

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 other wise 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).

U.S. Supreme Court decisions regarding the sovereign American people, filing fees and/or their free access to the courts.

The courts must realize the sovereign people, are not bound to pay filling fees as the sovereign people are not a person, or persons. The use of the word person is the reason the sovereign American people have been tricked into 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, so that's why the courts are not supposed to be falsely charging the sovereign American people to pay filing fees. When the courts state that Title 28 U.S.C. sec 1914 requires a person or persons to pay fees, that does not apply to sovereign American people. The CODE only applies to a person or persons, which are corporations. The sovereign American people require their lawful right to free access, without fees as ordered by the U.S. Supreme Court.

Take Mandatory Judicial Notice and Cognizance under (Federal Rules of Evidence 201 (d) that "plaintiff" i.e. Libellant, has a lawful right to proceed without cost, based upon the following case law:

The U.S. 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)

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 Henkel*, 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 Henkel*, 201 US 43

NOTICE AND CONCLUSION

So in closing it is clear that the sovereign American people, petitioners/plaintiffs/libellants must have their funds, refunded if they 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 already paid.

Petitioner/libellant also respectfully demands the Magistrate take judicial notice of all herein under RULE 201 (d) which are adjudicated facts.

Petitioner/libellant 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 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 and pursuant to 28 U.S. Code § 1746 - Unsworn declarations under penalty of perjury

THIS SECTION IS ALWAYS ON THE RIGHT NOT LEFT

on this fifth day of the tenth month, Two Thousand, Fifteen A.D.

:john-henry: doe

LikeShow more reactions

Comment

Comments

Edward Johnston

Edward Johnston this is why it has to be done in Admiralty law: In Title 28 U.S.C. Judiciary and Judicial Procedure, in the chapter and section that defines "court," "debt," "judgment," and "United States" (Chapter 176 Federal Debt Collection Procedure, Section 3002),