any arrest, ticket, or police service preformed is now an illegal act. It is tantamount to a citizen impersonating a police officer which as serious legal ramifications.

Should citizens become aware of this fact in their city - that their LPD is a corporation that has dissolved and is continuing to operate as if they have legal right to do so - there would be justified legal recourse for every citizen who had been arrested, jailed, forced to pay a ticket of any kind and forced to appear in municipal court under those circumstances (including court costs, attorney's fees and fees attributed by the court).

In 2012, Louis F. Quijas, Assistant Secretary of the Office for State and Local Law Enforcement (OSLLE), for the US Department of Homeland Security (DHS) explained the purpose of the OSLLE as a front "office that provided coordination and partnership with state, local, and tribal law enforcement."

The OSLLE was recommended by the 9/11 Commission. It was created to "lead the coordination of DHS-wide policies relating to state, local, and tribal law enforcement's role in preventing acts of terrorism and to serve as the primary liaison between non-Federal law enforcement agencies across the country and the Department."

Intelligence is disseminated through OSLLE to LPDs or "non-Federal law enforcement partners" to keep information flowing through initiatives such as the "If You See Something, Say Something™", the Blue Campaign, the Nationwide Suspicious Activity Reporting (SAR) Initiative (NSI), and the Department's efforts in Countering Violent Extremism.

OSLLE consistently works with LPDs on education, actionable information, operations and intelligence for the purpose of their part in the operations of the DHS with regard to keeping "our homeland safe".

OSLLE also works as a liaison between LPDs to maintain DHS leadership and considerations of "issues, concerns, and requirements of state, local, and tribal law enforcement during budget, grant, and policy development processes."

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) upholds relationships with LPDs for the purposes of and participation with National Preparedness Grant Program that began this year.

To ensure that local police departments continue to meet the requirements of training from DHS, officers regularly attend the DHS Federal Law Enforcement Training Centers (FLETC) in Glynco, Georgia. pass by William Jefferson and Hillary Clinton Congressional act passed in 1996 that pays judge police and dhs to imprison n children for profits for lawyers , attorneys and judges an further employments

Clinton health care plan of 1993 - Wikipedia

en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Clinton_health_care_plan_of_1993

The Clinton health care plan, was a 1993 healthcare reform package proposed by the ... According to an address to Congress by then-President Bill Clinton on ... Starting on September 28, 1993, Hillary Clinton appeared for several days of ... Senators behind a single proposal to pass a bill, let alone stop a filibuster.". WATCH BEFORE REMOVED!!! WE FOUND IT! THIS Hillary Clinton & Bill Clinton <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=f0mXDZI5KL4&feature=share>

Why Family Court is Corrupt - Black Hand Tactics and the Booze and Hooker Fund https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=F4yyXVgFqGE&feature=player_embedded

How & Why Family Courts are Allowed to be Corrupt <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2qVY7rMRneY>

LPDs are focused through OSLLE and DHS to "remain vigilant and to protect our communities from all threats, whether terrorism or other criminal activities" as DHS expands its control over local law enforcement and the communities they oversee.

As stated in the DHS directive from the Office for State and Local Law Enforcement (SLLE), the assistant Secretary for SLLE has "the primary official responsible for leading the coordination of Department-wide policies related to the role of state, tribal, and local law enforcement in preventing, preparing for, protecting against, and responding to natural disasters, acts of terrorism and other man- made disasters within the US."

This directive also sets guidelines of advocacy for DHS by the LPDs. Authorization of DHS to take over LPDs is given in Title 6 of the United States Code, Section 607,

3801 "Terrorism prevention".
3802
3803 In 2008, the Bureau of Justice Statistics stated that LPD "make up more than
3804 two-thirds of the 18,000 state and local law enforcement agencies in the US" which
3805 translates to an estimated 12,501 law
3806 enforcement agencies. Of those LPDs, there are more than 461,000 sworn officers.
3807
3808 Last year President Obama signed an executive order (EO) that created the White
3809 House Homeland Security Partnership Council and Steering Committee which tied
3810 DHS to local partnerships, federal
3811 and private institutions "to address homeland security challenges."
3812
3813 Members of the Steering Committee include:
3814
3815 • Department of State • Department of US Treasury • Department of Defense •
3816 Department of Justice • Department of Transportation • Department of Veterans
3817 Affairs • The Federal Bureau of Investigations
3818
3819 In 2011, Congress encouraged private sector "police companies" to replace law
3820 enforcement on the State and local level by coercing a new police protection
3821 insurance that would tack on a fee to citizens
3822 for the use of "police protection".
3823
3824 This move was justified by having citizens pay for the police to be called to scenes as
3825 a "communal service" that is contractual just as any other service or good is paid for.
3826 As a customer, the citizen
3827 would tell 911 dispatch their insurance information for payment purposes to be billed
3828 after the police were deployed to the scene, or services were rendered.
3829
3830 Turning LPDs into private security firms that provide services to the public was the
3831 scheme behind privatizing law enforcement.
3832
3833 Under state government contract, private security firms preform law enforcement
3834 services. With legislative bodies on both the state and Congressional level supporting
3835 this change, private corporations
3836 enter into contractual agreements with city councils to provide armed security patrol.
3837 Just as a rent-a-cop is hired to secure private property, local police departments are
3838 masked rent-a-cops that were hired by local government to secure their city.
3839
3840 This fact has been hidden from public scrutiny and has added to the blending of social
3841 perception of what the police are and what they do so that police services are able to
3842 function without question. At
3843 the same time, citizens are expected to pay fees for these "services" that were once
3844 inherent to life in a structured town or city.
3845
3846 In early 2012, the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) released a reportentitled
3847 "Homeland Security and Intelligence: Next Steps in Evolving the Mission" which
3848 outlined in part on how to redirect
3849 efforts of the federal government from international terrorism toward home-grown
3850 terrorists and build a DHS-controlled police force agency that would control all cities

3851 and towns through the use of local police departments.
3852
3853 DHS maintains that "the threat grows more localized" which necessitates the
3854 militarization of local police in major cities in the US and the training of staff from
3855 local agencies to make sure that oversight is restricted to the federal government.
3856
3857 Private corporations have been parading as public servants policing cities and towns
3858 across America without the knowledge of the average citizen for quite some time.
3859 Although they wear the same badges
3860 as LPDs of the past, these private security firms are not there to uphold peace or
3861 enforce any laws and city ordinances. Just like any other corporation, they seek out
3862 opportunities to collect revenue for the financial benefit of the city Attorney and
3863 council that hired them.
3864
3865
3866
3867
3868 exhibit Sevent and evidence judicial
3869
3870 I Living Native Man Nii Nee corpus delicti 18 usc 3771 request Certified copy's all of
3871 your Registration forms with the 1938 FARA
3872
3873 Because artificial entities cannot take oaths, they cannot make affidavits. See, e.g., In
3874 re Empire Refining Co., 1 F. Supp. 548, 549 (SD Cal. 1932) ("It is, of course,
3875 conceded that a corporation cannot make an affidavit in its corporate name. It is an
3876 inanimate thing incapable of voicing an oath"); Moya Enterprises, Inc. v. Harry
3877 Anderson Trucking, Inc., 162 Ga. App. 39, 290 S.E.2d 145 (1982); Strand Restaurant
3878 Co. v. Parks Engineering Co., 91 A.2d 711 (D.C. 1952); 9A T. Bjur C. Slezak,
3879 Fletcher Cyclopedia of Law of Private Corporations § 4629 (Perm. ed. 1992) ("A
3880 document purporting to be the affidavit of a corporation is void, since a corporation
3881 cannot make a sworn statement") (footnote omitted).ROWLAND v. CALIFORNIA
3882 MEN'S COLONY•506 U.S. 194, 203 (1993)PENAL CODE
3883
3884 A BAR Attorney has several "Capacities" for instance a Prosecutor is a BAR
3885 Attorney. If you are a "Defendant" and there is no Injured Party, you should know the
3886 TAX I.D. Number of the Court and the Prosecutor's Office and the Dunn and
3887 Bradstreet Trading Number.
3888 26 CFR 601.503 - Requirements of power of attorney, signatures, fiduciaries and
3889 Commissioner's authority to substitute other requirements.
3890 CFR › Title 26 › Chapter I › Subchapter H › Part 601 › Subpart E › Section 601.503
3891 § 601.503 Requirements of power of attorney, signatures, fiduciaries and
3892 Commissioner's authority to substitute other requirements.
3893
3894
3895 ...the US Foreign agents and all states are 100% Illegally controlled by judicial and
3896 political prostitutes and the BAR is the entity that has taken over:
3897 THE BAR CONTROLS ALL THREE BRANCHES OF GOVERNMENT. """"Except
3898 the First Branch of Government We the L awful Bloodline Americans""""..(See
3899 Below)
3900 1.) The ABA/BAR has a 100% racketeering monopoly on Justice.....they control

3901 every court every law; they control the entire Judicial Branch
 3902 2) Up to 70% of all members of every congress are BAR members.....So the BAR has
 3903 infiltrated the Legislative Branch..up to 70%
 3904 3.) Barack Obama a former BAR member, Hillary a BAR member so they have a lock
 3905 on the Executive Branch
 3906 4.) Many Governors are BAR members.....(Are you starting to see a pattern ...the
 3907 evidence is blatant!)
 3908 5) Adding icing to their mafia racketeering cake is the kicker of allthe BAR
 3909 controls the FBI, the US marshals, the ATF, the DEA the ENTIRE Department of
 3910 Justice via BAR member Loretta Lynch and Barack Obama
 3911 6.) And the final nail in our coffin is that the BAR controls every Sheriff in almost
 3912 every Country via a BAR members called the DA.....

3913
 3914 Title 8 USC 1481 stated once an oath of office is taken citizenship is relinquished,
 3915 thus you become a foreign entity, agency, or state. That means every public office is a
 3916 foreign state, including all political subdivisions. (i.e. every single court and that
 3917 courts personnel is considered a separate foreign entity)

3918
 3919 The Foreign Agents Registration Act (FARA) was enacted in 1938. FARA is a
 3920 disclosure statute that requires persons acting as agents of foreign principals in a
 3921 political or quasi-political capacity to make periodic public disclosure of their
 3922 relationship with the foreign principal, as well as activities, receipts and
 3923 disbursements in support of those activities. Disclosure of the required information
 3924 facilitates evaluation by the government and the American people of the statements
 3925 and activities of such persons in light of their function as foreign agents. The FARA
 3926 Registration Unit of the Counterintelligence and Export Control Section (CES) in the
 3927 National Security Division (NSD) is responsible for the administration and
 3928 enforcement of the Act. <http://www.fara.gov/>

3929
 3930 When a Judge is operating as a Clerk masquerading as a Judge, he cannot do anything
 3931 judicial, and if he attempts to do anything judicial, it is a nullity
 3932 “Ministerial officers are incompetent to receive grants of judicial power from the
 3933 legislature, their acts in attempting to exercise such powers are necessarily
 3934 nullities” Burns v. Sup., Ct., SF, 140 Cal. 1

3935
 3936 “It is the accepted rule, not only in state courts, but, of the federal courts as well, that
 3937 when a judge is enforcing administrative law they are described as mere ‘extensions
 3938 of the administrative agency for superior reviewing purposes’ as a ministerial clerk
 3939 for an agency...” 30 Cal 596; 167 Cal 762

3940
 3941 “”When acting to enforce a statute and its subsequent amendments to the present date,
 3942 the judge of the municipal court is acting as an administrative officer and not in a
 3943 judicial capacity; courts administering or enforcing statutes do not act judicially, but
 3944 merely ministerially....but merely act as an extension as an agent for the involved
 3945 agency— but only in a “ministerial” and not a “discretionary capacity...” Thompson v.
 3946 Smith, 154 S.E. 579, 583; Keller v. P.E., 261 US 428; F.R.C. v. G.E., 281, U.S. 464
 3947 [emphasis added]

3948
 3949 When a Judge is operating as a Clerk masquerading as a Judge, he cannot do anything
 3950 judicial, and if he attempts to do anything judicial, it is a nullity

3951 “Ministerial officers are incompetent to receive grants of judicial power from the
3952 legislature, their acts in attempting to exercise such powers are necessarily
3953 nullities” Burns v. Sup., Ct., SF, 140 Cal. 1

3954
3955
3956 When one takes a birds eye view of their insidious work they will realize such
3957 infiltration started in 1783 at the Signing of the Treaty of Paris.

3958
3959 “It is a clearly established principle of law that an attorney must represent a
3960 corporation, it being incorporeal and a creature of the law. An attorney representing
3961 an artificial entity must appear with the corporate charter and law in his hand. A
3962 person acting as an attorney for a foreign principal must be registered to act on the
3963 principal’s behalf.” See, Foreign Agents Registration Act” (22 USC § 612 et seq.);
3964 Victor Rabinowitz et. at. v. Robert F. Kennedy, 376 US 605. “Failure to file the
3965 "Foreign Agents Registrations Statement" goes directly to the jurisdiction and lack of
3966 standing to be before the court, and is a felony pursuant to 18 USC §§ 219, 951. The
3967 conflict of law, interest and allegiance is obvious.

3972 JUDICIAL IMMUNITY IS A FICTION

3973 “When a judge knows that he lacks jurisdiction, or acts in the face of clearly valid
3974 statutes expressly depriving him of jurisdiction, judicial immunity is lost¹.” ... “A
3975 judge is not immune for tortious² acts committed in a purely Administrative,
3976 non-judicial capacity³.” ... “There is no such thing as a power of inherent sovereignty
3977 in the government of the United States. It is a government of delegated powers,
3978 supreme within its prescribed sphere, but powerless outside of it. In this country
3979 sovereignty resides in the people, and Congress can exercise no power which they
3980 have not, by their Constitution, entrusted to it; all else is withheld⁴. ... “There is a
3981 general rule that a ministerial officer who acts wrongfully, although in good faith, is
3982 never-the-less liable in a civil action and cannot claim the immunity of the
3983 sovereign⁵”. ... “Where there is no jurisdiction, there can be no discretion, for
3984 discretion is incident to
3985 jurisdiction⁶.” ... “A judge must be acting within his jurisdiction as to subject matter
3986 and person, to be entitled to immunity from civil action for his acts⁷.”
3987 “When a judicial officer acts entirely without jurisdiction or without compliance with
3988 jurisdiction requisites he may be held civilly liable for abuse of process even though
3989 his act involved a decision made in good faith, that he had jurisdiction⁸.” ... “No
3990 judicial process, whatever form it may assume, can have any lawful authority outside
3991 of the limits of the jurisdiction of the court or judge by whom it is issued; and an
3992 attempt to enforce it beyond these boundaries is nothing less than lawless
3993 violence⁹.” ... “No man in this country is so high that he is above the law. No officer
3994 of the law may set that law at defiance with impunity. All the officers of the
3995 government, from the highest to the lowest, are creatures of the law and are bound to
3996 obey it... It is the only supreme power in our system of government, and every man
3997 who, by accepting office participates in its functions, is only the more strongly bound
3998 to submit to that supremacy, and to
3999 observe the limitations which it imposes on the exercise of the authority which it
4000 gives¹⁰.”

“All law (rules and practices) which are repugnant to the Constitution are VOID. ... NO State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the rights, privileges, or immunities of citizens of the United States nor deprive any citizens of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law, ... or equal protection under the law”, this renders judicial immunity unconstitutional¹¹.” ... “Any judge who does not comply with his oath to the Constitution of the United States wars against that Constitution and engages in acts in violation of the supreme law of the land. The judge is engaged in acts of treason¹².” ... “no state legislator or executive or judicial officer can war against the Constitution without violating his undertaking to support it¹³”.
 1 Zeller v. Rankin, 101 S.Ct. 2020, 451 U.S. 939, 68 L.Ed 2d 326
 2 TORTIOUS. Wrongful; of the nature of a tort. TORT (from Lat. torquere, to twist, tortus, twisted, wrested aside). A private or civil wrong or injury.
 3 Stump v. Sparkman, id., 435 U.S. 349
 4 Juliard v. Greeman, 110 U.S. 421 (1884)
 5 Cooper v. O'Conner, 99 F.2d 133;
 6 Piper v. Pearson, 2 Gray 120, cited in Bradley v. Fisher, 13 Wall. 335, 20 L.Ed. 646 (1872)
 7 Davis v. Burris, 51 Ariz. 220, 75 P.2d 689 (1938)
 8 U.S. Fidelity & Guaranty Co. (State use of), 217 Miss. 576, 64 So. 2d 697
 9 Ableman v. Booth, 21 Howard 506 (1859)
 10 U.S. v. Lee, 106 U.S. 196, 220 1 S. Ct. 240, 261, 27 L. Ed 171 (1882)
 11 Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S. (2 Cranch) 137, 180 (1803)
 12 Cooper v. Aaron, 358 U.S. 1, 78 S. Ct. 1401 (1958)
 13 Sawyer, 124 U.S. 200 (188); U.S. v. Will, 449 U.S. 200, 216, 101 S. Ct. 471, 66 L. Ed. 2d 392, 406 (1980); Cohens v. Virginia, 19 U.S. (6 Wheat) 264, 404, 5 L. Ed 257 (1821)

Whereas :Power of the Grand Jury - In a stunning 6 to 3 decision Justice Antonin Scalia, writing for the majority, confirmed that the American grand jury is neither part of the judicial, executive nor legislative branches of government, but instead belongs to the people. It is in effect a fourth branch of government "governed" and administered to directly by and on behalf of the American people, and its authority emanates from the Bill of Rights, see United States -v- Williams

Title 42 USC Section 1983 Information

Title 42, U.S.C., Section 14141
 Pattern and Practice

Laws: Cases and Codes : U.S. Code : Title 42 : Section 14141

This civil statute was a provision within the Crime Control Act of 1994 and makes it unlawful for any governmental authority, or agent thereof, or any person acting on behalf of a governmental authority, to engage in a pattern or practice of conduct by law enforcement officers or by officials or employees of any governmental agency with responsibility for the administration of juvenile justice or the incarceration of juveniles that deprives persons of rights, privileges, or immunities secured or protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States.

Whenever the Attorney General has reasonable cause to believe that a violation has occurred, the Attorney General, for or in the name of the United States, may in a civil action obtain appropriate equitable and declaratory relief to eliminate the pattern or practice.

Types of misconduct covered include, among other things:

1. Excessive Force
2. Discriminatory Harassment
3. False Arrest
4. Coercive Sexual Conduct
5. Unlawful Stops, Searches, or Arrests

In *Hurtado v. People of the State of California*, 110 US 516, the U.S Supreme Court states very plainly: "The state cannot diminish rights of the people."

And in *Bennett v. Boggs*, 1 Baldw 60, "Statutes that violate the plain and obvious principles of common right and common reason are null and void."

"The assertion of federal rights, when plainly and reasonably made, is not to be defeated under the name of local practice." *Davis v. Wechsler*, 263 US 22, at 24.

"Where rights secured by the Constitution are involved, there can be no rule making or legislation which would abrogate them." *Miranda v. Arizona*, 384 US 436, 491.

"The claim and exercise of a constitutional right cannot be converted into a crime." *Miller v. US*, 230 F 486, at 489.

"There can be no sanction or penalty imposed upon one because of this exercise of constitutional rights." *Sherer v. Cullen*, 481 F 946

"CONTEMPT FOR ENFORCING RIGHTS" ?

Title 42 USC § 12203 Prohibition against retaliation and coercion

(a) Retaliation

No person shall discriminate against any individual because such individual has opposed any act or practice made unlawful by this chapter or because such individual made a charge, testified, assisted, or participated in any manner in an investigation, proceeding, or hearing under this chapter.

(b) Interference, coercion, or intimidation

It shall be unlawful to coerce, intimidate, threaten, or interfere with any individual in the exercise or enjoyment of, or on account of his or her having exercised or enjoyed, or on account of his or her having aided or encouraged any other individual in the exercise or enjoyment of, any right granted or protected by this chapter.

(c) Remedies and procedures

The remedies and procedures available under sections 12117, 12133, and 12188 of this title shall be available to aggrieved persons for violations of subsections (a) and (b) of this section, with respect to subchapter I, subchapter II and subchapter III, respectively. (Pub. L. 101–336, title V, § 503, July 26, 1990, 104 Stat. 370.).

Title 42 US Code Sec. 1983, Sec. 1985, & Sec. 1986:

"Clearly established the right to sue anyone who violates your constitutional rights. The Constitution guarantees: he who would unlawfully jeopardize your property loses property to you, and that's what justice is all about."

The 6th Amendment is very SPECIFIC, that the accused ONLY has the right to the ASSISTANCE of counsel and this ASSISTANCE of counsel CAN BE ANYONE THE ACCUSED CHOOSES WITHOUT LIMITATION. LAWYERS and LAWYER-JUDGES: Created unconstitutional "lawyer system" pre-trial "motions" and "Hearings" to have eternal EXTORTIONISTIC litigation's, which is BARRATRY and also is in violation of the U.S. Constitution, and Article 1, as this places defendants in DOUBLE JEOPARDY a hundred times over. Defendants only have a right to A TRIAL, NOT TRIALS.

When a criminal is freed on a TECHNICALITY, HE IS FREED BECAUSE OF A FIX and a PAY-OFF, as a defendant can only be freed if found innocent BY A JURY NOT BY ANY "TECHNICALITY." Whenever a lawyer is involved in a case directly or indirectly, as a litigant or assisting in counsel, ALL LAWYER-JUDGES HAVE TO DISQUALIFY THEMSELVES, AS THERE CANNOT BE A CONSTITUTIONAL TRIAL and also there would be a violation of the conflict of interest laws, along with the violation of separation of powers and checks and balances, because "OFFICERS" OF THE COURT ARE ON BOTH SIDES OF THE BENCH. These same LAWYER-JUDGES are awarding or approving LAWYER FEES, directly and indirectly, amounting to BILLIONS OF DOLLARS annually, all in violation of conflict of interest laws. As long as there are lawyers, there will never be any law, constitution or justice. There will only be MOB RULE, RULE BY A MOB OF LAWYERS.

CASE "LAW" IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL: As CASE "LAW" IS ENACTED BY THE JUDICIAL BRANCH OF GOVERNMENT.

When a lawyer-judge instructs, directs, or gives orders to a jury, the lawyer-judge is TAMPERING WITH THE JURY. He also tampers with testimony when he orders the answers to be either "Yes" or "No." The lawyer-judge also tampers, fixes, and rigs the trial when he orders anything stricken from the record, or when he "rules" certain evidence and the truth to be inadmissible. This makes the trial and transcript FIXED and RIGGED, because the jury does not hear the REAL TRUTH and ALL THE FACTS. Juries are made into puppets by the lawyers and lawyer-judges. All lawyers are automatically in the judicial branch of government, as they have the unconstitutional TITLE OF NOBILITY (Article 1, Section 9 and 10), "Officer of the court." Citizens have to be elected or hired to be in any branch of government but non-lawyer Citizens are limited to only 2 of the 3 branches of government. Lawyers as 1st class citizens can be hired or elected to any of the three branches of government. Lawyers, "Officers of the Court," in the Judicial Branch, are unconstitutionally in 2 branches of government AT THE SAME TIME whenever they are hired or elected to the executive or legislative branches. This is a violation of the separation of powers, checks and balances, and the conflict of interest laws.

District attorneys and State's attorneys have taken over the Grand Juries FROM the people, where the people are DENIED ACCESS to the grand juries when they attempt to present evidence of crimes committed in the courtrooms by the lawyers and lawyer-judges. The U.S. Constitution, being the Supreme Fundamental Law, is not and CANNOT be ambiguous as to be interpreted, or it would be a worthless piece of paper (as recently stated by President Bush), and we would have millions of interpretations (unconstitutional amendments) instead of the few we have now. That is

4151 why all judges and public servants are SWORN TO SUPPORT the U.S. Constitution,
4152 NOT interpret it.

4153 Under INTERNATIONAL ORDERS: ALL LAWYERS, whether they left law school
4154 yesterday or 50 years ago, are EXACTLY THE SAME. All lawyers have to file the
4155 same motions and follow the same procedures in using the same unconstitutional
4156 "lawyer system". In probate, the lawyers place themselves in everyone's will and
4157 estate. When there are minor children as heirs, the lawyer-judges appoint a lawyer (a
4158 child molesting Fagin) for EACH CHILD and, at times, the lawyer fees EXCEED the
4159 total amount of the estate. An OUTRAGEOUS amount of TAX "MONEY" is directly
4160 and indirectly STOLEN BY LAWYERS. Money that is budgeted to County Boards,
4161 School Boards and other local and federal agencies eventually finds its way into the
4162 pockets of lawyers, as ALL of these agencies are "TRICKED" and "FORCED" into
4163 ETERNAL EXTORTIONISTIC LITIGATION.

4164
4165
4166
4167
4168
4169 IT IS ALL ABOUT BONDS
4170

4171 What they're doing in these courts is all about Bonds. When you go into the
4172 courtroom after you're arrested, they use two different sets of Bonds. What they do
4173 when your arrested they fill out a "Bid Bond". The United States District Court uses
4174 273, 274 & 275. SF = "Standard Form". Standard Form 273, Standard Form 274 &
4175 Standard Form 275. This is the United States District Court.

4176 A violation of an Indian treaty is a violation of FEDERAL LAW.

4177 NO FEDERAL TREATY NATION WAS EVER NOTIFIED - WHEN THE
4178 UNITED STATES WENT BANKRUPT..

4179 4 TIME DE FACTO UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT IS NOT A NATION.. IS A
4180 CORPORATION. AND THE TPP Trans-Pacific Partnership ARE AGAINST
4181 FEDERAL TREATY TRIBAL NATIONS ,
4182 THIS IS TREASON..

4183 It is an established fact that the United States Federal Government has been
4184 Dissolved by the "Emergency Banking Act, March 9, 1933, 48 Stat. 1, Public Law
4185 89-719; declared by President Roosevelt, being bankrupt and insolvent. H.J.R. 192,
4186 73rd Congress, M Session June 5, 1933—because of the Bankruptcy of the United
4187 States Congressional Record, March 17, 1993, Vol. 33 where all of Congress was
4188 forced to adjourn

4189 "Without Day" in 1861 March 3, "sin die."

4190 -----(MEANING NEVER TO MEET AGAIN.)!!-----

4191
4192 TREASON and Fraud by Trickery – and the Congress refuses to produce any
4193 Documentation as to exactly who formed this Federal Corporation now known as
4194 "THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, dba, A 4 TIME BANKRUPT
4195 CORPORATION" a fraud scheme their Charter and Bonding necessary for a lawfully
4196 established corporation.

4197
4198 Legal Max: "To conceal a fraud is to commit a fraud" BLACKS LAW. McNally vs.
4199 United States 483 U.S. 350 (1987) also United States vs. Dial, 757 F 2d 163, 168 (7th
4200 Circuit 1985)

Proof United States is NOT a country under this 2 court cases. Caha v. United States and US v Bond--you cannot contradiction in law or it now becomes Null and void, ab inito

Quoting from the Congressional Record 87th Congress April 4, 1962 Vol. 108 Congressman Berry/BERRY admits the Federal Government has gone to every extreme in attempting to prove that the Indians are wrong; "that the white man owes no one for lands and property that has been taken from the Indian, that the Federal Government is not under obligation to keep its treaties with the Indian People." (Congress admits to "Taking Land" IE Land Theft: Where is original Bills of Sale, Deeds, Land Transfer from Indians to British, French, Spain, Portugal or UNITED STATES, al et al.?)

Marbury v. Madison, arguably the most important case in Supreme Court history, was the first U.S. Supreme Court case to apply the principle of "judicial review" -- the power of federal courts to void acts of Congress in conflict with the Constitution.

By order of Pope Francis: All Bar Association licenses are extinguished
Posted on April 8, 2015

9.1 – Bonding Jail Procedure

A government, or an official, officer or clerk of a government, will lose its/his bond, will not be bonded and will not be bondable if a person, hereinafter referred to as the "prisoner," which it/he handles, who has been charged and arrested but who has not been convicted:

1. has been denied or delayed anything, or any right, or the equal protection of the law necessary for the prisoner's defense which an uncharged and unarrested citizen would have at his use, service and disposal,
2. has been denied or delayed legal paper work in the prisoner's case, including but not limited to affidavits of accusation, police reports, arrest warrants, mailing addresses for the delivery of all legal paperwork, etc.,
3. has been denied or delayed the assistant counsel of, or communication with any lawyer, attorney, spouse, relative, friend, non-union paralegal, non-union lawyer, etc., needed for his personal safety and legal defense,
4. Has been denied or delayed necessary appearances and opportunity to speak before a judge in court and on the court record ("necessary" as defined by the prisoner, not as defined by the jail, the judge, or the court), and/or consideration from the jailer, the judge of the court, and/or a hand-signed record of the proceedings before the judge and court,
5. has been denied or delayed a copy of anything: (such as a valid warrant)
 - (A) the prisoner has signed while entering or dwelling in the jail, or
 - (B) the prisoner has been required to sign while entering or dwelling in the jail,
10. has been denied or delayed medical needs. NOTE: the county shall provide all of the above services immediately to the un-convicted prisoner at no cost to the prisoner. Any county which fails to meet the above criteria will itself be totally liable for its own acts. It is not inconceivable that a county violating the above criteria could accumulate over one hundred million dollars worth of civil damages in one day's time involving only one prisoner, and no credible bonding company wants anything to do with that kind of obligation.

Conclusion

All judges of the lower courts are required to take two Oaths, (one being 28 USC 453, to do equal justice to all) before assuming Office and to file such Oaths in places designated by law and to abide by such Oaths during occupancy of such Offices and failure to take and file such Oaths constitutes de jure vacancies of Offices. All judges of the lower courts are required to uphold and defend the United States Constitution. All judges of the lower courts are required to follow all directives and rules issued by the United States Supreme Court for the conduct and procedures of such lower courts. All judges of the lower courts are required to abide by the Judicial Code of Conduct. All judges of the lower courts are required to abide by precedence law that has been set as the existing law of the land. All judges are directed by the United States Supreme Court that justice is the object and goal of the cases. All judges of the lower courts are required to avoid even the appearance of partiality or favoritism or cronyism. All judges of the lower courts injure and damage the United States, the laws thereof, and the United States District Courts when they violate the Judicial Code of Conduct. All judges of the lower courts damage the integrity of the courts and the confidence of the people in the judicial process when such judges violate Constitutional rights of parties, violate court rules, violate the Judicial Code of Conduct, accede to fraud, favor one party over the other, or fail to uphold the Constitution and laws of the United States. Thus judges acting outside their jurisdiction are committing criminal acts and are either incompetent, if they really had no idea, OR they are malfeasant because they really knew and didn't care. The Court in *Yates Vs. Village of Hoffman Estates, Illinois*, 209 F. Supp. 757 (N.D. Ill. 1962) held that, "Not every action by any judge is in exercise of his judicial function. It is not a judicial function for a judge to commit an intentional tort even though the tort occurs in the Courthouse. When a judge acts as a Trespasser of the Law, when a judge does not follow the law, the judge loses subject matter jurisdiction and the judge's orders are void, of no legal force or effect." The United States Supreme Court has stated that "No State legislator, or executive, or judicial officer can war against the Constitution without violating his undertaking to support it." *Cooper Vs. Aaron*. 358 U.S. 178 S.Ct. 1401 (1958) If a judge does not fully comply with the Constitution, then his orders are void. In *re Sawyer*, 124 U.S. 200 (1888), he/she is without jurisdiction, and he/she has engaged in an act or acts of TREASON! It is also Contempt of Constitution, Discrimination against the People. Every time public officials violate their Oath of Office, they are guilty of Contempt of Constitution which includes: General Contempt, Malicious Contempt, Tyrannical Malicious Contempt, Noble Contempt, Noble Malicious Contempt, Noble Tyrannical Malicious Contempt, Contempt By Perjury, Contempt By Omission, Contemptuous Corruption of Contempt, Conspiracy to Commit Contempt of Constitution, Seditious Contempt, Contempt by Accessory After the Fact, Obstruction of Constitutional Justice, and Order of Enforceability of Contempt of Constitution. All Contempt of Constitution is a Breach of the Oath of Office, and Discrimination Against the People. The right of the very people to enforce Contempt of Constitution as a matter of final judgment shall not be denied; the principle of the Eighth Amendment is the controlling standard for governing punishments for the Sovereign Crime, at any degree, of Contempt of Constitution. A Breach of the Oath of Office removes all immunity from the public servant.

The signer of this document speaks in truth and will so testify under Oath and present all evidence and other witnesses as may be necessary to establish the truth of this document, and if any wish to oppose or controvert these proclaimed truths, then let

4301 them come forth, with signed affidavits and verifiable evidence and let them oppose
4302 the truths as this signer knows them. I further Declare and Affirm that I am a live man,
4303 American Sovereign as stated in the original Constitution for the united States of
4304 America, of which all public servants/public officials are sworn by their Oaths of
4305 Office to protect and defend, both State and National, in which is also enumerated the
4306 type and size of bonds required by both elected and appointed positions, in order to
4307 assure the Sovereign public that their trust and faith in those public servants/public
4308 officials are well founded and that their duties will be discharged in the most
4309 Honorable means until completion of their term of office.

4310
4311 Write something...Please Pass on We the People have Servants All government
4312 offices are empty"?
4313 "All government offices are empty"?

4314
4315
4316 Whereas ;Violations of oath of office Capital Treason Under Title 18 USC 2381
4317
4318 Criminal Negligence Debtors slavery is modern day Slavery Peonage was outlawed
4319 by an Act of Congress

4320
4321 5 U.S.C. 3331 - Oath of office - US Government Publishing Office
4322 www.gpo.gov/fdsys/granule/USCODE-2010-title5/USCODE-2010-title5-partIII-subp
4323 [artB-chap33-subchapII-sec3331](http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/granule/USCODE-2010-title5/USCODE-2010-title5-partIII-subp)

4324
4325 Jan 7, 2011 ... Title 5 - GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION AND EMPLOYEES
4326 PART III - EMPLOYEES Subpart B - Employment and Retention CHAPTER 33 ...

4327
4328 (a) Except as provided by subsection (b) of this section, an individual who accepts
4329 office or employment in the Government of the United States or in the government of
4330 the District of Columbia shall execute an affidavit within 60 days after accepting the
4331 office or employment that his acceptance and holding of the office or employment
4332 does not or will not violate section 7311 of this title. The affidavit is prima facie
4333 evidence that the acceptance and holding of office or employment by the affiant does
4334 not or will not violate section 7311 of this title.

4335 (b) An affidavit is not required from an individual employed by the Government of
4336 the United States or the government of the District of Columbia for less than 60 days
4337 for sudden emergency work involving the loss of human life or the destruction of
4338 property. This subsection does not relieve an individual from liability for violation of
4339 section 7311 of this title.

4340 (Pub. L. 89-554, Sept. 6, 1966, 80 Stat. 424.)

4341
4342 Whereas : the demand of prof of your filing ,, One of the reason why Former FBI
4343 Director Comey was fired, Foreign Agents Registration Act - Wikipedia
4344 en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Foreign_Agents_Registration_Act

4345
4346 The Foreign Agents Registration Act (FARA) is a United States law passed in 1938
4347 requiring ... However, a civil injunctive remedy also was added to allow the
4348 Department of ... Organizations under such foreign control can include political
4349 agents, public relations counsel, publicity agents, information-service employees, ...

Whenever one of these so called Foreign agent that has to be register with 1938 FARA elected and or public paid servants including Judges is dealing with statutes (statutory = Administrativ law, 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.)

Whereas : "For a crime to exist, there must be an injured party. There can be no sanction or penalty imposed upon one because of this exercise of Constitutional rights."- Sherar v. Cullen, 481 F. 945.
AT LAW. "This phrase is used to point out that a thing is to be done according to the course of the common law; it is distinguished from a proceeding in equity."
"All laws, rules and practices which are repugnant to the Constitution are null and void" [Marbury v. Madison, 5th US (2 Cranch) 137, 180]
The common law is the real law, the Supreme Law of the land, the code, rules, regulations, policy and statutes are "not the law", [Self v. Rhay, 61 Wn (2d) 261]
"The general rule is that an unconstitutional statute, though having the form and name of law, is in reality no law, but is wholly void and ineffective for any purpose, since its unconstitutionality dates from the time of its enactment... In legal contemplation, it is as inoperative as if it had never been passed... Since an unconstitutional law is void, the general principles follow that it imposes no duties, confers no right, creates no office, bestows no power or authority on anyone, affords no protection and justifies no acts performed under it... A void act cannot be legally consistent with a valid one. An unconstitutional law cannot operate to supersede any existing law. Indeed insofar as a statute runs counter to the fundamental law of the land, (the Constitution) it is superseded thereby. No one is bound to obey an unconstitutional law and no courts are bound to enforce it." [Bonnett v. Vallier, 116 N.W. 885, 136 Wis. 193 (1908); NORTON v. SHELBY COUNTY, 118 U.S. 425 (1886)]

Whereas : MOST PEOPLE FAIL TO REALIZE that Birth Certificates are commercial paper, and the way they collect on that instrument, is that they drag you to court on some statutory violation, while SILENTLY asserting to be the holder in due course.

Which means that commercial (UCC) defenses can be used, such as a COUNTER-DEMAND.

BTW, in the "rule" below, YOU are the ISSUER, since you (or your guardian) SIGNED the Birth Certificate, and the United States is the POSSESSOR.

THE FUNDAMENTAL "RULE" OF COMMERCIAL PAPER

The possessor of a piece of commercial paper has an unconditional right to be paid, as long as:

(1)the paper is negotiable;

4401 (2)it has been negotiated to the possessor;
 4402 (3)the possessor is a holder in due course; and
 4403 (4) the issuer cannot claim a valid defense.
 4404
 4405 Aiding, abetting, harboring, encouraging illegals a felony
 4406 "Any person who . . . encourages or induces an alien to . . . reside . . . knowing or in
 4407 reckless disregard of the fact that such . . . residence is . . . in violation of law, shall be
 4408 punished as provided . . . for each alien in respect to whom such a violation occurs . . .
 4409 fined under title 18
 4410
 4411 The first amendment of the Constitution of the United States says:
 4412 Quote:
 4413 Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the
 4414 free exercise thereof."
 4415 It was written by Thomas Jefferson, who became President in 1801. In 1802 he wrote
 4416 a letter to the Danbury Baptist Association saying that its purpose was to build "a wall
 4417 of separation between Church and State", because they were asking him what the first
 4418 amendment was really all about.
 4419 Jefferson also wrote in his Inagural address:
 4420 Quote:
 4421 Still one thing more, fellow-citizens -- a wise and frugal Government, which shall
 4422 restrain men from injuring one another, shall leave them otherwise free to regulate
 4423 their own pursuits of industry and improvement, and shall not take from the mouth of
 4424 labor the bread it has earned. This is the sum of good government, and this is
 4425 necessary to close the circle of our felicities.
 4426 In other words, unless the government can show that people are injuring each other, it
 4427 has no business restricting their activities.
 4428 I agree with Jefferson that "No victim, no crime" is not just a catchy slogan, but
 4429 should be the foundation of all law, because the purpose of the law is to protect
 4430 people (and other innocent parties such as animals and the environment) from the
 4431 actions of others. If the law does anything else it becomes a set of meaningless rules
 4432 that has no real basis.
 4433 The the ninth and tenth amendments of the Constitution also state:
 4434 Quote:
 4435 Amendment 9 - Construction of Constitution. Ratified 12/15/1791.
 4436 The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny
 4437 or disparage others retained by the people.
 4438 Amendment 10 - Powers of the States and People. Ratified 12/15/1791.
 4439 The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it
 4440 to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.
 4441
 4442 See Supremacy Clauses 2 & 3 of Article VI of The Constitution:
 4443
 4444 =====
 4445 ARTICLE VI Supremacy clauses 2 & 3:
 4446
 4447 "This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which -->shall be<-- made
 4448 -->IN PURSUANCE thereof<--(including ARTICLE I Section 8 clause 17, pursuant
 4449 to our Ninth and TENTH Amendment supreme Constitutional laws of the land,
 4450 subsequent to THE EQUAL FOOTING DOCTRINE --> which EXPRESSLY

PROHIBITS the U.S. Government from owning or managing ANY LAND within the Continental united States of America, outside of THE LAST REMAINING "Territory" of Washington D.C. and "Places purchased by the Consent of the Legislature of the State in which the Same -->shall be<--, for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-Yards, and other needful Buildings;"); and all Treaties made, or which shall be made, under the Authority of the United States, --->shall be the supreme Law of the Land<---; and --->the Judges in every State<--- shall be bound thereby, --->any Thing in the Constitution or Laws of any State to the Contrary notwithstanding <---."

"The Senators and Representatives before mentioned, and the Members of the several State Legislatures, and all executive and judicial Officers, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by Oath or Affirmation, to support this Constitution"

Furthermore See Marbury v Madison:

Marbury v. Madison : 5 US 137 (1803)

"No provision of the Constitution is designed to be without effect," "Anything that is in conflict (with ARTICLE I Section 8 clause 17 pursuant to the Ninth and especially the TENTH Amendment laws) is null and void of law", "clearly, for a secondary law to come in conflict with the supreme Law was illogical, for certainly, the supreme Law would prevail over all other laws and certainly our forefathers had intended that the supreme Law would be the bases of all law and for any law to come in conflict would be null and void of law, in would bare no obligation to obey, it would purport to settle as if it had never existed, for unconstitutionality, would date for the enactment of such a law, not from the date so branded in an open court of law, no courts are bound to uphold it, and no Citizens are bound to obey it. It operates as a near nullity or a fiction of law."

If any statement, within any law, which is passed, is unconstitutional, (such as the 'so called' Enabling Act) the whole law is unconstitutional by Marbury v. Madison.

Shepard's Citations:

A group of reporters that go through and keep track of all court cases that have come before the courts, especially the Supreme Court and they clarify, before the court, all the cases. All cases which have cited Marbury v. Madison case, to the Supreme Court has not ever been overturned. (854 cases at last count) See Shepard's Citation of Marbury v. Madison.

=====
According to "THE LAW", which DOES NOT MEAN Codes or Statutes, but "THE LAW" MEANS ONLY The Declaration of Independence and its two dovetail documents of "supreme laws of the land" (See Supremacy clauses 2 & 3 of Article VI and Marbury v Madison, above) any law made, by any Congressmen or any President, or ruled in ANY Court, in violation of ARTICLE I Section 8 clause 17, subsequent to THE EQUAL FOOTING DOCTRINE, (and/or exceeds the eighteen "delegated" powers and SPENDING privileges granted to The President of The United States of America, to both Houses of Congress and to The Supreme Court of The United States)

both pursuant to our Ninth and TENTH Amendment supreme laws of the land, AS ENUMERATED UNDER ARTICLE I Section 8, is pure unadulterated Title 18 U.S. Code 2381 Capital Felony Treason and thus anybody who makes a law in violation of, repugnant to, and/or against these supreme laws of the land, without an Article V Amendment to The Constitution, is subject to hanging:

The right to a fair trial, guaranteed to state criminal defendants by the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, imposes on States certain duties consistent with their sovereign obligation to ensure "that 'justice shall be done' " in all criminal prosecutions. *United States v. Agurs*, 427 U.S. 97, 111, 96 S.Ct. 2392, 49 L.Ed.2d 342 (1976) (quoting *Berger v. United States*, 295 U.S. 78, 88, 55 S.Ct. 629, 79 L.Ed. 1314 (1935)). In *Brady v. Maryland*, 373 U.S. 83, 83 S.Ct. 1194, 10 L.Ed.2d 215 (1963), we held that when a State suppresses evidence favorable to an accused that is material to guilt or to punishment, the State violates the defendant's right to due process, "irrespective of the good faith or bad faith of the prosecution." *Id.*, at 87, 83 S.Ct. 1194.

Cone v. Bell, 556 U.S. 449, 451 (U.S. 2009)

Whereas ; The State.....according to law.....has to use gold as a payment for debts.

Article 1 sec. 10 No State shall coin money on anything but gold and silver(exodus 3:22, 12:14) for the payment of debts....

Now...."the State" no longer uses gold.....rather....it uses fiat currency which is borrowed from the Federal Reserve bank which is the international bankers and Mystery Babylon. So what jurisdiction are they in if they no longer follow the law???

The bible says that God is going to lay waste the earth for the earth had forsaken the everlasting covenant and have removed the ordinance. The ordinance is the gold standard with the passover as the lamb for the sacrifice. Now the nations are fallen which is the great falling away in II thessalilonians 2:3 and the son of perdition is also the see of transgression in Isaiah 57:3 and their nativityor birth is in the land of Canaan or merchants described in Ezekiel 16:3

Whereas ; The Federal Employees Liability Reform and Tort Compensation Act of 1988 (Liability Reform Act or Act) limits the relief available to persons injured by Government employees acting within the scope of their employment. For persons so injured, the Act provides that "[t]he remedy against the United States" under the Federal Tort Claims Act (FTCA) "is exclusive of any other civil action or proceeding for money damages." 28 U.S.C. § 2679(b)(1). Subject to certain exceptions, the FTCA permits a person injured by a Government employee acting within the scope of his or her employment to seek tort damages against the Government. *United States v. Smith*, 499 U.S. 160, 161-62 (U.S. 1991)

Whereas: Fabrication of Evidence

"Involving a coerced false confession that resulted in what we described as one of the "worse miscarriage[s] of justice" we had ever seen"

4551 Boseman v. Upper Providence Twp., No. 16-1338 (3d Cir. Feb. 27, 2017)
4552
4553 “Explaining that police officers can be liable for § 1983 claims for malicious
4554 prosecution when they “misrepresent material facts” to the prosecuting authorities”
4555 Dress v. Falls Twp., CIVIL ACTION No. 16-4918 (E.D. Pa. May. 18, 2017)
4556
4557 “Noting “[i]n the future ... we might be required to decide precisely when an unlawful
4558 seizure ends and [a] due process ... [violation] begins” (alterations in original)”
4559 Bocchino v. City of Atl. City, 179 F.Supp.3d 387 (D.N.J. 2016)
4560
4561 “Discussing fabrication of evidence”
4562 Sanchez v. Town of Morristown, DOCKET NO. A-2076-13T3 (N.J. Super. App. Div.
4563 Aug. 7, 2015)
4564 “Inasmuch as every government is an artificial person, an abstraction, and a creature
4565 of the mind only, a government can interface only with other artificial persons. The
4566 imaginary, having neither actuality nor substance, is foreclosed from creating and
4567 attaining parity with the tangible. The legal manifestation of this is that no
4568 government, as well
4569 as any law, agency, aspect, court, etc. can concern itself with
4570 anything other than corporate, artificial persons and the contracts between them.”
4571 S.C.R. 1795, Penhallow v. Doane's Administrators (3 U.S. 54; 1 L.Ed. 57; 3 Dall. 54)
4572
4573 Since in common usage, the term ‘person’ does not include the sovereign, statutes
4574 employing the phrase are ordinarily construed to exclude it.” U.S. v. General Motors
4575 Corporation, D.C. Ill, 2 F.R.D. 528, 530: In “common usage the word ‘person’ does
4576 not include the sovereign, and statutes employing the word are generally construed to
4577 exclude the sovereign.” Church of Scientology v. US Department of Justice, 612 F.2d
4578 417 @425 (1979): “the word ‘person’ in legal terminology is perceived as a general
4579 word which normally includes in its scope a variety of entities other than human
4580 beings., see e.g. 1, U.S.C. § para 1.” In the 1935 Supreme Court case of Perry v. US
4581 (294 US 330) the Supreme Court found that: “In United States, sovereignty resides in
4582 people... the Congress cannot invoke the sovereign power of the People to override
4583 their will as thus declared.”,
4584
4585 “It is a clearly established principle of law that an attorney must represent a
4586 corporation, it being incorporeal and a creature of the law.
4587 An attorney representing an artificial entity must appear with the corporate charter
4588 and law in his hand. A person acting as an attorney for a foreign principal must be
4589 registered to act on the principal’s behalf.” See, Foreign Agents Registration Act” (22
4590 USC § 612 et seq.);
4591 Victor Rabinowitz et. at. v. Robert F. Kennedy, 376 US 605. “Failure to file the
4592 “Foreign Agents Registrations Statement” goes directly to the jurisdiction and lack of
4593 standing to be before the court, and is a felony pursuant to 18 USC §§ 219, 951. The
4594 conflict of law, interest and allegiance is obvious. A Lawyer can not make a claim to
4595 your rights ,
4596 Only you can . Federal District Court Judge James Alger Fee's mind blowing
4597 assertion in United States v. Johnson, 76 F. Supp. 538 (M.D. Pa. 1947)
4598
4599 U.S. District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania - 76 F. Supp. 538 (M.D.
4600 Pa. 1947) February 26, 1947 , Congress cannot by legislation enlarge the federal

jurisdiction, and it cannot be enlarged under the treaty making power.” Mayor, Alderman and Inhabitants of City of New Orleans v. U.S., 35 U.S. 662, 10 Pet. 662, 9 L.Ed. 573 (1836).And; 18 U.S. Code § 661 - Within special maritime and territorial jurisdiction Current through Pub. L. 114-38. (See Public Laws for the current Congress.)

Whoever, within the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States, takes and carries away, with intent to steal or purloin, any personal property of another shall be punished as follows:

If the property taken is of a value exceeding \$1,000, or is taken from the person of another, by a fine under this title, or imprisonment for not more than five years, or both; in all other cases, by a fine under this title or by imprisonment not more than one year, or both.

18 U.S. Code § 1341 - Frauds and swindles
Current through Pub. L. 114-38. (See Public Laws for the current Congress.)

Whoever, having devised or intending to devise any scheme or artifice to defraud, or for obtaining money or property by means of false or fraudulent pretenses, representations, or promises, or to sell, dispose of, loan, exchange, alter, give away, distribute, supply, or furnish or procure for unlawful use any counterfeit or spurious coin, obligation, security, or other article, or anything represented to be or intimated or held out to be such "COUNTERFEIT" or spurious article..... et seq.

Whereas : Sedition by Syntax" "BAR Sedition"

1. Perpetrate (third-person singular simple present perpetrates, present participle perpetrating, simple past and past participle perpetrated) (transitive) To be guilty of, or responsible for a deception, crime, etc) ; to carry out or commit (a harmful, illegal, or immoral action).

"a crime has been perpetrated against the Sovereign People

2. Crime

n. a violation of a law in which there is injury to the public or a member of the public and a term in jail or prison, and/or a fine as possible penalties.

“Corpus delicti consists of a showing of “1) the occurrence of the specific kind of injury and 2) someone’s criminal act as the cause of the injury.” Johnson v. State, 653 N.E.2d 478, 479 (Ind. 1995).

“State must produce corroborating evidence of “corpus delicti,” showing that injury or harm constituting crime occurred and that injury or harm was caused by someone’s criminal activity.” Jorgensen v. State, 567 N.E.2d 113, 121.

“To establish the corpus delicti, independent evidence must be presented showing the occurrence of a specific kind of injury and that a criminal act was the cause of the injury.” Porter v. State, 391 N.E.2d 801, 808-809.

3.Fraud

wrongful or criminal deception intended to result in financial or personal gain. a person or thing intended to deceive others, typically by unjustifiably claiming or

being credited with accomplishments or qualities.

4. Treason

the crime of betraying one's country, especially by attempting to kill the sovereign (s) or overthrow the government.

The action of betraying someone or something.

the offense of attempting to overthrow the government of one's country or of assisting its enemies in war; specifically : the act of levying war against the United States or adhering to or giving aid and comfort to its enemies by one who owes it allegiance.

18 U.S. Code § 2381 - Treason

Whoever, owing allegiance to the United States, levies war against them or adheres to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort within the United States or elsewhere, is guilty of treason and shall suffer death, or shall be imprisoned not less than five years and fined under this title but not less than \$10,000; and shall be incapable of holding any office under the United States.

(June 25, 1948, ch. 645, 62 Stat. 807; Pub. L. 103-322, title XXXIII, § 330016(2)(J), Sept. 13, 1994, 108 Stat. 2148.)

5. Sedition Espionage

The Espionage Act of 1917 was passed, along with the Trading with the Enemy Act, just after the United States entered World War I in April 1917. It was based on the Defense Secrets Act of 1911, especially the notions of obtaining or delivering information relating to "national defense" to a person who was not "entitled to have it", itself based on an earlier British Official Secrets Act. The Espionage Act law imposed much stiffer penalties than the 1911 law, including the death penalty.[3]

Use of semantics: There are some immature people with mental imbalances, such as the craving to dominate other people, who masquerade as "government," and call the noises and scribbles that emanate from their mouths and pens "the law" which "must be obeyed." Just because they alter definitions of words in their "law" books to their supposed advantage, doesn't mean I accept those definitions. The fact that they define the words "person," "address," "mail," "resident," "motor vehicle," "driving," "passenger," "employee," "income," and many others, in ways different from the common usage, so as to be associated with a subject or slave status, means nothing in real life.

Because the "courts" have become entangled in the game of semantics, be it known to all "courts" and all parties, that if I have ever signed any document or spoken any words on record, using words defined by twists in any "law" books different from the common usage, there can be no effect whatsoever on my sovereign status in society thereby, nor can there be created any "obligation" to perform in any manner, by the mere use of such words. Where the definition in the common dictionary differs from the definition in the "law" dictionary, it is the definition in the common dictionary that prevails, because it is more trustworthy. Such compelled and supposed "benefits" include, but are not limited to, the aforementioned typical examples. My use of such alleged "benefits" is under duress only, and is with full reservation of all my natural inherent rights. I have waived none of my intrinsic rights and freedoms by my use thereof. Furthermore, my use of such compelled "benefits" may be temporary, until alternatives become available, practical, and widely recognized.

"Sedition by Syntax"

Are you a National or citizen of the United States INC Be careful! I'll tell you something that the United States Government will never want to tell you: That's a

4701 "trick" question. The federal
4702 (feudal?) government will ask you that trick question quite often.
4703 It would be better to put the question like this: Are you a National or citizen of the
4704 United States INC, or a Citizen of one of the United
4705 States of America? Do you think the two are one and the same thing? Your education
4706 via government schools serves you poorly.
4707 Recall some fourth grade grammar, then check the Constitution for the United States
4708 of America, particularly the Preamble in that important document. Hereafter, we will
4709 refer to this
4710 Constitution as the "U.S. Constitution".for more

4711

4712 JUDICIAL IMMUNITY IS A FICTION

4713 "When a judge knows that he lacks jurisdiction, or acts in the face of clearly valid
4714 statutes expressly depriving him of jurisdiction, judicial immunity is lost¹." ... "A
4715 judge is not immune for tortious² acts committed in a purely Administrative,
4716 non-judicial capacity³." ... "There is no such thing as a power of inherent sovereignty
4717 in the government of the United States. It is a government of delegated powers,
4718 supreme within its prescribed sphere, but powerless outside of it. In this country
4719 sovereignty resides in the people, and Congress can exercise no power which they
4720 have not, by their Constitution, entrusted to it; all else is withheld⁴. ... "There is a
4721 general rule that a ministerial officer who acts wrongfully, although in good faith, is
4722 never-the-less liable in a civil action and cannot claim the immunity of the
4723 sovereign⁵". ... "Where there is no jurisdiction, there can be no discretion, for
4724 discretion is incident to
4725 jurisdiction⁶." ... "A judge must be acting within his jurisdiction as to subject matter
4726 and person, to be entitled to immunity from civil action for his acts⁷."
4727 "When a judicial officer acts entirely without jurisdiction or without compliance with
4728 jurisdiction requisites he may be held civilly liable for abuse of process even though
4729 his act involved a decision made in good faith, that he had jurisdiction⁸." ... "No
4730 judicial process, whatever form it may assume, can have any lawful authority outside
4731 of the limits of the jurisdiction of the court or judge by whom it is issued; and an
4732 attempt to enforce it beyond these boundaries is nothing less than lawless
4733 violence⁹." ... "No man in this country is so high that he is above the law. No officer
4734 of the law may set that law at defiance with impunity. All the officers of the
4735 government, from the highest to the lowest, are creatures of the law and are bound to
4736 obey it... It is the only supreme power in our system of government, and every man
4737 who, by accepting office participates in its functions, is only the more strongly bound
4738 to submit to that supremacy, and to
4739 observe the limitations which it imposes on the exercise of the authority which it
4740 gives¹⁰."

4741 "All law (rules and practices) which are repugnant to the Constitution are VOID. ...
4742 NO State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the rights, privileges, or
4743 immunities of citizens of the United States nor deprive any citizens of life, liberty, or
4744 property, without due process of law, ... or equal protection under the law", this
4745 renders judicial immunity unconstitutional¹¹." ... "Any judge who does not comply
4746 with his oath to the Constitution of the United States wars against that Constitution
4747 and engages in acts in violation of the supreme law of the land. The judge is engaged
4748 in acts of treason¹²." ... "no state legislator or executive or judicial officer can war
4749 against the Constitution without violating his undertaking to support it¹³".

4750 1 Zeller v. Rankin, 101 S.Ct. 2020, 451 U.S. 939, 68 L.Ed 2d 326

4751 2 TORTIOUS. Wrongful; of the nature of a tort. TORT (from Lat. torquere, to twist,
 4752 tortus, twisted, wrested aside). A private or civil wrong or injury.
 4753 3 Stump v. Sparkman, id., 435 U.S. 349
 4754 4 Juliard v. Greeman, 110 U.S. 421 (1884)
 4755 5 Cooper v. O'Conner, 99 F.2d 133;
 4756 6 Piper v. Pearson, 2 Gray 120, cited in Bradley v. Fisher, 13 Wall. 335, 20 L.Ed. 646
 4757 (1872)
 4758 7 Davis v. Burris, 51 Ariz. 220, 75 P.2d 689 (1938)
 4759 8 U.S. Fidelity & Guaranty Co. (State use of), 217 Miss. 576, 64 So. 2d 697
 4760 9 Ableman v. Booth, 21 Howard 506 (1859)
 4761 10 U.S. v. Lee, 106 U.S. 196, 220 1 S. Ct. 240, 261, 27 L. Ed 171 (1882)
 4762 11 Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S. (2 Cranch) 137, 180 (1803)
 4763 12 Cooper v. Aaron, 358 U.S. 1, 78 S. Ct. 1401 (1958)
 4764 13 Sawyer, 124 U.S. 200 (188); U.S. v. Will, 449 U.S. 200, 216, 101 S. Ct. 471, 66 L.
 4765 Ed. 2d 392, 406 (1980); Cohens v. Virginia, 19 U.S. (6 Wheat) 264, 404, 5 L. Ed 257
 4766 (1821)
 4767
 4768
 4769
 4770
 4771 exhibit Eight and evidence Kidnap and held for ransom human trafficking
 4772
 4773
 4774 In Bounds v. Smith, 430 U.S. 817 (1977), we held that "the fundamental
 4775 constitutional right of access to the courts requires prison authorities to assist inmates
 4776 in the preparation and filing of meaningful legal papers by providing prisoners with
 4777 adequate law libraries or adequate assistance from persons trained in the law."
 4778
 4779 Lewis v. Casey, 518 U.S. 343, 346 (U.S. 1996)
 4780
 4781 Whereas :
 4782 Title 42 § 408(a)(8) Title 42 § 408
 4783 (a) In general Whoever -
 4784 (8) discloses, uses, or compels the disclosure of the social security number of any
 4785 person in violation of the laws of the United States; shall be guilty of a felony and
 4786 upon conviction thereof shall be fined under title 18 or imprisoned for not more than
 4787 five years, or both.
 4788
 4789 Whereas : I Giving public notice on filing
 4790
 4791 Criminal Section Civil Rights Division
 4792 U.S. Department of Justice
 4793 P.O. Box 66018
 4794 Washington, D.C. 20035-6018
 4795 Civil Actions for False Imprisonment
 4796
 4797 Title 42, U.S.C., Section 14141, makes it unlawful for state or local law enforcement
 4798 agencies to allow officers to engage in a pattern or practice of conduct that deprives
 4799 persons of rights protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States. This law
 4800 is commonly referred to as the Police Misconduct Statute. This law gives DOJ the

authority to seek civil remedies in cases where it is determined that law enforcement agencies have policies or practices which foster a pattern of misconduct by employees. This action is directed against an agency, not against individual officers. The types of issues which may initiate a Pattern and Practice investigation include:

- Lack of supervision/monitoring of officers' actions.
- Officers not providing justification or reporting incidents involving the use of force.
- Lack of, or improper training of officers.
- A department having a citizen complaint process which treats complainants as adversaries.

Under Title 42, U.S.C., Section 1997, DOJ has the ability to initiate civil actions against mental hospitals, retardation facilities, jails, prisons, nursing homes, and juvenile detention facilities, when there are allegations of systemic derivations of the constitutional rights of institutionalized persons.

Also see Department of Justice 8-1.000 CIVIL RIGHTS DIVISION

False imprisonment is the unlawful restraint of a person without consent or legal justification. False imprisonment can be committed by words, acts, or by both[i]. The common law tort of false imprisonment is defined as an unlawful restraint of an individual's personal liberty or freedom of movement[ii]. In order to constitute the wrong it is not necessary that the individual be actually confined or assaulted[iii].

It is to be noted that, there is no necessity in a false imprisonment case to prove that a person used physical violence or laid hands on another person. It is sufficient to show that at any time or place the person in any manner deprived another person of his/her liberty without sufficient legal authority[iv].

False arrest is sometimes used interchangeably with false imprisonment. False arrest is the unlawful violation of the personal liberty of another consisting of detention without sufficient legal authority. In order to establish a false arrest claim, the person detained must prove that the arrest is unlawful and such unlawful arrest resulted in injury. An arrest is unlawful when the police officers in question did not have probable cause to make the arrest[v].

An arresting officer who fails to take the arrested person before a court or magistrate within a reasonable time or without unnecessary delay is guilty of false imprisonment. Similarly, an officer who arrests a person without a warrant is liable for false imprisonment by detaining the prisoner an unreasonable time[vi].

Generally, false arrest is one of several means of committing false imprisonment. False arrest describes the setting for false imprisonment when it is committed by a peace officer or by one who claims the power to make an arrest. Thus, a tort action for false imprisonment based on false arrest against a person who is not a peace officer implies that the detention or restraint to support the tort was done by one who claims the power of arrest[vii].

However, false arrest is almost indistinguishable from false imprisonment[viii]. The only distinction lies in the manner in which they arise. False arrest is merely one means of committing a false imprisonment. Whereas, false imprisonment is

committed without any thought of attempting arrest[ix].

The principal element of damages in an action for false imprisonment is the loss of freedom. Sometimes, a court also takes into account the fear and nervousness suffered as a result of the detention[x]. The tort of false imprisonment involves an unlawful restraint on freedom of movement or personal liberty. Therefore, two essential elements to constitute false imprisonment are[xi]:

Detention or restraint against a person's will,
Unlawfulness of the detention or restraint.

Whereas, after liability is established for false arrest, the person who suffered may recover nominal damages as well as compensation for mental suffering, including fright, shame, and mortification from the indignity and disgrace, consequent upon an illegal detention[xii]. However, in a suit for false arrest and false imprisonment, a person cannot recover attorney's fees incurred or loss of earnings suffered while defending an underlying criminal action[xiii].

The elements to be considered by the jury in awarding compensatory damages in a false imprisonment case are physical suffering, mental suffering and humiliation, loss of time and interruption of business, reasonable and necessary expenses incurred, and injury to reputation[xiv]. However, it is to be noted that a mere loss of freedom will not constitute false imprisonment[xv].

In a suit for false imprisonment, the damages award may include compensation for loss of earnings while imprisoned, for bodily and mental suffering caused by the imprisonment, and for expenses incurred in securing discharge from restraint including a reasonable attorney fee[xvi].

The measure of damages for false imprisonment is a sum that will fairly and reasonably compensate the injured person for the injuries caused by the wrongful act including any special pecuniary loss which is a direct result of the false imprisonment[xvii]. A jury can award punitive damages in a false arrest or imprisonment case, if the requisite level of malice or other requisite mental state is established.

All persons who personally participate or cause an unlawful detention are held to be liable. Similarly, persons other than those who actually cause an imprisonment may be held jointly liable with others, as instigators or participants. However, passive knowledge or consent to the acts of another, or acting on a superior's order, is not sufficient to make a person liable for false imprisonment.

It is to be noted that the jail officials are also held liable for false imprisonment for holding a person for an unreasonable time. A jail official is liable for false imprisonment if s/he knows that an arrest was illegal and that there is no right to imprison the person so arrested.

The liability of a principal for the act of an agent in causing a false arrest or imprisonment depends upon whether the principal previously authorized the act, or subsequently ratified it, or whether the act was within the scope of the employee's or

agent's employment[xviii]. However, an employer will not be held liable for false imprisonment for the actions of an employee which are outside the scope of employment.

In order to avoid liability in an action for false imprisonment, a person must establish that s/he did not imprison the other person or s/he must justify the imprisonment. The presence of probable cause for imprisonment is a defense if it constitutes reasonable grounds for acting in defense of property or making an arrest without a warrant. A person is not liable for false imprisonment, if the person restrained is a child under the age of seventeen upon certain conditions. However, contributory negligence is not considered a defense if the wrong is something more than mere negligence[xix].

A false imprisonment action cannot be maintained if a person is properly arrested by lawful authority without a warrant. In order to justify an arrest without a warrant, the arrestor must proceed as soon as may be to make the arrest. Therefore, a private person can arrest another for a public offense committed or attempted in his/her presence[xx].

Certain officials and professionals are exempted from civil liability for false imprisonment under certain circumstances. They are:

Judicial officers;
Government officials entrusted with judicial functions;
Attorneys;
Physicians.

A judicial officer who has jurisdiction of the person and of the subject matter is exempted from civil liability for false imprisonment so long as the judge acts within that jurisdiction and in a judicial capacity[xxi]. Similarly, officers in other government departments are also exempted from liability for false imprisonment whenever they are entrusted with the judicial exercise of discretionary power. Likewise, an attorney is also protected from personal liability for false imprisonment if s/he acts in good faith on behalf of his/her client. It is to be noted that physicians who give evidence in proceedings to determine sanity are also immune from liability for false imprisonment.

In the case of false imprisonment, the plaintiff has the burden of proving the false arrest. The plaintiff in a false imprisonment action must prove that the defendant proximately caused the injuries for which the plaintiff seeks damages[xxii].

[i] Dietz v. Finlay Fine Jewelry Corp., 754 N.E.2d 958 (Ind. Ct. App. 2001).

[ii] Pechulis v. City of Chicago, 1997 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 11856 (N.D. Ill. Aug. 7, 1997).

[iii] Whitman v. Atchison, T. & S. F. R. Co., 85 Kan. 150 (Kan. 1911).

[iv] Pechulis v. City of Chicago, 1997 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 11856 (N.D. Ill. Aug. 7, 1997).

- [v] Landry v. Duncan, 902 So. 2d 1098 (La.App. 5 Cir. Apr. 26, 2005).
- [vi] Dragna v. White, 45 Cal. 2d 469 (Cal. 1955).
- [vii] Rife v. D.T. Corner, Inc., 641 N.W.2d 761 (Iowa 2002).
- [viii] Kraft v. Bettendorf, 359 N.W.2d 466 (Iowa 1984).
- [ix] Harrer v. Montgomery Ward & Co., 124 Mont. 295 (Mont. 1950).
- [x] Pitts v. State, 51 Ill. Ct. Cl. 29 (Ill. Ct. Cl. 1999).
- [xi] Ette v. Linn-Mar Cmty. Sch. Dist., 656 N.W.2d 62 (Iowa 2002).
- [xii] Barnes v. District of Columbia, 452 A.2d 1198 (D.C. 1982).
- [xiii] Id.
- [xiv] Jenkins v. Pic-n-Pay Shoes, Inc., 1985 Tenn. LEXIS 536 (Tenn. July 15, 1985).
- [xv] Gee v. State, 21 Ill. Ct. Cl. 573 (Ill. Ct. Cl. 1954).
- [xvi] Phillips v. District of Columbia, 458 A.2d 722 (D.C. 1983).
- [xvii] Sindle v. New York City Transit Authority, 64 Misc. 2d 995 (N.Y. Sup. Ct. 1970).
- [xviii] Sears, Roebuck & Co. v. Steele, 23 Tenn. App. 275 (Tenn. Ct. App. 1939).
- [xix] Aiken v. Holyoke S. R. Co., 184 Mass. 269, 271 (Mass. 1903).
- [xx] Hill v. Levy, 117 Cal. App. 2d 667 (Cal. App. 1953).
- [xxi] Bahakel v. Tate, 503 So. 2d 837 (Ala. 1987).
- [xxii] Fischer v. Famous-Barr Co., 618 S.W.2d 446 (Mo. Ct. App. 1981)

Whereas :

PRISONER MAY NOT BE COMPEL TO STAND TRIAL BEFORE JURY IN
PRISION CLOTHES

“Holding that it is unconstitutional for a state to compel a defendant to stand trial before a jury while dressed in prison clothes because this "furthers no essential state policy" and presents an unacceptable risk of affecting jurors' judgment”
Padgett v. Sexton, No. 11-6276 (6th Cir. Jul. 2, 2013)

“Holding that a state cannot compel a criminal defendant to stand trial while dressed in identifiable prison clothes”

5001 U.S. v. FUERTES, 10-12111 (11th Cir. 2-22-2011), No. 10-12111 Non-Argument
 5002 Calendar. (11th Cir. Feb. 22, 2011)
 5003
 5004 “Holding that “the failure to make an objection to the court as to being tried in such
 5005 clothes . . . is sufficient to negate the presence of compulsion necessary to establish a
 5006 constitutional violation””
 5007 U.S. v. COOPER, 591 F.3d 582 (7th Cir. 2010)
 5008
 5009 “Holding that an accused may not be compelled to stand trial before a jury while
 5010 dressed in identifiable prison clothes”
 5011 U.S. v. RODRÍGUEZ-DURÁN, 507 F.3d 749 (1st Cir. 2007)
 5012
 5013 “Holding that forcing defendant to wear prison clothing violated his right to
 5014 presumption of innocence”
 5015 CHAVEZ v. COCKRELL, 310 F.3d 805 (5th Cir. 2002)
 5016
 5017 “Holding unconstitutional a requirement that defendant appear in prison garb at trial”
 5018 U.S. v. CHILDRESS, 58 F.3d 693 (D.C. Cir. 1995)
 5019
 5020 “Holding that both due process and equal protection rights are violated when a
 5021 defendant is forced to appear in prison garb simply because he cannot afford bail”
 5022 Hyatt v. Gelb, 142 F.Supp.3d 198 (D. Mass. 2015)
 5023
 5024 “Holding that compelling a defendant to appear at trial in jail uniform violates due
 5025 process”
 5026 Throop v. Diaz, CASE NO. 12cv1870-LAB (NLS) (S.D. Cal. Feb. 26, 2015)
 5027
 5028 “Holding that state cannot, consistent with due process and equal protection, require
 5029 an accused to stand trial while wearing identifiable prison clothes”
 5030 Nelson v. McDaniel, 3:09-cv-00742-RCJ-VPC (D. Nev. Oct. 17, 2013)
 5031
 5032 “Holding that the 14th Amendment forbids a requirement that a criminal defendant
 5033 stand trial in identifiable prison clothes” Chavez v. Yates, No. CIV S-09-1876 KJM
 5034 CHS (E.D. Cal. Dec. 15, 2011)
 5035
 5036 “Holding that defendants may not be presented to the jury in prison-issue clothing so
 5037 that “an unacceptable risk is presented of impermissible factors coming into play”
 5038 where to do so “furthers no essential state policy”” EVANS v. VOORHIES, Case No.
 5039 1:06cv746. (S.D. Ohio Aug. 30, 2007)
 5040
 5041 “Holding that defendants may not be presented to the jury in prison issue clothing so
 5042 that “an unacceptable risk is presented of impermissible factors coming into play”
 5043 where to do so “furthers no essential state policy”” EARHART v. KONTEH,
 5044 C-1-06-62. (S.D. Ohio Aug. 29, 2007)
 5045
 5046 “Holding that, because criminal defendants sometimes choose to appear in jail clothes
 5047 in hopes of eliciting sympathy from the jury, an objection must be made when
 5048 non-jail clothes are not made available” KING v. WHITE, (C.D.Cal. 1993), 839 F.
 5049 Supp. 718 (C.D. Cal. 1993)
 5050

5051 “Holding that the presumption of innocence is a basic component of a fair trial”
5052 Gates v. State, 381 P.3d 614 (Nev. 2012)
5053
5054 “Holding that defendant who appeared before jury in prison uniform had received fair
5055 trial because he was not compelled to appear in that manner and noting that "it is not
5056 an uncommon defense tactic to produce the defendant in jail clothes in the hope of
5057 eliciting sympathy from the jury"”
5058 RYAN v. PALMATEER, 338 Or. 278 (Or. 2005)
5059
5060 “Holding that criminal defendants have a constitutional right not to be compelled to
5061 appear before a jury in jail attire” State v. Cunningham, No. 1 CA-CR 15-0831 (Ariz.
5062 Ct. App. Jun. 29, 2017)
5063
5064 “Holding that threat to the "fairness of the factfinding process" created by forcing a
5065 defendant to appear in prison garb must be justified by an "essential state policy"”
5066 State v. Davidson, No. E2013-00394-CCA-R3-DD (Tenn. Crim. App. Mar. 10, 2015)
5067
5068 “Holding the jury's continuous exposure to the defendant in jail attire amounted to
5069 prejudice and impaired the presumption of innocence”Cunningham v. State, 992
5070 N.E.2d 235 (Ind. App. 2013)
5071
5072 “Holding that the State cannot, consistently with the Fourteenth Amendment, compel
5073 an accused to stand trial before a jury while dressed in identifiable prison clothes, but
5074 that the absence of objection negates the compulsion.”STATE v. SIMPSON, 202 N.C.
5075 App. 586 (N.C. Ct. App. 2010)
5076
5077 “Holding that although a defendant cannot be compelled to stand trial in prison garb,
5078 failure to object negates the presence of any compulsion that would give rise to a due
5079 process violation”
5080 WATLEY v. DEPT. OF REHAB. CORR., 06AP-1128 (4-19-2007), No. 06AP-1128.
5081 (Ohio Ct. App. Apr. 19, 2007)
5082
5083 “Holding that identifiable prison garb bears an unmistakable mark of guilt”
5084 STATE v. MAKI, W2001-00414-CCA-R3-CD (Tenn.Crim.App. 12-28-2001), No.
5085 W2001-00414-CCA-R3-CD. (Tenn. Crim. App. Dec. 28, 2001)
5086
5087 “Holding violation of due process to compel defendant to wear prison attire in front of
5088 jury because attire may affect fact-finding process” STATE v. REMUS,
5089 W1999-01448-CCA-R3-CD (Tenn.Crim.App. 3-8-2000), No.
5090 W1999-01448-CCA-R3-CD. (Tenn. Crim. App. Mar. 8, 2000)
5091
5092 “Holding that although the State cannot compel an accused to stand trial while
5093 dressed in identifiable prison clothes, the failure to make an objection is sufficient to
5094 negate the presence of compulsion necessary to establish a constitutional violation”
5095 DICKENS v. STATE, 0112001247 (Del.Super. 7-11-2003), I.D.# 0112001247. (Del.
5096 Super. Ct. Jul. 11, 2003)
5097
5098 “Finding that an inflammatory photograph of a defendant in a prison jumpsuit
5099 "constant[ly] remind[ed]" the jury of past criminality and "undermine[d] the fairness
5100 of the fact-finding process"”

U.S. v. ORTIZ, 474 F.3d 976 (7th Cir. 2007)

"Finding that a "constant reminder of the accused's condition implicit in such distinctive, identifiable attire [prison clothes] may affect a juror's judgment," and thereby unacceptably "undermine the fairness of the fact-finding process"" U.S. v. OWENS, 424 F.3d 649 (7th Cir. 2005)

Whereas: The first amendment of the Constitution of the United States says:

Quote:

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

It was written by Thomas Jefferson, who became President in 1801. In 1802 he wrote a letter to the Danbury Baptist Association saying that its purpose was to build "a wall of separation between Church and State", because they were asking him what the first amendment was really all about.

Jefferson also wrote in his Inagural address:

Quote:

Still one thing more, fellow-citizens -- a wise and frugal Government, which shall restrain men from injuring one another, shall leave them otherwise free to regulate their own pursuits of industry and improvement, and shall not take from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned. This is the sum of good government, and this is necessary to close the circle of our felicities.

In other words, unless the government can show that people are injuring each other, it has no business restricting their activities.

I agree with Jefferson that "No victim, no crime" is not just a catchy slogan, but should be the foundation of all law, because the purpose of the law is to protect people (and other innocent parties such as animals and the environment) from the actions of others. If the law does anything else it becomes a set of meaningless rules that has no real basis.

The the ninth and tenth amendments of the Constitution also state:

Quote:

Amendment 9 - Construction of Constitution. Ratified 12/15/1791.

The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

Amendment 10 - Powers of the States and People. Ratified 12/15/1791.

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

"Color of law"

From FBI website at <http://www.fbi.gov/hq/cid/civilrights/color.htm>

It is a crime for one or more persons acting under color of law willfully to deprive or conspire to deprive another person of any right protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States.

"Color of law" simply means that the person doing the act is using power given to him or her by a governmental agency (local, state or federal).

Criminal acts under color of law include acts not only done by local, state, or federal

officials within the bounds or limits of their lawful authority, but also acts done beyond the bounds of their lawful authority. Off-duty conduct may also be covered under color of law, if the perpetrator asserted their official status in some manner. Color of law may include public officials who are not law enforcement officers, for example, judges and prosecutors, as well as, in some circumstances, non governmental employees who are asserting state authority, such as private security guards. While the federal authority to investigate color of law type violations extends to any official acting under "color of law", the vast majority of the allegations are against the law enforcement community. The average number of all federal civil rights cases initiated by the FBI from 1997 -2000 was 3513. Of those cases initiated, about 73% were allegations of color of law violations. Within the color of law allegations, about 82% were allegations of abuse of force with violence (59% of the total number of civil rights cases initiated).

"PEOPLE COMPELLED TO FILE INCOME TAXES VIOLATES THE 5TH AMENDMENT" Supreme Court ruled that income taxes constitute the compelled testimony of a witness: "The information revealed in the preparation and filing of an income tax return is, for the purposes of Fifth Amendment analysis, the testimony of a witness." "Government compels the filing of a return much as it compels, for example, the appearance of a 'witness' before a grand jury." *Garner v. United States*, 424 U.S. 648 (1975). ∴ Established that wages and income are NOT equivalent as far as taxes on income are concerned. "Decided cases have made the distinction between wages and income and have refused to equate the two in withholding or similar controversies. *Central Illinois Public Service Co. v. United States*, 435 U.S. 21(1978); *Peoples Life Ins. Co. v. United States*, 179 Ct. Cl. 318, 332, 373 F.2d 924, 932 (1967); *Humble Pipe Line Co. v. United States*, 194 Ct. Cl. 944, 950, 442 F.2d 1353, 1356 (1971); *Humble Oil & Refining Co. v. United States*, 194 Ct. Cl. 920, 442 F.2d 1362 (1971); *Stubbs, Overbeck & Associates v. United States*, 445 F.2d 1142 (CA5 1971); *Royster Co. v. United States*, 479 F.2d, at 390; (4th Cir. 1973); *Acacia Mutual Life Ins. Co. v. United States*, 272 F. Supp. 188 (Md. 1967). Supreme Court ruled that: "Waivers of Constitutional Rights not only must be voluntary, they must be knowingly intelligent acts, done with sufficient awareness of the relevant circumstances and consequences.": *Brady v. U.S.*, 397 U.S. 742 at 748 (1970) (a) not effectively connected with the conduct of a "trade or business" (public office per 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(26)) in the United States (government), (b) not earned from sources within the geographical federal 5 territory. See *Newman-Green v. Alfonso Larrain*, 490 U.S. 826 (1989) "United States" defined in 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(9) and (a)(10), (c) not subject to reporting per 26 U.S.C. §6041 because not connected to a statutory "trade or business" (public office) (d) not subject to withholding because not statutory "income" per 26 U.S.C. §643(b) and earned by a "non-resident non-person non-taxpayer" <http://new.oregontrackers.com/home.html>

COURTS ARE FREE IF YOU DON'T READ AND LEARN THIS YOU WILL END UP PAYING BETWEEN 300 AND 600 DOLLARS TO FILE A 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 US653 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,

5301 NOTICE AND CONCLUSION IN LAW

5302 So in closing it is clear petitioners /plaintiffs must have their funds, refunded if
5303 PLAINTIFFS have paid under Title 28 U.S.C. 1914 – (District court; filing and
5304 miscellaneous fees; rules of court) or not be charged at all, as the sovereign people are
5305 entitled to free access of the courts. Plaintiffs believe this is proper, in any form, as
5306 the people's tax dollars fund these courts. If the people are not, to have free access
5307 then the tax dollars should stop flowing, for this purpose. Because it would mean the
5308 courts, are receiving enumeration twice. Once by taxes then paid, again by the people
5309 paying for a use of the courts, when, their tax dollars had already paid. Petitioners also
5310 respectfully demands the Magistrate takes judicial notice of all herein under RULE
5311 201 (d) which is adjudicated facts.

5312 Petitioners also gives notice to the Magistrate, that the Magistrate is bound by US
5313 Supreme Court rulings please see the following. Howlett V. Rose, 496 U.S. 356 (1990)
5314 Federal Law and Supreme Court cases apply to State court cases. (Cooper v. Aaron,
5315 358 U.S. 1) (1958)--States are bound by United States Supreme Court Case decisions.
5316 I/We declare swear and affirm under penalty of perjury that, to the best of my
5317 knowledge and belief, the information herein is true, correct, and complete &
5318 pursuant to 28 U.S. Code § 1746 - Unsworn declarations under penalty of perjury

5319
5320 lawful bloodline Americans only.....Federal Immigration and Nationality Act
5321 Section 8 USC 1324(a)(1)(A)(iv)(b)(iii) original 1774 do you research
5322 <http://www.americanpatrol.com/.../AidAbetUnlawfulSec8USC1324....>

5323
5324
5325
5326 TITLE 7. OFFENSES AGAINST PROPERTY CHAPTER 31. THEFT
5327 Sec. 31.01. DEFINITIONS. In this chapter:

5328
5329
5330
5331
5332
5333 Exhibit Nine and Evedence I lawful Native Not your Citezen

5334
5335
5336
5337 "I'm not your citizen," NIT' NE'E' SPEAKS (1/2)
5338 <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2dsK86X8jk4>

5339
5340
5341 "I'm not your citizen," NIT' NE'E' SPEAKS (2/2)
5342 <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zMDb-gBPtBo>

5343
5344
5345 Federal Immigration and Nationality Act Section 8 USC 1324(a)(1)(A)(iv)(b)(iii)
5346 "Any person who . . . encourages or induces an alien to . . . reside . . . knowing or in
5347 reckless disregard of the fact that such . . . residence is . . . in violation of law, shall be
5348 punished as provided . . . for each alien in respect to whom such a violation occurs . . .
5349 fined under title 18 . . . imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both."

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, unless an American Indian original to this land, subject to the jurisdiction of the Fourteenth Amendment "...Elk v. Wilkins, Neb (1884) 5 s.ct.41,112 U.S. 99,28 L.Ed. 643.

Citizens(Federal) and Persons vs. Lawful bloodline american People Non Corporation

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

[1] This is a BOLD LIE, it was never ratified per Article V of the U.S. Constitution (Congressional Record House, June 13, 1967, pg 15641-15646 and Dyett v Turner (1968) are VERY CLEAR about this)

trust no man or woman who claims to be a national

this new group of of folks apprises to conspired and pirated to steal David and

Edwards Book for their own gain wont to call them selves lawful American solution ,
 to heed of mine and David work and education for the last sever years . I recognize
 the set up by men and woman attempting to claim a title of nobility in a contract
 violation of the Constitution of the untied State of forty eight states lawful American
 bloodline , lawful Americans lawful native rights rights
<https://lookaside.fbsbx.com/.../A%20Constitutional%20Affidavi...>
 Look at the fraud folks Gibbons v Ogden 1824 supreme court “Persons are not the
 subjects of commerce...”
 “There is a distinction between a debt discharged and one paid. When discharged, the
 debt still exists, though divested of its character as a legal obligation during the
 operation of the discharge.” Stanek v. White (1927), 172 Minn. 390, 215 N.W. 781.
 Ballentines Law Dictionary, 3rd Edition: Dollar. The legal currency of the United
 States; State v Downs, 148 Ind 324, 327; the unit of money consisting of one hundred
 cents. The aggregate of specific coins which add up to one dollar. 36 Am J1st Money
 § 8. In the absence of qualifying words, it cannot mean promissory notes, bonds, or
 other evidences of debt. 36 AM J 1st Money § 8. 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, unless an American Indian original to this
 land, subject to the jurisdiction of the Fourteenth Amendment “...Elk v. Wilkins, Neb
 (1884) 5 s.ct.41,112 U.S. 99,28 L.Ed. 643.
 8 U.S. Code § 1401 - Nationals and citizens of United States at birth
 1978—Subsec. (a). Pub. L. 95–432, § 3, struck out “(a)” before “The following” and
 redesignated pars. (1) to (7) as (a) to (g), respectively.
 wake to the truth nationals and U.S. citizens are declared enemies of the U.S. by
 F.D.R. by Executive Order No. 2040 and ratified by Congress on March 9, 1933
 FDR changed the meaning of The Trading with the Enemy Act of December 6, 1917
 by changing the word "without" to citizens "within" the United States
 To cover the debt in 1933 and future debt, the corporate government determined and
 established the value of the future labor of each incorporated individual in its
 jurisdiction to be \$630,000. A bond of \$630,000 is set on each Certificate of Live
 Birth. The certificates are bundled together into sets and then placed as securities on
 the open market. These certificates are then purchased by the Federal Reserve and/or
 foreign bankers. The purchaser is the "holder" of "Title." This process made each and
 every person in this jurisdiction a bond servant.
 U.S. citizens were declared enemies of the U.S. by F.D.R. by Executive Order No.
 2040 and ratified
 WHAT IS HJR 192? Can we Discharge our Debts to
 the...<http://understandcontractlawandyouwin.com/hjr-192-discharg>
 .../ Jun 7, 2014 ... House Joint Resolution 192 was then passed by Congress on June 5,
 1933. This law was passed to do away with the gold clause For lawful Bloodline
 American ...
 House Joint Resolution 192, 1933 - *****Redemption - tribe.net

5451 tribes.tribe.net/redemption101/thread/07f05122-0090-408b

5452 ...

5453

5454 House Joint Resolution 192 ... this Article does not contain an absolute prohibition

5455 against the States making something else a tender in transfer of debt. HJR-192 ...

5456

5457 .Background- 1933 The Bankruptcy of the

5458 UNITED...www.youhavetheright.com/tour3

5459

5460

5461 randy was on a lot of on talk shows Joseph F. Bataillon; Impersonating a Judge?

5462 DEMAND FOR CERTIFIED COPIES OF REQUIRED CONSTITUTIONAL

5463 OATHS AND BONDING AND/OR PUBLIC OFFICIAL LIABILITY INSURANCE

5464 POLICIES<https://scannedretina.com/2013/06/04/joseph-f-bataillon-impersonating-a-judge/>

5465

5466

5467

5468

5469

5470 exhibit Ten and evidence claim

5471

5472 Whereas As I believe in the greatspirit and mother earth the creator not the British

5473 bible of enslavement

5474

5475 It is my innerstanding that the foreign power controlling Americans operates under

5476 the corporate name UNITED STATES (INC.), also doing business as THE UNITED

5477 STATES OF AMERICA (INC.). This corporation is controlled by the Crowns of the

5478 Vatican (the Holy See). The Vatican is one of the States of the Holy Roman Empire.

5479 To learn more about this, read my empowering article titled Why Rome (the Holy

5480 Roman Empire) Still Rules the the black rob popes aka Black robe judges and

5481 attorney lawyers administration rules for the profits of the Vatican .

5482

5483 To really innerstand what this drama is really about, you need to know the spiritual

5484 side of the legal system and how words are used to enslave your body, mind and soul.

5485 A great source to learn about the powers of words and the legal system is my

5486 empowering and enlightening book titled Word Magic: The Powers & Occult

5487 Definitions of Words.

5488

5489 Religious discrimination treating a person or group differently because of what they

5490 believe in. Specifically, it is when adherents of different religions (or Taking action

5491 about discrimination on the grounds of religion or belief, explaining when it is

5492 unlawful or not unlawful and organisations which can help. including cruelty to

5493 animals is a crime

5494

5495

5496

5497 The treaty of 1213 invaded our native lands The British bible

5498

5499

5500 British servant John Milton Chivington (January 27, 1821 – October 4, 1894) was a

former Methodist pastor who served as colonel in the United States Volunteers during the Colorado War and the Ignoring the U.S. flag, and a white flag they raised shortly after the soldiers began firing, Chivington's soldiers massacred the majority of the ...

Still to-date British Foreign Agents Elected and public servants still Assault , cage people lOct 17, 2014 ... The U.S. Federal Bureau of Investigation will soon classify animal abuse as a Group A offense — a crime category shared with murder and This new FBI categorization is intended to improve the way crimes against animals are tracked nationwide and could help bolster state animal cruelty laws jail shall be included 7 U.S. Code § 136 - Definitions | US Law | LII / Legal...

www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/7/136

The term “animal” means all vertebrate and invertebrate species, including but together with any requirements imposed under section 136a(d) of this title.... including attempt to kill , kill , rape robe in the name of the bible god,

Is it true the Indians were intentionally wrapped in blankets...

www.missionscalifornia.com/ate/it-true-indians-intentionally-wrapped-blankets-had-been-infected-chicken-pox-order-kill-them.htm

... infected by chicken pox in order to kill them? Where can I find the information concerning the causes of the sharp decline in the California Indian population?

Did the U.S. Army Distribute Smallpox Blankets to Indians ...

quod.lib.umich.edu/p/plag/5240451.0001.009/--did-the-us-army-distribute-smallpox-blankets-to-indians?rgn=main;view=fulltext

There is no evidence that anyone passed out infested blankets to Indians with The same year that Churchill published his Roosting Chickens version of the 1837 ... Quarantining people who'd come down with the pox had been standard ...

Native American disease and epidemics - Wikipedia

en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Native_American_disease_and_epidemics

European diseases and epidemics pervade many aspects of Native American life , both ... Native Americans, due to the lack of prior contact with Europeans, had not not be contrived to send the small pox among the disaffected tribes of Indians? ... smallpox-infested blankets were intentionally given to Native Americans in ...

Native Americans in the U.S. and Property Rights: A Comparative...

www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2016/07/native-americans-property-rights/492941/

Jul 30, 2016 ... The Pine Ridge Indian Reservation in South Dakota Andy Clark / Reuters ... is worse among the half of Natives who live on reservations. ... As Cecilia Fire Thunder, the former chief of the Lakota tribe on the Pine Ridge reservation, told ... No bank could ever foreclose on a property, because the bank can't .

5551 Whereas :Henry B. Whipple | The U.S.-Dakota War of 1862
5552 www.usdakotawar.org/history/henry-b-whipple
5553
5554 Abraham Lincoln on Henry Whipple's report during his visit to the President in the
5555 fall ... From, in part, Henry Benjamin Whipple: An Inventory of His Papers at the ...
5556
5557 To date Elected and public servants our doing this to all to protect privately owns
5558 jails Private Jails in the United States - FindLaw
5559 [civilrights.findlaw.com/other-constitutional-rights/private-jails-in-the-united-states.ht](http://civilrights.findlaw.com/other-constitutional-rights/private-jails-in-the-united-states.html)
5560 [ml](http://civilrights.findlaw.com/other-constitutional-rights/private-jails-in-the-united-states.html)
5561
5562 Privately run prisons promised increased, business-like efficiency, which would ...
5563 Corrections Corporation of America alone owns more than 65 correctional ...
5564
5565 What's the matter with Kansas's private prisons? - Daily Kos
5566 [www.dailykos.com/story/2016/9/9/1568429/-What-s-the-matter-with-Kansas-s-privat](http://www.dailykos.com/story/2016/9/9/1568429/-What-s-the-matter-with-Kansas-s-private-corrections)
5567 [e-corrections](http://www.dailykos.com/story/2016/9/9/1568429/-What-s-the-matter-with-Kansas-s-private-corrections)
5568
5569 Sep 9, 2016 ... Leavenworth Detention Center, a private prison in Kansas, is facing
5570 investigation after ... large, privately held firms that earn an estimated \$1.2 billion per
5571 year. ... The private companies also offer state and local authorities a ...
5572
5573 Kansas Department of Corrections - Wikipedia
5574 en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kansas_Department_of_Corrections
5575
5576 The Kansas Department of Corrections is a cabinet-level agency of Kansas that
5577 operates the state's correctional facilities, both juvenile and adult; the state's
5578
5579 A long time ago the Indian people also promised to protect the land and have the. ... It
5580 was almost two decades before the Catholic Missionaries returned. ... Tribes heard
5581 rumors that government representatives were plotting to steal the homelands. By
5582 1878 in the "Annual Report" from the Commissioner of Indian Affairs it ..to force
5583 them to become christens . 1878 British catholic missionaries stealing native Indians
5584 still to-date
5585
5586
5587 Kill the Indian, Save the Man: The Genocidal Impact of ... -...
5588 [en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kill_the_Indian,_Save_the_Man:_The_Genocidal_Impact_of](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kill_the_Indian,_Save_the_Man:_The_Genocidal_Impact_of_American_Indian_Residential_Schools)
5589 [American_Indian_Residential_Schools](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kill_the_Indian,_Save_the_Man:_The_Genocidal_Impact_of_American_Indian_Residential_Schools)
5590
5591 Kill the Indian, Save the Man: The Genocidal Impact of American Indian Residential
5592 Schools is a 2004 book by the American Ward Churchill, then a professor at ... Kill
5593 the Indian, Save the Man: The Genocidal Impact of ... -...
5594 [en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kill_the_Indian,_Save_the_Man:_The_Genocidal_Impact_of](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kill_the_Indian,_Save_the_Man:_The_Genocidal_Impact_of_American_Indian_Residential_Schools)
5595 [American_Indian_Residential_Schools](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kill_the_Indian,_Save_the_Man:_The_Genocidal_Impact_of_American_Indian_Residential_Schools)
5596
5597 Kill the Indian, Save the Man: The Genocidal Impact of American Indian Residential
5598 Schools is a 2004 book by the American Ward Churchill, then a professor at ... Kill
5599 the Indian, Save the Man: The Genocidal Impact of ... -...
5600 [en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kill_the_Indian,_Save_the_Man:_The_Genocidal_Impact_of](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kill_the_Indian,_Save_the_Man:_The_Genocidal_Impact_of_American_Indian_Residential_Schools)

[American Indian Residential Schools](#)

Kill the Indian, Save the Man: The Genocidal Impact of American Indian Residential Schools is a 2004 book by the American Ward Churchill, then a professor at ...

Private Industries — Kansas Department of Corrections

www.doc.ks.gov/facilities/hcf/programs/private-industry

Mar 7, 2017 ... Private correctional industries are public-private partnerships in or ... fee for room and board costs that are repaid to the state's general fund.

Whereas Feed the Devil ,, destroy family children woman and men for the devils bible in the name of god

Kansas prisons full; official outlines \$27 million expansion...

www.kansas.com/news/politics-government/article42343665.html

Nov 2, 2015 ... He also said the state could boost the number of inmates held in county jails or private prisons, though he called either idea a temporary

The Royal Blog of Oz: Was L. Frank Baum racist?

newwoz.blogspot.com/2013/03/was-l-frank-baum-racist.html

Mar 19, 2013 ... In The Patchwork Girl of Oz, Baum introduces a lively group of people ... is a couple columns for his newspaper The Aberdeen Saturday Pioneer. ... Writing a suggestion to exterminate the remaining Sioux was wrong, ... I recently read a 19th Century Peruvian novel that champions the cause of the Indians of ..

Black Hills Land Claim - Wikipedia

en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Black_Hills_Land_Claim

The Black Hills Land Claim is an ongoing land dispute between Native Americans from the On June 30, 1980 the United States Supreme Court ruled in an 8-1 majority to uphold the In the present day, the government has recognized that the seizure of land in 1877 was illegal but is still unwilling to return the Black Hills.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

www.bia.gov/cs/groups/public/documents/text/idc011935.pdf

September 8, 2000. 202-208-3710. GOVER APOLOGIZES FOR BIA's MISDEEDS ... 175th anniversary, Assistant Secretary-Indian Affairs Kevin Gover today

Whereas ;hemp

""""Whereas: The Constitution fact Keep in mind that this Hemp plant existed at the time of the founders, as did others that had similar effects. And yet the federal

government did not regulate them. Instead, they chose to leave it to the states, which, for the most part, also chose not to regulate it until the last century or so. Indeed, an early federal prohibition against marijuana, the Marihuana Stamp Tax Act of 1937, was later found unconstitutional on the grounds that it required self incrimination.

Leary v. United States, 395 U.S. 6 (1969), is a U.S. Supreme Court case dealing with the constitutionality of the Marihuana Tax Act of 1937. Timothy Leary, a professor and activist, was arrested for the possession of marijuana in violation of the Marihuana Tax Act. Leary challenged the act on the ground that the act required self-incrimination, which violated the Fifth Amendment. The unanimous opinion of the court was penned by Justice John Marshall Harlan II and declared the Marihuana Tax Act unconstitutional. Thus, Leary's conviction was overturned. Congress responded shortly thereafter by replacing the Marihuana Tax Act with the newly written Controlled Substances Act while continuing the prohibition of certain drugs in the United States.[1]

Marihuana Tax Act, marijuana was used almost peyote was unconstitutional as applied to members of the Native American. Stamp Act violated the bounds of the British constitutional system. ... to evade federal attempts to prohibit marijuana and create a federal ID

Whereas by the Constitution First, I would like to discuss the “peace” pipes, something that is both a symbol for Native Americans, and in many ways a stereotype. Many aspects of the Pan-Indian icon image have infiltrated the media. I refer to the long-standing tradition of grouping all natives into one basic image of a man, almost naked, a peace pipe in his hand and a feathered headdress on his long-haired head, and no clue about the “modern” world is a In some ceremonies hemp were burnt as an "invitation to the spirits". ... in Mie prefecture and other shrines that involve the burning of taima (marijuana).

Cannabis is considered a sacred herb in many tribes, . Some used it in food, medicine, and smoke blends. Some tribes used it in a handful of rituals; others used it more as a daily prayer and meditation herb. There are many forms of anthropological evidence of this, dating a few thousand years before the Asians have written proof of use. Most strains found on the East coast were not as good as those from India, but were growing both wild and cultivated long before Europeans’ arrival on this side of the world.

.Considered to be sacred, marijuana has been used in religious worship from This common thread is found throughout the Bible, including the New Testament. religious ceremonies because of hemp's traditional association with purity.

exhibit Eleven and evidence claim

Judge I Nii Nee Lawful Bloodline Native 18 U.S. Code § 3771 - Crime victims’ rights Kidnap and held for reason personage Injured Party insert my rights to Elected and public Severn of the State of Kansas Corporation One State of the forty eight states

5701 union
5702 DEMAND FOR CERTIFIED COPIES OF REQUIRED Certified
5703 CONSTITUTIONAL OATHS AND All BONDING AND/OR PUBLIC OFFICIAL
5704 LIABILITY INSURANCE POLICE and personal liability
5705
5706
5707 Original ratified Amendment 13, dates back to 1812-1818, and I have 4 original
5708 volumes in my possession showing the ORIGINAL 13th printed in Mass. 1822, Conn.
5709 1835, & more. So all the above crap about Anti-slavery so called "Thirteenth
5710 Amendment of 1865" is just that ... Long ROTTING CRAP. It was in fact
5711 mis-numbered intentionally and should have been the 14th. Lincoln was soon
5712 assassinated and few cared about the NUMBER of an Amendment that could only be
5713 passed after a CIVIL WAR. My 4 volumes are ORIGINALS, not reprints or
5714 copies. They are almost 200 years old and were the respective states OWN official
5715 records.
5716
5717 Proposed thirteenth amendment, April 30, 1861. ... was proposed and finally passed;
5718 the ratified Thirteenth Amendment ended slavery throughout the United
5719
5720 On this day in History, 13th Amendment ratified on Dec 06, 1865. Learn more about
5721 what happened today on History.
5722
5723 Original 13th Amendment Testimony in New Hampshire
5724 https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=q9SXU_I1nIY
5725
5726
5727 The Constitution is not a physical substance. It is in the nature of a grant or power, or
5728 what would be termed, in private law, a power of attorney. A real Constitution is a
5729 grant of rights or powers by a sovereign. The sovereign cannot be limited, for he is the
5730 source of all law. Judge Matthews in Yick Wo v. Hopkins, 118 U.S. 370.
5731
5732 If the sovereign, so called, is limited by some external power, then he is not the real
5733 sovereign; it is the power imposing the limitation that possesses sovereignty. This is
5734 so because sovereignty is something which cannot be limited. It is the ultimate power.
5735 The sovereignty in the United States is in the people of the States.
5736
5737 De Lima v. Bidwell, 182 U.S. 1, 35 (U.S. 1901)
5738
5739
5740 It is the duty of every lawful Bloodline American to oppose all enemies of this Nation,
5741 foreign and DOMESTIC. (Note added: Every Lawful and recognized American
5742 Citizen including all Elected, Appointed, hired public servant(s), Children's Protection
5743 Services, Police, Sheriff's, Martials, CIA, FBI, Capital Police, Secret Service, City
5744 Council, County Commissioners, Board of Commissioners, et al, Religious
5745 Organizations, Associations, Schools, Colleges, Universities, Schools of Law,
5746 Corporations, LLC's, Doctors, Nurses, Health Care Providers, Unions, et al, to
5747 preform they of Oath of Office, in compliance to the 1776 Constitution for the United
5748 States of America, to all matters herein related thereof.) Please help pass this
5749 information to other professionals in your area – and honor thy 1776 Constitutional
5750 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 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]

National , Citizens(Federal) and Persons vs. Lawful bloodline americans we the People

NATIONALS , 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---

artificial entities cannot take oaths, they cannot make affidavits. See, e.g., In re Empire Refining Co., 1 F. Supp. 548, 549 (SD Cal. 1932) ("It is, of course, conceded that a corporation cannot make an affidavit in its corporate name. It is an inanimate thing incapable of voicing an oath"); Moya Enterprises, Inc. v. Harry Anderson Trucking, Inc., 162 Ga. App. 39, 290 S.E.2d 145 (1982); Strand Restaurant Co. v. Parks Engineering Co., 91 A.2d 711 (D.C. 1952); 9A T. Bjur C. Slezak, Fletcher Cyclopedia of Law of Private Corporations § 4629 (Perm. ed. 1992) ("A document purporting to be the affidavit of a corporation is void, since a corporation cannot make a sworn statement") (footnote omitted). ROWLAND v. CALIFORNIA MEN'S COLONY•506 U.S. 194, 203 (1993)

All codes, rules, and regulations are for government authorities only, not human/Creators in accordance with God's laws. All codes, rules, and regulations are unconstitutional and lacking due process..." Rodriques v. Ray Donovan (U.S. Department of Labor) 769 F. 2d 1344, 1348 (1985).

Federal Law also prohibits Cities and Counties from issuing citations against businesses, see Title 18 U.S.C.891-896, quoting Section 891 "An extortionate means is any means which involves the use, or an express or implicit threat of use, of violence or other criminal means to cause harm to the person, reputation, or property." No one Is bound to obey an unconstitutional law and no courts are bound to enforce them Federal Law also prohibits Cities and Counties from issuing citations against businesses, see Title 18 U.S.C.891-896, quoting Section 891 "An extortionate means is any means which involves the use, or an express or implicit threat of use, of violence or other criminal means to cause harm to the person, reputation, or property." No one Is bound to obey an unconstitutional law and no courts are bound to enforce "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. It is not the duty of the police to protect you. Their job is to protect the Corporation and arrest code breakers." (Sapp v. Tallahasee, 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.) Palazzolo v. Rhode Island | The Oyez Project at IIT Chicago-Kent ... Palazzolo v. Rhode Island | The Oyez Project at IIT Chicago-Kent College of Law

A matter of schematics peritrated by the fraudster BAR wizards of word magicState 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.".....Change in government... hmmm, could that be the unconstitutional act of 1871, and the secret second corporate charter Called the CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES INC? I do believe it is, All of which Are Repugnant to The original Organic CONSTITUTION and therefore NULL AND VOID of law, not to mention fraud & treason

These Title, Statutes, CODES and rules are the printed letter of what the fascist foreign AGENT BAR attorneys are trying to say are "laws" and at the same time we all realize that these corporate gangsters do not play fair and frequently do not adhere to their own rules.

A motion filed as a "Legal Notice" or by way of affidavit will not be read and will likely be ignored by the foreign AGENTS in one of their private administrative tribunals (COURTS) of admiralty and equity.

- Without prejudice, without recourse - Jefferson Versus the Muslim Pirates | City Journal
city-journal.org/html/jefferson-versus-muslim..

from the magazine Jefferson Versus the Muslim Pirates America's first confrontation with the Islamic world helped forge a new nation's character.

First Barbary War - Wikipedia
en.wikipedia.org/wiki/First_Barbary_War

Title 18 U.S. Code section 2381 Capital Felony Treason

Title 18 U.S. Code section 2381:

When in the presence of two witnesses to the same overt act or in an open court of law if you fail to timely move to protect and defend the constitution of the United States and honor your oath of office you are subject to the charge of capital felony treason, and upon conviction you will be taken by the posse to the nearest busy intersection and at high noon hung by the neck until dead...The body to remain in

state till dusk as an example to anyone who takes his oath of office lightly.

For: ALL OTHER Powers and SPENDING are "reserved to the States respectively, or to the people". - TENTH Amendment law of The Constitution

That is why the Supreme Court ruled in several cases that Withholding Taxes, Income Taxes nor the invisible matching Employer Taxes can be taken out of your weekly paycheck, unless you VOLUNTEER to LET them do so in opposition of THE EXISTING CONSTITUTIONAL laws regarding that Taxes DO NOT APPLY TO Lawful Bloodline AMERICANS --> so that We and/or our States can have all the money, ON OUR WEEKLY PAYCHECKS we need to pay for all of the health care we want, all the money we need to raise our own children in our own homes without "The Village", have a good life, pay for college, and retire in style. THAT IS "THE LAW". - - - THAT IS FREEDOM !

Whereas : Consistency in the application of the rules of practice in this Court does not require us in this unique set of circumstances to put the State in such an equivocal position simply because the person against whom the injury is directed is not before the Court to speak for himself. The law will permit respondent to resist any effort to compel her to observe such a covenant, so widely condemned by the courts, since she is the one in whose charge and keeping reposes the power to continue to use her property to discriminate or to discontinue such use. The relation between the coercion exerted on respondent and her possible pecuniary loss thereby is so close to the purpose of the restrictive covenant, to violate the constitutional rights of those discriminated against, that respondent is the only effective adversary of the unworthy covenant in its last stand. She will be permitted to protect herself and, by so doing, close the gap to the use of this covenant, so universally condemned by the courts.

Barrows v. Jackson, 346 U.S. 249, 259 (U.S. 1953)

"An appearance in court is not necessarily an appearance, but service of process is an appearance." Code Civ. Proc. §§ 437, 581a, 1014. -- Schultz v. Schultz, 161 P.2d 36, 70 C.A.2d 203. So BEWARE. You receive an appearance date but it is not really an appearance they can order

exhibit Twelve and evidence

Since 1871 the United States president and the United States Congress has been playing politics under a different set of rules and policies. The American people do not know that there are two Constitutions in the United States. The first penned by the leaders of the newly independent states of the United States in 1776. On July 4, 1776, the people claimed their independence from Britain and Democracy was born. And for 95 years the United States people were free and independent. That freedom ended in 1871 when the original "Constitution for the united states for America" was changed to the "THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA".

The Congress realized that the country was in dire financial straits, so they made a financial deal with the devil – international bankers — (in those days, the Rothschilds of London) thereby incurring a DEBT to said bankers. The conniving international bankers were not about to lend the floundering nation any money without some serious stipulations. So, they devised a way of taking back control of the United States and thus, the Act of 1871 was passed. With no constitutional authority to do so, Congress created a separate form of government for the District of Columbia.

With the passage of “the Act of 1871” a city state (a state within a state) called the District of Columbia located on 10 sq miles of land in the heart of Washington was formed with its own flag and its own independent constitution – the United States’ secret second constitution.

Pope meeting with the board of directors of The Vatican Bank

POTUS is the Chief Executive (president) of the Corporation of the United States operating as any other CEO of the corporation — governs w/a Board of Directors (cabinet officials) and managers (Senators/Congress) Obama as others before him is POTUS — operating as “vassal king” taking orders once again from “The City of London” through the RIIA (Royal Institute of Intl Affairs). The Illuminati (founded by the The Society of Jesus or Jesuits, the largest Roman Catholic Religious Military Order headed by the Black Pope) created the Royal Institute of International Affairs (RIIA) in 1919. The American equivalent to the RIIA is the Council of Foreign Relations (CFR). The RIIA and CFR set up Round Table Groups (based on the King Arthur myths).

What did the Act of 1871 achieve? The ACT of 1871 put the United States back under British rule (which is under Vatican rule). The United States people lost their independence in 1871.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA is the constitution of the incorporated UNITED STATES OF AMERICA. It operates in an economic capacity and has been used to fool the People into thinking it governs the Republic. It does not! Capitalization is NOT insignificant when one is referring to a legal document. This seemingly “minor” alteration has had a major impact on every subsequent generation of Americans. What Congress did by passing the Act of 1871 was create an entirely new document, a constitution for the government of the District of Columbia, an INCORPORATED government.

The flag of Washington’s District of Columbia has 3 red stars, each symbolizing a city state within the three city empire. The three city empire consists of Washington D.C., London, and Vatican City. London is the corporate center of the three city states and controls the world economically. Washington’s District of Columbia city state is in charge of the military, and the Vatican controls it all under the guise of spiritual guidance. Although geographically separate, the city states of London, the Vatican and the District of Columbia are one interlocking empire called “Empire of the City”

The constitution for the District of Columbia operates under tyrannical Vatican law known as “Lex Fori” (local law). When congress passed the act of 1871 it created a separate corporation known as THE UNITED STATES and corporate government for

the District of Columbia. This treasonous act has unlawfully allowed the District of Columbia to operate as a corporation outside the original constitution of the United States and in total disregard of the best interests of the American citizens.

Instead of having absolute and unalienable rights guaranteed under the organic Constitution, we the people now have “relative” rights or privileges. One example is the Sovereign’s right to travel, which has now been transformed (under corporate government policy) into a “privilege” that requires citizens to be licensed – driver’s licenses and Passports. By passing the Act of 1871, Congress committed TREASON against the People who were Sovereign under the grants and decrees of the Declaration of Independence and the organic Constitution. The Act of 1871 became the FOUNDATION of all the treason since committed by government officials.

Supreme Court: Jones v. Temmer, 89 F. Supp 1226: "The privileges and immunities clause of the 14th Amendment protects very few rights because it neither incorporates the Bill of Rights, nor protects all rights of individual citizens. Instead this provision protects only those rights peculiar to being a citizen of the federal government; it does not protect those rights which relate to state citizenship." Supreme Court: US vs. Valentine 288 F. Supp. 957: "The only absolute and unqualified right of a United States citizen is to residence within the territorial boundaries of the United States." Supreme Court 1795 a. "Inasmuch as every government is an artificial person, an abstraction, and a creature of the mind only, a government can interface only with other artificial persons. The imaginary, having neither actuality nor substance, is foreclosed from creating and attaining parity with the tangible. The legal manifestation of this is that no government, as well as any law, agency, aspect, court, etc. can concern itself with anything other than corporate, artificial persons and the contracts between them." S.C.R. 1795, Penhallow v. Doane’s Administrators 3 U.S. 54; 1 L.Ed. 57; 3 Dall. 54; and,

b. “the contracts between them” involve U.S. Citizens, which are deemed as Corporate Entities:

c. “Therefore, the U.S. Citizens residing in one of the states of the union, are classified as property and franchises of the federal government as an “individual entity””, Wheeling Steel Corp. v. Fox, 298 U.S. 193, 80 L.Ed. 1143, 56 S.Ct. 773OUR rights” are such as “existed” by the Law of the Land (Common Law) “long antecedent” to the organization of the State”, and can only be taken from him by “due process of law”, and “in accordance with the Constitution.” (the original organic Constitution not the Second Secret fake FEDERAL D.C. Corporate CONstitution charter version)

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]

Sexual assaults by officials acting under "color of law" could happen in a variety of venues. They could occur in court scenarios, jails, and/or traffic stops to name just a few of the settings where an official might use their position of authority to coerce another individual into sexual compliance. The compliance is generally gained because of a threat of an official action against the other if they do not comply.

The Fourth Amendment of the United States Constitution guarantees the right against unreasonable searches or seizures. A law enforcement official using his authority provided under the "color of law" is allowed to stop individuals and even if necessary to search them and retain their property under certain circumstances. It is in the abuse of that discretionary power that a violation of a person's civil rights might occur. An unlawful detention or an illegal confiscation of property would be examples of such an abuse of power.

An official would violate the color of law statute by fabricating evidence against or conducting a false arrest of an individual. That person's rights of due process and unreasonable seizure have been violated. In the case of deprivation of property, the official would violate the color of law statute by unlawfully obtaining or maintaining the property of another. In that case, the official has overstepped or misapplied his authority.

The Fourteenth Amendment secures the right to due process and the Eighth Amendment also prohibits the use of cruel and unusual punishment. In an arrest or detention context, these rights would prohibit the use of force amounting to punishment (summary judgment). The idea being that a person accused of a crime is to be allowed the opportunity to have a trial and not be subjected to punishment without having been afforded the opportunity of the legal process.

The public entrusts its law enforcement officials with protecting the community. If it is shown that an official willfully failed to keep an individual from harm that official could be in violation of the color of law statute.

Whereas: please read about the law .The fourth amendment and the federal Constitution makes a careful distinction between natural born Citizens and citizens of the United States** (compare 2:1:5 with Section 1 of the so-called 14th Amendment). One is an unconditional Sovereign by natural birth, who is endowed by the Creator with certain unalienable rights; the other has been granted the revocable privileges of U.S.** citizenship, endowed by the Congress of the United States**. One is a Citizen, the other is a subject. One is a Sovereign, the other is a subordinate. One is a Citizen of our constitutional Republic; the other is a citizen of a legislative democracy (the federal zone). Notice the superior/subordinate relationship between these two statuses.I don't know how many can hear or comprehend this.... But we lawful bloodline Americans STAND strong, we STAND our ground, we STAND for our rights. Standing is strength, standing is a sign of a Breathing living man and woman, thinking,, Man or Woman.Kneeling is a sign of enslavement religious worship,...enslavement

“Both Bivens and § 1983 allow a plaintiff to seek money damages from government officials who have violated his Fourth Amendment rights. See § 1983; Bivens, supra, at 397. ” Wilson v. Layne, 526 U.S. 603, 609 (U.S. 1999)

Whereas : To determine the constitutionality of a seizure "[w]e must balance the nature and quality of the intrusion on the individual's Fourth Amendment interests against the importance of the governmental interests alleged to justify the intrusion." United States v. Place, 462 U.S. 696, 703 (1983); see Delaware v. Prouse, 440 U.S. 648, 654 (1979); United States v. Martinez-Fuerte, 428 U.S. 543, 555 (1976). We have described "the balancing of competing interests" as "the key principle of the Fourth Amendment." Michigan v. Summers, 452 U.S. 692, 700, n. 12 (1981). See also Camara v. Municipal Court, 387 U.S. 523, 536-537 (1967). Because one of the factors is the extent of the intrusion, it is plain that reasonableness depends on not only when a seizure is made, but also how it is carried out. United States v. Ortiz, 422 U.S. 891, 895 (1975); Terry v. Ohio, 392 U.S. 1, 28-29 (1968).

Tennessee v. Garner, 471 U.S. 1, 8 (U.S. 1985)

Police work for the City county state as tax collectors for the Vatican

Warren v. District of Columbia - Wikipedia

en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Warren_v._District_of_Columbia

Warren v. District of Columbia is an oft-quoted District of Columbia Court of Appeals case that held that the police do not owe a specific duty to provide police services ... held that the police were under no specific legal duty to provide protection to the By using this site, you agree to the Terms of Use and Privacy Policy.

The Police are Not Required to Protect You - Barnes Law LLP

www.barneslawllp.com/police-not-required-protect/

The Police are Not Required to Protect You. June 26, 2016. “To Protect and to Serve” – the ubiquitous creed emblazoned across millions of police cars ...

CIVIL FORFEITURE

“Holding that forfeiture under § 881(a)(7) is limited by the Eighth Amendment's Excessive Fines Clause”

U.S. v. WAGONER COUNTY REAL ESTATE, 278 F.3d 1091 (10th Cir. 2002)

“Holding that the Excessive Fines Clause applies to civil forfeitures”

U.S. v. 5 S 351 TUTHILL RD., NAPERVILLE, ILL, 233 F.3d 1017 (7th Cir. 2000)

“Holding that a civil penalty can be so extreme as to violate the Eighth Amendment”

DAWSON v. U.S, 77 F.3d 180 (7th Cir. 1996)

“Holding that civil forfeiture is punishment for purposes of triggering the Eighth Amendment's excessive fines clause”

U.S. v. PENNY, 60 F.3d 1257 (7th Cir. 1995)

“Holding that §§ 881(a)(4) and 881(a)(7) are punitive in nature”

U.S. v. ONE 1973 ROLLS ROYCE, V.I.N. SRH-16266, 43 F.3d 794 (3d Cir. 1994)

“Holding that civil forfeiture is subject to the Excessive Fines Clause of the Eighth Amendment”

U.S. v. \$191,910.00 IN U.S. CURRENCY, 16 F.3d 1051 (9th Cir. 1994)

“Holding the Eighth Amendment prohibits excessive punishment and not excessive remedial goals”

Brown v. Transurban USA, Inc., 144 F.Supp.3d 809 (E.D. Va. 2015)

“Holding that Eighth Amendment applied to civil forfeiture proceedings that were not solely remedial in nature”

Robinson v. Huerta, 123 F.Supp.3d 30 (D.D.C. 2015)

“Holding that the Excessive Fines Clause applies to in rem civil forfeiture proceedings”

Green v. Brown, Civil Action No. 10-cv-02669-WYD-MEH (D. Colo. Aug. 29, 2011)

“Holding forfeiture there to be a "fine", in part, because the statute at issue in Austin explicitly provided an innocent owner defense”

U.S. v. APPROXIMATELY 1,170 CARATS OF ROUGH DIAMONDS (E.D.N.Y. 7-22-2008), 05-CV-5816 (ARR) (MDG). (E.D.N.Y. Jul. 22, 2008)

“Holding that Eighth Amendment could apply in both civil and criminal actions”

U.S. v. PROCHNOW, CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:02-CV-0917-JOF. (N.D. Ga. Dec. 21, 2006)

“Holding that a modern statutory fine is a "fine" if it constitutes punishment even in part regardless of whether the proceeding is criminal or civil”

U.S. v. ONE HUN. TWENTY THOUS. EOGHT HUN, 394 F. Supp.2d 687 (D.V.I. 2005)

6151
6152 “Holding Eighth Amendment applicable to civil forfeitures and cited as controlling in
6153 \$405k”
6154 U.S. v. \$4,229.32 U.S. CURRENCY, (W.D.Wash. 1996), 922 F. Supp. 430 (W.D.
6155 Wash. 1996)
6156
6157 “Holding that the Eighth Amendment's excessive fines clause applies to in rem civil
6158 forfeiture proceedings”
6159 U.S. v. WARDA, (E.D.Wis. 1996), 921 F. Supp. 580 (E.D. Wis. 1996)
6160
6161 “Holding that civil forfeiture that constitutes punishment is subject to Excessive Fines
6162 Clause”
6163 U.S. v. MOFFITT, ZWERLING KEMLER, P.C., ([E.D.Va.](#) 1995), 875 F. Supp. 1190
6164 (E.D. Va. 1995)
6165
6166 “Holding that forfeitures of real property pursuant to federal law are fines that fall
6167 within the scope of the Excessive Fines Clause of the United States Constitution”
6168 TORGELSON v. REAL, 749 N.W.2d 24 (Minn. 2008)
6169
6170 “Holding that civil in rem forfeiture constituted "excessive fine" violating Eighth
6171 Amendment”
6172 WAISTE v. STATE, 10 P.3d 1141 (Alaska 2000)
6173
6174 “Holding that the Excessive Fines Clause applies to forfeitures of property under 21
6175 U.S.C. § 881(a)(4) and (a)(7)”
6176 EX PARTE DOROUGH, 773 So.2d 1001 (Ala. 2000)
6177
6178 “Holding that drug-related forfeiture of property, "constituted payment to a sovereign
6179 as punishment for some offense and did not serve solely a remedial purpose””
6180 IN RE SHARP, 674 A.2d 899 (D.C. 1996)
6181
6182 “Holding forfeiture is subject to the Excessive Fines Clause if the forfeiture can be
6183 viewed as punitive”
6184 POPE v. GORDON, 359 S.C. 572 (S.C. Ct. App. 2004)
6185
6186 “Holding that “[w]e need not exclude the possibility that a forfeiture serves remedial
6187 purposes to conclude that it is subject to the limitations of the Excessive Fines Clause.
6188 We, however, must determine that it can only be explained as serving in part to
6189 punish.””
6190 STATE v. DAVIS, 903 P.2d 940 (Utah Ct. App. 1995)
6191
6192 “Holding that in rem civil forfeitures that serve in part as punishment are subject to an
6193 Eighth Amendment excessive fines analysis”
6194 Agresta v. City of Maitland, 159 So.3d 876 (Fla. Dist. Ct. App. 2015)
6195
6196 “Finding that innocent owner defenses "serve to focus the [forfeiture] provisions on
6197 the culpability of the owner," thus making such provisions look more punitive”
6198 U.S. v. UNION BANK, 487 F.3d 8 (1st Cir. 2007)
6199
6200 “Finding that the forfeiture provisions under 21 U.S.C. § 881(a)(4) and (a)(7) are a

monetary punishment and subject to the Eighth Amendment”
 STATE v. DAY, 191 W. Va. 641 (W. Va. 1994)

“Finding civil forfeiture constituted punishment for an offense under the eighth amendment's excessive-fines clause”
 People v. Koy, 2014 IL App (2d) 130906 (Ill. App. Ct. 2014)

“THE CLAIM AND EXERCISE OF A CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT CANNOT BE CONVERTED INTO A CRIME.” – Miller v U.S., 230 F 2d 486. 489.

"governments are but trustees acting under derived authority and have no power to delegate what is not delegated to them, But the people, as the original fountain, might take away what they have delegated and entrust to whom they please. ... The sovereignty on every state resided in the people of the state and they may alter or change their form of government at their own pleasure."
 Luther v Borden, 48 U.S. 1, 12 Led 581

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.”

Supreme Court: Jones v. Temmer, 89 F. Supp 1226: "The privileges and immunities clause of the 14th Amendment protects very few rights because it neither incorporates the Bill of Rights, nor protects all rights of individual citizens. Instead this provision protects only those rights peculiar to being a citizen of the federal government; it does not protect those rights which relate to state citizenship." Supreme Court: US vs. Valentine 288 F. Supp. 957: "The only absolute and unqualified right of a United States citizen is to residence within the territorial boundaries of the United States." Supreme Court 1795 a.“Inasmuch as every government is an artificial person, an abstraction, and a creature of the mind only, a government can interface only with other artificial persons. The imaginary, having neither actuality nor substance, is foreclosed from creating and attaining parity with the tangible. The legal manifestation of this is that no government, as well as any law, agency, aspect, court, etc. can concern itself with anything other than corporate, artificial persons and the contracts between them.” S.C.R. 1795, Penhallow v. Doane’s Administrators 3 U.S. 54; 1 L.Ed. 57; 3 Dall. 54; and,

b. “the contracts between them” involve U.S. Citizens, which are deemed as Corporate Entities:

c. “Therefore, the U.S. Citizens residing in one of the states of the union, are classified as property and franchises of the federal government as an “individual entity””, Wheeling Steel Corp. v. Fox, 298 U.S. 193, 80 L.Ed. 1143, 56 S.Ct. 773OUR rights” are such as “existed” by the Law of the Land (Common Law) “long antecedent” to the organization of the State”, and can only be taken from him by “due process of law”, and “in accordance with the Constitution.” (the original organic Constitution not the Second Secret fake FEDERAL D.C. Corporate CONstitution charter version)

Pursuant to the powers of duties bestowed upon us by citizens, the undersigned do hereby resolve that any Federal officer, agent, or employee, regardless of supposed congressional authorization, is required to obey the law and observe limitations consisting of the enumerated powers as detailed within Article 1 Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution and the Bill Of Rights.

The term “person” shall be construed to mean and include an individual, a trust, estate, partnership, association, company or corporation.

In 1993: They Removed Publication 515 References to Citizens Not being Liable for Tax and Confused a key of the puzzle that unraveled the IRS’ Great Deception was formerly found in 26 CFR § 1.1441 and in IRS Publication 515. Recall that we have been saying all along that foreign eared income is the only thing to be counted as “gross income” for the purposes of 26 U.S.C. § 861? Call 800-TAX-FORM and request a copy of IRS Publication 515, titled “Withholding of Tax on Nonresident Aliens and Foreign Corporation”. Now, you might look this up and ask yourself, what on Earth does that have to do with me? Here’s what. Inside Publication 515, there appears a statement the IRS hopes you never see. Under the main heading “Withholding Exemptions and Reductions and within the paragraph title “Evidence of Residence” the IRS states in speaking to the payer of income:

RE TO: Identity Theft/Forgery under Theft & Conspiracy to Defraud under Theft, under Violations Title 18 U.S. Code § 1001 by Trickery, lies and deception, under Violations Rule 1 and Frivolous Acts under Rule 4-8.4 Attorney Misconduct under Intrinsic Fraud under violations of § 3-311, ACCORD AND SATISFACTION BY INSTRUMENT. And Acted upon Violations under Rule 60 under Violations 42 U.S. Code § 10607 - Services to Victims of a Crime. Under Due Course status defined under identity theft, (“means of identification”) in connection with some underlying crime. Congress has passed two statues that criminalize identity theft. In 1998, Congress enacted the Identity Theft and Assumption Deterrence Act, which set forth the substantive offense of identity theft at 18 U.S.C. § 1028(a)(7). That provision prohibits the use of another’s identifying information in connection with any federal crime or any state or local felony.

“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]

8 U.S. Code § 1401 - Nationals and citizens of United States at birth

6301 1978—Subsec. (a). Pub. L. 95–432, § 3, struck out “(a)” before “The
6302 following” and redesignated pars. (1) to (7) as (a) to (g),
6303 respectively.
6304

6305 U.S. Nationals , citizens were declared enemies of the U.S. by F.D.R. by Executive
6306 Order No. 2040 and ratified by Congress on March 9, 1933 FDR changed the
6307 meaning of The Trading with the Enemy Act of December 6, 1917 by changing the
6308 word "without" to citizens "within" the United States
6309

6310 To cover the debt in 1933 and future debt, of the British corporate government
6311 determined and established the value of the future labor of each incorporated
6312 individual in its jurisdiction to be \$630,000. A bond of \$630,000 is set on each
6313 Certificate of Live Birth. The certificates are bundled together into sets and then
6314 placed as securities on the open
6315 market. These certificates are then purchased by the Federal Reserve and/or foreign
6316 bankers. The purchaser is the "holder" of "Title." This process made each and every
6317 person in this jurisdiction a bond servant.
6318

6319 U.S. citizens were declared enemies of the U.S. by F.D.R. by Executive Order No.
6320 2040 and ratified
6321

6322 WHAT IS HJR 192? Can we Discharge our Debts to
6323 the...<http://understandcontractlawandyouwin.com/hjr-192-discharg>
6324

6325 .../ Jun 7, 2014 ... House Joint Resolution 192 was then passed by Congress on June 5,
6326 1933. This law was passed to do away with the gold clause For lawful Bloodline
6327 American ... House Joint Resolution 192, 1933 - ****Redemption - tribe.net
6328 tribes.tribe.net/redemption101/thread/07f05122-0090-408b
6329 ...
6330

6331 House Joint Resolution 192 ... this Article does not contain an absolute prohibition
6332 against the States making something else a tender in transfer of debt. HJR-192 ...
6333

6334 The first amendment of the Constitution of the United States says:
6335 Quote:
6336 Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the
6337 free exercise thereof."
6338 It was written by Thomas Jefferson, who became President in 1801. In 1802 he wrote
6339 a letter to the Danbury Baptist Association saying that its purpose was to build "a wall
6340 of separation between Church and State", because they were asking him what the first
6341 amendment was really all about.
6342 Jefferson also wrote in his Inagural address:
6343 Quote:
6344 Still one thing more, fellow-citizens -- a wise and frugal Government, which shall
6345 restrain men from injuring one another, shall leave them otherwise free to regulate
6346 their own pursuits of industry and improvement, and shall not take from the mouth of
6347 labor the bread it has earned. This is the sum of good government, and this is
6348 necessary to close the circle of our felicities.
6349 In other words, unless the government can show that people are injuring each other, it
6350 has no business restricting their activities.

I agree with Jefferson that "No victim, no crime" is not just a catchy slogan, but should be the foundation of all law, because the purpose of the law is to protect people (and other innocent parties such as animals and the environment) from the actions of others. If the law does anything else it becomes a set of meaningless rules that has no real basis.

The the ninth and tenth amendments of the Constitution also state:
Quote:
Amendment 9 - Construction of Constitution. Ratified 12/15/1791.
The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.
Amendment 10 - Powers of the States and People. Ratified 12/15/1791.
The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

See Supremacy Clauses 2 & 3 of Article VI of The Constitution:
§1401. Nationals and citizens of United States at birth
<http://corpuslegalis.com/.../nationals-and-citizens-of...>

"U.S. CITIZEN UPDATE"

U.S. CITIZEN, In American law, one who, under the constitution and laws of the United States, has a right to vote for civil officers, and himself is qualified to fill elective offices. One of the sovereign people. A constituent member of the sovereignty, synonymous with the people. 19 How. 404.
All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, citizens of the United States and of the state within they reside. Amend. XIV. Const. U.S. Black's Law Dictionary First Edition, 1891. A citizen of the United States is a citizen of the federal government ..." Kitchens v. Steele, 112 F.Supp 383 (1953) State v. Manuel, 20 NC 122 (1838): "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." Supreme Court: Jones v. Temmer, 89 F. Supp 1226 (1993) "The privileges and immunities clause of the 14th Amendment protects very few rights because it neither incorporates the Bill of Rights, nor protects all rights of individual citizens. Instead this provision protects only those rights peculiar to being a citizen of the federal government; it does not protect those rights which relate to state citizenship." "The only absolute and unqualified right of a United States citizen is to residence within the territorial boundaries of the United States." Supreme Court: US vs. Valentine 288 F. Supp. 957 (D.C.P.R., (1968)

exhibit Thirteen and evidence Religions violation against treaties Constitution for native people

discrimination treating a person or group differently because of what they believe in. Specifically, it is when adherents of different religions From Christianity or roman catholic church of enslavement and programed thinking of Courts Elected and public

servants ,, As the Elected and public servants can believe in there religion Can practice and only of the clock not on the public payment employment hints freedom of realigns so they can not be terminate for their belief on the public payment so neither can violates the Constitution laws

Whereas As I believe in the greatspirit and mother earth the creator not the British bible of enslavement

It is my innerstanding that the foreign power controlling Americans operates under the corporate name UNITED STATES (INC.), also doing business as THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA (INC.). This corporation is controlled by the Crowns of the Vatican (the Holy See). The Vatican is one of the States of the Holy Roman Empire. To learn more about this, read my empowering article titled Why Rome (the Holy Roman Empire) Still Rules the the black rob popes aka Black robe judges and attorney lawyers administration rules for the profits of the Vatican .

To really innerstand what this drama is really about, you need to know the spiritual side of the legal system and how words are used to enslave your body, mind and soul. A great source to learn about the powers of words and the legal system is my empowering and enlightening book titled Word Magic: The Powers & Occult Definitions of Words.

Religious discrimination treating a person or group differently because of what they believe in. Specifically, it is when adherents of different religions (or Taking action about discrimination on the grounds of religion or belief, explaining when it is unlawful or not unlawful and organisations which can help. including cruelty to animals is a crime

The treaty of 1213 invaded our native lands The British bible

British servant John Milton Chivington (January 27, 1821 – October 4, 1894) was a former Methodist pastor who served as colonel in the United States Volunteers during the Colorado War and the Ignoring the U.S. flag, and a white flag they raised shortly after the soldiers began firing, Chivington's soldiers massacred the majority of the ...

Still to-date British Foreign Agents Elected and public servants still Assault , cage people lOct 17, 2014 ... The U.S. Federal Bureau of Investigation will soon classify animal abuse as a Group A offense — a crime category shared with murder and This new FBI categorization is intended to improve the way crimes against animals are tracked nationwide and could help bolster state animal cruelty laws jail shall be included 7 U.S. Code § 136 - Definitions | US Law | LII / Legal...

www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/7/136

The term “animal” means all vertebrate and invertebrate species, including but together with any requirements imposed under section 136a(d) of this title.... including attempt to kill , kill , rape robe in the name of the bible god,

6451
6452 Is it true the Indians were intentionally wrapped in blankets...
6453 [www.missionscalifornia.com/ate/it-true-indians-intentionally-wrapped-blankets-had-b](http://www.missionscalifornia.com/ate/it-true-indians-intentionally-wrapped-blankets-had-been-infected-chicken-pox-order-kill-them.htm)
6454 [een-infected-chicken-pox-order-kill-them.htm](http://www.missionscalifornia.com/ate/it-true-indians-intentionally-wrapped-blankets-had-been-infected-chicken-pox-order-kill-them.htm)
6455
6456 ... infected by chicken pox in order to kill them? Where can I find the information
6457 concerning the causes of the sharp decline in the California Indian population?
6458 Did the U.S. Army Distribute Smallpox Blankets to Indians ...
6459 [quod.lib.umich.edu/p/plag/5240451.0001.009/--did-the-us-army-distribute-smallpox-](http://quod.lib.umich.edu/p/plag/5240451.0001.009/--did-the-us-army-distribute-smallpox-blankets-to-indians?rgn=main;view=fulltext)
6460 [blankets-to-indians?rgn=main;view=fulltext](http://quod.lib.umich.edu/p/plag/5240451.0001.009/--did-the-us-army-distribute-smallpox-blankets-to-indians?rgn=main;view=fulltext)
6461
6462 There is no evidence that anyone passed out infested blankets to Indians with The
6463 same year that Churchill published his Roosting Chickens version of the 1837 ...
6464 Quarantining people who'd come down with the pox had been standard ...
6465 Native American disease and epidemics - Wikipedia
6466 en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Native_American_disease_and_epidemics
6467
6468 European diseases and epidemics pervade many aspects of Native American life ,
6469 both ... Native Americans, due to the lack of prior contact with Europeans, had not
6470 not be contrived to send the small pox among the disaffected tribes of Indians? ...
6471 smallpox-infested blankets were intentionally given to Native Americans in ...
6472
6473
6474 Native Americans in the U.S. and Property Rights: A Comparative...
6475 [www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2016/07/native-americans-property-rights/4929](http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2016/07/native-americans-property-rights/492941/)
6476 [41/](http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2016/07/native-americans-property-rights/492941/)
6477
6478 Jul 30, 2016 ... The Pine Ridge Indian Reservation in South Dakota Andy Clark /
6479 Reuters ... is worse among the half of Natives who live on reservations. ... As Cecilia
6480 Fire Thunder, the former chief of the Lakota tribe on the Pine Ridge reservation,
6481 told ... No bank could ever foreclose on a property, because the bank can't .
6482
6483
6484
6485 Whereas :Henry B. Whipple | The U.S.-Dakota War of 1862
6486 www.usdakotawar.org/history/henry-b-whipple
6487
6488 Abraham Lincoln on Henry Whipple's report during his visit to the President in the
6489 fall ... From, in part, Henry Benjamin Whipple: An Inventory of His Papers at the ...
6490
6491 To date Elected and public servants our doing this to all to protect privately owns
6492 jails Private Jails in the United States - FindLaw
6493 [civilrights.findlaw.com/other-constitutional-rights/private-jails-in-the-united-states.ht](http://civilrights.findlaw.com/other-constitutional-rights/private-jails-in-the-united-states.html)
6494 [ml](http://civilrights.findlaw.com/other-constitutional-rights/private-jails-in-the-united-states.html)
6495
6496 Privately run prisons promised increased, business-like efficiency, which would ...
6497 Corrections Corporation of America alone owns more than 65 correctional ...
6498
6499 What's the matter with Kansas's private prisons? - Daily Kos
6500 www.dailykos.com/story/2016/9/9/1568429/-What-s-the-matter-with-Kansas-s-privat

6501 [e-corrections](#)
6502
6503 Sep 9, 2016 ... Leavenworth Detention Center, a private prison in Kansas, is facing
6504 investigation after ... large, privately held firms that earn an estimated \$1.2 billion per
6505 year. ... The private companies also offer state and local authorities a ...
6506
6507 Kansas Department of Corrections - Wikipedia
6508 en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kansas_Department_of_Corrections
6509
6510 The Kansas Department of Corrections is a cabinet-level agency of Kansas that
6511 operates the state's correctional facilities, both juvenile and adult; the state's
6512
6513 A long time ago the Indian people also promised to protect the land and have the. ... It
6514 was almost two decades before the Catholic Missionaries returned. ... Tribes heard
6515 rumors that government representatives were plotting to steal the homelands. By
6516 1878 in the "Annual Report" from the Commissioner of Indian Affairs it ..to force
6517 them to become christens . 1878 British catholic missionaries stealing native Indians
6518 still to-date
6519
6520
6521 Kill the Indian, Save the Man: The Genocidal Impact of ... -...
6522 [en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kill_the_Indian_Save_the_Man:_The_Genocidal_Impact_of](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kill_the_Indian_Save_the_Man:_The_Genocidal_Impact_of_American_Indian_Residential_Schools)
6523 [American_Indian_Residential_Schools](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kill_the_Indian_Save_the_Man:_The_Genocidal_Impact_of_American_Indian_Residential_Schools)
6524
6525 Kill the Indian, Save the Man: The Genocidal Impact of American Indian Residential
6526 Schools is a 2004 book by the American Ward Churchill, then a professor at ... Kill
6527 the Indian, Save the Man: The Genocidal Impact of ... -...
6528 [en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kill_the_Indian_Save_the_Man:_The_Genocidal_Impact_of](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kill_the_Indian_Save_the_Man:_The_Genocidal_Impact_of_American_Indian_Residential_Schools)
6529 [American_Indian_Residential_Schools](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kill_the_Indian_Save_the_Man:_The_Genocidal_Impact_of_American_Indian_Residential_Schools)
6530
6531 Kill the Indian, Save the Man: The Genocidal Impact of American Indian Residential
6532 Schools is a 2004 book by the American Ward Churchill, then a professor at ... Kill
6533 the Indian, Save the Man: The Genocidal Impact of ... -...
6534 [en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kill_the_Indian_Save_the_Man:_The_Genocidal_Impact_of](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kill_the_Indian_Save_the_Man:_The_Genocidal_Impact_of_American_Indian_Residential_Schools)
6535 [American_Indian_Residential_Schools](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kill_the_Indian_Save_the_Man:_The_Genocidal_Impact_of_American_Indian_Residential_Schools)
6536
6537 Kill the Indian, Save the Man: The Genocidal Impact of American Indian Residential
6538 Schools is a 2004 book by the American Ward Churchill, then a professor at ...
6539
6540
6541
6542 Private Industries — Kansas Department of Corrections
6543 www.doc.ks.gov/facilities/hcf/programs/private-industry
6544 Mar 7, 2017 ... Private correctional industries are public-private partnerships in or ...
6545 fee for room and board costs that are repaid to the state's general fund.
6546
6547
6548 Whereas Feed the Devil ,, destroy family children woman and men for the devils bible
6549 in the name of god
6550 Kansas prisons full; official outlines \$27 million expansion...

www.kansas.com/news/politics-government/article42343665.html

Nov 2, 2015 ... He also said the state could boost the number of inmates held in county jails or private prisons, though he called either idea a temporary

The Royal Blog of Oz: Was L. Frank Baum racist?

newwwoz.blogspot.com/2013/03/was-l-frank-baum-racist.html

Mar 19, 2013 ... In The Patchwork Girl of Oz, Baum introduces a lively group of people ... is a couple columns for his newspaper The Aberdeen Saturday Pioneer. ... Writing a suggestion to exterminate the remaining Sioux was wrong, ... I recently read a 19th Century Peruvian novel that champions the cause of the Indians of ..

Black Hills Land Claim - Wikipedia

en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Black_Hills_Land_Claim

The Black Hills Land Claim is an ongoing land dispute between Native Americans from the On June 30, 1980 the United States Supreme Court ruled in an 8-1 majority to uphold the In the present day, the government has recognized that the seizure of land in 1877 was illegal but is still unwilling to return the Black Hills.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

www.bia.gov/cs/groups/public/documents/text/idc011935.pdf

September 8, 2000. 202-208-3710. GOVER APOLOGIZES FOR BIA's MISDEEDS ... 175th anniversary, Assistant Secretary-Indian Affairs Kevin Gover today

Whereas ;hemp

""""Whereas: The Constitution fact Keep in mind that this Hemp plant existed at the time of the founders, as did others that had similar effects. And yet the federal government did not regulate them. Instead, they chose to leave it to the states, which, for the most part, also chose not to regulate it until the last century or so. Indeed, an early federal prohibition against marijuana, the Marihuana Stamp Tax Act of 1937, was later found unconstitutional on the grounds that it required self incrimination.

Leary v. United States, 395 U.S. 6 (1969), is a U.S. Supreme Court case dealing with the constitutionality of the Marihuana Tax Act of 1937. Timothy Leary, a professor and activist, was arrested for the possession of marijuana in violation of the Marihuana Tax Act. Leary challenged the act on the ground that the act required self-incrimination, which violated the Fifth Amendment. The unanimous opinion of the court was penned by Justice John Marshall Harlan II and declared the Marihuana Tax Act unconstitutional. Thus, Leary's conviction was overturned. Congress responded shortly thereafter by replacing the Marihuana Tax Act with the newly written Controlled Substances Act while continuing the prohibition of certain drugs in the United States.[1]

6601 Marihuana Tax Act, marijuana was used almost peyote was unconstitutional as
6602 applied to members of the Native American. Stamp Act violated the bounds of the
6603 British constitutional system. ... to evade federal attempts to prohibit marijuana and
6604 create a federal ID

6605

6606 Whereas by the Constitution First, I would like to discuss the “peace” pipes,
6607 something that is both a symbol for Native Americans, and in many ways a stereotype.
6608 Many aspects of the Pan-Indian icon image have infiltrated the media. I refer to the
6609 long-standing tradition of grouping all natives into one basic image of a man, almost
6610 naked, a peace pipe in his hand and a feathered headdress on his long-haired head,
6611 and no clue about the “modern” world is a In some ceremonies hemp were burnt as
6612 an "invitation to the spirits". ... in Mie prefecture and other shrines that involve the
6613 burning of taima (marijuana).

6614

6615 Cannabis is considered a sacred herb in many tribes, . Some used it in food, medicine,
6616 and smoke blends. Some tribes used it in a handful of rituals; others used it more as a
6617 daily prayer and meditation herb. There are many forms of anthropological evidence
6618 of this, dating a few thousand years before the Asians have written proof of use. Most
6619 strains found on the East coast were not as good as those from India, but were
6620 growing both wild and cultivated long before Europeans’ arrival on this side of the
6621 world.

6622

6623 .Considered to be sacred, marijuana has been used in religious worship from This
6624 common thread is found throughout the Bible, including the New Testament.
6625 religious ceremonies because of hemp's traditional association with purity.

6626

6627

6628 Exhibit Fourteen and evidence

6629

6630

6631 Conflict of Interest Form - Justice
6632 www.justice.gov/sites/default/files/usao-sdny/...
6633

6634 Conflict of Interest Form Author: SDNY Personnel Office Created Date: 1/26/2005
6635 12:48:02 PM ...

6636 Conflicts of Interest - American Bar Association
6637 www.americanbar.org/.../conflictsofinterest.html
6638

6639 Conflicts of interest appear in an infinite variety of situations and are ... forms, or
6640 memos that ... and of counsel attorneys. Conflict checking that includes all ...

6641

6642

6643 Federal Law of Attorney Conduct, Conflicts of Interest -...
6644 [litigation-essentials.lexisnexis.com/webcd/app?action=DocumentDisplay&crawlid=1](http://litigation-essentials.lexisnexis.com/webcd/app?action=DocumentDisplay&crawlid=1&doctype=cite&docid=30-808+Moore's+Federal+Practice+-+Civil+808.syn&srctype=smi&srcid=2929&key=81afeeffef6f43129d6d0cb626e140f1)
6645 [&doctype=cite&docid=30-808+Moore's+Federal+Practice+-+Civil+808.syn&srctype](http://litigation-essentials.lexisnexis.com/webcd/app?action=DocumentDisplay&crawlid=1&doctype=cite&docid=30-808+Moore's+Federal+Practice+-+Civil+808.syn&srctype=smi&srcid=2929&key=81afeeffef6f43129d6d0cb626e140f1)
6646 [=smi&srcid=2929&key=81afeeffef6f43129d6d0cb626e140f1](http://litigation-essentials.lexisnexis.com/webcd/app?action=DocumentDisplay&crawlid=1&doctype=cite&docid=30-808+Moore's+Federal+Practice+-+Civil+808.syn&srctype=smi&srcid=2929&key=81afeeffef6f43129d6d0cb626e140f1)
6647

6648 May 10, 2017 ... As fiduciaries, lawyers owe a duty to avoid conflicts of interest.
6649 Federal courts are willing to disqualify attorneys for engaging in conflicts of ...
6650 Rule 1.7: Conflict of Interest: Current Clients | The Center for...

www.americanbar.org/groups/professional_responsibility/publications/model_rules_of_professional_conduct/rule_1_7_conflict_of_interest_current_clients.html

(a) Except as provided in paragraph (b), a lawyer shall not represent a client if ... of a concurrent conflict of interest under paragraph (a), a lawyer may represent ...

Exhibit Fifteen and Evidence

Exhibit sixteen and evidence

Martial Law Flag “Pursuant to 4 U.S.C. chapter 1, §1, 2, & 3; Executive Order 10834, August 21, 1959; 24 F.R.6865; a military flag is a flag that resembles the regular flag of the United States, except that it has a YELLOW FRINGE border on three sides. The President of the United States designates this deviation from the regular flag, by executive order, and in his capacity as Commander-in-Chief of the military. The placing of a fringe on the national flag, the dimensions of the flag and the arrangement of the stars in the union are matters of detail not controlled by statute, but are within the discretion of the President as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy.” 34 Ops. Atty. Gen. 83.

President, Dwight David Eisenhower, by Executive Order No.10834, signed on August 21, 1959, and printed in the Federal Register at 24 F.R. 6865, pursuant to law, stated that: “A military flag is a flag that resembles the regular flag of the United States, except that it has a yellow fringe border on three sides.”

GOLD FRINGED FLAG

The flags displayed in State courts and courts of the United States have gold or yellow fringes. That is your WARNING that you are entering into a foreign enclave, the same as if you are stepping into a foreign embassy and you will be under the jurisdiction of that flag. The flag with the gold or yellow fringe has no constitution, no laws, and no rules of court, and is not recognized by any nation on the earth, and is foreign to you and the United States of America. more information

MILITARY FLAG WITH THE GOLD FRINGE

Martial Law Flag "Pursuant to 4 U.S.C. chapter 1, §§1, 2, & 3; Executive Order 10834, August 21, 1959; 24 F.R.6865; a military flag is a flag that resembles the regular flag of the United States, except that it has a YELLOW FRINGE border on three sides. The President of the United States designates this deviation from the regular flag, by executive order, and in his capacity as Commander-in-Chief of the military. The placing of a fringe on the national flag, the dimensions of the flag and

the arrangement of the stars in the union are matters of detail not controlled by statute, but are within the discretion of the President as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy." 34 Ops. Atty. Gen. 83.

President, Dwight David Eisenhower, by Executive Order No.10834, signed on August 21, 1959 and printed in the Federal Register at 24 F.R. 6865, pursuant to law, stated that: "A military flag is a flag that resembles the regular flag of the United States, except that it has a yellow fringe border on three sides."

THE LAW OF THE FLAG

The Law of the Flag, an International Law, which is recognized by every nation of the planet, is defined as:

"... a rule to the effect that a vessel is a part of the territory of the nation whose flag she flies. The term is used to designate the RIGHTS under which a ship owner, who sends his vessel into a foreign port, gives notice by his flag to all who enter into contracts with the ship master that he intends the Law of that Flag to regulate those contracts, and that they must either submit to its operation or not contract with him or his agent at all." Ref.: Ruhstrat v. People, 57 N.E. 41

By the doctrine of "four cornering" the flag establishes the law of the country that it represents. For example, the embassies of foreign countries, in Washington D.C., are "four cornered" by walls or fencing, creating an "enclave." Within the boundaries of the "enclave" of the foreign embassy, the flag of that foreign country establishes the jurisdiction and law of that foreign country, which will be enforced by the Law of the Flag and international treaty. If you enter an embassy, you will be subject to the laws of that country, just as if you board a ship flying a foreign flag, you will be subject to the laws of that flag, enforceable by the "master of the ship," (Captain), by the law of the flag.

When you enter a courtroom displaying a gold or yellow fringed flag, you have just entered into a foreign country, and you better have your passport with you, because you may not be coming back to the land of the free for a long time. The judge sitting under a gold or yellow fringe flag becomes the "captain" or "master" of that ship or enclave and he has absolute power to make the rules as he goes. The gold or yellow fringe flag is your warning that you are leaving your Constitutionally secured RIGHTS on the floor outside the door to that courtroom.

This is exactly why so many judges are appointed, and not elected by the people. The Federal judges are appointed by the President, the national military commander in chief. The State judges are appointed by the Governors, the state military commanders. The judges are appointed because the courts are military courts and civilians do not "elect" military officers.

Under martial law, you are presumed guilty until proven innocent.

The gold-fringed flag only stands inside military courts that sit in summary court martial proceedings against civilians and such courts are governed in part by local rules, but more especially by "The Manual of Courts Martial", U.S., 1994 Ed., at Art.

99, (c)(1)(b), pg. IV-34, PIN 030567-0000, U.S. Government Printing Office, Wash. D.C. The details of the crimes that civilians can commit, that are classed as 'Acts of War,' cover 125 pages in the Manual of Courts Martial.

Under Article IV, section 3, of the Constitution for the united States of America, no new State shall be formed or erected within the Jurisdiction of any other State. So -- Why have the judges of the State and Federal courts been allowed to erect foreign enclaves within our public courthouses under a foreign flag with the yellow fringe upon the soil of your state?

We just thought you would like to know, so that the next time you see this yellow fringed flag you will know what you are looking at and what it really means. If you are in Spain and you see the National Flag of Spain, you would know that you are under the jurisdiction of Spain; and their laws govern you at this time. You are officially NOTICED when you see their flag. This is an admiralty law that says that all who see this flag understand they are governed by the laws of the country that this flag represents. You SHOULD understand that the gold or yellow fringed flag signifies the same thing. It is a notice to you that you are under the rules and regulations of the military force that is flying that flag.

"It is an elementary rule of pleading, that a plea to the jurisdiction is a tacit (silent) admission that the court has a right to judge the case and is a waiver to all exception to the jurisdiction." (Girty v. Logan, 6 Bush KY, 8)

Currently, the Flag of the united States of America is defined at title 4 U.S.C. 1, 2 and Presidential Executive Order 10834, found in the Federal Register at Vol. 24. No. 166, P. 6365-6367. The American Flag of Peace of the united States of America is described as red, white and blue, with thirteen alternating red and white horizontal stripes, and a blue field (union) with 50 stars, one to represent each of the several States. The Flag is proportional, (1 X 1.9). This proportion is easily determined by measuring the length (fly) and dividing by the measurement of the width (hoist). The length divided by the width should be very nearly 1.9. If the flag is not to the correct 1 X 1.9 proportion, it is not a title 4 U.S.C. 1,2 American Flag of Peace of the united States of America.

THERE ARE ABSOLUTELY NO PROVISIONS IN THE LAW FOR ADDING A FOURTH COLOR (YELLOW FRINGE) TO THE TITLE 4 U.S.C. 1,2 FLAG.

Title 4 U.S.C. 3 provides that anything put on the Title 4 U.S.C. 1,2 Flag (gold fringe) MUTILATES the Flag, and carries a one-year prison term. [Note: According to Law.Cornell.edu, the prison term is not to exceed thirty days.] This is confirmed by the authority of title 36 U.S.C. 176 (G). The gold fringe is the fourth color and represents "color of law", and, when placed on the title 4 U.S.C. 1,2 Flag, mutilates the Flag and suspends the organic Constitution for the United States of America, and establishes "color of law". (Refer to title 18 U.S.C. 242. See Black's Law Dictionary).

As provided by title 36 U.S.C. 173, and Army Regulation 840-10, chapter 2-1(b), the Flag of the united States of America is defined and described in title 4 U.S.C. 1,2. Civilians must use the title 4 U.S.C. 1,2 Flag (see title 36 U.S.C. 173 and Army Regulation 840-10, chapter 2-7) and when military flags are displayed by Army

6801 Regulation 840-10, chapter 2 and title 36 U.S.C. 175.

6802
6803 THE ONLY AUTHORITY FOR A FRINGE ON THE FLAG IS IN THE ARMY
6804 REGULATIONS FOR THE NATIONAL (MILITARY) FLAGS ONLY.

6805
6806 The U.S. Attorney General has stated: “The placing of a gold fringe on the
6807 National flag, the dimensions of the flag, and the arrangement of the stars in the union
6808 are matters of detail not controlled by statute, but are within the discretion of the
6809 President as Commander-in-Chief of the Army and Navy. . . ancient custom sanctions
6810 the use of fringe on regimental colors and standards, but there seems to be no good
6811 reason or precedent for its use on other flags. . . the use of such a fringe is prescribed
6812 in current Army Regulations, No. 260-10.” (See 34 Ops. Atty. Gen. 483 & 485). The
6813 only statute or regulation, in the United States, prescribing a yellow fringed United
6814 States flag is Army Regulation No. 260-10, making it a military flag.

6815
6816 By army regulation 260-10, the gold fringe may be used only on regimental
6817 “colors”, the President’s flag, for military courts martial, and the flags used at military
6818 recruiting centers.

6819
6820 “A military flag emblem of a nation, usually made of cloth and flown from a staff;
6821 FROM A MILITARY STANDPOINT flags are of two general classes...those flown
6822 from stationary masts over army posts, and those carried by troops in formation. The
6823 former are referred to by the general name of flags. The latter are called colors when
6824 carried by dismounted troops. COLORS AND STANDARDS are more nearly square
6825 than flags , and are made of silk, with a knotted FRINGE OF YELLOW ON THREE
6826 SIDES...USE OF A FLAG — THE MOST GENERAL AND APPROPRIATE USE
6827 OF THE FLAG IS AS A NATIONAL SYMBOL OF AUTHORITY AND POWER”
6828 (National Encyclopedia, Vol. 4)

6829
6830 The adornments on the top of the flag pole are for military use only. The gold
6831 eagle is for the use of the President of the United States only, and only in time of war.
6832 (Or when he is standing as Commander-in-Chief of the military, having declared
6833 Martial Law, and suspended the Constitution). The gold spear ball is for military
6834 recruiting centers only. The gold acorn is for military parades only. (Army Regulation
6835 840-10, chapter 8).

6836
6837 Colors “A flag, ensign, or standard borne in an army or fleet.” (Webster’s, 1971).

6838
6839 Color An appearance, semblance, or simulacrum, as distinguished from that which
6840 is real. A prima facie or apparent right. Hence, a deceptive appearance; a plausible,
6841 assumed exterior, concealing a lack or reality; a disguise or pretext. (Black’s Law
6842 Dictionary, 6th Ed.)

6843
6844 Color of law The appearance or semblance, without the substance, of legal right.
6845 Misuse of power, possessed by virtue of state law and made possible only because
6846 wrongdoer is clothed with authority of state, is action taken under “color of state law”.

6847
6848 Colorable That which is in appearance only, and not in reality, what it purports to
6849 be, hence counterfeit, feigned, having the appearance of truth. (Windel v. Flinn, 251 P
6850 2d 136, 146).

Colorable alteration One which makes no real or substantial change, but is introduced only as a subterfuge or means of evading the patent or copyright law.

Colorable imitation In the law of trademarks, this phrase denotes such a close or ingenious imitation as to be calculated to deceive ordinary persons. (Blacks Law 6th).

The title 4 U.S.C. 1,2 American Flag of the united States of America takes precedence over all other flags, as it is the superior flag, and establishes the jurisdiction of the united States of America, and the laws made in pursuance thereof.

THE LAW OF THE FLAG

The Law of the Flag, an International Law, which is recognized by every nation of the planet, is defined as: "...a rule to the effect that a vessel is a part of the territory of the nation whose flag she flies. The term is used to designate the right under which a ship owner, who sends his vessel into a foreign port, gives notice by his flag to all who enter into contracts with the ship master that he intends the Law of that Flag to regulate those contracts, and that they must either submit to its operation or not contract with him or his agent at all." (Ref. Ruhstrat v. People, 57 N.E. 41)

By the doctrine of "four cornering: the flag establishes the law of the country that it represents. For example, the embassies of foreign countries, in Washington, D.C., are "four cornered" by walls or fencing, creating an "enclave." Within the boundaries of the "enclave" of the foreign embassy, the flag of that foreign country establishes the jurisdiction and law of that foreign country, which will be enforced by the Law of the Flag and international treaty. If you enter an embassy, you will be subject to the laws of that country, just as if you board a ship flying a foreign flag, you will be subject to the laws of that flag, enforceable by the "master of the ship," (Captain), by the law of the flag.

Under Article IV, section 3, of the organic Constitution for the United States of America (1787), no new State shall be formed or erected within the Jurisdiction of any other State. So — why have the Germans been allowed to erect a German enclave at Holloman Air Force Base in New Mexico, under the Law of the Flag? Why have the judges of the State and Federal Courts been allowed to erect foreign enclaves within our courthouses under the foreign flag of the yellow fringe on the soil of our Republic?

The flags displayed in State courts and courts of the United States have gold or yellow fringes. It is your warning that you are entering a foreign enclave and will be subject to the jurisdiction of that flag. The flag of the gold or yellow fringe has no constitution, no laws, and no rules of court, and is not recognized by any Nation on the earth, and is foreign to this Republic and the united States of America. When you enter a courtroom displaying a gold or yellow fringed flag, you have just entered into a foreign country, and you had better have your passport with you, you may not be coming back. The judge under a gold or yellow fringe flag become the "captain" or "master" and has absolute power to make the rules as he goes. The gold or yellow fringe flag is your warning that you are leaving your constitutionally secured rights at the door. "It is an elementary rule of pleading, that a plea to the jurisdiction is a tacit

(silent) admission that the court has a right to judge in the case and is a waiver to all exception to the jurisdiction.” (Girty v. Logan, 6 Bush KY. 8)

You can watch over the ramparts by the dawn’s early light, with bombs bursting in the air, until you go blind, but you will not see a title 4 U.S.C. 1,2 Flag with its bright stars and broad stripes. When the flags are gone, the Country is gone. You may see something that looks like an American Flag, (a colorable flag, a colorable alteration or imitation) but it is a shortened National Flag, for military use only. Take your tape measure and calculator to determine what kink of a flag it is. Five will get you ten that its proportion is 1 X 1.66 or 1 X 1.5. It looks like a duck, walks like a duck, quacks like a duck, but it ain’t a duck.

Why do private businesses display National Flags with military adornments on the flag pole? Why do banks display gold or yellow fringed flags, with gold adornments, in their lobbies? Is McDonald’s competing with the Army recruiters? Why do churches display military flags? Does your Church have a pastor, or chaplain? Why have military “colors” been placed in our public schools? Why are our children being taught under martial law, in a foreign or military “enclave” with no constitutionally secured rights, under the Law of the Flag? A military or foreign flag, displayed without the presence of a title 4 U.S.C. 1,2 Flag suspends the Constitution, by the International law of the flag.

Flag – Martial law “The placing of a fringe on the national flag, the dimensions of the flag and the arrangement of the stars in the union are matters of detail not controlled by statute, but are within the discretion of the President as Commander In Chief of the Army and Navy.” 34 Ops. Atty. Gen. 483.

The "Bar" Treaty of 1947
Effectively Tying the Bar Associations of the Respective Pan-American States
Together and subverting our Constitution to United Nations International
Law AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION
(Organized at Saratoga Springs New York, August 21, 1878)

It's object shall be to advance the science of jurisprudence, promote the administration of justice and uniformity of legislation and of judicial decision throughout the Nation, uphold the honor of the profession of the law, encourage cordial intercourse among the members of the American Bar and to correlate the activities of the Bar organizations of the respective States on a representative basis, in the interest of the legal profession and of the public throughout the United States. (ABA Constitution, Article 1)

REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE FOR PEACE AND LAW THROUGH
UNITED NATIONS (relative to the Bar Treaty of 1947)

Further
THERE ARE ABSOLUTELY NO PROVISIONS IN THE LAW FOR ADDING A
FOURTH COLOR (YELLOW FRINGE) TO THE TITLE 4 U.S.C. 1,2 FLAG.

Title 4 U.S.C. 3 provides that anything put on the Title 4 U.S.C. 1,2 Flag (gold fringe) MUTILATES the Flag, and carries a one-year prison term. This is confirmed by the authority of title 36 U.S.C. 176 (G). The gold fringe is the fourth color and represents “color of law” , and, when placed on the title 4 U.S.C. 1,2 Flag, mutilates the Flag and suspends the organic Constitution for the United States of America, and establishes “color of law”. (Refer to title 18 U.S.C. 242. See Black’s Law Dictionary).

As provided by title 36 U.S.C. 173, and Army Regulation 840-10, chapter 2-1(b), the Flag of the united States of America is defined and described in title 4 U.S.C. 1,2. Civilians must use the title 4 U.S.C. 1,2 Flag (see title 36 U.S.C. 173 and Army Regulation 840-10, chapter 2-7) and when military flags are displayed by Army Regulation 840-10, chapter 2 and title 36 U.S.C. 175.

THE ONLY AUTHORITY FOR A FRINGE ON THE FLAG IS IN THE ARMY REGULATIONS FOR THE NATIONAL (MILITARY) FLAGS ONLY.

The U.S. Attorney General has stated: “The placing of a gold fringe on the National flag, the dimensions of the flag, and the arrangement of the stars in the union are matters of detail not controlled by statute, but are within the discretion of the President as Commander-in-Chief of the Army and Navy. . . ancient custom sanctions the use of fringe on regimental colors and standards, but there seems to be no good reason or precedent for its use on other flags. . . the use of such a fringe is prescribed in current Army Regulations, No. 260-10.” (See 34 Ops. Atty. Gen. 483 & 485). The only statute or regulation, in the United States, prescribing a yellow fringed United States flag is Army Regulation No. 260-10, making it a military flag.

By army regulation 260-10, the gold fringe may be used only on regimental “colors”, the President’s flag, for military courts martial, and the flags used at military recruiting centers.

“A military flag emblem of a nation, usually made of cloth and flown from a staff; FROM A MILITARY STANDPOINT flags are of two general classes...those flown from stationary masts over army posts, and those carried by troops in formation. The former are referred to by the general name of flags. The latter are called colors when carried by dismounted troops. COLORS AND STANDARDS are more nearly square than flags , and are made of silk, with a knotted FRINGE OF YELLOW ON THREE SIDES...USE OF A FLAG -- THE MOST GENERAL AND APPROPRIATE USE OF THE FLAG IS AS A NATIONAL SYMBOL OF AUTHORITY AND POWER” (National Encyclopedia, Vol. 4)

The adornments on the top of the flag pole are for military use only. The gold eagle is for the use of the President of the United States only, and only in time of war. (Or when he is standing as Commander-in-Chief of the military, having declared Martial Law, and suspended the Constitution). The gold spear ball is for military recruiting centers only. The gold acorn is for military parades only. (Army Regulation 840-10, chapter 8).

Colors “A flag, ensign, or standard borne in an army or fleet.” (Webster’s, 1971).

Color An appearance, semblance, or simulacrum, as distinguished from that which

is real. A prima facie or apparent right. Hence, a deceptive appearance; a plausible, assumed exterior, concealing a lack or reality; a disguise or pretext. (Black's Law Dictionary, 6th Ed.)

Color of law The appearance or semblance, without the substance, of legal right. Misuse of power, possessed by virtue of state law and made possible only because wrongdoer is clothed with authority of state, is action taken under "color of state law".

Colorable That which is in appearance only, and not in reality, what it purports to be, hence counterfeit, feigned, having the appearance of truth. (Windel v. Flinn, 251 P 2d 136, 146).

Colorable alteration One which makes no real or substantial change, but is introduced only as a subterfuge or means of evading the patent or copyright law.

Colorable imitation In the law of trademarks, this phrase denotes such a close or ingenious imitation as to be calculated to deceive ordinary persons. (Blacks Law 6th).

The title 4 U.S.C. 1,2 American Flag of the united States of America takes precedence over all other flags, as it is the superior flag, and establishes the jurisdiction of the united States of America, and the laws made in pursuance thereof.

Exhibit seventeen and Evidence

In an action for false imprisonment, an injured person alleges that s/he was intentionally held or confined for some period of time by the defendant. There are three remedies for false imprisonment. They are damages, habeas corpus, and self help. Being a tort, the basic remedy for false imprisonment is an action for damages. An action for damages can be based on physical or mental suffering; loss of reputation; or malicious intent on behalf of the defendant. When a person is unlawfully confined, s/he can be released from such confinement by the writ of habeas corpus. A person can also use reasonable force in order to escape from the confinement.

Action for damages in false imprisonment flows from the unlawful detention. A plaintiff who has suffered injuries can be compensated for:

- physical injuries;
- mental suffering;
- loss of earnings;
- injury to the reputation;
- reasonable and necessary expenses incurred, like attorneys' fees; and
- deprivation of any right caused by the loss of liberty.

Exemplary damages will not be allowed:

in the absence of actual damage sustained by plaintiff;
where the false imprisonment was brought about in good faith, without malice in
fact or in law; or
where there is no element of wantonness or oppression.

When a jury makes an honest mistake as to the nature and extent of damages,
normally a new trial is not required. Usually, court will order a remittitur. After
reviewing the evidence in support of the jury's verdict, when the court finds that the
jury's verdict is excessive, the court will order a remittitur. The award considered for
review must exceed fair and reasonable compensation. A remittitur is an order by the
court to remit a portion of the award. The remedy of a remittitur is designed to cure
an award of damages that is grossly excessive without the necessity of a new trial or
an appeal[iii].

[i] Marshall v. District of Columbia, 391 A.2d 1374, 1380 (D.C. 1978).

[ii] Atkins v. New York City, 143 F.3d 100, 103 (2d Cir. N.Y. 1998).

[iii] Armon v. Griggs, 60 S.W.3d 37, 40 (Mo. Ct. App. 2001).

Attorney Licensing Is a Fraud
(1957) and is located for all to read at the following pages in volume 353 U.S.
pgs.238, 239 of the United States Reports. Here is a quote from that case:

"It is a clearly established principle of law that an attorney must represent a
corporation, it being incorporeal and a creature of the law. An attorney representing
an artificial entity must appear with the corporate charter and law in his hand. A
person acting as an attorney for a foreign principal must be registered to act on the
principal's behalf." See, Foreign Agents Registration Act" (22 USC § 612 et seq.);
Victor Rabinowitz et. at. v. Robert F. Kennedy, 376 US 605. "Failure to file the
"Foreign Agents Registrations Statement" goes directly to the jurisdiction and lack of
standing to be before the court, and is a felony pursuant to 18 USC §§ 219, 951. The
conflict of law, interest and allegiance is obvious.

Whereas :Power of the Grand Jury - In a stunning 6 to 3 decision Justice Antonin
Scalia, writing for the majority, confirmed that the American grand jury is neither part
of the judicial, executive nor legislative branches of government, but instead belongs
to the people. It is in effect a fourth branch of government "governed" and
administered to directly by and on behalf of the American people, and its authority
emanates from the Bill of Rights, see United States -v- Williams

Conflict of Interest Form - Department of Justice
www.justice.gov/usao/nys/forms/ethics.pdf

Sep 14, 1987 ... Selected ethics opinions relating to potential conflicts of interest
resulting from an. Application for ... employment relationship with the clerk will
develop, the judge may lawyer should first make disclosure to his supervisor in.

7101
7102 1.7 Conflict of Interest - Kansas Judicial Branch
7103 www.kscourts.org/rules/Rule-Info.asp?r1=Rules+Relating+to+discipline+of+Attorneys&r2=48
7104
7105
7106 For specific Rules regarding certain concurrent conflicts of interest see Rule 1.8. ...
7107 For example, a lawyer asked to represent several individuals seeking to form a ... The
7108 mere possibility of subsequent harm does not itself require disclosure ...
7109 Code of Judicial Conduct - Kansas Judicial Branch
7110 www.kscourts.org/Kansas-Courts/Supreme-Court/Orders/2009/2009sc006.pdf
7111
7112 Mar 1, 2009 ... Robert J. Fleming, District Court Judge, Parsons, Kansas; Vice- ...
7113 cautionary and a statement of what is or is not appropriate conduct but not a ...
7114 “Economic interest” means ownership of more than a de minimis legal or defined
7115 in general terms because of the widely varying forms of judicial service. The.
7116 Kansas Judicial Branch - Appellate Clerk - Judicial Ethics...
7117 www.kscourts.org/appellate-clerk/general/judicial-ethics.asp
7118
7119 Oct 20, 2015 ... Court Rules and Forms ... 2014, JE 180, Whether a Kansas judge may
7120 write a short column for a ... judge to hear cases involving other lawyers in the firm if
7121 a conflict does exist. meetings appearing pro se on a matter of personal interest.
7122 be made to former public statements and publicly taken positions.
7123
7124
7125 Whereas : Change of judge; procedure; grounds. - Statute | Kansas State ...
7126 www.kslegislature.org/li_2012/b2011_12/statute/020_000_0000_chapter/020_003_0000_article/020_003_0011d_section/020_003_0011d_k/
7127
7128
7129 If the judge disqualifies the judge's self, the action shall be assigned to another judge
7130 by the chief judge. If the judge refuses to disqualify the judge's self, the ...
7131 Unraveling the Woolsack: How to Recuse or ... - Monnat & Spurrier
7132 monnat.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/03/Woolsack07-06.pdf
7133
7134 worst thing that could happen? Surely no Kansas judge would re- spond as did the
7135 federal Rhode Island judge who was so infuriated by a recusal motion that he ...
7136 101624 - Kansas Judicial Branch
7137 www.kscourts.org/Cases-and-Opinions/Opinions/SupCt/2013/20130726/101624.pdf
7138
7139 Jul 26, 2013 ... 311d(c)(1)-(5); the Kansas Code of Judicial Conduct, Canon 2, Rule ...
7140 Sawyer filed a motion seeking Judge McNally's recusal on February 28, ...
7141 83955 -- In re Platt -- Per Curiam -- Kansas Supreme Court
7142 www.kscourts.org/cases-and-opinions/opinions/supct/2000/20000616/83955.htm
7143
7144 Jun 16, 2000 ... (1) A judge shall disqualify himself or herself in a proceeding in
7145 which the judge's impartiality might reasonably be questioned.
7146 RULE 2.11: Disqualification (A) A judge shall disqualify himself...
7147 www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/administrative/professional_responsibility/211.pdf
7148
7149
7150 Apr 15, 2011 ... (C) A judge subject to disqualification under this Rule, other than

7151 for KS. Effective. 3/1/2009. Deletes Model Code (A)(4). (A)(4): same as ...
7152 The Judicial Disqualification Project - American Bar Association
7153 www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/administrative/judicial_independence/jdp_gey
7154 h_report.authcheckdam.pdf
7155
7156 what the disqualification rules say, so much as how judges apply those rules in ...
7157 disqualification practices around the country, to the end of supplying judges and
7158 148 California, Connecticut, Georgia, Kansas, Louisiana, Montana, Nevada, ...
7159 Disqualifying the High Court - University Press of Kansas
7160 kansaspress.ku.edu/978-0-7006-2271-9.html
7161
7162 Choice Outstanding Academic Title Since at least the time of Justinian—under
7163 statutes, codes of judicial ethics, and the common law—judges have been ...
7164 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT ...
7165 ecf.ksd.uscourts.gov/cgi-bin/show_public_doc?2013cv4008-73
7166
7167 May 25, 2015 ... FOR THE DISTRICT OF KANSAS. QUINN NGIENDO, ... The
7168 Court will first address Plaintiff's request for recusal. Plaintiff ... Under 28 U.S.C. §
7169 455(a) and (b)(1) a judge “shall disqualify himself in any proceeding in which his ...
7170
7171 THE TREATY OF WASHINGTON Whereas : Treaties as Law of the Land -
7172 United States Constitution
7173 law.onecle.com › United States Constitution
7174 Treaties as Law of the Land. Treaty commitments of the United States are of two
7175 kinds. In the language of Chief Justice Marshall in 1829: “A treaty is, in its Cases will
7176 be provided to the federal courts of their own records
7177
7178
7179 The year 1871 was marked by the conclusion of an important treaty between England ,
7180 Vatican and the United States. Besides settling certain questions which threatened the
7181 friendly relations of the two countries, the treaty enunciated important principles of
7182 international law, and afforded the world a shining instance of peaceful arbitration as
7183 a substitute for the horrors of war.
7184
7185 Ever since 1863 the United States had been seeking satisfaction from Great Britain for
7186 the depredations committed by the Alabama and other Confederate cruisers sailing
7187 from English ports. Negotiations were broken off in 1865 and again in 1868. The next
7188 year Reverdy Johnson, American Minister to England, negotiated a treaty, but it was
7189 rejected by the Senate.
7190
7191 United States Code Title 18. Crimes and Criminal Procedure Part I. Crimes Chapter
7192 53. Indians
7193 18 USCS §1152 (2005) Have to have and injured party , CORPS aka Corporation can
7194 not be injured party because they fictions .
7195
7196 Whereas :If a public entity denies an otherwise "qualified individual" "meaningful
7197 access" to its "services, programs, or activities" "solely by reason of" his or her
7198 disability, that individual may have an ADA claim against the public entity. Id. (citing
7199 Alexander v. Choate, 469 U.S. 287, 301-02, 105 S.Ct. 712, 83 L.Ed.2d 661 (1985)
7200 (internal citation omitted)).LEE v. CITY OF LOS ANGELES•250 F.3d 668, 690 (9th

Cir. 2001)

Whereas : LEGAL is, "THE UNDOING OF the Greatspirit mother earth the creator . GOD'S LAW." [1893 Dictionary of Arts and Sciences, Encyclopedia Britannica, a dictionary of arts, sciences and general literature / The R.S Peale 9th 1893]

The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a Republican Form of Government, and shall protect each of them against Invasion; and on Application of the Legislature, or of the Executive (when the legislature cannot be convened) against domestic Violence.

The Oath of office is a quid pro quo contract cf [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 cf [Title 18 U.S.C., Sections 241, 242]. Treason under the Constitution at Article 3, Section 3., and Intrinsic Fraud cf [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"

U.S. Code § 2381 - defines Treason as - "Whoever, owing allegiance to the United States, levies war against them or adheres to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort within the United States or elsewhere, is guilty of treason..." and the law states that those convicted of treason - "shall suffer death, or shall be imprisoned not less than five years and fined under this title but not less than \$10,000; and shall be incapable of holding any office under the United States."

Prigg v. Pennsylvania: When the Supreme Court Supported James Madison's Advice to Stop Federal Power

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xcIIAwkcTv0&feature=youtu.be>

Whereas : the foreign agents 39,160,729 pounds of beef, "delivered [in 1880] at 34 Indian agencies in ten western states" to feed American Indians whose subsistence, the buffalo, had so recently been driven to the brink of extinction.

7251
 7252 Last Words of Buffalo Inspiration: General Nelson Miles When we get rid of the
 7253 Indians and buffalo, the cattle will fill this country. ~ Nelson Miles, 1876 tghat they
 7254 wioe out for personal gain depriving lawful bloodline american of there food
 7255 resources and land
 7256
 7257
 7258 Kansas Notarial Certificates
 7259
 7260
 7261
 7262 Legatus Non Violatur ,Without Prejudice , Non Assumpsit , I-207--I-308 All Rights
 7263 Reserved
 7264
 7265 Autograph in red ink
 7266 _____Dateandtime_____
 7267
 7268
 7269
 7270
 7271
 7272 Redink seal _____
 7273
 7274
 7275 Acknowledgment of woman or and man the Individual
 7276 Acknowledgment of Individual
 7277
 7278 STATE OF KANSAS
 7279
 7280 COUNTY OF _____
 7281
 7282 This instrument was acknowledged to me on _____
 7283 (date) by _____ [name(s) of person(s)].
 7284
 7285 _____
 7286
 7287 Notary Public
 7288
 7289 Print Name: _____
 7290
 7291 My commission expires:
 7292
 7293 _____
 7294
 7295 Acknowledgment of Corporation
 7296
 7297 STATE OF KANSAS
 7298
 7299 COUNTY OF _____
 7300

7301 This instrument was acknowledged before me on _____
7302 (date) by _____ [name(s) of person(s)]
7303 as
7304 _____
7305 _____ (type of authority,
7306 e.g., officer, trustee, etc.) of _____ (name of
7307 party on behalf of whom instrument was executed.)
7308
7309
7310
7311 _____
7312
7313 Notary Public
7314
7315 Print Name: _____
7316
7317 My commission expires:
7318
7319 _____