

LEGAL NOTICE OF CHANGE IN DOMICILE/CITIZENSHIP RECORDS AND DIVORCE FROM THE “UNITED STATES” FORM INSTRUCTIONS

Last revised: 07/15/23

WARNING: This form is posted for historical and educational purposes. It is no longer part of our Path to Freedom, Form #09.015, Section 2 compliance processes. The replacement form is below:

Identity Theft Affidavit, Form #14.020

https://sedm.org/Forms/14-PropProtection/Identity_Theft_Affidavit-f14039.pdf

1. **PURPOSE:**

- 1.1. To allow people to legally, politically, and commercially completely divorce the state and government they were born in under the civil law without expatriating or abandoning their nationality and becoming an alien on every country on earth.
- 1.2. To facilitate becoming a sovereign human and not statutory “person” or “individual” immune from the jurisdiction of state and federal courts in your state.
- 1.3. To become a “nontaxpayer” not subject to any part of the Internal Revenue Code.
- 1.4. To become a “de facto stateless person” without giving up one’s nationality. This condition is described in the Social Security Program Operations Manual System (POMS), Section

[RS 02640.040 Stateless Persons](#)

A. **DEFINITIONS**

There are two classes of stateless persons:

1. **DE JURE**—Persons who do not have nationality in any country.

2. **DE FACTO**—Persons who have left the country of which they were nationals and no longer enjoy its protection and assistance. They are usually political refugees. They are legally citizens [really they mean NATIONALS, not statutory CITIZENS] of a country because its laws do not permit denaturalization or only permit it with the country’s approval.

B. POLICY

1. De Jure Status

Once it is established that a person is de jure stateless, he/she keeps this status until he/she acquires nationality in some country.

Any of the following establish an individual is de jure stateless:

a. a “travel document” issued by the individual’s country of residence showing the:

1. holder is stateless; and

2. document is issued under the United Nations Convention of 28 September 1954 Relating to the Status of Stateless Persons. (The document shows the phrase “Convention of 28 September 1954” on the cover and sometimes on each page.)

b. a “travel document” issued by the International Refugee Organization showing the person is stateless.

c. a document issued by the officials of the country of former citizenship showing the individual has been deprived of citizenship in that country.

2. De Facto Status

Assume an individual is de facto stateless if he/she:

- a. says he/she is stateless but cannot establish he/she is de jure stateless; and
- b. establishes that:

- 1. he/she has taken up residence outside the country of his/her nationality;
- 2. there has been an event which is hostile to him/her, such as a sudden or radical change in the government, in the country of nationality; and

NOTE: In determining whether an event was hostile to the individual, it is sufficient to show the individual had reason to believe it would be hostile to him/her.

- 3. he/she renounces, in a sworn statement, the protection and assistance of the government of the country of which he/she is a national and declares he/she is stateless. The statement must be sworn to before an individual legally authorized to administer oaths and the original statement must be submitted to SSA.

De facto status stays in effect only as long as the conditions in b. continue to exist. If, for example, the individual returns [changes his/her domicile, NOT physically returns] to his/her country of nationality, de facto statelessness ends.

[SOURCE: Social Security POMS Manual, Section RS 0024640.040
<https://s044a90.ssa.gov/apps10/poms.nsf/lxx/0302640040>]

2. **INTENDED AUDIENCE:**

Those born anywhere in the American Union, including states of the Union, federal territories, and U.S. possessions but who are PRESENTLY domiciled either abroad or within constitutional but not statutory states of the Union at the time they send in the document.

NOTE: If you have questions about whether you are eligible to use this document, please read the following document in its entirety in an effort to understand citizenship well enough to answer your question by yourself BEFORE contacting us for help. This is an important part of exercising your due diligence as a sovereign:

Why You are a “national”, “state national”, and Constitutional but not Statutory Citizen, Form #05.006

DIRECT LINK: <http://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/WhyANational.pdf>

FORMS PAGE: <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

3. **REASON WHY THIS DOCUMENT IS NECESSARY:**

- 3.1. It is extremely important to build a complete administrative record documenting your status and intentions relating to the government to prevent injurious presumptions that financially benefit them and violate the law. This document is one of the first steps in doing that. See:

Techniques for Building a Good Administrative Record, Form #09.008

<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

- 3.2. If you DON'T submit this document, then it will be very difficult later in a court setting to get this kind of evidence in the record. This is because a corrupted government and corrupt judges frequently will abuse the rules of evidence to prejudice your case because they lose jurisdiction when this kind of information used against them in a civil proceeding.
- 3.3. There is no form or procedure published by any government agency or website that accomplishes what this document accomplishes. The government doesn't want you to know you can do this, but you have a legal right to.
- 3.4. We have found no form available from any private organization or individual that accomplishes what this form accomplishes. The evidence and facts contained in this Legal Notice protect and preserve your Constitutional and religious Rights in a way that no other approach we are aware of can.
- 3.5. People and organizations who offer similar techniques for civilly divorcing the state typically do so incorrectly and in a way that unnecessarily undermines the rights of the party, using expatriation. Expatriation is defined as “the process of abandoning nationality and allegiance”. Expatriation is completely unnecessary to do in order to become a “transient foreigner” or “stateless person” immune from the civil jurisdiction of courts in your state. Domicile, not citizenship, is where nearly all of the government’s civil jurisdiction originates from. An example of a group that incorrectly asserts that “expatriation” is necessary is the Minnesota Common Law Court. If you don't understand the significance of domicile, see:

Why Domicile and Becoming a “Taxpayer” Require Your Consent, Form 05.002

DIRECT LINK: <http://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/Domicile.pdf>

FORMS PAGE: <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

4. **GETTING YOUR SUBMISSION INTO THE PUBLIC RECORD AND PROTECTING YOUR EVIDENCE**

- 4.1. Apostille of documents: If you want to apostille your document with the secretary of state of your state, you must file an original and not a copy and include the correct fee. Fees vary depending on the state, so you will need to visit the secretary of state's website to find out the correct fee. Keep the following in mind:
 - 4.1.1. The thing to be apostilled is the Certificate of Service for this document and NOT the entire document because the Secretary of State typically charges an exorbitant amount by the page to apostille the entire document.
 - 4.1.2. Both federal and state Secretaries of State can apostille documents.
 - 4.1.3. For details on apostille of documents, read our document on apostilles so you can find out how it works:

Apostille of Documents, Form #09.004
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
 - 4.1.4. To find the secretary of state websites for each state, visit:
<http://famguardian.org/TaxFreedom/LegalRef/StateLegalResources.htm>
- 4.2. On some occasions, secretary of states have been known to try to interfere with the apostille process because this document is too damning for them. Hence, they may not even acknowledge receipt of your submission and not return the original you sent them for apostille. For this reason, we recommend making FOUR originals:
 - 4.2.1. Keep one.
 - 4.2.2. One for backup.
 - 4.2.3. Send one to the Secretary of state of your state.
 - 4.2.4. Send one to the Secretary of state of the United States.
- 4.3. This document also incorporates in section 0 a request to have the document apostilled. This process makes the document the highest form of legal evidence available. This is important as a way to obtain legally admissible evidence of your civil legal status that you can use and admit in any court of law as evidence as a public record. If the Secretary of State of the United States or of your State do not honor the request in section 0 and refuse to apostille the document, you wish to try again using the following procedure:
 - 4.3.1. Make two more copies of the package.
 - 4.3.2. Read our document on apostilles so you can find out how it works:

Apostille of Documents, Form #09.004
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
 - 4.3.3. Write a short cover letter explaining what you want.
 - 4.3.4. Mail the original to the Secretary of State of your state asking them to apostille the document and return one of the documents to you promptly. Usually, the Secretary of State will only apostille originals and not copies.

WARNING: Some of our readers have reported that the Secretary of State of their State has received communication from the Secretary of the State of the United State instructing them NOT to apostille this document. They are doing this because this document is very effective at accomplishing the purposes it was intended for and the government wants to avoid the severe adverse consequences to them of handing you this key to your chains as one of their indentured slaves. For such a case, please communicate to us [VIA THE MEMBER FORUMS SECTION 2.1.3](#) AND [NOT OUR CONTACT US PAGE](#) as much evidence as you can obtain of the government's efforts to interfere with developing evidence of your status and citizenship by doing a FOIA for a copy of the communication received by the Secretary of State of your State and then either faxing it to us or preferably PDFing it and emailing it to us so we can use this as evidence of violation of rights by the government. Thanks!

- 4.4. Keep the original in a safe place locked up, preferably away from your house so that it may not be seized. Also, scan it in as a full color PDF and make backups you keep in several locations. One of the first things a judge will do if you want the document admitted as evidence in a legal trial is ask about the chain of custody of the document and whether it has remained under your own control at all times so that there is an assurance that it is a reliable source of evidence.

5. **PROCEDURE FOR USE:**

- 5.1. This form has the effect of creating dual citizenship: 1. In the country and Republic of your birth; 2. In Heaven. It also makes one of the two citizenships subordinate to the other. You may therefore benefit from reading the dual citizenship questions and answers found on the internet at the address below:
<http://www.richw.org/dualcit/>
- 5.2. Form #10.001 consists of a Certificate of Service, a cover letter, two self-contained enclosures and the title-pages for five other enclosures obtained from external sources. The cover letter with its seven enclosures is a rather large set of documents (348 pages total as of October 2011). Therefore it is recommended that the cover letter and its enclosures be bounded together into a book using what is sometimes called a "19-hole punched plastic comb binder". Use a heavy clear plastic front cover and a heavy solid color plastic rear cover for your books to help prevent damage to any of the pages. You will want the Certificate of Service to be a stand-alone document, not

bound with the cover letter and enclosures, for ease of authenticating the Certificate of Service in the form of an apostille. The goal of the below detailed steps is to generate 2 originals and 4 copies of the book as well as 6 originals of the Certificate of Service. While you are assembling your books, before binding them, consider keeping the contents of each book in its own separate envelope/folder to keep the pages sorted in the right order and to prevent losing or mixing up the pages between the books.

- 5.3. The documents will be distributed to the below listed people as follows:
 - 5.3.1. **Submitter:** the 2 original books and 2 Certificate of Services. Keep 1 book and certificate in a safe place and keep the other book and certificate in another safe place at some other address.
 - 5.3.2. **U.S. Secretary of State:** 1 copied book and 2 Certificate of Services. The Secretary of State is to authenticate the Certificate of Services. One authenticated Certificate of Service is to be filed by the Secretary of State and the other is to be returned to you.
 - 5.3.3. **U.S. Attorney General:** 1 copied book
 - 5.3.4. **Secretary of State of your state:** 1 copied book and 2 Certificate of Services. The Secretary of State is to authenticate the Certificate of Services. One authenticated Certificate of Service is to be filed by the Secretary of State and the other is to be returned to you.
 - 5.3.5. **Attorney General of your state:** 1 copied book
- 5.4. The cost of this process is as follows:
 - 5.4.1. Six notarizations. At \$10/notarization that is \$60.
 - 5.4.2. Four registered mailings. Typically, these cost about \$10 for a total of \$40.
 - 5.4.3. About 350 pages times 5 photocopies, or 1750 pages. At 5 cents per page, that works out to \$87.
 - 5.4.4. A twenty dollar tip each to the mail server and the notary respectively for a total of \$40.
 - 5.4.5. Total cost: \$227. Well worth the effort and time to regain your freedom.
- 5.5. Start the process by gathering all the needed information
 - 5.5.1. Name of the Secretary of State and the Attorney General for the United States
 - 5.5.2. Name and address of the Secretary of State and the Attorney General for your state
 - 5.5.3. You can find the names and addresses of the addressee from the below listed resources:
 - 5.5.3.1. *SEDM Jurisdictions Database*, Litigation Tool # 10.010, <http://sedm.org/Litigation/LitIndex.htm>.
 - 5.5.3.2. *State Legal Resources*, <http://fanguardian.org/TaxFreedom/LegalRef/StateLegalResources.htm>
 - 5.5.4. The fee to apostille a document by the Secretary of State of your state.
 - 5.5.5. The fee to apostille a document by the Secretary of State of the United States.
- 5.6. Gather all the materials that you will need in addition to Form #10.001, which are the external enclosures and Certified mail slips, envelopes, and money order checks. Some of the enclosures for Form #10.001 are self-contained within the form while others must be obtained from external sources.
 - 5.6.1. Enclosure 1: a certified copy of your birth certificate from the county recorder where you were born. You will need two of these. You can obtain this document from the following link: <http://www.vitalchek.com/>
 - 5.6.2. Enclosure 2: *Affidavit of Citizenship, Domicile, and Tax Status*, Form #02.001 at: <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
 - 5.6.3. Enclosure 5: *USA Passport Application Attachment*, Form #06.007. The purpose of this form, as the cover page for Enclosure 5 says, is to amend all past USA passport applications. It serves as a substitute for the *Passport Amendment Request*, Form #06.016 and makes that request optional. It is a mandatory part of this form. This enclosure is available at: <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
 - 5.6.4. Four Certified Mail slips from a U.S. Postal Office
 - 5.6.5. Four 10" x 13" high strength bubble postal envelopes.
 - 5.6.6. Two money order checks: one to cover the apostille fees for two documents from the Secretary of State of United States, and one to cover the apostille fees for two documents from the Secretary of State of your state.
- 5.7. Build your master set of documents. The master set of documents will be used to make all needed copies and will also serve as one of your original set of documents.
 - 5.7.1. The form is electronically fillable with the free Adobe Acrobat Reader, which is available at the link below. Please download and install the latest version of the program. <http://www.adobe.com/products/acrobat/readstep2.html>
 - 5.7.2. If you have the full version of Acrobat instead of the free Reader, you can also save copies of the form containing all the values you typed in each field.
 - 5.7.3. Electronically fill out Enclosure 2 as directed in its instructions
 - 5.7.4. Electronically fill out page 1 of Form #10.001 (from top to bottom)
 - 5.7.4.1. At the top right corner fill in your name, your mailing address, followed by today's date
 - 5.7.4.2. Fill in the name of the Secretary of State of the United States

- 5.7.4.3. Fill in the name of the Attorney General of the United States
- 5.7.4.4. Fill in the name and address for the Secretary of State for your state
- 5.7.4.5. Fill in the name and address for the Attorney General for your state
- 5.7.5. Print a set of documents
 - 5.7.5.1. To save paper, print all documents using double sided paper.
 - 5.7.5.2. Print Form #10.001 – Form #10.001 contains several documents. To ensure that each documents starts on the front side of a page, print out the following sections separately: Certificate of Service, Cover Letter, Enclosure 1 title-page, Enclosure 2, Enclosure 3, and the title-pages for enclosures 4, 5, and 6.
 - 5.7.5.3. Print out Forms # 02.001, 05.006, and 06.007
- 5.7.6. Remove the instruction sections from the enclosure print-outs.
- 5.7.7. Print by hand your name at Section 13 (Affirmation section) of the Cover Letter.
- 5.7.8. Fill in each of the four Certified Mail slips with an addressee and address from the page 1 of the Cover Letter.
- 5.7.9. Fill in by hand the Certified Mail numbers on page 1 of the Cover Letter and on the Certificate of Service. Be certain to match the same number to the same addressee as shown on the Certified Mail slips.
- 5.7.10. Fill in by hand item 1 of the Certificate of Service with the correct total number of pages for each listed document, the correct number of listed documents and the correct number of total pages for all of the listed documents combined. Also fill in item 2 of the Certificate of Service with the addresses of the addressees as shown on page 1 of the Cover Letter.
- 5.7.11. Fill in by hand all other fields on the Certificate of Service that are known at this time. The reasons for you yourself doing this rather than the Mail Server are to minimize the risk of errors being made by the Mail Server and to simply the efforts of the Mail Server, making it easier for you to find a person willing to act as your Mail Server. Potentially, you could fill in all fields except for the name of Mail Server, the name of the city, the date, and the method documents will be mailed.
- 5.7.12. Write by hand “ENCLOSURE 2” at the bottom right corner of every page to Form #02.001.
- 5.7.13. Write by hand “ENCLOSURE 5” at the bottom right corner of every page to Form #06.007.
- 5.7.14. Assemble your master book - Gather the following documents in the order listed: Cover Letter, enclosure 1 title-page, Enclosure 2, title-page and enclosure for Enclosure 2, Enclosure 3, title-page and enclosure for Enclosures 5.
- 5.8. Make another original book by photocopying your master book one time using 2-sided paper. Your master book will also serve as one of your original books, giving you a total of two original books.
- 5.9. On the bottom right corner of your two Birth Certificates, write “ENCLOSURE 1”. Insert one of the certificates immediately following the Enclosure 1 title-page for both your master book and your original book.
- 5.10. Make another five original Certificate of Services by photocopying your master Certificate of Service five times using 2-sided paper. Your master Certificate of Service will also serve as one of your original certificate of Services, giving you a total of six original Certificate of Services.
- 5.11. Pre-address the four envelopes with the addressees and addresses from page 1 of the cover letter.
- 5.12. Sign, date and notarize documents for both the master book and the original book.
 - 5.12.1. Find a Postal Annex or Mailboxes etc. or other business services provider that has two people on duty, one of which is a notary and the other which would be willing to act your Mail Server. The Mail Server will complete the Certificate of Service form and then mail out all documents in accordance to that described in the Certificate of Service. Alternatively, you can search for a Mail Server from the people that you know and use a bank as your Notary Public. Banks will typically be cheaper than a business service provider. Also, finding someone that you know to act as your Mail Server will probably be easier than finding a business service provider that can provide both a Public Notary and a Mail Server.
 - 5.12.2. Sign, date, and print your name on the Affirmation section of Enclosure 6
 - 5.12.3. In the presence of a Notary Public, in blue ink (not black ink), sign and date the Signature Section (section 7) of Enclosure 2 and have the form notarized
 - 5.12.4. In the presence of a Notary Public and Mail Server, in blue ink (not black ink), sign the Affirmation section of the Cover Letter and then have the notary notarize your identity in the space provided below your signature
 - 5.12.5. Have the Mail Server sign and date under “Signature of witness” in the Affirmation section of the Cover Letter.
- 5.13. Make the documents for your four copied books - photocopy your master book four times using 2-sided paper.
- 5.14. Bind all six books as described above. You keep the master and original books
- 5.15. Prepare the six Certificates of Services

- 5.15.1. Have your Mail Server fill out the remaining fields on the Certificate of Services.
- 5.15.2. Have the Notary Public fill out the Notary Public Jurat at the end of the Certificate of Services, which authenticates the identity of the Mail Server.
- 5.15.3. You keep two of the original Certificate of Services
- 5.16. Mail the documents
 - 5.16.1. Have the Mail Server place the documents into the four envelopes as follows:
 - 5.16.1.1. One copied book (with money order attached) and TWO original Certificate of Services in the envelope going to the Secretary of State of the United States.
 - 5.16.1.2. One copied book in the envelope going to the Attorney General of the United States.
 - 5.16.1.3. One copied book (with money order attached) and TWO original Certificate of Services in the envelope going to the Secretary of State of your state
 - 5.16.1.4. One copied book in the envelope going to the Attorney General of your state.
 - 5.16.2. Accompany the Mail Server to your local post office
 - 5.16.3. Give the Mail Server the four Certified Mail slips that you previously filled out.
 - 5.16.4. Have the Mail Server mail the documents, certified mail
 - 5.16.5. Take possession of the stamped Certified Mail receipts after the documents are mailed.
- 5.17. Wait until the apostilled Certificate of Services comes back from the Secretary of State of your state and the Secretary of State of the United States. When they do arrive, you might want record one of the apostilled Certificate of Services with your County Recorder so that it becomes a public record which is automatically admissible as evidence in any court trial. The reason is that under [Federal Rule of Evidence 902](#), public records are not subject to the Hearsay Rule.
- 5.18. If by chance you do not receive an apostilled Certificate of Service from the Secretary of State of the United States or the Secretary of State of your state, then you will want to take action yourself to authenticate the two original Certificate of Services in your possession as describe in section 4 above. Some states offer document authentication services on a walk-in basis. If your state is one of them, consider using the service on a walk-in basis. Advantages of services on walk-in versus mail-in basis are: You never lose sight of the documents and you are more likely to get full cooperation.
- 5.19. We always want to improve the quality of the information we offer on our website and feedback helps with that improvement. If you receive a negative or derogatory response from the government to this form, we would appreciate if you would submit the response to the fax number on our Contact Us page.

<https://sedm.org/about/contact/>

6. **FURTHER READING AND RESEARCH:**

The following documents will help you preserve the sovereignty established or re-established by this document:

- 6.1. *Citizenship Status v. Tax Status*, Form #10.011 – summary of the relationship between nationality, domicile, and tax status
<http://sedm.org/Forms/10-Emancipation/CitizenshipStatusVTaxStatus/CitizenshipVTaxStatus.htm>
- 6.2. *Developing Evidence of Citizenship and Sovereignty Course*, Form #12.002-describes the process for restoring the sovereignty you unknowingly surrendered by misrepresenting your status on government forms, of which this form is a part.
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
- 6.3. *Affidavit of Citizenship, Domicile, and Tax Status*, Form #02.001-use this form to describe your citizenship and tax status to all financial institutions, government, and private employers after you send this in.
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
- 6.4. *How to Apply for a Passport as a “non-citizen national”*, Form #09.007:
<http://famguardian.org/Subjects/Taxes/Citizenship/ApplyingForAPassport.htm>
- 6.5. *USA Passport Application Attachment*, Form #06.007. Use this attachment to protect your sovereign status when applying for a U.S.A. passport.
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
- 6.6. *Voter Registration Attachment*, Form #06.003. Attach to voter registration to prevent waiver of sovereign immunity.
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
- 6.7. *Jury Summons Response Attachment*, Form #06.015
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
- 6.8. *Tax Form Attachment*, Form #04.201: Use this form whenever you submit a tax form to prevent compromising the legal status established by this document.
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

- 6.9. *Sovereignty Forms and Instructions Online*, Form #10.004, Instructions, Step 3.13: Correct government records documenting your citizenship status:
<http://famguardian.org/TaxFreedom/Instructions/3.13ChangeUSCitizenshipStatus.htm>
- 6.10. *Federal Enforcement Authority Within States of the Union*, Form #05.032. Proves that the federal government has no enforcement authority in states of the Union over anyone other than government entities and instrumentalities.
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
- 6.11. *About SSNs/TINs on Government Forms and Correspondence*, Form #05.012. Free memorandum of law that explains the nuances of using SSNs and TINs on government forms and correspondence.
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
- 6.12. *Citizenship and Sovereignty Course*, Form #12.001:
VIDEO: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xMrSiiAqJAU>
PDF: <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
- 6.13. *Sovereignty Forms and Instructions Online*, Form #10.004: How to become sovereign.
<http://famguardian.org/TaxFreedom/FormsInstr.htm>
- 6.14. *Sovereignty Forms and Instructions Manual*, Form #10.005. Free Adobe Acrobat ebook on how to become sovereign.
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
- 6.15. *Laws of the Bible*, Form #13.001. Memorandum of law that details all the laws that you are now exclusively and only subject to after sending in this document.
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
- 6.16. *Wrong Party Notice*, Form #07.002. Free form you can use if the government tries to address you using the Social Security Number after you have ended compelled participation in the system.
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
- 6.17. *Social Security: Mark of the Beast*, Form #11.407. Free electronic book containing detailed legal research into Social Security. Available from:
<http://famguardian.org/Publications/SocialSecurity/TOC.htm>
- 6.18. *Socialism: The New American Civil Religion*, Form #05.016. Free electronic book about how socialism is taking over the American body politic in fulfillment of Biblical prophecy. Available from:
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Republic of _____)
Subscribed and Affirmed _____)
County of _____)

I, _____, the undersigned mailer/server, being of sound mind and under no duress, do hereby certify, attest and affirm that the following facts are true and correct, to wit:

- That, at the city of _____, County of _____ and the Republic of _____ (statename), on the _____, 20____, that, on behalf of (name) _____, a natural person, the undersigned personally deposited the following documents (listed below) inside the envelope, sealed them and transmitted them via the carrier indicated in item 2 below, to wit:

Item #	Document Description	Number of pages
1	Certificate of Service	3
2	Cover Letter: Declaration of Intention to Change Domicile/Citizenship and Divorce the "United States"	107
3	Enclosure (1): Certified copy of Certificate of Naturalization by Notary or Certified Copy of Birth Certificate (certified by Notary stamp at the end of this letter)	2
4	Enclosure (2): Affidavit of Citizenship, Domicile, and Tax Status	
5	Enclosure (3): Declaration of Personal Independence (incorporated by reference)	9
7	Enclosure (4): Why you are a "national" or "state national" and not a "U.S. Citizen" (incorporated by reference)	
8	Enclosure (5): Mandatory USA Passport Application Attachment	

Total of ____ () documents with combined total of _____ (____) pages.

- That I personally mailed said document(s) via (initial those which apply):

_____ United States Postal Office, by regular mail, postage prepaid
 _____ United States Postal Office, by **Certified Mail #** _____, Return Receipt Requested
 _____ United Parcel Service (UPS), tracking number # _____
 _____ Federal Express, tracking number # _____
 _____ Other (specify): _____

at said City and State, one (1) set of copied documents numbered 2 through 8 in item 1 above and two (2) original certificates of Service (document numbered one in item 1 above), properly enveloped and addressed to (addressee and address):

- Secretary of State; U.S. Department of State; 2201 C Street NW; Washington, DC 20520.
Cert. Mail #: _____
- Secretary of State; State of _____,
Cert. Mail #: _____

and one (1) set of copied documents numbered two through nine in item 1 above, properly enveloped and addressed to (addressee and address):

1. Attorney General; U.S. Department of Justice; 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW; Washington, DC 20530-0001

Cert. Mail #: _____

2. Attorney General; State of _____,

Cert. Mail #: _____

1. That I am at least 18 years of age;
2. That I am not related to _____ by blood, marriage, adoption, or employment, but serve as a “disinterested third party” (herein “Server”); and further,
5. That I am in no way connected to, or involved in or with, the person and/or matter at issue in this instant action.

_____ SIGNATURE AND NOTARY JURAT ON NEXT PAGE _____

I now affix my signature to these affirmations.

(Signature): _____, Mailer/Server

(Printed name): _____

NOTARY PUBLIC'S JURAT

BEFORE ME, the undersigned authority, a Notary Public, of the County of _____,
Republic of _____(statename), this _____ day of _____, 20____,
_____, the Mail Server did personally appear and was identified by (check all that
apply):

1. Passport
2. Birth Certificate
3. Military ID
4. Driver license
5. Other

..and who, upon first being duly sworn and/or affirmed, deposes and says that the foregoing asseveration is true to the best of his/her knowledge and belief.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of _____ that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

/s/ _____ SEAL
Notary Public

My Commission Expires On:

TO:

Secretary of State
U.S. Department of State
2201 C Street NW
Washington, DC 20520.

Registered/Certified Mail #:

Attorney General
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20530-0001

Registered/Certified Mail #:

Registered/Certified Mail #:

Registered/Certified Mail #:

**DECLARATION OF INTENTION
TO CHANGE DOMICILE/CITIZENSHIP,
DIVORCE THE "UNITED STATES",
AND CRIMINAL COMPLAINT**

Enclosures:

1. Certified copy of Certificate of Naturalization by Notary or Certified Copy of Birth Certificate (certified by Notary stamp at the end of this letter)
2. Affidavit of Citizenship, Domicile, and Tax Status.
3. Declaration of Personal Independence
4. Copy of last U.S. passport (optional)

5. Why you are a “national”, “state national”, and Constitutional but not Statutory Citizen
6. USA Passport Application Attachment

References:

1. *Why Domicile and Becoming a “Taxpayer” Require Your Consent*, Form #05.002. Available from:
 DIRECT LINK: <http://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/Domicile.pdf>
 FORMS PAGE: <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	2
LIST OF TABLES	3
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	3
1. PURPOSE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.....	19
1.1. Legal authority for sending this legal notice and demand	21
1.2. Your Express CONSENT is NOT required in order to impose duties upon you personally through this communication. IMPLIED consent is sufficient	22
1.3. Your Burden or Proof in Demonstrating No Implied Consent	28
1.4. Why this matter is ALSO a violation of STATE law if not acted upon	31
1.5. Why you in particular received this communication	38
1.6. Request for correction-violation of fiduciary duty NOT to correct	40
1.7. Intended effect of this communication upon the government	41
1.8. Consequences of interfering with the filing of or government action related to this communication	43
2. WHAT THIS DOCUMENT IS NOT.....	44
2.1. Not an attempt to evade personal responsibility for myself or any of my actions or choices	45
2.2. Not an attempt to abandon Constitutional citizenship	46
2.3. Not an act of allegiance to a “foreign” human ruler or man-made government	47
2.4. Not an attempt to “simulate legal process” or threaten any person or government with violence	47
2.5. Not an act of expatriation or abandonment of “nationality” under 8 U.S.C.	48
2.6. Not an act of “expatriation” under the I.R.C.	49
2.7. Not connected with the “sovereign citizen movement”	50
2.8. Not associated with any known flawed argument advanced by the government	50
2.9. Not an act of “paper terrorism”	50
2.10. Not an attempt to promote “anarchy”, lawlessness, or violence of any kind.....	51
3. DETAILS OF CHANGE IN MY LEGAL DOMICILE/CITIZENSHIP AND PERSONAL ALLEGIANCE RECORDS	58
4. CONTRACTUAL AND COMMERCIAL DIVORCE FROM THE STATE AND UNITED STATES	66
4.1. Constraints upon my right to contract	66
4.2. Reservation of rights.....	69
4.3. Perpetual abandonment of all statutory “employment”, agency, or “public office” on behalf of the U.S. government or any State government.....	69
4.4. Perpetual Abandonment of all “benefits”, privileges, and “public rights” arising under Titles 26 and 42 of the United States Code	72
5. EFFECT ON MY CITIZENSHIP AND LEGAL STATUS	73
6. EFFECT ON FEDERAL JURISDICTION.....	77
7. EFFECT ON STATE JURISDICTION	80
8. FACTS AND PRESUMPTIONS ESTABLISHED BY THIS LEGAL NOTICE	82
8.1. Presumptions about the meaning of terms in this document	83
8.2. Presumptions about Meaning of words in all correspondence to or from the government before or after this correspondence is sent.....	83
8.3. Privacy Act Warning, License Agreement, and “Shrink Wrap” License applying to all correspondence sent to government.....	83
8.4. Penalty of Perjury and jurat statements on government forms submitted	84
8.5. All alleged “taxes” paid UNDER PROTEST presumptions.....	84
8.6. Presumptions Against the existence of Federal Jurisdiction in States of the Union	88
8.7. Federal Identifying Number Presumptions.....	91
8.8. Facts about Penalties for submission of this form	92
8.9. Fair Debt Collection Practices Act (FDCPA) Presumptions	95

8.10. Federal Court Litigation Presumptions.....	95
8.11. NONConsent to an extension of time to file presumptions	96
9. AFFIDAVIT OF DURESS	97
10. ACTIONS REQUESTED OF YOU AND YOUR RESPONSE.....	100
10.1. Secretary of State of United States and Secretary of State of a state of the Union Must Apostille both copies of this document they receive, return one copy, and record the other copy	101
10.2. AMEND PAST and FUTURE USA Passport applications by appending Enclosure (6).....	101
10.3. Update NUMIDENT status with the Social Security Administration	101
10.4. Update all SS-5, IRS Form W-8, DOS Form I-9, and USCIS E-Verify Applications on file	101
10.5. Update of all existing government records describing me.....	105
10.6. Removal of all information about me in all government records	105
10.7. Legal Requirements Imposed Upon Your Response	105
10.8. Significance of behaviors and responses to this correspondence	106
11. CRIMINAL COMPLAINT	108
11.1. Request to criminally and civilly prosecute violations of law by Social Security and other government personnel	108
11.2. Criminal Complaint against those engaged in the Government ID Scam documented in section 9.....	108
12. ADVANCE REBUTTAL OF GOVERNMENT LIES AND PROPAGANDA DESIGNED TO DISCREDIT THE SUBMITTER OR THIS COMMUNICATION	111
13. AFFIRMATION	112
14. ENCLOSURE (1): CERTIFIED COPY OF BIRTH or NATURALIZATION CERTIFICATE	14-1
15. ENCLOSURE (2): AFFIDAVIT OF CITIZENSHIP, DOMICILE, AND TAX STATUS	15-1
16. ENCLOSURE (3): DECLARATION OF PERSONAL INDEPENDENCE	16-1
17. ENCLOSURE (4): WHY YOU ARE A “NATIONAL”, “STATE NATIONAL”, AND CONSTITUTIONAL BUT NOT STATUTORY CITIZEN	17-1
18. ENCLOSURE (5): MANDATORY USA PASSPORT APPLICATION ATTACHMENT.....	18-1

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Statutory remedies for those compelled to act as public officers and straw man	31
Table 2: Tabular Summary of Citizenship Status on Government Forms	103

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Constitutional Provisions

14th Amend., Sect. 1	103, 104
Art. 80, Sect. 14.....	31
Art. III, Sect. 4(D) (governor)	32
Art. V, Sect. 10.....	31
Article 1, Section 10.....	59, 92
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 17	75, 89
Article 1, Section 9, Clause 8	39
Article 4, Section 3.....	26
Article 4, Section 4 of the Constitution	52
Article 5, Section 10.....	31
Article 7, Section 7.....	31
Article I, Section 9, Clause 8.....	98
Article III.....	77
Article III, Section 2.....	77, 78
Article III, Section 25	31
Article IV, Sect. 22.....	31
Article VI, Section 12.....	31
Article VII, Section 9 (judges)	33
Bill of Rights	75, 82
Const. art. 6, cl. 2	57

Const. Art. 94-95	33
Const. Article 1, Section 11	31
Const. Article 1, Section 19	32
Const. Article 1, Section 8	34
Const. Article 2, Section 04 (legislature)	34
Const. Article 2, Section 1	34
Const. Article 2, Section 9	32
Const. Article 3, Section 10	31
Const. Article 3, Section 13 (judges)	32
Const. Article 3, Section 3	34
Const. Article 4, Part 2, Section 4	31
Const. Article 4, Section 06, Para. (B)	34
Const. Article 4, Section 30 (legislative)	32
Const. Article 4, Section 6	34
Const. Article 4, Section 9	33
Const. Article 5, Section 14	31
Const. Article 5, Section 2	31
Const. Article 5, Section 7	31
Const. Article 6, Section 16 (senators)	35
Const. Article 6, Section 28	31
Const. Article 7, Section 4 (executive)	35
Const. Article 8, Section 7 (judges)	35
Const. Article I, Section II, Para. III	32
Const. Article II, Section 10	34
Const. Article II, Section 12	34
Const. Article II, Section 14 (legislature)	35
Const. Article II, Section 2	32, 34
Const. Article II, Section 26	34
Const. Article II, Section 5	32
Const. Article III, Section 1	33
Const. Article III, Section 2	32
Const. Article III, Section 22 (legislature)	32
Const. Article III, Section 6	34
Const. Article III, Section 7 (legislature)	33
Const. Article III, Section 8	32
Const. Article III, Section II, Para. IV(b)	32
Const. Article III-9	33
Const. Article IV, Section 13	35
Const. Article IV, Section 14 (governor)	32
Const. Article IV, Section 15 (judges)	35
Const. Article IV, Section 2 (executive)	32
Const. Article IV, Section 2(e) (legislative)	32
Const. Article IV, Section 3 (senators)	33
Const. Article IV, Section 4 (legislature)	35
Const. Article IV, Section 5	33
Const. Article IV, Section 8	33
Const. Article IV, Section V, Sections 3-4	33
Const. Article V, Section 1	34
Const. Article V, Section 17 (judges)	34
Const. Article V, Section 18 (legislature)	34
Const. Article V, Section 4 (governor)	35
Const. Article V, Section 7 (judges)	32
Const. Article V, Section 8	31
Const. Article V, Section 9 (office)	33
Const. Article V, Section I, Section 3	33
Const. Article VI, Section 19 (judge)	33
Const. Article VI, Section 20(b)(1)	33
Const. Article VI, Section 3	34

Const. Article VI, Section 9	33
Const. Article VII, Section 9	33
Const. Article VIII, Section 10 (judges).....	34
Const. Chapter II, Section 54	34
Const. Chapter VI, Article 2.....	33
Const. Const. Declaration of Rights, Article 35 (officers)	33
Const. Declaration of Rights, Article 33 (judges)	33
Const. of D.C., Article IV, Sect. 4(B) (judges)	32
Const. Section 97-3-008.....	35
Const. Section 97-5-027.....	35
Const. Sections 2.5, 3.6, 4.8	31
Declaration of Independence.....	25, 37, 42, 43, 45, 51, 53, 55, 56, 67, 75, 109
Declaration of Personal Independence	1
Federalist Paper #51	42
Federalist Paper #58.....	42
Fifth Amendment	28, 43
First Amendment.....	19, 20, 43, 44, 45, 47, 48, 58, 59, 63, 64, 66, 77, 79, 88, 94, 96, 106, 109
First Amendment Petition Clause.....	21
Fourteenth Amendment, Section 1	49, 68, 107
Ninth and Tenth Amendment	56
Ninth and Tenth Amendments.....	43
Thirteenth Amendment.....	28, 44, 46, 48, 58, 94, 108

Statutes

1 U.S.C. §204	105
12 Stat. 411.....	68
13 V.S.A. §3002.....	34
15 U.S.C. §1692g	95
15 U.S.C. §1692g(b)	95
18 Pa.C.A. §4120	34
18 U.S.C. §§1001, 1002, 1028, 1028A, 1029, 1039.....	101
18 U.S.C. §§3 and 4	91
18 U.S.C. §1001	44, 101
18 U.S.C. §1028(a)(7).....	99, 108
18 U.S.C. §1028A	99, 108
18 U.S.C. §1030.....	96
18 U.S.C. §112	61
18 U.S.C. §1201	108
18 U.S.C. §1512	44
18 U.S.C. §1512(b)	92
18 U.S.C. §1542	44, 101
18 U.S.C. §1581	58
18 U.S.C. §1589.....	94
18 U.S.C. §1621	44, 101
18 U.S.C. §1622	44
18 U.S.C. §1951	58
18 U.S.C. §1956.....	87
18 U.S.C. §201	86
18 U.S.C. §208	44, 72, 84
18 U.S.C. §2381	43
18 U.S.C. §241	44, 70
18 U.S.C. §3.....	101
18 U.S.C. §371	98
18 U.S.C. §4.....	101
18 U.S.C. §641	91
18 U.S.C. §654.....	99, 108
18 U.S.C. §872	70, 72

18 U.S.C. §911	101, 108
18 U.S.C. §912	39, 91, 99, 108
22 U.S.C. §2721	47
26 U.S.C. §3121(e).....	19, 101
26 U.S.C. §6013(g) and (h)	92
26 U.S.C. §6013(g) or (h).....	71
26 U.S.C. §6020(b)	70
26 U.S.C. §6041	70, 88
26 U.S.C. §6065	57, 95
26 U.S.C. §6109	91, 92
26 U.S.C. §6671(b)	70, 71, 94
26 U.S.C. §6700	71
26 U.S.C. §7343	70, 71
26 U.S.C. §7408(c).....	89
26 U.S.C. §7408(d)	99
26 U.S.C. §7434	70, 88
26 U.S.C. §7491	105
26 U.S.C. §7601	89
26 U.S.C. §7621	89
26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(12)(B).....	89
26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(14)	50, 91, 93
26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(16)	98
26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(26)	69, 74, 88, 89, 92, 93, 108
26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(30)	74, 92
26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(31)	92
26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(39)	89, 99
26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(9) and (a)(10)	89, 97
26 U.S.C. §7701(b)(1).....	74
26 U.S.C. §7701(b)(1)(A)	74, 92, 97, 98
26 U.S.C. §7701(b)(4)(B).....	71, 92
26 U.S.C. §871	91, 93
26 U.S.C. §877	49, 50
28 U.S.C. §§754 and 959(a)	77
28 U.S.C. §1332	77
28 U.S.C. §1332(c) and (d)	61
28 U.S.C. §1332(d)	61, 77
28 U.S.C. §1603(b)	61
28 U.S.C. §1605(a)(2)	62
28 U.S.C. §1653	49
28 U.S.C. §1746	83, 93
28 U.S.C. §1746(1)	19, 84, 112
28 U.S.C. §1746(2)	94
28 U.S.C. §2201	50
28 U.S.C. §2201(a).....	50
28 U.S.C. §297(a) and (b)	63
28 U.S.C. §455	72, 84
28 U.S.C. §636(b)(2).....	96
31 U.S.C. §3113	86
4 U.S.C. §106	69, 91
4 U.S.C. §72	89
42 U.S.C. §1301(a)(1)	73
42 U.S.C. §1981	107
42 U.S.C. §1994	58, 94
42 U.S.C. §405(c)(2)(C)(i)	99, 108
42 U.S.C. §408(a)(7)	99
42 U.S.C. §408(a)(8)	92, 108
48 U.S.C. §1612	89
5 U.S.C. §5517	69, 91

5 U.S.C. §552(a).....	93
5 U.S.C. §552a(12).....	26
5 U.S.C. §552a(a)(2)	74
5 U.S.C. §552a(b).....	83, 105
5 U.S.C. §553(a)(2).....	26, 27
50 U.S.C. §841	39
53 Stat 1, Section 4.....	105
720 ILCS 5/17-2.....	32
8 U.S.C. §1101(a)(21).....	49, 63, 71, 74, 92, 103, 104
8 U.S.C. §1101(a)(22).....	76
8 U.S.C. §1101(a)(22)(B).....	74, 103
8 U.S.C. §1101(a)(29).....	103
8 U.S.C. §1101(a)(3).....	74, 98, 104
8 U.S.C. §1101(a)(38), (a)(36).....	103
8 U.S.C. §1302	74
8 U.S.C. §1401	19, 46, 49, 50, 61, 71, 74, 75, 76, 92, 97, 98, 101, 103
8 U.S.C. §1408	74, 103
8 U.S.C. §1452(b)	41
8 U.S.C. §1481	49
8 U.S.C. §1481(a)(2).....	47, 63
A.R.S. §13-2006.....	31
A.R.S. §13-2406.....	31
A.S. §11.46.160.....	31
A.S. §11.56.830.....	31
A.S.C. §5-37-208	31
Administrative Procedures Act, 5 U.S.C. §556(d)	105
Affidavit of Duress: Illegal Enforcement by De Facto Officers, Form #02.005	39
Buck Act of 1940	69
C.O.A. §13A-10-10.....	31
C.O.A. Title 13A, Article 10.....	31
C.O.V. §18.2-186.3.....	35
Calif.Evid.Code, §600.....	82
California Civil Code Section 2224	30
California Civil Code, Section 1589	88
California Vehicle Code.....	82
California Vehicle Code, Section 12505	81
California Vehicle Code, Section 12805	81
D.C. Code §22-1404.....	32
D.C. Title 11, Section 854.....	32
D.C. Title 11, Section 907(3)	32
Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, Title 15, Chapter 41, Subchapter V	95
False Claims Act, 31 U.S.C. §3729.....	73, 88, 108
Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act	79
Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act (F.S.I.A.), 28 U.S.C. §1602 et seq.....	80
Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act (F.S.I.A.), 28 U.S.C. §1605(a)(2).....	78
Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act of 1976	61
Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act, 28 U.S.C. Chapter 97	25
G.L.M. Chapter 268, Section 33.....	33
G.L.R.I. §11-14-1	34
General Business Law 380-S	33
H.R.S. §710-1016.....	32
I.C. §25-30-1-18.....	32
I.C. Title XVI, Section 718.2	32
I.S. §18-3001	32
Internal Revenue Code	55, 85, 88, 105
Internal Revenue Code of 1986.....	50
Internal Revenue Code, Subtitle A	49, 50, 84, 89
K.R.S. §21-3825.....	32

K.R.S. §434.570	32
K.R.S. §514.60	32
K.R.S. §532.034	32
K.R.S. §61.080	32
M.C. §97-7-43	33
M.C.A. §45-7-209	33
M.R.S. §570.223	33
M.S. §609.475	33
Mich. Penal Code, Chapter XXXV, Section 750.217c	33
N.C.G.S. §14-277	34
N.D.C.C. §12.1-13-04	34
N.H.R.S. §359-I:2	33
N.J.S.A. §2C:28-8	33
N.M.S.A. §30-16-21.1	33
N.R.S. §197.120	33
N.R.S. §28-636	33
N.R.S. §28-639	33
O.C.G.A. §16-10-23	32
O.R.S. §162.365	34
O.R.S. §165.803	34
O.S. Title 21, Section 1533	34
O.S. Title 21, Section 1533.1	34
Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA)	105
Penal Code §484.1	31
Penal Law §190.23	33
Penal Law 190.78	33
Privacy Act, 5 U.S.C. §552a	83
Privacy Act, 5 U.S.C. §552a(b)	105
R.C.W. §18.71.190	35
R.S. §14:112	32
Religious Freedom Restoration Act, 42 U.S.C. Chapter 21B	47
Revised Statutes, Section 3228	85
Rules of Decision Act, 28 U.S.C. §1652	106
S.D.C.L. §22-40-16	34
S.D.C.L. §22-40-8	34
Social Security Act	73, 78, 88
Statutes §8-301	33
T.C. §39-16-301	34
T.S. §32.51	34
Title 17 of the U.S. Code	91
Title 42, Chapter 7	72
Title 42, Chapter 7, Subchapter III	73
Title 42, Chapter 7, Subchapter XVIII	73
Title 5 of the U.S. code	74
Tucker Act (Judicial Code, sec. 24, par. 20, ch. 397, 24 Stat. 635)	85
Tucker Act, 28 U.S.C. §1491	88
U.C. §76-8-512	34
U.C.C. §1-202	22
U.C.C. §1-207	69, 88, 95, 112
U.C.C. §1-308	69, 88, 95, 112
U.C.C. §2-103(1)(a)	25, 83
U.C.C. §2-104(1)	25
U.C.C. §2-206	83
U.C.C. §2-209	83
U.C.C. §3-308	69
U.C.C. §9-307	90
U.S. Code	70
Uniform Commercial Code	90

Uniform Commercial Code (UCC), Section 1-205	105
W.S. §6-3-901	35
W.S. §6-5-307	35
W.S. §943.201	35
W.V.C. §61-5-27a(e).....	35

Regulations

20 C.F.R.	92
20 C.F.R. §422.103(d).....	92, 98
20 C.F.R. §422.104	91, 98
26 C.F.R. §1.1-1(c).....	19, 101
26 C.F.R. §1.1441-1(c)(3)	92
26 C.F.R. §1.872-2(f)	71, 74
26 C.F.R. §301.609-1(d)(3).....	92
26 C.F.R. §301.6109-1(g)	75, 91, 92
26 C.F.R. §301.6109-1(g)(1)(i).....	105
26 C.F.R. §601.702(a)(2)(ii)	93
Federal Register.....	92

Rules

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 17(b)	60, 61, 77, 80, 106
Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 19(b)	49, 78
Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 29	95
Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 44.1	60, 77
Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b)	96
Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(b)(6).....	107
Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 43.....	96
Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 54(c)	88
Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 54(c), prior to Dec. 2002	88
Federal Rule of Evidence 802	106
Federal Rule of Evidence 803(8)(A)	96
Federal Rules of Evidence.....	73, 106

Cases

99 Pratt Street Corp. v. Stand Realty Corp., 27 Conn Supp 101, 230 A.2d. 613	86
Aboud v. Detroit Bd. of Ed., 431 U.S. 209, 97 S.Ct. 1782, 52 L.Ed.2d. 261, 95 L.R.R.M. (BNA) 2411, 81 Lab. Cas. (CCH) ¶ 55041 (1977)	20
Aboud v. Detroit Board of Education, 431 U.S. 209 (1977)	44
Adams v. Gillig, 199 N.Y. 314, 92 N.E. 670	87
Adams v. New Bedford, 155 Mass. 317.....	84
Adkins v. Children's Hospital, 261 U.S. 525, 544 , 43 S.Ct. 394, 24 A.L.R. 1238	57
Afroyim v. Rusk, 387 U.S. 253, 87 S.Ct. 1660 (1967).....	76
Afroyim v. Rusk, 387 U.S. 254 (1967)	76
Alder v. Crosier, 50 Utah 437, 168 P. 83	86
Andrews v. Andrews, 188 U.S. 14	81
Angelina v. Euclid Concrete Corp. 280 App.Div. 405, 113 N.Y.S.2d. 537, affd 306 N.Y. 606, 115 N.E.2d. 831	87
Ashton v. Cameron County Water Improvement District No. 1, 298 U.S. 513, 56 S.Ct. 892 (1936)	90
Aspinwall v. Sabin, 22 Neb. 73, 34 N.W. 72	86
Baker v. Grice, 169 U.S. 284, 290 , 42 S.L.Ed. 748, 750, 18 Sup.Ct.Rep. 323.....	90
Bancroft & Masters, 223 F.3d. at 1087	80
Bancroft & Masters, Inc. v. Augusta Nat'l Inc., 223 F.3d. 1082, 1087 (9th Cir. 2000).....	79
Barnette v. Wells Fargo Nevada Nat'l Bank, 270 U.S. 438, 70 L.Ed. 669, 46 S.Ct. 326	86, 100
Baxter v. Palmigiano, 425 U.S. 308 (1976).....	107
Baylies v. Vanden Boom, 40 Wyo. 411, 278 P. 551, 70 A.L.R. 924	86

Beer v. Moffatt, 192 Fed. 984, affirmed 209 Fed. 779	84
Bell v. Bell, 181 U.S. 175.....	81
Berry v. Stevens, 168 Okla. 124, 31 P.2d. 950.....	86
Blagge v. Balch, 162 U.S. 439, 40 L.Ed. 1032, 16 S.Ct. 853.....	87
Block v. Block, 165 Ohio.St. 365, 60 Ohio.Ops. 1, 135 N.E.2d. 857	87
Blue v. Blue, 38 Ill 9	87
Boyd v. State of Nebraska, 143 U.S. 135 (1892)	41
Brady v. U.S., 397 U.S. 742 (1970)	68
Brookhart v. Janis, 384 U.S. 1, 86 S.Ct. 1245, 16 L.Ed.2d. 314 (1966).....	69
Brown v. Keene, 8 Pet. 112, 115 (1834)	49, 78
Brown v. Pierce, 74 U.S. 205, 7 Wall. 205, 19 L.Ed. 134.....	85, 100
Brown v. Scott, 140 Md. 258, 117 A. 114, 22 A.L.R. 810.....	86
Bull v. United States, 295 U.S. 247, 261, 55 S.Ct. 695, 700, 79 L.Ed. 1421	30
Bull v. United States, 295 U.S. 247, 79 L.Ed. 1421, 55 S.Ct. 695, 35-1 U.S.T.C. ¶ 9346, 15 A.F.T.R. 1069	87
Burgin v. Forbes, 293 Ky. 456, 169 S.W.2d. 321, 325	89
Button's Estate v. Anderson, 112 Vt 531, 28 A.2d. 404, 143 A.L.R. 195	87
Calder v. Jones, 465 U.S. 783 (1984).....	79
Calder v. Jones, 465 U.S. 783, 789-90 (1984).....	79
Carmichael v. Southern Cole and Coke Co, 301 U.S. 495 (1937)	78
Carroll v. Fetty, 121 W.Va. 215, 2 S.E.2d. 521, cert den 308 U.S. 571, 84 L.Ed. 479, 60 S.Ct. 85	100
Carter v. Carter Coal Co., 298 U.S. 238 (1936)	43, 57, 58
Carter v. Carter Coal Co., 298 U.S. 238, 56 S.Ct. 855 (1936)	90
Caruth v. Int'l Psychoanalytical Ass'n, 59 F.3d. 126, 128 (9th Cir. 1995)	80
Cary v. Curtis (3 How. 236).....	85
CE Distrib., LLC v. New Sensor Corp., 380 F.3d. 1107, 1111 (9th Cir. 2004)	79
Chesebrough v. United States, 192 U.S. 253.....	84
Chicago ex rel. Cohen v. Keane, 64 Ill.2d. 559, 2 Ill.Dec. 285, 357 N.E.2d. 452.....	36, 41
Chicago Park Dist. v. Kenroy, Inc., 78 Ill.2d. 555, 37 Ill.Dec. 291, 402 N.E.2d. 181	36, 41
Chisholm, Ex'r. v. Georgia, 2 Dall. (U.S.) 419, 1 L.Ed. 454, 457, 471, 472 (1793).....	44
Christie Street Commission Co. v. United States, 126 Fed. 991	84
Christie Street Commission Co. v. United States, 136 Fed. 326.....	85
Cincinnati & C. R. Co. v. Hamilton County, 120 Tenn. 1	84
City of Boerne v. Florez, Archbishop of San Antonio, 521 U.S. 507 (1997).....	74
City of Dallas v. Mitchell, 245 S.W. 944	54, 73
Clark v. United States, 95 U.S. 539 (1877).....	68
Cleveland Bd. of Ed. v. LaFleur (1974) 414 U.S. 632, 639-640, 94 S.Ct. 1208, 1215.....	59, 82
Coffin v. United States, 156 U.S. 432, 453 (1895).....	82
Cohens v. Virginia, 19 U.S. 264, 6 Wheat. 265, 5 L.Ed. 257 (1821)	47
Colautti v. Franklin, 439 U.S. 379, 392, and n. 10 (1979)	71
Colautti v. Franklin, 439 U.S. at 392-393, n. 10	71
Commissioner of Banks v. Cosmopolitan Trust Co., 253 Mass. 205, 148 N.E. 609, 41 A.L.R. 658	86
Cook v. Hart, 146 U.S. 183, 194, 36 S.L.Ed. 934, 939, 13 Sup.Ct.Rep. 40	90
Cook v. Hudson, 511 F.2d. 744, 9 Empl.Prac.Dec. (CCH) ¶ 10134 (5th Cir. 1975).....	20
Core-Vent Corp. v. Nobel Indus. AB, 11 F.3d. 1482 (9th Cir. 1993)	79
Corkie v. Maxwell, 7 Fed. Cas. 3231	84
Crane v. Conklin, 1 N.J.Eq. 346.....	87
Davis v. Beason, 133 U.S. 333, 342 , 10 S.Ct. 299, 300	62
Davis v. Davis, 305 U.S. 32, 41	81
Delo v. Lashely, 507 U.S. 272 (1993).....	82
Dexter v. Boston, 176 Mass. 247	84
Doe v. Glanzer, 232 F.3d. 1258, 232 F.3d. 1258 (9th Cir. 11/17/2000).....	107
Dole Food Co. v. Watts, 303 F.3d. 1104, 1111 (9th Cir. 2002)	79
Dollar Savings Bank v. United States, 19 Wall. 227.....	26
Downes v. Bidwell, 182 U.S. 244 (1901).....	47, 48, 67, 97
Dred Scott v. Sandford, 60 U.S. 393 (1856).....	60
Dred Scott v. Sandford, 60 U.S. 393 (1857).....	26
Economy Plumbing & Heating v. U.S., 470 F.2d. 585 (1972).....	50, 93
Elliott v. Swartwout, 10 Pet. 137.....	84, 85

Erie Railroad v. Tompkins, 304 U.S. 64 (1938).....	94, 106
Estelle v. Williams, 425 U.S. 501 (1976).....	82
Ettlinger v. National Surety Co., 221 N.Y. 467, 117 N.E. 945, 3 A.L.R. 865.....	86, 87
Ex parte Fonda, 117 U.S. 516, 518, 29 S.L.Ed. 994, 6 Sup.Ct.Rep. 848	90
Ex parte Royall, 117 U.S. 241, 250, 29 S.L.Ed. 868, 871, 6 Sup.Ct.Rep. 734.....	90
Faske v. Gershman, 30 Misc.2d. 442, 215 N.Y.S.2d. 144.....	86, 100
Fauntleroy v. Lum, 210 U.S. 230 , 28 S.Ct. 641	26
Federal corn: Procter & Gamble Co. v. United States, 281 Fed. 1014.....	84
Field v. Seabury, 19 How (US) 323, 15 L.Ed. 650.....	86
Fitts v. McGhee, 172 U.S. 516, 533, 43 S.L.Ed. 535, 543, 19 Sup.Ct.Rep. 269	90
Flemming v. Nestor, 363 U.S. 603, 608 -611 (1960)	78
Flower v. Lance, 59 N.Y. 603	84
Fong Yu Ting v. United States, 149 U.S. 698 (1893)	21
Fox v. Standard Oil Co. of N.J., 294 U.S. 87, 95-96 (1935)	71
Fred Martin Motor Co., 374 F.3d. 797, 802 (9th Cir. 2004)	79
Frost & Frost Trucking Co. v. Railroad Comm'n of California, 271 U.S. 583.....	97
Fry v. United States, 421 U.S. 542 (1975)	23
Gar v. Hurd, 92 Ills. 315.....	84
Georgia Dep't of Human Resources v. Sistrunk, 249 Ga. 543, 291 S.E.2d. 524	36, 41
Georgia R. & Power Co. v. Atlanta, 154 Ga. 731, 115 S.E. 263.....	99
Giaccio v. State of Pennsylvania, 382 U.S. 399, 86 S.Ct. 518 (1966).....	82
Glass v. The Sloop Betsy, 3 (U.S.) Dall 6	55
Glasser v. United States, 315 U.S. 60, 70-71, 86 L.Ed. 680, 699, 62 S.Ct. 457	69
Glenney v. Crane (Tex Civ App Houston (1st Dist)), 352 S.W.2d. 773	86, 100
Gomillion v. Lightfoot, 364 U.S. 339, 345.....	97
Gordon v. U. S., 227 Ct.Cl. 328, 649 F.2d. 837 (Ct.Cl., 1981)	30
Gould v. Hennepin County, 76 Minn. 379	84
Great Falls Manufacturing Co. v. Attorney General, 124 U.S. 581, 8 S.Ct. 631, 31 L.Ed. 527	27
Gulf, C. & S. F. R. Co. v. Ellis, 165 U.S. 150 (1897)	53
Hale v. Henkel, 201 U.S. 43, 69-70 (1906).....	36
Hammer v. Dagenhart, 247 U.S. 251, 275, 38 S.Ct. 529, 3 A.L.R. 649, Ann.Cas.1918E 724.....	90
Harman v. Forssenius, 380 U.S. 528 at 540, 85 S.Ct. 1177, 1185 (1965).....	97
Heart of Atlanta Motel, Inc. v. United States, 379 U.S. 241 (1964).....	74
Heider v. Unicum, 142 or 416, 20 P.2d. 384	86, 100
Hisquierdo v. Hisquierdo, 439 U.S. 572, 575 (1979).....	78
Hobbs v. McLean, 117 U.S. 567, 29 L.Ed. 940, 6 S.Ct. 870.....	87
Hooven and Allison v. Evatt, 324 U.S. 652 (1945).....	75
Hughes v. United States, 953 F.2d. 531, 536-537 (9th Cir. 1991)	50
Iasigi v. Van De Carr, 166 U.S. 391, 395, 41 S.L.Ed. 1045, 1049, 17 Sup.Ct.Rep. 595.....	90
Indiana State Ethics Comm'n v. Nelson (Ind App), 656 N.E.2d. 1172.....	36, 41
Insurance Co. of North America v. Kunin, 175 Neb. 260, 121 N.W.2d. 372, 375, 376.....	96
International Shoe Co. v. Washington, 326 U.S. 310 (1945)	25, 79, 80
Ivanhoe Irrigation Dist. v. McCracken, 357 U.S. 275, 294 -296 (1958).....	23
Jackson v. State, 210 App.Div. 115, 205 N.Y.S. 658, affd 241 N.Y. 563, 150 N.E. 556.....	86
James v. Bowman, 190 U.S. 127, 139 (1903)	74
Jersey City v. Hague, 18 N.J. 584, 115 A.2d. 8.....	36, 40
Johnson v. Waters, 111 U.S. 640, 28 L.Ed. 547, 4 S.Ct. 619	86
Johnson v. Zerbst, 304 U.S. 458, 464, 82 L.Ed. 1461, 1466; 58 S.Ct. 1019, 146 A.L.R. 357	69
Joseph Martinelli & Co. v. Simon Siegel Co. (CA1 Mass) 176 F.2d. 98, 13 A.L.R.2d. 1243	86
Keeton v. Hustler Magazine, 465 U.S. 770 (1984)	79
Kentucky Bank v. Stone, 88 Fed. 383	84
Kulko v. California Superior Court, 436 U.S. 84, 91 (1978).....	80
Lake v. Lake, 817 F.2d. 1416, 1421 (9th Cir. 1987)	79
Lamborn v. County Commissioners, 97 U.S. 181	84
LaSalle Bank Lake View v. Seguban, 54 F.3d. 387, 391 (7th Cir. 1995)	107
Lathrop v. Donohue, 367 U.S. 820, 81 S.Ct. 1826, 6 L.Ed.2d. 1191 (1961).....	20
License Tax Cases, 72 U.S. 462, 18 L.Ed. 497, 5 Wall. 462, 2 A.F.T.R. 2224 (1866)	27, 89
Lippencott v. Allander, 27 Iowa 460.....	99

Little v. Bowers, 134 U.S. 547, 554	84
Long v. Rasmussen, 281 F. 236 (1922).....	93
Madlener v. Finley (1st Dist), 161 Ill.App.3d. 796, 113 Ill.Dec. 712, 515 N.E.2d. 697	41
Madlener v. Finley, 161 Ill.App.3d. 796, 113 Ill.Dec. 712, 515 N.E.2d. 697 (1st Dist)	36
Malkin v. United States (2nd Cir.2001), 243 F.3d. 120, 124	96
Manly v. Ohio Shoe Co. (CA4), 25 F.2d. 384, 59 A.L.R. 413	86
Manning v. Leighton, 65 Vt. 84, 26 A. 258, motion dismd 66 Vt. 56, 28 A. 630.....	87
Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S. 137, 1 Cranch 137, 2 L.Ed. 60 (1803)	107
Markuson v. Boucher, 175 U.S. 184 , 44 L.Ed. 124, 20 Sup.Ct.Rep. 76	90
Massachusetts v. United States, 435 U.S. 444 (1978).....	23
Maxwell v. Dow, 176 U.S. 581 (1899)	46
McAfferty v. Conover, 7 Ohio.St. 99	87
McCloud v. Testa, 97 F.3d. 1536, 12 I.E.R. Cas. (BNA) 1833, 1996 Fed.App. 335P (6th Cir. 1996)	20
McCue v. Monroe County, 162 N.Y. 235	84
McElvaine v. Brush, 142 U.S. 155, 160 , 35 S.L.Ed. 971, 973, 12 Sup.Ct.Rep. 156.....	90
McGee v. International Life Ins. Co., 355 U.S. 220, 223 (1957)	80
McNair v. Southern States Finance Co., 191 N.C. 710, 133 S.E. 85.....	86
Mcnally v. United States, 483 U.S. 350 (1987).....	68
Meese v. Keene, 481 U.S. 465, 484 (1987).....	71
Meese v. Keene, 481 U.S. 465, 484-485 (1987).....	71
Meredith v. United States, 13 Pet. 486, 493	26
Miller Brothers Co. v. Maryland, 347 U.S. 340 (1954).....	42
Milliken v. Meyer, 311 U.S. 457, 463 (1940)	79, 80
Milwaukee v. White, 296 U.S. 268 (1935).....	26
Miranda v. Arizona, 384 U.S. 436, 491 (1966)	56, 69
Montgomery v. Cowlitz County, 14 Wash. 230.....	84
Mullane v. Central Hanover Trust Co., 339 U.S. 306, 313 -314 (1950)	80
Munn v. Illinois, 94 U.S. 113 (1876)	22, 23
Munn. v. Illinois, 94 U.S. 113 (1876)	45
Nash v. United States, 229 U.S. 373, 377 (1913).....	68
National League of Cities v. Usery, 426 U.S. 833, 853 (1976).....	23
Nat'l Acceptance Co. v. Bathalter, 705 F.2d. 924, 930 (7th Cir. 1983).....	107
Newblock v. Bowles, 170 Okl. 487, 40 P.2d. 1097, 1100.....	89
Newhall v. Jordan, 160 Fed. 661	84
Newman-Green v. Alfonso Larrain, 490 U.S. 826 (1989)	49, 78
Nichols v. Michael, 23 N.Y. 264.....	86
Nikulnikoff v. Archbishop, etc., of Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church, 142 Misc. 894, 255 N.Y.S. 653, 663	53
Norton v. Shelby County, 118 U.S. 425 (1885)	40
Nudd v. Burrows, 91 U.S. 426, 23 L.Ed. 286.....	86
Oakland Cemetery Association v. Ramsey County, 98 Minn. 404	84
Oklahoma v. Civil Service Comm'n, 330 U.S. 127, 142 -144 (1947)	23
Olmstead v. United States, 277 U.S. 438 (1928).....	38
Olmstead v. United States, 277 U.S. 438, 478 (1928).....	38, 48, 51, 65
Ortiz-Pinero v. Rivera-Arroyo, 84 F.3d. 7 (1st Cir. 1996)	20
Panavision, 141 F.3d. at 1321	80
Parrish v. Nikolits, 86 F.3d. 1088 (11th Cir. 1996).....	20, 21
Peebles v. Pittsburgh, 101 Pa.St. 304	84
Peiffer v. Lebanon Sch. Dist., 848 F.2d. 44, 46 (3d Cir. 1988).....	107
Pennoyer v. Neff, 95 U.S. 714, 732-733 (1878).....	66, 80
People of Territory of Guam v. Fegurur, 800 F.2d. 1470 (9th Cir. 1986)	56, 66
Pepke v. Cronan, 155 U.S. 100 , 39 L.Ed. 84, 15 Sup.Ct.Rep. 34	90
Perkins v. Elg, 307 U.S. 325, 59 S.Ct. 884, 83 L.Ed. 1320 (1939)	48
Pocatello Secur. Trust Co. v. Henry, 35 Idaho 321, 206 P. 175, 27 A.L.R. 337	86
Price v. United States, 269 U.S. 492 , 46 S.Ct. 180.....	26
Proprietors of Charles River Bridge v. Proprietors of Warren Bridge, 36 U.S. 420 (1837).....	35
Railroad Co. v. Commissioner, 98 U.S. 541, 543	84
Railway Emp. Dept. v. Hanson, 351 U.S. 225, 76 S.Ct. 714, 100 L.Ed. 1112 (1956)	20
Rathbun v. Baumel, 196 Iowa 1233, 191 N.W. 297, 30 A.L.R. 216.....	86

Re Chapman, 156 U.S. 211, 216, 39 S.L.Ed. 401, 402, 15 Sup.Ct.Rep. 331	90
Re Duncan, 139 U.S. 449 , 454, sub nom. Duncan v. McCall, 35 L.Ed. 219, 222, 11 Sup.Ct.Rep. 573	90
Re Ernst, 179 Wis. 646,192 N.W. 65, 30 A.L.R. 681	86
Re Frederick, 149 U.S. 70, 75 , 37 S.L.Ed. 653, 656, 13 Sup.Ct.Rep. 793	90
Re Wood, 140 U.S. 278 , 289, Sub nom. Wood v. Bursh, 35 L.Ed. 505, 509, 11 Sup.Ct.Rep. 738.....	90
Robertson v. Cease, 97 U.S. 646, 648-649 (1878)	49, 78
Robins v. Latham, 134 No. 466.....	84
Roboz v. Kennedy, 219 F.Supp. 892 (D.D.C. 1963), p. 24	66, 74
Rowen v. U.S., 05-3766MMC. (N.D.Cal. 11/02/2005).....	50
Rutan v. Republican Party of Illinois, 497 U.S. 62, 110 S.Ct. 2729, 111 L.Ed.2d. 52, 5 I.E.R. Cas. (BNA) 673 (1990)	20
Ryan v. Motor Credit Co., 30 N.J.Eq. 531, 23 A.2d. 607, 621	65
Sage v. United States, 250 U.S. 33.....	85
Salter v. Aviation Salvage Co. 129 Miss 217, 91 So 340, 26 A.L.R. 987	86
Schechter Poultry Corp. v. United States, 295 U.S. 495, 549 , 550 S., 55 S.Ct. 837, 97 A.L.R. 947.....	57
Schwarzenegger, 374 F.3d. at 803.....	79
SEC v. Colello, 139 F.3d. 674, 677 (9th Cir. 1998)	107
Shaffer v. Heitner, 433 U.S. 186, 211 , n. 37 (1977).....	80
Sinking Fund Cases, 99 U.S. 700 (1878)	59
Slimmer v. Chickasaw County, 140 Iowa 448	84
Smietanka v. Indiana Steel Co., 257 U.S. 1.....	85
Smith v. Allwright, 321 U.S. 649, 644	97
St. Louis, etc., Co., v. George C. Prendergast Const. Co., 260 U.S. 469, 43 S.Ct. 178, 67 L.Ed. 351.....	27
State ex rel. Hutton v. Baton Rouge, 217 La 857, 47 So.2d. 665	99
State ex rel. Nagle v. Sullivan, 98 Mont. 425, 40 P.2d. 995, 99 A.L.R. 321	36, 40
State of Minnesota v. Brundage, 180 U.S. 499 (1901).....	90
State v. Chicago & C. R. Co., 165 No. 597.....	84
Stenberg v. Carhart, 530 U.S. 914 (2000)	71
Stockwell v. United States, 13 Wall. 531, 542	26
Stoddard v. Chambers, 2 How (U.S.) 284, 11 L.Ed. 269	86
Strawbridge v. Curtiss, 3 Cranch 267 (1806)	78
Sutton v. U.S., 256 U.S. 575 (1921).....	68
Taylor v. Philadelphia Board of Health, 31 P.St. 73	84
Taylor v. State, 73 Md. 208, 20 A. 914	86
Texas v. White, 7 Wall. 700, 725	43, 56
The Antelope, 23 U.S. 66, 10 Wheat 66, 6 L.Ed. 268 (1825)	45, 69
The Scotia, 81 U.S. (14 Wall.) 170 (1871).....	54
Thorpe v. R. & B. Railroad Co., 27 Vt. 143.....	45
Tinsley v. Anderson, 171 U.S. 101, 105, 43 S.L.Ed. 91, 96, 18 Sup.Ct.Rep. 805	90
Tower v. Tower & S. Street R. Co., 68 Minn 500, 71 N.W. 691	99
Trowbridge v. Oehmsen, 207 App.Div. 740, 202 N.Y.S. 833.....	86
U.S. v. Kyh, D.C.N.Y., 49 F.Supp 407, 414	65
U.S. v. Macintosh, 283 U.S. 605 (1931)	62
U.S. v. Prudden, 424 F.2d. 1021 (5th Cir. 1970).....	37
U.S. v. Tweel, 550 F.2d. 297, 299 (5th Cir. 1977)	37
U.S. v. William M. Butler, 297 U.S. 1 (1936).....	52
U.S. v. Wong Kim Ark, 169 U.S. 649, 18 S.Ct. 456, 42 L.Ed. 890 (1898).....	46, 61
United States ex rel. Angarica v. Bayard, 127 U.S. 251, 32 L.Ed. 159, 8 S.Ct. 1156, 4 A.F.T.R. 4628	87
United States Railroad Retirement Board v. Fritz, 449 U.S. 166 (1980)	78
United States v. Boylan (CA1 Mass), 898 F.2d. 230, 29 Fed.Rules.Evid.Serv. 1223	41
United States v. Boylan, 898 F.2d. 230, 29 Fed.Rules.Evid.Serv. 1223 (CA1 Mass).....	36
United States v. Chamberlin, 219 U.S. 250, 31 S.Ct. 155	26
United States v. Conkins, 9 F.3d. 1377, 1382 (9th Cir. 1993).....	66
United States v. Cruikshank, 92 U.S. 542 (1875).....	58, 59
United States v. Goodwin, 457 U.S. 368, 372, 102 S.Ct. 2485, 2488, 73 L.Ed.2d. 74 (1982)	55, 66
United States v. Guest, 383 U.S. 745 (1966).....	74
United States v. Harris, 106 U.S. 629, 639 (1883)	74
United States v. Holzer (CA7 Ill), 816 F.2d. 304	41
United States v. Holzer, 816 F.2d. 304 (CA7 Ill)	36

United States v. Hvoslef, 237 U.S. 1, 12.....	85
United States v. Little, 889 F.2d. 1367 (CA5 Miss).....	36
United States v. Minker, 350 U.S. 179, 76 S.Ct. 281 (1956).....	69
United States v. New York & Cuba Mail Steamship Co. (200 U. S. 488, 493, 494).....	84
United States v. Reese, 92 U.S. 214, 218 (1876).....	74
United States v. San Francisco, 310 U.S. 16 (1940).....	23
United States v. Solano-Godines, 120 F.3d. 957, 962 (9th Cir. 1997).....	107
United States v. State Bank, 96 U.S. 30, 96 Otto 30, 24 L.Ed. 647.....	87
United States v. The Amistad, 15 Pet (U.S.) 518, 10 L.Ed. 826.....	86
United States v. Throckmorton, 98 U.S. 61, 25 L.Ed. 93.....	86
United States v. Winstar Corp. 518 U.S. 839 (1996).....	25
United States vs. Lee, 106 U.S. 196, 1 S.Ct. 240 (1882).....	43
Vaughan v. Riordan, 280 Fed. 742, 745.....	84
Vickery v. Jones, 100 F.3d. 1334 (7th Cir. 1996), cert. denied, 117 S.Ct. 1553, 137 L.Ed.2d. 701 (U.S. 1997).....	20
Vlandis v. Kline (1973) 412 U.S. 441, 449, 93 S.Ct. 2230, 2235.....	58, 82
Wall v. Parrot Silver & Copper Co., 244 U.S. 407, 37 S.Ct. 609, 61 L.Ed. 1229.....	27
Warren v. San Francisco, 150 Calif. 167.....	84
Washington v. Harper, 494 U.S. 210 (1990).....	48, 51
Western Union Telegraph Co. v. Lenroot, 323 U.S. 490, 502 (1945).....	71
Whitbeck v. Minch, 48 Ohio St. 210.....	84
Whitten v. Tomlinson, 160 U.S. 231, 242, 40 S.L.Ed. 406, 412, 16 Sup.Ct.Rep. 297.....	90
Williams v. Merritt, 152 Mich. 621.....	84
Williams v. North Carolina, 325 U.S. 226 (1945).....	81
Wilson v. Shaw, 204 U.S. 24, 51 L.Ed. 351, 27 S.Ct. 233.....	87
Wisconsin v. Pelican Insurance Co., 127 U.S. 265, 292, et seq. 8 S.Ct. 1370.....	26
Wooley v. Maynard, 430 U.S. 703 (1977).....	43
World-Wide Volkswagen Corp. v. Woodson, 444 U.S. 286 (1980).....	80
Wright v. Blakeslee, 101 U.S. 174, 178.....	84
Yahoo! Inc. v. La Ligue Contre Le Racisme Et L'Antisemitisme, 433 F.3d. 1199 (9th Cir. 01/12/2006).....	80
Yick Wo v. Hopkins, 118 U.S. 356, 369, 6 S.Sup.Ct. 1064, 1071.....	52

Other Authorities

"Continental Congress To The Inhabitants Of The Province Of Quebec." Journals of the Continental Congress. 1774 - 1789. Journals 1: 105-13.....	42
106 A.L.R. Fed. 396.....	20
107 A.L.R. Fed. 21.....	20
108 A.L.R. Fed. 117.....	20
109 A.L.R. Fed. 9.....	20
17 American Jurisprudence 2d, Contracts §151 (1999).....	86
17 American Jurisprudence 2d, Contracts §191 (1999).....	86
17 American Jurisprudence 2d, Contracts §509 (1999).....	87
2 Foreign Affairs Manual (F.A.M.) 1292.1.....	101
2A N. Singer, Sutherland on Statutes and Statutory Construction § 47.07, p. 152, and n. 10 (5th ed. 1992).....	71
32 American Jurisprudence 2d, False Pretenses §§88-96 (1999).....	87
32B American Jurisprudence 2d, Federal Courts §§2266 et seq. (1999).....	87
37 American Jurisprudence 2d, Fraud and Deceit, §8 (1999).....	87
63C American Jurisprudence 2d, Public Officers and Employees, §247 (1999).....	36, 41
97 L.Ed.2d. 903.....	20
Affidavit of Duress: Illegal Tax Enforcement by De Facto Officers, Form #02.005.....	100
American Bar Association (ABA).....	39
American Jurisprudence 2d, Constitutional law, §546: Forced and Prohibited Associations (1999).....	21
American Jurisprudence 2d, Duress, §21 (1999).....	86, 100
American Jurisprudence 2d, Franchises, §4: Generally (1999).....	99
American Jurisprudence 2d, United States, §45 (1999).....	30, 87
Avoiding Traps in Government Forms Course, Form #12.023.....	29, 51
Black's Law Dictionary, Fourth Edition, p. 1693.....	53, 67
Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 1185.....	82

Black’s Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 1407.....	65
Black’s Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 1473.....	96
Black’s Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 1498.....	77
Black’s Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 281.....	55
Black’s Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 485 under “domicile”.....	81
Black’s Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 581.....	89
Black’s Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 623.....	65
Black’s Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 74.....	65
Black’s Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 97.....	96
Bouvier’s Law Dictionary, Fourth Edition, 1848.....	25
Bouvier’s Maxims of Law, 1856.....	37, 46, 107
Challenge to Income Tax Enforcement Authority Within Constitutional States of the Union, Form #05.052.....	27, 52
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.....	85
Common Sense, Thomas Paine.....	41
Conduct and Belief: Public Employees' First Amendment Rights to Free Expression and Political Affiliation. 59 U Chi LR 897, Spring, 1992.....	21
Conflicts in a Nutshell, David D. Siegel and Patrick J. Borchers, West Publishing, p. 24.....	66, 74
Congressional Record-Senate, Volume 77- Part 4, June 10, 1933, Page 12522.....	72
Congressional Research Report 97-59A.....	106
Cooley on Taxation, vol. 2, 3d ed. p. 1495.....	84
Corporatization and Privatization of the Government, Form #05.024.....	98, 109
Corpus Juris Secundum (C.J.S.), Territories, §1 (2003).....	96
Correcting Erroneous Information Returns, Form #04.001.....	39
D.O.S. Form DS-11 or DS-82.....	18-1
De Facto Government Scam, Form #05.043.....	40, 45, 51
Delegation of Authority Order from God to Christians, Form #13.007.....	68
Department of Homeland Security.....	99
Department of State Form DS-11.....	101
Department of State Form I-9.....	102
Enclosure (2): Affidavit of Citizenship, Domicile, and Tax Status.....	76
Enclosure (6).....	101
Executive Order 10289.....	89
Executive Order 12612.....	41
Executive Order 12612, Oct. 26, 1987.....	42
Federal Civil Trials and Evidence, Rutter Group, Sections 8:2786-8:2799.1, Year 2007, pp. 8G-118-8G-119.....	97
Federal Civil Trials and Evidence, Rutter Group, paragraph 8:4993, p. 8K-34.....	59, 82
Federal Enforcement Authority Within States of the Union, Form #05.032.....	93
Federal Petition/Pleading/Motion Attachment, Litigation Tool #01.002.....	96
Federal Reserve.....	39
First Amendment Law in a Nutshell, Second Edition, Barron-Dienes, West Publishing, ISBN 0-314-22677-X, pp. 266-267	44
First Amendment Law in a Nutshell, Second Edition, Barron-Dienes, West Publishing, ISBN 0-314-22677-X, pp. 266-267	64
Flawed Tax Arguments to Avoid, Form #08.004.....	111
Form #05.030.....	23
Form #05.040.....	23
Form #12.040.....	23
Founding Fathers.....	42
George Washington, (letter to Patrick Henry, 9 October 1775).....	67
George Washington, Farewell Address.....	66
Getting A USA Passport as a “state national”, Form #09.007.....	98
Government Conspiracy to Destroy the Separation of Powers, Form #05.023.....	64, 98
Government Instituted Slavery Using Franchises, Form #05.030.....	22, 52, 58, 62, 108
Greenawalt, Religion As a Concept in Constitutional Law, 72 Cal. L.Rev. 753 (1984).....	64
Henry David Thoreau.....	72
Highlights of American Legal and Political History CD, Form #11.202.....	<u>16-1</u>
How State Nationals Volunteer to Pay Income Tax, Form #08.024.....	31

Identity Theft Laws: State Penalties and Remedies and Pending Federal Bills, Congressional Research Service Report #RL34028 / 2007-08-06	109
Injury Defense Franchise and Agreement, Form #06.027	25, 29, 53
Injury Defense Franchise and Agreement, Form #06.027, Section 11	46
Injury Defense Franchise and Agreement, Form #06.027, Section 4	83
Internal Revenue Manual (I.R.M.), Section 1.1.1.1	93
Internal Revenue Manual (I.R.M.), Section 4.10.7.2.8	94, 95, 106
Internal Revenue Manual (I.R.M.), Section 4.10.7.2.9.8	106
Internal Revenue Manual (I.R.M.), Section 4.10.7.2.9.8 (05/14/99)	93
IRS "The Truth About Frivolous Tax Arguments"	106
IRS Form 1040	71
IRS Form 1042-S	70
IRS Form 1098	70
IRS Form 1099	70
IRS Form 4868	96
IRS Form 8300 Currency Transaction Reports	70
IRS Form K-1	70
IRS Form RACS006	95
IRS Form W-2	70
IRS Form W-4	70
IRS Form W-8	102
IRS Forms 1040 and 1040NR jurat/perjury statement	93
IRS Forms W-2, 1098, 1099	88
IRS Individual Master File (IMF)	96
Jesus Is an Anarchist, James Redford	60
John Adams, 2nd President	66
Laws of the Bible, Form #13.001	60, 77
Legal Deception, Propaganda, and Fraud, Form #05.014	38, 70
Letter from Social Security Administration, Exhibit #07.004	92
Memorandums of Law, Forms 05.001 through 05.099	95
Merriam Webster Dictionary	60
Minimum Contacts Doctrine	79
Newbreak Fellowship, Pastor D.J. Marx, July 16, 2013	62
Ninth Circuit Court of Federal Appeals	79
Pastor Mike Macintosh of Horizon Christian Fellowship	62
Policy Document: Rebutted False Arguments About Sovereignty, Form #08.018	111
Policy Document: Rebutted False Arguments About Sovereignty, Form #08.018, Sections 6.1 through 6.4	50
Policy Document: Rebutted False Arguments Against this Website, Form #08.011	111
Presumption: Chief Weapon for Unlawfully Enlarging Federal Jurisdiction, Form #05.017	70, 83
Professor Kent Greenawalt	64
Property and Privacy Protection Page, Section 10: Identity Theft	109
Prosecuting Social Security Number Misuse: Attacking Identity Theft at its Source, U.S. Attorney Bulletin, Vol. 53, No. 1	109
Public Employees and the First Amendment Petition Clause: Protecting the Rights of Citizen-Employees Who File Legitimate Grievances and Lawsuits Against Their Government Employers. 90 N.W. U LR 304, Fall, 1995	20
Readings on the History and System of the Common Law, Roscoe Pound, Second Edition, 1925, p. 2	38
Readings on the History and System of the Common Law, Roscoe Pound, Second Edition, 1925, p. 4	56
Reasonable Belief About Income Tax Liability, Form #05.007	39, 83, 105
Rebutted False Arguments About the Common Law, Form #08.025	111
Rebutted Version of "Tax Resister Frequently Asked Questions", Form #08.007	111
Rebutted Version of Congressional Research Service Report 97-59A: Frequently Asked Questions Concerning the Federal Income Tax, Form #08.006	111
Rebutted Version of the IRS "The Truth About Frivolous Tax Arguments", Form #08.005	111
Ref. (1)	58, 61, 73
Ref. (1), Section 13	100
Reference (1)	45
Requirement for Reasonable Notice, Form #05.022	70
Resignation of Compelled Social Security Trustee, Form #06.002	73, 91, 92, 97, 99, 109

Resources to Rebut Government, Legal, and Tax Profession Deception and False Propaganda	50
Restatement 2d, Contracts § 174	86, 100
Rights of British America, 1774.....	75
SEDM Jurisdictions Database, Litigation Tool #09.003	35
SEDM Litigation Tools page	35
Separation Between Public and Private Course, Form #12.025	28, 52
Socialism: The New American Civil Religion, Form #05.016.....	53, 54
SSA Form SS-5	102
The “Trade or Business” Scam, Form #05.001	71, 89, 99
The Right to Petition, Form #05.049.....	22
The Writings of George Washington, Fitzpatrick, ed., vol. 34 (335)	67
Thomas Jefferson, First Inaugural Address, March 4, 1801.....	67
Thomas Jefferson: Notes on Virginia Q.XVIII, 1782. ME 2:227	75
Thomas Paine	41
Treasury Decision 3445.....	84
Treasury Decision 3445, February 27, 1923	85
Treasury Order 150-02	89
Treatise on Government, Joel Tiffany, p. 49, Section 78	91
U.S. Department of State Website, Foreign Affairs Manual	101
U.S. Supreme Court	43, 62, 89
U.S. Supreme Court decisions.....	70
USCIS E-Verify Application.....	102
W.N. Grigg.....	109
We Are the Church, Family Guardian Fellowship	109
What Happened to Justice?, Form #06.012	72
What Is “law”?, Form #05.048.....	51
When Freedoms Conflict: Party Discipline and the First Amendment. 11 JL &Pol 751, Fall, 1995	20
Why Domicile and Becoming a “Taxpayer” Require Your Consent, Form #05.002, Section 13.1	74
Why It is Illegal for Me to Request or Use a “Taxpayer Identification Number”, Form #04.205	97, 108
Why Penalties are Illegal for Anything But Federal Employees, Contractors, and Agents, Form #05.010	70
Why the Federal Income Tax is a Privilege Tax Upon Government Property, Form #04.404	27
Why the Government Can’t Lawfully Assess Human Beings With an Income Tax Liability Without Their Consent, Form #05.011	70
Why You are a “national”, “state national”, and Constitutional but not Statutory Citizen, Form #05.006	17-1
Why You Aren’t Eligible for Social Security, Form #06.001	27, 28, 52, 108
Why Your Government is Either a Thief or You are a “Public Officer” for Income Tax Purposes, Form #05.008	36, 50
William Penn.....	47
Your Exclusive Right to Declare or Establish Your Civil Status, Form #13.008.....	21

Scriptures

1 Cor. 3:16-17	109
1 John 4:16.....	77
1 Peter 2:15-16	50
1 Tim. 6:10.....	70
2 Cor. 6:17.....	72
2nd Corinthians 5:20	64
Deut. 10:14.....	77
Deut. 6:13.....	63
Deuteronomy 10:14.....	63
Exodus 20.....	61
Exodus 20:2-3	47
Exodus 20:2-6	64
Exodus 20:3.....	67
Exodus 23:32-33	68
Exodus 23:8.....	72
Exodus 34:12.....	68
Ezekial 20:10-20	67

Ezra 8:21-22	61
Gal. 5:18	60
Holy Bible	77
Isaiah 33:22	59, 60, 61
Isaiah 45:12	63
James 4:4	62
John 14:21	77
Luke 16:13	54
Matt. 10:42-45	47
Matt. 23:1-36	57
Matt. 4:10	19
Matt. 5:33-37	63
Matt. 8:19-20	60
Numbers 15:30	106
Philippians 3:20	61
Prov. 17:15	72
Prov. 21:6-7	70
Prov. 29:12	72
Psalms 118:8-9	64
Psalms 119:19	61
Psalms 47:7	61, 63, 77
Psalms 69:8-9	61
Psalms 89:11-13	63
Rev. 18:1-8	51
Rev. 18:4-8	72, 110
Rev. 19:19	109
Rev. 5:9-10	59, 60
Revelation 19:19	62
Romans 13:8	65
Ten Commandments	47, 61

1 Dear Sir/Mam:

2 **1. PURPOSE OF THIS COMMUNICATION**

3 This Declaration of Intention and the attachments provided constitute reasonable and formal legal notice of an important
4 change in legal status and the legal relation between the submitter and the recipient which needs to become a permanent part
5 of the government's records. This Declaration of Intention and the attachments hereto:

- 6 1. Constitutes a notice and demand to do all the things documented in section 10 later.
- 7 2. Constitutes a Declaration of Intention to permanently change domicile to without the "United States" and to abandon
8 **statutory** "U.S. citizen" status pursuant to 8 U.S.C. §1401, 26 U.S.C. §3121(e), and 26 C.F.R. §1.1-1(c) but not
9 **constitutional** citizenship.
- 10 3. **Does not** constitute any of the things described in Section 2, the next section.
- 11 4. Constitutes a notice and demand to update all records about me that may be in your possession which describe either my
12 citizenship or my legal domicile by all of the following entities
13 4.1. The government of the United States.
14 4.2. Every state of the Union.
15 4.3. The state of the Union in which the submitter maintains a transient place of abode.
16 4.4. You as the recipient.
- 17 5. Constitutes legal notice that if the above things are NOT done, then you will become party to the crimes documented
18 herein.
- 19 6. Constitutes a formal request to eliminate the criminal and illegal duress documented herein, and especially in section 9
20 because the ability to act in a "voluntary" manner is impossible unless and until all such sources of CRIMINAL duress
21 are completely and systematically eliminated.

22 I have a personal knowledge as a witness of the truthfulness and accuracy of all the facts described in this Declaration of
23 Intention and consistent with 28 U.S.C. §1746(1) , have verified same with a notarized signature at the end. You are
24 personally in receipt of this notice because not only are you the person responsible for the records which need to be modified
25 and the actions which are requested to be taken on your part, but also because you will become the person responsible as a
26 public official if the actions requested are not taken and injury results to me personally because of omissions on your part or
27 breach of your oath.

28 This political, legal, and commercial civil divorce from the "government" but not the "state" instead represents a decision to
29 maintain dual citizenship in the following order of precedence: 1. Citizenship in the Kingdom of God; 2. Citizenship in the
30 country of my birth. It also defines and prescribes that:

- 31 1. Citizenship in the country of my birth is **subordinate to**, and inferior to my citizenship in Heaven and all the legal
32 obligations arising from it under God's Law found in the Holy Bible.
- 33 2. My earthly allegiance to the "state", which is the Sovereign people (We The People) and **not** the de facto "government"
34 that serves them, is **secondary** to that of my Lord, Savior, Lawgiver, and Judge, Jesus Christ and His laws. Since Jesus
35 Christ says I can serve ONLY God and not any man, then I can only obey God's laws and not any vain substitute for His
36 laws written by any ruler or legislator:

37 *"Away with you, Satan! For it is written, 'You shall worship the Lord your God, and Him **ONLY** [NOT our
38 **SERVANTS** in government!] you shall serve.'"*
39 *[Matt. 4:10, Bible, NKJV]*

- 40 3. The voluntary decision to abandon all man-made domiciles and surrender exclusively to God's authority and His Holy
41 Law and ONLY the Common Law that implements it documented herein is an act of religious worship in satisfaction of
42 the tenets of my religious faith. The recipient is reminded that the **First Amendment** to the United States Constitution
43 prohibits any government, state or federal, from interfering with the free exercise of my religious beliefs, including those
44 practices which completely remove and destroy all legal connections between me and the government or state.

45 This document therefore describes an act of political and legal **disassociation** which is a fulfillment of my right to freely
46 associate and to be free from the compelled association with persons, governments, and laws which I view as harmful to my
47 best interests and that of my family and friends.

1 “The right to associate or not to associate with others solely on the basis of individual choice, not being absolute,
2 may conflict with a societal interest in requiring one to associate with others, or to prohibit one from associating
3 with others, in order to accomplish what the state deems to be the common good. **The Supreme Court, though**
4 **rarely called upon to examine this aspect of the right to freedom of association, has nevertheless established**
5 **certain basic rules which will cover many situations involving forced or prohibited associations.** Thus, where a
6 sufficiently compelling state interest, outside the political spectrum, can be accomplished only by requiring
7 individuals to associate together for the common good, then such forced association is constitutional.¹ **But the**
8 **Supreme Court has made it clear that compelling an individual to become a member of an organization with**
9 **political aspects [such as a GOVERNMENT], or compelling an individual to become a member of an**
10 **organization which financially supports, in more than an insignificant way, political personages or goals**
11 **lusing voluntary donations deceitfully called “TAXES”] which the individual does not wish to support, is an**
12 **infringement of the individual's constitutional right to freedom of association.**² **The First Amendment**
13 **prevents the government, except in the most compelling circumstances, from wielding its power to interfere**
14 **with its employees' freedom to believe and associate, or to not believe and not associate; it is not merely a**
15 **tenure provision that protects public employees from actual or constructive discharge.**³ **Thus, First**
16 **Amendment principles prohibit a state from compelling any individual to associate with a political party [or**
17 **GOVERNMENT as a private individual], as a condition of retaining public employment.**⁴ **The First Amendment**
18 **protects nonpolicymaking public employees from discrimination based on their political beliefs or affiliation.**⁵
19 **But the First Amendment protects the right of political party members to advocate that a specific person be elected**
20 **or appointed to a particular office and that a specific person be hired to perform a governmental function.**⁶ **In**
21 **the First Amendment context, the political patronage exception to the First Amendment protection for public**
22 **employees is to be construed broadly, so as presumptively to encompass positions placed by legislature outside**
23 **of “merit” civil service. Positions specifically named in relevant federal, state, county, or municipal laws to**
24 **which discretionary authority with respect to enforcement of that law or carrying out of some other policy of**
25 **political concern is granted, such as a secretary of state given statutory authority over various state corporation**
26 **law practices, fall within the political patronage exception to First Amendment protection of public employees.**⁷

¹ Lathrop v. Donohue, 367 U.S. 820, 81 S.Ct. 1826, 6 L.Ed.2d. 1191 (1961), reh'g denied, 368 U.S. 871, 82 S.Ct. 23, 7 L.Ed.2d. 72 (1961) (a state supreme court may order integration of the state bar); Railway Emp. Dept. v. Hanson, 351 U.S. 225, 76 S.Ct. 714, 100 L.Ed. 1112 (1956), motion denied, 351 U.S. 979, 76 S.Ct. 1044, 100 L.Ed. 1494 (1956) and reh'g denied, 352 U.S. 859, 77 S.Ct. 22, 1 L.Ed.2d. 69 (1956) (upholding the validity of the union shop provision of the Railway Labor Act).

The First Amendment right to freedom of association of teachers was not violated by enforcement of a rule that white teachers whose children did not attend public schools would not be rehired. Cook v. Hudson, 511 F.2d. 744, 9 Empl.Prac.Dec. (CCH) ¶ 10134 (5th Cir. 1975), reh'g denied, 515 F.2d. 762 (5th Cir. 1975) and cert. granted, 424 U.S. 941, 96 S.Ct. 1408, 47 L.Ed.2d. 347 (1976) and cert. dismissed, 429 U.S. 165, 97 S.Ct. 543, 50 L.Ed.2d. 373, 12 Empl.Prac.Dec. (CCH) ¶ 11246 (1976).

Annotation: Supreme Court's views regarding Federal Constitution's First Amendment right of association as applied to elections and other political activities, 116 L.Ed.2d. 997, § 10.

² Rutan v. Republican Party of Illinois, 497 U.S. 62, 110 S.Ct. 2729, 111 L.Ed.2d. 52, 5 I.E.R. Cas. (BNA) 673 (1990), reh'g denied, 497 U.S. 1050, 111 S.Ct. 13, 111 L.Ed.2d. 828 (1990) and reh'g denied, 497 U.S. 1050, 111 S.Ct. 13, 111 L.Ed.2d. 828 (1990) (conditioning public employment hiring decisions on political belief and association violates the First Amendment rights of applicants in the absence of some vital governmental interest).

³ Rutan v. Republican Party of Illinois, 497 U.S. 62, 110 S.Ct. 2729, 111 L.Ed.2d. 52, 5 I.E.R. Cas. (BNA) 673 (1990), reh'g denied, 497 U.S. 1050, 111 S.Ct. 13, 111 L.Ed.2d. 828 (1990) and reh'g denied, 497 U.S. 1050, 111 S.Ct. 13, 111 L.Ed.2d. 828 (1990).

Annotation: Public employee's right of free speech under Federal Constitution's First Amendment—Supreme Court cases, 97 L.Ed.2d. 903.

First Amendment protection for law enforcement employees subjected to discharge, transfer, or discipline because of speech, 109 A.L.R. Fed. 9.

First Amendment protection for judges or government attorneys subjected to discharge, transfer, or discipline because of speech, 108 A.L.R. Fed. 117.

First Amendment protection for public hospital or health employees subjected to discharge, transfer, or discipline because of speech, 107 A.L.R. Fed. 21.

First Amendment protection for publicly employed firefighters subjected to discharge, transfer, or discipline because of speech, 106 A.L.R. Fed. 396.

⁴ Abood v. Detroit Bd. of Ed., 431 U.S. 209, 97 S.Ct. 1782, 52 L.Ed.2d. 261, 95 L.R.R.M. (BNA) 2411, 81 Lab. Cas. (CCH) ¶ 55041 (1977), reh'g denied, 433 U.S. 915, 97 S.Ct. 2989, 53 L.Ed.2d. 1102 (1977); Parrish v. Nikolits, 86 F.3d. 1088 (11th Cir. 1996), cert. denied, 117 S.Ct. 1818, 137 L.Ed.2d. 1027 (U.S. 1997).

⁵ LaRou v. Ridlon, 98 F.3d. 659 (1st Cir. 1996); Parrish v. Nikolits, 86 F.3d. 1088 (11th Cir. 1996), cert. denied, 117 S.Ct. 1818, 137 L.Ed.2d. 1027 (U.S. 1997).

⁶ Vickery v. Jones, 100 F.3d. 1334 (7th Cir. 1996), cert. denied, 117 S.Ct. 1553, 137 L.Ed.2d. 701 (U.S. 1997).

Responsibilities of the position of director of a municipality's office of federal programs resembled those of a policymaker, privy to confidential information, a communicator, or some other office holder whose function was such that party affiliation was an equally important requirement for continued tenure. Ortiz-Pinero v. Rivera-Arroyo, 84 F.3d. 7 (1st Cir. 1996).

⁷ McCloud v. Testa, 97 F.3d. 1536, 12 I.E.R. Cas. (BNA) 1833, 1996 Fed.App. 335P (6th Cir. 1996), reh'g and suggestion for reh'g en banc denied, (Feb. 13, 1997).

Law Reviews: Stokes, When Freedoms Conflict: Party Discipline and the First Amendment. 11 JL & Pol 751, Fall, 1995.

Pave, Public Employees and the First Amendment Petition Clause: Protecting the Rights of Citizen-Employees Who File Legitimate Grievances and Lawsuits Against Their Government Employers. 90 N.W. U LR 304, Fall, 1995.

1 *However, a supposed interest in ensuring effective government and efficient government employees, political*
2 *affiliation or loyalty, or high salaries paid to the employees in question should not be counted as indicative of*
3 *positions that require a particular party affiliation. ⁸*
4 *[American Jurisprudence 2d, Constitutional law, §546: Forced and Prohibited Associations (1999)]*

5 This communication and request is a lawful exercise of rights established and protected by the Constitution of the United
6 States of America. The reader will note that those rights attach to the place of my transient occupancy on land protected by
7 the Constitution, and not to either my citizenship or domicile or statutory status under a franchise of any kind.

8 *“It is locality that is determinative of the application of the Constitution, in such matters as judicial procedure,*
9 *and not the status of the people who live in it.”*
10 *[Balzac v. Porto Rico, 258 U.S. 298 (1922)]*

11 **1.1. Legal authority for sending this legal notice and demand**

12 The authority for submitting this document to you was described by the U.S. Supreme Court, which said on this subject:

13 **“This right of domicile [. . .] is not established unless the person makes sufficiently known his intention of**
14 **fixing [or NOT fixing] there, either tacitly or by an express declaration.”**
15 *[Fong Yu Ting v. United States, 149 U.S. 698 (1893)]*

16 This document therefore constitutes an “express declaration” or “declaration of intention” of my political intentions into
17 perpetuity in relation to both the “United States” as well as every state of the Union. As a government agency that must keep
18 track of and interface with foreigners domiciled or present anywhere within your jurisdiction and who therefore have
19 volunteered to be subject to your civil laws, you are the proper party to receive this Legal Notice. Notice to the agent is notice
20 to the principle. Please copy and distribute the paper only version of this document to all interested parties within your
21 government agency and other government agencies who might require this information in order to update their records to
22 properly reflect my change of civil status. The legal significance of “civil status” is documented:

[Your Exclusive Right to Declare or Establish Your Civil Status, Form #13.008](https://sedm.org/Forms/13-SelfFamilyChurchGovnce/RightToDeclStatus.pdf)
<https://sedm.org/Forms/13-SelfFamilyChurchGovnce/RightToDeclStatus.pdf>

23 In addition, the First Amendment Petition Clause authorizes me to petition my government for a redress of the grievances
24 described herein.

25 *First Amendment of the US Constitution -- Religion and Expression*

26 *Religion And Free Expression*

27 *Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or*
28 *abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and **to petition***
29 ***the Government for a redress of grievances.***

30 *[SOURCE: <https://law.justia.com/constitution/us/amendment-01/>]*

31 Every right in the Constitution gives rise to a corresponding obligation on your part, as the government recipient, to receive
32 a factual answer and response addressing the allegations and remedying them if criminal or harmful activity is being
33 complained of and a law is cited authorizing your to prosecute it. Without such a response and a prosecution of the crime or
34 injury complained of, the right has effectively been unconstitutionally ELIMINATED and the government has engaged in a
35 criminal conspiracy to obstruct justice.

36 I remind you that as the “Department of Justice” you have a MONOPOLY on criminal prosecutions. NO one else and
37 certainly not private citizens ordinarily engage in prosecuting crime. Thus, if YOU or your employer are habitually engaged
38 in crime and you refuse to prosecute it, then you become a mafia protection racket that only protects ITSELF. That

Singer, Conduct and Belief: Public Employees' First Amendment Rights to Free Expression and Political Affiliation. 59 U Chi LR 897, Spring, 1992.

As to political patronage jobs, see § 472.

⁸ Parrish v. Nikolits, 86 F.3d. 1088 (11th Cir. 1996), cert. denied, 117 S.Ct. 1818, 137 L.Ed.2d. 1027 (U.S. 1997).

1 organization of the government itself is a criminal enterprise under RICO laws and any money collected in the that capacity
2 becomes money laundering subject to civil forfeiture, INCLUDING but not limited to so-called “taxes”.

3 Further, to PENALIZE such a petition in any way, or use it as a basis for “selective enforcement” or persecution of the
4 whistleblower would be the MOST egregious violation of your fiduciary duty as a public servant that there is. What do you
5 think a jury is going to say about a public officer such as yourself charged with prosecuting criminal activities by your fellow
6 employees who responds by targeting those who submit such criminal complaints such as me with “selective enforcement”
7 and persecution and penalties?

8 Pursuant to U.C.C. §1-202, this submission gives REASONABLE NOTICE and conveys FULL KNOWLEDGE to the
9 Recipient of all the terms and conditions *exclusively* governing their commercial relationship and shall be the ONLY and
10 exclusive method and remedy by which their relationship shall be legally governed. Ownership by the Submitter of him/her
11 self and his/her PRIVATE property implies the *right to exclude ALL others* from using or benefitting from the use of his/her
12 exclusively owned property. All property held in the name of the Submitter is, always has been, and always will be stipulated
13 by all parties to this agreement and stipulation as: 1. Presumed EXCLUSIVELY PRIVATE until PROVEN WITH
14 EVIDENCE to be EXPRESSLY and KNOWINGLY and VOLUNTARILY (absent duress) donated to a PUBLIC use IN
15 WRITING; 2. ABSOLUTE, UNQUALIFIED, and PRIVATE; 3. Not consensually shared in any way with any government
16 or pretended DE FACTO government. Any other commercial use of any submission to any government or any property of
17 the Submitter shall be stipulated by all parties concerned and by any and every court as eminent domain, THEFT, an
18 unconstitutional taking in violation of the Fifth Amendment, and a violation of due process of law.

19 For a history of the unalienable constitutional right to petition, see:

<p><i>The Right to Petition</i>, Form #05.049 https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/RightToPetition.pdf</p>

20 **1.2. Your Express CONSENT is NOT required in order to impose duties upon you personally**
21 **through this communication. IMPLIED consent is sufficient**

22 Because this communication establishes my labor and property as absolutely owned, then by implication it also establishes
23 my ability to use that property as a means to control and impose duties upon all those who attempt to use, control, or receive
24 the “benefit” of said property:

25 *“The State in such cases exercises no greater right than an individual may exercise over the use of his own*
26 *property when leased or loaned to others. The conditions upon which the privilege shall be enjoyed being stated*
27 *or implied in the legislation authorizing its grant, no right is, of course, impaired by their enforcement. The*
28 *recipient of the privilege, in effect, stipulates to comply with the conditions. It matters not how limited the*
29 *privilege conferred, its acceptance implies an assent to the regulation of its use and the compensation for it.”*
30 *[Munn v. Illinois, 94 U.S. 113 (1876)]*

31 The basis of all of your civil statutory control over the populace originates from grants of state property WITH CIVIL legal
32 strings attached. The civil statutory code, in fact, is the method of publishing and enforcing rules or conditions placed upon
33 all those who seek to use public property (publici juris). That property includes civil statutory statuses such as “person”,
34 “citizen”, or “resident” (under the civil code), “taxpayer” (under the revenue codes), “driver” (under the vehicle code),
35 “spouse” (under the Family Code), etc. It also includes all government “benefits”, driver licensing, Social Security, marriage
36 licensing, professional licensing, etc. This is exhaustively proven with evidence in:

<p><i>Government Instituted Slavery Using Franchises</i>, Form #05.030 https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/Franchises.pdf</p>
--

37 Under all franchises, mere RECEIPT of government “benefits”, civil services, government property, or chattel property
38 constitutes CONSTRUCTIVE CONSENT to the terms of the loan:

39 *“The recipient of the privilege, in effect, stipulates to comply with the conditions. It matters not how limited*
40 *the privilege conferred, its acceptance implies an assent to the regulation of its use and the compensation for*
41 *it.”*
42 *[Munn v. Illinois, 94 U.S. 113 (1876)]*

1 It matters NOT that the recipient has NO KNOWLEDGE that the consequences of their receipt of use of property granted by
2 the GRANTOR are authority for making them the LAWFUL target of civil or administrative enforcement. They can be held
3 LIABLE for the terms of the GRANT even if they expressly SAY or INSIST that they have no such obligations. To wit:

4 *“We have repeatedly held that the Federal Government may impose appropriate conditions on the use of*
5 *[federal property](#) or [privileges \[franchises, Form #05.030\]](#) and may require [COMPEL] that state*
6 *instrumentalities comply with [conditions \[obligations, Form #12.040\]](#) that are reasonably related to the federal*
7 *interest in particular national projects or programs. See, e. g., [Ivanhoe Irrigation Dist. v. McCracken](#), 357 U.S.*
8 *275, 294 -296 (1958); [Oklahoma v. Civil Service Comm'n](#), 330 U.S. 127, 142 -144 (1947); [United States v. San](#)*
9 *Francisco, 310 U.S. 16 (1940); cf. [National League of Cities v. Usery](#), 426 U.S. 833, 853 (1976); [Fry v. United](#)*
10 *States, 421 U.S. 542 (1975). A requirement that States, like all other users, pay a portion of the costs of the*
11 *[benefits \[Form #05.040\]](#) they enjoy from federal programs is surely permissible [meaning*
12 *CONSTITUTIONAL] since it is closely related to the [435 U.S. 444, 462] federal interest in recovering costs*
13 *from those who [benefit](#) and since it effects no greater interference with state sovereignty than do the restrictions*
14 *which this Court has approved.”*
15 *[[Massachusetts v. United States](#), 435 U.S. 444 (1978);*
16 *https://scholar.google.com/scholar_case?case=16842193024599209893]*

17 Based on Munn v. Illinois, PRIVATE people such as myself may ALSO impose and enforce the terms of the grant of property
18 on THE GOVERNMENT:

19 *“[The State in such cases exercises no greater right than an individual may exercise over the use of his own](#)*
20 *[property when leased or loaned to others.](#) “*
21 *[[Munn v. Illinois](#), 94 U.S. 113 (1876)]*

22 Therefore, I TOO can turn any use, benefit, control of my absolutely owned private property into an enforceable obligation
23 against any and all governments, regardless of whether they expressly consent or not, and even in the face of their EXPRESS
24 DENIAL of any such liability with language like the following:

25 **Figure 1: Notice of Non-consent**



COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL
DEPARTMENT OF STATE
OFFICE OF CHIEF COUNSEL
HARRISBURG, PA 17120

DATE: July 12, 2021

SUBJECT: Declaration of Intention to Change Domicile/Citizenship, Divorce the
"United States", and Criminal Complaint

TO: Christopher Isaac Broughton
7558 Stephen Drive
Harrisburg, PA 17111

This is in response to correspondence mailed to Veronica Degraffenreid, Secretary of State. This document was forwarded to the Office of Chief Counsel of the Pennsylvania Department of State for a response.

Be advised that the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and/or the Secretary of the Commonwealth is not in any way associated with the documents that you forwarded. The mailing of your document to the Secretary of State has no legal effect, nor is any notice taken of the statements, claims and asseverations made within the documents. **The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the Secretary of the Commonwealth do not agree to any of the terms and conditions in your mailing and specifically deny your claims.** The Secretary is not in any way bound by the receipt of or the content in this document. This office specifically rejects the premise that any document is now a public record as a result of your mailing. The Office of the Secretary also rejects the concept that failure to respond to your document constitutes notice of or the admission of any of the statements within said document. Accordingly, your original correspondence will be destroyed.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. This office anticipates that this is the last correspondence it will receive from you about this subject matter.

1

2 Just like with YOUR franchises, licensing, and civil code, so long as you receive or invoke the "benefit", use, or custody of
3 my absolutely owned private property, then you are deemed by the courts to consent to the terms of the grant of such property.
4 The purpose of this communication is to give legally enforceable "notice" of such terms of use, in fact.

5 I therefore don't give a CRAP about whether you EXPRESSLY consent or not beyond this point. Mere receipt, custody,
6 temporary control, or "benefit" from the commercial use of my PRIVATE property, and especially in a way the produces
7 revenue for you, constitutes CONSTRUCTIVE consent to the terms of the TEMPORARY and revocable grant of such a
8 privilege.

1 For your information, the terms of that grant are documented in:

Injury Defense Franchise and Agreement, Form #06.027
<https://sedm.org/Forms/06-AvoidingFranch/InjuryDefenseFranchise.pdf>

2 I DON'T care if you want to say with false words like the above that you don't consent. You are deemed BY YOUR
3 ACTIONS in accepting the property or benefitting from it, to IMPLICITLY CONSENT unless or until you return the
4 property, control over the property, or pay all debts incurred through its use:

5 *Consent*

6 [. . .]

7 2. Consent is either express or implied. Express, when it is given viva voce, or in writing; implied, when it
8 is manifested by signs, actions, or facts, or by inaction or silence, which raise a presumption that the consent
9 has been given.

10 [. . .]

11 9. The consent which is implied in every agreement is excluded, 1. By error in the essentials of the contract;
12 is, if Paul, in the city of Philadelphia, buy the horse of Peter, which is in Boston, and promise to pay one
13 hundred dollars for him, the horse at the time of the sale, unknown to either party, being dead. This decision
14 is founded on the rule that he who consents through error does not consent at all; non consentiunt qui errant.
15 Dig. 2, 1, 15; Dig. lib. 1, tit. ult. 1, 116, Sec. 2. 2. Consent is excluded by duress of the party making the
16 agreement. 3. Consent is never given so as to bind the parties, when it is obtained by fraud. 4. It cannot be
17 given by a person who has no understanding, as an idiot, nor by one who, though possessed of understanding,
18 is not in law capable of making a contract, as a feme covert. See Bouv. Inst. Index, h.t.
19 *[Bouvier's Law Dictionary, Fourth Edition, 1848]*

20 SO, don't try to assert official, judicial, or sovereign immunity to avoid the IMPLIED obligations of the terms of the loan or
21 use or grant or benefit of my absolutely owned private property, services, or private rights. It is a nullity. If you as a
22 government engage in commercial activity by pursuing OTHER people's property in what the courts call "purposeful
23 availment" extraterritorially, then you:

- 24 1. Are entering the PRIVATE commercial marketplace on an equal footing with ever OTHER private man or woman or
25 corporation.
- 26 2. Expressly waive official, judicial, and sovereign immunity under the Clearfield Doctrine. See [United States v. Winstar](#)
27 [Corp. 518 U.S. 839 \(1996\)](#).
- 28 3. Waive your sovereign immunity under the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act, 28 U.S.C. Chapter 97.
- 29 4. Waive your sovereign immunity under *International Shoe Co. v. Washington*, 326 U.S. 310 (1945).
- 30 5. Are interacting with us commercially:
 - 31 5.1. With Us as the Merchant under U.C.C. §2-104(1). Sometimes also called a Creditor or Seller.
 - 32 5.2. With you acting as the Buyer under U.C.C. §2-103(1)(a)). Sometimes also called a Debtor or Borrower.
- 33 6. Are interacting in a non-governmental capacity. REAL government PROTECTS absolutely owned private property
34 rather than making a business or "trade or business" out of converting it to PUBLIC property or property CONTROLLED
35 by the public without the EXPRESS consent of the affected party.
 - 36 6.1. All just powers of the government derive from the CONSENT of the people governed per the Declaration of
37 Independence.
 - 38 6.2. Every attempt to civilly enforce against a party who consents to NOTHING the government offers and waives any
39 and all benefits and privileges is, therefore UNJUST. Not only is it UNJUST, it is ANTI-GOVERNMENTAL,
40 because it accomplishes a purpose OPPOSITE that for creating government to begin with, which is to protect
41 absolutely owned, private property against the consent of the owner.

42 So, I don't give a damn whether your consent is explicit or not. Your IMPLIED consent is manifested by your ACTIONS in
43 continuing to benefit from PRIVATE absolutely owned property and rights, not in what you actually say or deny, because
44 that is how you also approach everyone requesting YOUR services or participating in YOUR franchises. Under the concept
45 of equal protection and equal treatment, whatever you can do, I can do too. I can collect "taxes" from you just as readily as
46 you can collect them from me, because both pay for property and services demanded or even used without consent of the
47 other. There is an IMPLIED contract, or "quasi-contract" to pay for those services and property per the U.S. Supreme Court:

1 "Even if the judgment is deemed to be colored by the nature of the obligation whose validity it establishes, and
2 we are free to re-examine it, and, if we find it to be based on an obligation penal in character, to refuse to enforce
3 it outside the state where rendered, see *Wisconsin v. Pelican Insurance Co.*, 127 U.S. 265, 292, et seq. 8 S.Ct.

4 1370, compare *Fauntleroy v. Lum*, 210 U.S. 230, 28 S.Ct. 641, **still the obligation to pay**
5 **taxes is not penal. It is a statutory liability, quasi contractual in**
6 **nature, enforceable, if there is no exclusive statutory remedy,**
7 **in the civil courts by the common-law action of debt or**
8 **indebitatus assumpsit.** *United States v. Chamberlin*, 219 U.S. 250, 31 S.Ct. 155; *Price v.*
9 *United States*, 269 U.S. 492, 46 S.Ct. 180; *Dollar Savings Bank v. United States*, 19 Wall. 227; and see
10 *Stockwell v. United States*, 13 Wall. 531, 542; *Meredith v. United States*, 13 Pet. 486, 493. This was the rule
11 established in the English courts before the Declaration of Independence. *Attorney General v. Weeks*, *Bunbury's*
12 *Exch. Rep.* 223; *Attorney General v. Jewers and Batty*, *Bunbury's Exch. Rep.* 225; *Attorney General v. Hatton*,
13 *Bunbury's Exch. Rep.* [296 U.S. 268, 272] 262; *Attorney General v. —*, 2 *Ans.Rep.* 558; see *Comyn's Digest*
14 (Title 'Dett,' A, 9); 1 *Chitty on Pleading*, 123; cf. *Attorney General v. Sewell*, 4 *M.&W.* 77. "
15 [*Milwaukee v. White*, 296 U.S. 268 (1935)]

16 The ability of me to regulate and control your conduct originates from YOUR similar ability to control all those in possession,
17 use, custody, or control of government property. The people cannot delegate such an authority if they do not ALSO possess
18 it personally, since the government is one of delegated powers ALONE per the U.S. Supreme Court:

19 *United States Constitution*

20 *Article 4, Section 3*

21 The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the
22 Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so
23 construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

24
25 "The Constitution permits Congress to dispose of and to make all needful rules and regulations respecting the
26 territory or other property belonging to the United States. This power applies as well to territory belonging to
27 the United States within the States, as beyond them. It comprehends all the public domain, wherever it may be.
28 The argument is, that 510*510 the power to make "ALL needful rules and regulations" "is a power of legislation,"
29 "a full legislative power;" "that it includes all subjects of legislation in the territory," and is without any
30 limitations, except the positive prohibitions which affect all the powers of Congress. Congress may then regulate
31 or prohibit slavery upon the public domain within the new States, and such a prohibition would permanently
32 affect the capacity of a slave, whose master might carry him to it. And why not? Because no power has been
33 conferred on Congress. This is a conclusion universally admitted. But the power to "make rules and regulations
34 respecting the territory" is not restrained by State lines, nor are there any constitutional prohibitions upon its
35 exercise in the domain of the United States within the States; and whatever rules and regulations respecting
36 territory Congress may constitutionally make are supreme, and are not dependent on the situs of "the territory."
37 [*Dred Scott v. Sandford*, 60 U.S. 393
38 (1857); https://scholar.google.com/scholar_case?case=3231372247892780026]

39 Congress exercises this authority over its property EVERYWHERE IN THE WORLD that it is located or used, including the
40 states. It expresses that authority by waiving the need for regulations and exercising DIRECT legislative control over its
41 property as authorized by 5 U.S.C. §553(a)(2):

42 5 U.S. Code §553 - Rule making

43 (a) This section applies, according to the provisions thereof, except to the extent that there is involved—

44 (2) a matter relating to agency management or personnel or to public property, loans, grants, benefits, or contracts.

45
46 TITLE 5 > PART 1 > CHAPTER 5 > SUBCHAPTER II > §552a
47 §552a. Records maintained on individuals

48 Definitions.— For purposes of this section—

1 (12) the term “Federal benefit program” means any program administered or funded by the Federal Government,
2 or by any agent or State on behalf of the Federal Government, providing cash or in-kind assistance in the form of
3 payments, grants, loans, or loan guarantees to individuals: . . .

4 So long as you are BENEFITTING from MY absolutely owned, constitutionally protected, PRIVATE property, then I can
5 make any rule that I want for you until you RETURN it or pay for the services or property you already consumed. This is
6 the whole idea, in fact, behind the notion of a “tax RETURN”. But it applies equally to YOU when you are using or
7 benefitting from MY property. An entire book has been written about the origins of the income tax essentially as a RENTAL
8 or USE fee on federal property, in fact:

Why the Federal Income Tax is a Privilege Tax Upon Government Property, Form #04.404
<https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

9 The income tax is a RENTAL fee for the use or benefit of legislatively created fictional offices called civil “taxpayers” and
10 “persons”, “citizens”, “residents”, and “individuals”. The rights attached to said offices are the “benefit” or property
11 conveyed, and the corresponding OBLIGATIONS attached to said offices are the COST of “procuring” the “benefit”. To
12 invoke these civil statutory statuses is to implicitly surrender ALL constitutional protections and waive sovereign immunity
13 in relation to the GRANTOR of the franchise implementing said offices:

14 “The principle is invoked that **one who accepts the benefit of a statute cannot be heard to question its**
15 **constitutionality.** Great Falls Manufacturing Co. v. Attorney General, 124 U.S. 581, 8 S.Ct. 631, 31 L.Ed. 527; Wall
16 v. Parrot Silver & Copper Co., 244 U.S. 407, 37 S.Ct. 609, 61 L.Ed. 1229; St. Louis, etc., Co., v. George C.
17 Prendergast Const. Co., 260 U.S. 469, 43 S.Ct. 178, 67 L.Ed. 351.”
18 [Ashwander v. Tennessee Valley Authority, 297 U.S. 288, 56 S.Ct. 466 (1936)]

19 So long as the “benefit” is never claimed, constitutional protections REMAIN and there are NO enforceable obligations
20 without corresponding BENEFITS per 5 U.S.C. §553(a)(2).

21 In your case, the BENEFIT is the commercial use of my identity to “benefit” yourself financially. Without my consent, that
22 is criminal THEFT and IDENTITY THEFT as it is now. This includes any commercial civil use such as income tax, social
23 security tax, licensing, federal benefit programs, etc. All such programs MAY NOT lawfully be enforced within
24 constitutional states, even WITH my consent, as proven in:

Challenge to Income Tax Enforcement Authority Within Constitutional States of the Union, Form #05.052
<https://sedm.org/Forms/05-Memlaw/ChallengeToIRSEnforcementAuth.pdf>

25 National franchises cannot lawfully be offered in the States of the Union per the License Tax Cases:

26 *“Thus, Congress having power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and*
27 *with the Indian tribes, may, without doubt, provide for granting coasting licenses, licenses to pilots, licenses to*
28 *trade with the Indians, and any other licenses necessary or proper for the exercise of that great and extensive*
29 *power; and the same observation is applicable to every other power of Congress, to the exercise of which the*
30 *granting of licenses may be incident. All such licenses confer authority, and give rights to the licensee.*

31 *But very different considerations apply to the internal commerce or domestic trade of the States. Over this*
32 *commerce and trade Congress has no power of regulation nor any direct control. This power belongs exclusively*
33 *to the States. No interference by Congress with the business of citizens transacted within a State is warranted by*
34 *the Constitution, except such as is strictly incidental to the exercise of powers clearly granted to the legislature.*
35 *The power to authorize a business within a State is plainly repugnant to the exclusive power of the State over the*
36 *same subject. It is true that the power of Congress to tax is a very extensive power. It is given in the Constitution,*
37 *with only one exception and only two qualifications. Congress cannot tax exports, and it must impose direct taxes*
38 *by the rule of apportionment, and indirect taxes by the rule of uniformity. Thus limited, and thus only, it reaches*
39 *every subject, and may be exercised at discretion. But, it reaches only existing subjects. Congress cannot authorize*
40 *a trade or business within a State in order to tax it.”*
41 *[License Tax Cases, 72 U.S. 462, 18 L.Ed. 497, 5 Wall. 462, 2 A.F.T.R. 2224 (1866)]*

42 Thus, anyone domiciled within or born within a constitutional state of the Union who participates in these programs does so
43 ILLEGALLY and by MISTAKE OF LAW without any lawful authority. If they collect revenue by virtue of their
44 participation, the conduct a FRAUD upon the United States cognizable as a qui tam action, as documented in:

Why You Aren't Eligible for Social Security, Form #06.001
<https://sedm.org/Forms/06-AvoidingFranch/SSNotEligible.pdf>

1 NO SUCH constitutional limitation, however, limits me offering franchises or benefits to YOU as a legislatively foreign
2 jurisdiction. Thus I can entrap you but you cannot entrap me. And by ENTRAP I mean entice you with the grant or loan of
3 PRIVATE property with strings attached, as I have done here. All I have to do is give you the constitutionally required
4 REASONALBE NOTICE of the terms of the loan, which this document does. No further communication and even a denial
5 from you of consent, can dismantle the obligations that such notice produces on your part, because ACTION is how consent
6 is manifested in the granting or loaning of my property to you. DO NOT therefore try to assert sovereign immunity, claim
7 you didn't consent, or pretend like you never received notice. All such actions are futile so long as your ACTIONS in
8 receiving the commercial benefit of my absolutely owned constitutionally protected PRIVATE property, rights, or services
9 are futile.

10 Unless and until my PRIVATE property, PRIVATE rights, and civil status is returned to its natural state at birth, it is
11 established as STOLEN or being used by you nonconsensually for commercial purposes and "benefit". The way you
12 "RETURN" it, not unlike a "tax RETURN", is to correct my status in all your records.

13 There is NO NEED to "exhaust administrative remedies" to terminate civil status under these programs as a person eligible,
14 because NO ONE born within and domiciled within a constitutional state such as me has EVER been eligible to BEGIN
15 WITH. Any participation is a product of MISTAKE OF LAW at best and FRAUD at worst, either of which form the basis
16 of a Qui Tam action to stop the illegal offering or enforcement of the program or the income tax that piggy backs illegally
17 upon it within the exclusive jurisdiction of constitutional states of the Union. See:

Why You Aren't Eligible for Social Security, Form #06.001
<https://sedm.org/Forms/06-AvoidingFranch/SSNotEligible.pdf>

18 **1.3. Your Burden or Proof in Demonstrating No Implied Consent**

19 The Thirteenth Amendment establishes the concept of self-ownership. You own your body. The Fifth Amendment
20 establishes that your property is PRIVATE property until you KNOWINGLY and VOLUNTARILY transmute it by
21 contracting or giving it away, and thereby changing the civil or legal status of the property from PRIVATE to PUBLIC. The
22 process of VOLUNTARY conversion from PRIVATE to PUBLIC is thoroughly documented in:

Separation Between Public and Private Course, Form #12.025
<https://sedm.org/LibertyU/SeparatingPublicPrivate.pdf>

23 As the PRIVATE owner of my body and all my property, I have an absolute, unimpaired, undiluted right to regulate and
24 control all those who attempt to use, benefit, or control that property. This right is an outgrowth of ownership itself. Only if
25 I SHARE ownership with the government through a VOLUNTARY moiety or usufruct can that right lawfully be diluted or
26 eliminated. I am not aware of any such consent being given and the Recipient has the burden or proof that it HAS been give
27 expressly before it may regulate, control, or tax PRIVATE rights or property.

28 The usual method of giving said consent is to connect is manifested in one of two ways:

- 29 1. Convert the civil/legal status of the owner of property from PRIVATE to PUBLIC. For instance, filling out a
30 government form identifying oneself as any of the following CIVIL STATUTORY legal statuses:
 - 31 1.1. "person".
 - 32 1.2. "individual".
 - 33 1.3. "taxpayer".
 - 34 1.4. "U.S. person".
 - 35 1.5. "citizen".
 - 36 1.6. "resident".
 - 37 1.7. "Spouse" (under the family code).
 - 38 1.8. "Driver" (under the vehicle code).
- 39 2. Convert the civil/legal status of the PROPERTY from PRIVATE to PUBLIC. This is normally done by associating a
40 PUBLIC franchise mark such as a STATUTORY Social Security Number (SSN) or Taxpayer Identification Number
41 (TIN). These marks are legislatively created property of the government grantor, and associating them with otherwise
42 PRIVATE property is usually UNLAWFULLY deemed to be an act of consent to donate them to a PUBLIC use,
43 purpose, office, or franchise.

1 All of the above are done by filling out government applications or forms of one kind or another as documented in:

- 2 1. *Avoiding Traps in Government Forms Course*, Form #12.023
- 3 <https://sedm.org/LibertyU/AvoidingTrapsGovForms.pdf>
- 4 2. Section 8.2 later.

5 The weak point of this process of converting PRIVATE to PUBLIC using government forms is that:

- 6 1. The forms in their entirety and the words printed on them are untrustworthy according to the courts and the
- 7 government itself. See item 1 above.
- 8 2. The person completing and signing the form is the creator of the form and the person who signs under penalty of
- 9 perjury as a witness.
- 10 3. No government witnesses are involved, and they can't and won't provide legally actionable definitions of the terms on
- 11 the form. Thus, the submitter may define the terms on the form and the terms under which it is submitted, and even
- 12 turn the form into a counter-offer that reverses the roles between Merchant and Buyer.
- 13 4. The submitter of the form, like the government, is operating under a delegation of authority order just like those in
- 14 government. In the case of Christians, that would be the Holy Bible, which BY THE WAY forbids doing anything that
- 15 would convert PRIVATE to PUBLIC and forbids Christians from interacting with the government as a Buyer. Thus, it
- 16 is a legal impossibility to consent to convert PRIVATE to PUBLIC because it is outside the delegated authority of the
- 17 signer or submitter. God owns EVERYTHING, and we are mere trustees under the Bible as a trust indenture. The
- 18 trustees cannot give away property that doesn't belong to them and any attempt to do so on a government form is a
- 19 nullity.

20 Thus, the person filling out the form or application has a DUTY to define the terms on the form in such a way that the

21 submission accomplishes NO conversion from PRIVATE to PUBLIC and constitutes a COUNTER-OFFER. That, in fact,

22 is what this communication does. There is NO ONE in government who can reverse this relationship because it is a legislative

23 function and all the people accepting government forms are not in the legislative branch, but the executive branch. Therefore,

24 there is no lawful way for a government recipient of a form to change from a Buyer to a Merchant without the consent of me,

25 the submitter. This correspondence merely gives reasonable notice of this fact required by the constitution.

26 In the submitters case, I therefore have made any conversion from PRIVATE to PUBLIC legally impossible and have given

27 you the required notice of such by:

- 28 1. Defining the terms on all forms as NOT originating from any civil statute.
- 29 2. Defining the forms submitted to you as intended ONLY to establish me the submitter as the only Merchant offering
- 30 services or property to the government under the terms of my own franchise.
- 31 3. Documented that it is outside my biblical delegation of authority order to interact with any government as anything
- 32 OTHER than a Merchant.
- 33 4. Approached the situation with entirely "clean hands" under equity, by saying that if the government can prove that I
- 34 asked for any benefit, privilege, or property in a writing that is actionable, I would be willing to pay for the cost of that
- 35 service PROVIDED that it abides by the same rules as me in such a case.
- 36 5. Offered any and all services the government uses, steals, or obtains usually through illegal enforcement as property on
- 37 loan with legal strings attached as documented in:

Injury Defense Franchise and Agreement, Form #06.027
<https://sedm.org/Forms/06-AvoidingFranch/InjuryDefenseFranchise.pdf>

38 Below are the billable services and property I have been providing to the government under the above agreement and franchise

39 to date. This communication constitutes an INVOICE for those services and property:

- 40 1. The value of currency held in my hands that lost value because of your money printing. This is an involuntary and
- 41 invisible form of taxation of all who hold legal tender. All such commercial "benefits" constitute consideration that
- 42 creates an implied obligation to repay the money stolen from the victims.
- 43 2. Any and all amounts paid to you through income tax withholding or tax enforcement against me as a nonresident alien
- 44 with no "trade or business" earnings or earnings from the United States federal corporation. All such amounts are
- 45 temporary grants or loans with conditions identified in the above agreement.

- 1 3. Educating you about the limits the law places on your behavior towards me who has no privity or obligation owed to
- 2 you and receives no privilege or benefit that was asked for.
- 3 4. Satisfying all the civil statutory obligations associated with the civil status I unlawfully acquired without my consent.
- 4 5. Responding to any government collection or enforcement correspondence to pay for any government civil service.
- 5 6. Using the courts to compel you to obey the quasi-contract documented above if you refuse.
- 6 7. Responding to civil litigation to enforce any government franchise. This:
- 7 7.1. Constitutes criminal identity theft.
- 8 7.2. Constitutes criminal simulation of legal process against a nonresident.
- 9 8. Making any demands on my time through audits, summons, depositions relating to enforcement of any aspect of civil
- 10 statutory law.

11 All of the above represent absolutely owned private property provided to you through force, fraud, illegal duress, or mistake
12 of law that is in your temporary custody and which the value of must be returned to me not unlike a "tax RETURN". Unless
13 and until you do so, you are an involuntary trustee of the property or its value until it is returned:

14 *California Civil Code Section 2224*

15 *"One who gains a thing by fraud, accident, mistake, undue influence, the violation of a trust, or other wrongful*
16 *act, is, unless he or she has some other and better right thereto, an involuntary trustee of the thing gained, for the*
17 *benefit of the person who would otherwise have had it."*

18
19

20 ***"The United States, we have held, cannot, as against the claim of an innocent party, hold his money which has***
21 ***gone into its treasury by means of the fraud of its agent. While here the money was taken through mistake***
22 ***without element of fraud, the unjust retention is immoral and amounts in law to a fraud of the taxpayer's***
23 ***rights. What was said in the State Bank Case applies with equal force to this situation. 'An action will lie***
24 ***whenever the defendant has received money which is the property of the plaintiff, and which the defendant is***
25 ***obligated by natural justice and equity to refund. The form of the indebtedness or the mode in which it was***
26 ***incurred is immaterial."***

27 [[Bull v. United States, 295 U.S. 247, 261, 55 S.Ct. 695, 700, 79 L.Ed. 1421](#)]

28
29

30 *"When the Government has illegally received money which is the property of an innocent citizen and when this*
31 *money has gone into the Treasury of the United States, there arises an implied contract on the part of the*
32 *Government to make restitution to the rightful owner under the Tucker Act and this court has jurisdiction to*
33 *entertain the suit. [90 Ct.Cl. at 613, 31 F.Supp. at 769.](#)"*

34 [[Gordon v. U. S., 227 Ct.Cl. 328, 649 F.2d. 837 \(Ct.Cl., 1981\)](#)]

35
36

37 *"A claim against the United States is a right to demand money from the United States. [1] Such claims are*
38 *sometimes spoken of as gratuitous in that they cannot be enforced by suit without statutory consent. [2] **The***
39 ***general rule of non-liability of the United States does not mean that a citizen cannot be protected against the***
40 ***wrongful governmental acts that affect the citizen or his or her property.**[3] **If, for example, money or property***
41 ***of an innocent person goes into the federal treasury by fraud to which a government agent was a party, the***
42 ***United States cannot [lawfully] hold the money or property against the claim of the injured party.**[4]."*

43 [*American Jurisprudence 2d, United States, §45 (1999)*]

44 FOOTNOTES:

45 [1] *United States ex rel. Angarica v. Bayard, 127 U.S. 251, 32 L.Ed. 159, 8 S.Ct. 1156, 4 AFTR 4628 (holding*
46 *that a claim against the Secretary of State for money awarded under a treaty is a claim against the United States);*
47 *Hobbs v. McLean, 117 U.S. 567, 29 L.Ed. 940, 6 S.Ct. 870; Manning v. Leighton, 65 Vt. 84, 26 A 258, motion*
48 *dism'd 66 Vt. 56, 28 A 630 and (disapproved on other grounds by *Button's Estate v. Anderson, 112 Vt. 531, 28**
49 *A.2d. 404, 143 A.L.R. 195).*

50 [2] *Blagge v. Balch, 162 U.S. 439, 40 L.Ed. 1032, 16 S.Ct. 853.*

[3] *Wilson v. Shaw*, 204 U.S. 24, 51 L.Ed. 351, 27 S.Ct. 233.

[4] *Bull v. United States*, 295 U.S. 247, 79 L.Ed. 1421, 55 S.Ct. 695, 35-1 USTC ¶9346, 15 AFTR 1069; *United States v. State Bank*, 96 U.S. 30, 96 Otto 30, 24 L.Ed. 647.

The above authorities are the SAME authorities that you use against withholding agents in custody of public property they have not turned over to you, or government services received that are not paid for. Under the concept of EQUAL PROTECTION and EQUAL TREATMENT, they apply as much to those have to “make a return” of income as they do to you. That “income” in fact, is PRIVATE property VOLUNTARILY converted to PUBLIC property by its original owner. There is no such “income” in my case because I not only don’t volunteer as described below, but am forbidden by my biblical delegation of authority order from volunteering:

How State Nationals Volunteer to Pay Income Tax, Form #08.024
<https://sedm.org/Forms/08-PolicyDocs/HowYouVolForIncomeTax.pdf>

It represents a supreme act of irresponsibility and injustice for you to be insulated from the consequences of all the undesired, unwelcome and injurious activities documented above that your careless, legally ignorant, and irresponsible behavior causes. Justice itself demands the right to be let alone, and all of the above work an INJUSTICE.

1.4. Why this matter is ALSO a violation of STATE law if not acted upon

This correspondence relates directly to violations of state as well as national laws if it is either ignored or not acted upon BY YOU, THE RECIPIENT, PERSONALLY. Below are the STATE statutes violated by a failure to correct the MY status in state records as described and requested herein. There are literally hundreds more statutes I could cite, but do not cite here in the interests of brevity to simplify your response and save you time.

Table 1: Statutory remedies for those compelled to act as public officers and straw man

<i>Jurisdiction</i>	<i>Legal Cite Type</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Legal Cite</i>
Alabama	Constitution	Dual Office Prohibition	Article III, Section 25; Article IV, Sect. 22; Art. V, Sect. 10; Article VI, Section 12
Alabama	Statute	Crime: Impersonating Public Officer	C.O.A. §13A-10-10
Alabama	Statute	Crime: Identity Theft	C.O.A. Title 13A, Article 10
Alaska	Constitution	Dual Office Prohibition	Const. Sections 2.5, 3.6, 4.8
Alaska	Statute	Crime: Identity Theft	A.S. §11.46.160
Alaska	Statute	Crime: Impersonating Public Officer	A.S. §11.56.830
Arizona	Constitution	Dual Office Prohibition	Const. Article 4, Part 2, Section 4; Const. Article 6, Section 28
Arizona	Statute	Crime: Identity Theft	A.R.S. §13-2006
Arizona	Statute	Crime: Impersonating Public Officer	A.R.S. §13-2406
Arkansas	Constitution	Dual Office Prohibition	Const. Article 3, Section 10; Const. Article 5, Section 7; Article 5, Section 10; Art. 80, Sect. 14
Arkansas	Statute	Crime: Impersonating Public Officer	A.S.C. §5-37-208
California	Constitution	Dual Office Prohibition	Const. Article 5, Section 2 (governor); Const. Article 5, Section 14; Article 7, Section 7
California	Statute	Crime: Identity Theft	Penal Code §484.1
Colorado	Constitution	Dual Office Prohibition	Const. Article V, Section 8 (internal)
Connecticut	Constitution	Dual Office Prohibition	Const. Article 1, Section 11 (internal)

<i>Jurisdiction</i>	<i>Legal Cite Type</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Legal Cite</i>
Connecticut	Statute	Crime: Identity Theft	C.G.S.A. § 53a-129a to 53a-129c
Delaware	Constitution	Dual Office Prohibition	Const. Article 1, Section 19
Delaware	Statute	Crime: Identity Theft	D.C. Title 11, Section 854
Delaware	Statute	Crime: Impersonating Public Officer	D.C. Title 11, Section 907(3)
District of Columbia	Constitution	Dual Office Prohibition	Const. of D.C., Article IV, Sect. 4(B) (judges); Art. III, Sect. 4(D) (governor)
District of Columbia	Statute	Crime: Impersonating Public Officer	D.C. Code §22-1404
Florida	Constitution	Dual Office Prohibition	Const. Article II, Section 5
Florida	Statute	Crime: Impersonating Public Officer	F.S. Title XLVI, Section 817.02
Georgia	Constitution	Dual Office Prohibition	Const. Article I, Section II, Para. III; Const. Article III, Section II, Para. IV(b)
Georgia	Statute	Crime: Impersonating Public Officer	O.C.G.A. §16-10-23
Hawaii	Constitution	Dual Office Prohibition	Const. Article III, Section 8 (internal)
Hawaii	Statute	Crime: Impersonating Public Officer	H.R.S. §710-1016
Idaho	Constitution	Dual Office Prohibition	Const. Article V, Section 7 (judges)
Idaho	Statute	Crime: Impersonating Public Officer	I.S. §18-3001
Illinois	Constitution	Dual Office Prohibition	Const. Article IV, Section 2(e) (legislative)
Illinois	Statute	Crime: Impersonating Public Officer	720 ILCS 5/17-2
Indiana	Constitution	Dual Office Prohibition	Const. Article 2, Section 9; Const. Article 4, Section 30 (legislative)
Indiana	Statute	Crime: Impersonating Public Officer	I.C. §25-30-1-18
Iowa	Constitution	Dual Office Prohibition	Const. Article III, Section 22 (legislature); Const. Article IV, Section 14 (governor)
Iowa	Statute	Crime: Impersonating Public Officer	I.C. Title XVI, Section 718.2
Kansas	Constitution	Dual Office Prohibition	Const. Article 3, Section 13 (judges)
Kansas	Statute	Crime: Impersonating Public Officer	K.R.S. §21-3825
Kentucky	Statute	Crime: Impersonating Public Officer	K.R.S. §434.570
Kentucky	Statute	Crime: Identity Theft	K.R.S. §514.60; K.R.S. §532.034
Kentucky	Statute	Dual Office Prohibition	K.R.S. §61.080
Louisiana	Constitution	Dual Office Prohibition	Const. Article II, Section 2 (internal); Const. Article IV, Section 2 (executive)
Louisiana	Statute	Crime: Impersonating Public Officer	R.S. §14:112
Maine	Constitution	Dual Office Prohibition	Const. Article III, Section 2 (internal)
Maine	Statute	Crime: Impersonating Public Officer	17-A M.R.S. Section 457

Jurisdiction	Legal Cite Type	Title	Legal Cite
Maryland	Constitution	Dual Office Prohibition	Const. Declaration of Rights, Article 33 (judges); Const. Const. Declaration of Rights, Article 35 (officers)
Maryland	Statute	Crime: Impersonating Public Officer	Statutes §8-301
Massachusetts	Constitution	Dual Office Prohibition	Const. Chapter VI, Article 2
Massachusetts	Statute	Crime: Impersonating Public Officer	G.L.M. Chapter 268, Section 33
Michigan	Constitution	Dual Office Prohibition	Const. Article IV, Section 8
Michigan	Statute	Crime: Impersonating Public Officer	Mich. Penal Code, Chapter XXXV, Section 750.217c
Minnesota	Constitution	Dual Office Prohibition	Const. Article IV, Section 5
Minnesota	Statute	Crime: Impersonating Public Officer	M.S. §609.475
Mississippi	Statute	Crime: Impersonating Public Officer	M.C. §97-7-43
Missouri	Constitution	Dual Office Prohibition	Const. Article VII, Section 9
Missouri	Statute	Crime: Impersonating Public Officer	M.R.S. §570.223
Missouri	Statute	Crime: Identity Theft	M.R.S. §570.223
Montana	Constitution	Dual Office Prohibition	Const. Article III, Section 1; Const. Article V, Section 9 (office); Article VII, Section 9 (judges)
Montana	Statute	Crime: Impersonating Public Officer	M.C.A. §45-7-209
Nebraska	Constitution	Dual Office Prohibition	Const. Article III-9
Nebraska	Statute	Crime: Impersonating Public Officer	N.R.S. §28-636
Nebraska	Statute	Crime: Identity Theft	N.R.S. §28-639
Nevada	Constitution	Dual Office Prohibition	Const. Article 4, Section 9 (officers)
Nevada	Statute	Crime: Impersonating Public Officer	N.R.S. §197.120
New Hampshire	Constitution	Dual Office Prohibition	Const. Art. 94-95
New Hampshire	Statute	Crime: Identity Theft	N.H.R.S. §359-I:2
New Jersey	Constitution	Dual Office Prohibition	Const. Article III, Section 1; Const. Article IV, Section V, Sections 3-4; Const. Article V, Section I, Section 3
New Jersey	Statute	Crime: Impersonating Public Officer	N.J.S.A. §2C:28-8
New Mexico	Constitution	Dual Office Prohibition	Const. Article IV, Section 3 (senators); Const. Article VI, Section 19 (judge)
New Mexico	Statute	Crime: Identity Theft	N.M.S.A. §30-16-21.1
New York	Constitution	Dual Office Prohibition	Const. Article III, Section 7 (legislature); Const. Article VI, Section 20(b)(1)
New York	Statute	Crime: Identity Theft	General Business Law 380-S; Penal Law 190.78
New York	Statute	Crime: Impersonating Public Officer	Penal Law §190.23
North Carolina	Constitution	Dual Office Prohibition	Const. Article VI, Section 9

Jurisdiction	Legal Cite Type	Title	Legal Cite
North Carolina	Statute	Crime: Impersonating Public Officer	N.C.G.S. §14-277
North Dakota	Statute	Crime: Impersonating Public Officer	N.D.C.C. §12.1-13-04
Ohio	Constitution	Dual Office Prohibition	Const. Article 2, Section 04 (legislature); Const. Article 4, Section 06, Para. (B)
Ohio	Statute	Crime: Impersonating Public Officer	
Oklahoma	Constitution	Dual Office Prohibition	Const. Article II, Section 12; Const. Article V, Section 18 (legislature)
Oklahoma	Statute	Crime: Impersonating Public Officer	O.S. Title 21, Section 1533
Oklahoma	Statute	Crime: Identity Theft	O.S. Title 21, Section 1533.1
Oregon	Constitution	Dual Office Prohibition	Const. Article II, Section 10
Oregon	Statute	Crime: Impersonating Public Officer	O.R.S. §162.365
Oregon	Statute	Crime: Identity Theft	O.R.S. §165.803
Pennsylvania	Constitution	Dual Office Prohibition	Const. Article V, Section 17 (judges)
Pennsylvania	Statute	Crime: Identity Theft	18 Pa.C.A. §4120
Rhode Island	Constitution	Dual Office Prohibition	Const. Article III, Section 6
Rhode Island	Statute	Crime: Impersonating Public Officer	G.L.R.I. §11-14-1
South Carolina	Constitution	Dual Office Prohibition	Const. Article 1, Section 8(internal); Const. Article VI, Section 3 (officers)
South Carolina	Statute	Crime: Impersonating Public Officer	S.C.C.O.L. § 16-13-290
South Dakota	Constitution	Dual Office Prohibition	Const. Article 3, Section 3
South Dakota	Statute	Crime: Impersonating Public Officer	S.D.C.L. §22-40-16
South Dakota	Statute	Crime: Identity Theft	S.D.C.L. §22-40-8
Tennessee	Constitution	Dual Office Prohibition	Const. Article II, Section 2 (internal); Const. Article II, Section 26 (officers)
Tennessee	Statute	Crime: Impersonating Public Officer	T.C. §39-16-301
Texas	Constitution	Dual Office Prohibition	Const. Article 2, Section 1 (internal); Const. Article 3, Section 18 (legislature); Const. Article 4, Section 6 (executive)
Texas	Statute	Crime: Impersonating Public Officer	Penal Code, Section 37.11
Texas	Statute	Crime: Identity Theft	T.S. §32.51
United States	Statute	Crime: Impersonating Public Officer	18 U.S.C. §912
Utah	Constitution	Dual Office Prohibition	Const. Article V, Section 1 (internal); Const. Article VIII, Section 10 (judges)
Utah	Statute	Crime: Impersonating Public Officer	U.C. §76-8-512
Vermont	Constitution	Dual Office Prohibition	Const. Chapter II, Section 54
Vermont	Statute	Crime: Impersonating Public Officer	13 V.S.A. §3002

Jurisdiction	Legal Cite Type	Title	Legal Cite
Virginia	Constitution	Dual Office Prohibition	Const. Article IV, Section 4 (legislature); Const. Article V, Section 4 (governor)
Virginia	Statute	Crime: Identity Theft	C.O.V. §18.2-186.3
Washington	Constitution	Dual Office Prohibition	Const. Article II, Section 14 (legislature); Const. Article IV, Section 15 (judges)
Washington	Statute	Crime: Impersonating Public Officer	R.C.W. §18.71.190
West Virginia	Constitution	Dual Office Prohibition	Const. Article 6, Section 16 (senators); Const. Article 7, Section 4 (executive); Const. Article 8, Section 7 (judges)
West Virginia	Statute	Crime: Impersonating Public Officer	W.V.C. §61-5-27a(e)
Wisconsin	Constitution	Dual Office Prohibition	Const. Article IV, Section 13
Wisconsin	Statute	Crime: Identity Theft	W.S. §943.201
Wyoming	Constitution	Dual Office Prohibition	Const. Section 97-3-008 (legislature); Const. Section 97-5-027 (judges)
Wyoming	Statute	Crime: Identity Theft	W.S. §6-3-901
Wyoming	Statute	Crime: Impersonating Public Officer	W.S. §6-5-307

1 If you would like to research further the laws and remedies available in the specific jurisdiction you are in, we highly
2 recommend the following free tools on our website:

[SEDM Jurisdictions Database](http://sedm.org/Litigation/LitIndex.htm), Litigation Tool #09.003
<http://sedm.org/Litigation/LitIndex.htm>

3 The above tool is also available at the top row under the menu on our SEDM Litigation Tools page at the link below:

4 <http://sedm.org/Litigation/LitIndex.htm>

5 It is further emphasized to prevent any claim of “plausible deniability” on your part that:

6 1. The national and state governments are all corporations, or what the U.S. Supreme Court calls a “body corporate”.

7 *“Corporations are also of all grades, and made for varied objects; **all governments are corporations, created by***
8 ***usage and common consent, or grants and charters which create a body politic for prescribed purposes; but***
9 ***whether they are private, local or general, in their objects, for the enjoyment of property, or the exercise of***
10 ***power, they are all governed by the same rules of law, as to the construction and the obligation of the***
11 ***instrument by which the incorporation is made. One universal rule of law protects persons and property.** It is*
12 *a fundamental principle of the common law of England, that the term freemen of the kingdom, includes ‘all*
13 *persons,’ ecclesiastical and temporal, incorporate, politique or natural; it is a part of their magna charta (2 Inst.*
14 *4), and is incorporated into our institutions. The persons of the members of corporations are on the same footing*
15 *of protection as other persons, and their corporate property secured by the same laws which protect that of*
16 *individuals. 2 Inst. 46-7. ‘No man shall be taken,’ ‘no man shall be disseised,’ without due process of law, is a*
17 *principle taken from magna charta, infused into all our state constitutions, and is made inviolable by the federal*
18 *government, by the amendments to the constitution.”*
19 *[Proprietors of Charles River Bridge v. Proprietors of Warren Bridge, 36 U.S. 420 (1837)]*

20 2. Officers of said corporation such as you the recipient cannot claim Fifth Amendment in response to either criminal
21 complaints or criminal violations by themselves.

22 *“The right of a person under the 5th Amendment to refuse to incriminate himself is purely a personal privilege*
23 *of the witness. It was never intended to permit him to plead the fact that some third person might be incriminated*
24 *by his testimony, even [201 U.S. 43, 70] though he were the agent of such person. A privilege so extensive might*
25 *be used to put a stop to the examination of every witness who was called upon to testify before the grand jury with*
26 *regard to the doings or business of his principal, whether such principal were an individual or a corporation.*

1 The question whether a corporation is a 'person' within the meaning of this amendment really does not arise,
2 except, perhaps, where a corporation is called upon to answer a bill of discovery, since it can only be heard by
3 oral evidence in the person of some one of its agents or employees. The amendment is limited to a person who
4 shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself; and if he cannot set up the privilege of a
5 third person, he certainly cannot set up the privilege of a corporation."
6 [Hale v. Henkel, 201 U.S. 43, 69-70 (1906)]

- 7 3. A failure BY YOU PERSONALLY to prevent or prosecute the crimes documented herein by either ignoring or
8 returning this criminal complaint or this correspondence make you an accessory and accomplice to the crimes
9 documented herein. It also makes you guilty of misprision of felony if you are a federal officer, which you are if you
10 are a federal taxpayer.
- 11 4. Any attempt to destroy, return, or tamper with this criminal complaint also makes the recipient guilty of criminal
12 obstruction of justice, destruction of evidence, and witness tampering, because I am the witness who will be and is
13 being persecuted BECAUSE of attempts to prosecute these crimes, and that tampering will continue until YOU
14 prosecute it under state AND national law.
- 15 5. If you or any officer of the state are acting as a federal taxpayer, you are subject to ALL federal law as a "person" and
16 "individual" and therefore, laws of the national government DO regulate and govern not only you, but the affairs of
17 individual officers of the state and indirectly, the state itself thereby. See:
- 18 [Why Your Government is Either a Thief or You are a "Public Officer" for Income Tax Purposes](http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm), Form #05.008
19 <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
- 20 6. You took an oath to support and defend both the state constitution and the federal constitution. The purpose of that
21 oath was to protect PRIVATE property, and yet when called upon to prevent said property from being converted to
22 PUBLIC property without my consent by prosecuting the crimes documented herein, you have suborned your oath if
23 you refuse the prosecution.

22 *"As expressed otherwise, the powers delegated to a public officer are held in trust for the people and are to be*
23 *exercised in behalf of the government or of all citizens who may need the intervention of the officer.* ⁹
24 *Furthermore, the view has been expressed that all public officers, within whatever branch and whatever level*
25 *of government, and whatever be their private vocations, are trustees of the people, and accordingly labor under*
26 *every disability and prohibition imposed by law upon trustees relative to the making of personal financial gain*
27 *from a discharge of their trusts.* ¹⁰ *That is, a public officer occupies a fiduciary relationship to the political*
28 *entity on whose behalf he or she serves.* ¹¹ *and owes a fiduciary duty to the public.* ¹² *It has been said that the*
29 *fiduciary responsibilities of a public officer cannot be less than those of a private individual.* ¹³ *Furthermore,*
30 *it has been stated that any enterprise undertaken by the public official which tends to weaken public confidence*
31 *and undermine the sense of security for individual [PRIVATE] rights is against public policy.* ¹⁴
32 [63C American Jurisprudence 2d, Public Officers and Employees, §247 (1999)]

33 It is therefore farcical, insincere, a breach of your fiduciary duty as a public officer, and truly psychopathic to respond to this
34 request for CONSTITUTIONAL and not STATUTORY protection as follows:

35 We have received your correspondence dated _____. Please be advised that because the form you have
36 submitted has no force or effect under ____ Law, we are returning it. This office is not a repository for filling
37 documents of this nature; therefore no documents you have sent has been filed by this Office.

38 That type of a psychopathic response implies that the only duties you have are STATUTORY duties, which simply isn't the
39 case. You have COMMON LAW and CONSTITUTIONAL duties to prosecute crimes, and this is both a criminal complaint
40 that you AND ONLY YOU are authorized to receive and prosecute. That duty comes from the fiduciary duty you have as

⁹ State ex rel. Nagle v. Sullivan, 98 Mont. 425, 40 P.2d. 995, 99 A.L.R. 321; Jersey City v. Hague, 18 N.J. 584, 115 A.2d. 8.

¹⁰ Georgia Dep't of Human Resources v. Sistrunk, 249 Ga. 543, 291 S.E.2d. 524. A public official is held in public trust. Madlener v. Finley (1st Dist), 161 Ill.App.3d. 796, 113 Ill.Dec. 712, 515 N.E.2d. 697, app gr 117 Ill.Dec. 226, 520 N.E.2d. 387 and revd on other grounds 128 Ill.2d. 147, 131 Ill.Dec. 145, 538 N.E.2d. 520.

¹¹ Chicago Park Dist. v. Kenroy, Inc., 78 Ill.2d. 555, 37 Ill.Dec. 291, 402 N.E.2d. 181, appeal after remand (1st Dist) 107 Ill.App.3d. 222, 63 Ill.Dec. 134, 437 N.E.2d. 783.

¹² United States v. Holzer (CA7 Ill), 816 F.2d. 304 and vacated, remanded on other grounds 484 U.S. 807, 98 L.Ed. 2d 18, 108 S.Ct. 53, on remand (CA7 Ill) 840 F.2d. 1343, cert den 486 U.S. 1035, 100 L.Ed. 2d 608, 108 S.Ct. 2022 and (criticized on other grounds by United States v. Osser (CA3 Pa) 864 F.2d. 1056) and (superseded by statute on other grounds as stated in United States v. Little (CA5 Miss) 889 F.2d. 1367) and (among conflicting authorities on other grounds noted in United States v. Boylan (CA1 Mass), 898 F.2d. 230, 29 Fed.Rules.Evid.Serv. 1223).

¹³ Chicago ex rel. Cohen v. Keane, 64 Ill.2d. 559, 2 Ill.Dec. 285, 357 N.E.2d. 452, later proceeding (1st Dist) 105 Ill.App.3d. 298, 61 Ill.Dec. 172, 434 N.E.2d. 325.

¹⁴ Indiana State Ethics Comm'n v. Nelson (Ind App), 656 N.E.2d. 1172, reh gr (Ind App) 659 N.E.2d. 260, reh den (Jan 24, 1996) and transfer den (May 28, 1996).

1 an oath taking public servant. That duty extends to both NONRESIDENT and RESIDENT victims of crime. You can't
2 truthfully claim that I as a nonresident and civil statutory "non-person" VICTIM am not entitled to either CRIMINAL
3 protection, common law protection, or CONSTITUTIONAL protections demanded herein, especially since what I want
4 protection from is ONLY the crimes of government public officer actors such as yourself and all those filing FRAUDULENT
5 information returns against me and compelling me to illegally procure an office in the national government called either
6 "citizen" or "taxpayer".

7 If you have no duty to accept and prosecute criminal complaints of this nature, then:

- 8 1. Specifically who does? And if no one does, how the HELL can you truthfully claim to either BE a government or to
9 REPRESENT a government whose only purpose, according to the Declaration of Independence, is to protect ONLY
10 PRIVATE rights, and especially PRIVATE rights that are being habitually STOLEN by your OWN coworkers in the
11 state and/or national government?
- 12 2. What am I paying you for? It's obviously not PROTECTION of ME. You only protect YOURSELF in that scenario,
13 which means you're a criminal RICO protection racket and mafia.

14 The above response by a state attorney general also represents an attempt to nullify or refuse to enforce constitutional law
15 and criminal laws of the state governments that you took an oath to execute and prosecute. That is an unconstitutional
16 violation of the separation of powers doctrine, which says that members of the Executive Branch cannot legislate, and by
17 refusing to enforce or prosecute specific, identified violations of law documented herein, you have effectively repealed it.
18 Only a Legislature can do that.

19 Certainly, even if you are not the proper recipient, you should consider it your constitutional duty to identify who WOULD
20 BE within the Attorney General's Office, the ONLY office that can prosecute the crimes documented herein. That is why I
21 sent it to the Attorney General and not his/her underlings. It is a mistake to expect you to take your job seriously and not act
22 like a criminal by not taking it seriously?

23 It is truly unconscionable that I even have to explain this aspect of your constitutional duties to you to overcome the possibly
24 pathetic and irresponsible avoidance of those duties on your part.

25 Remember, under the common law, gross negligence of this kind equates with FRAUD.

26 *"Lata culpa dolo aequiparatur. Gross negligence is equal to fraud."*
27 *[Bouvier's Maxims of Law, 1856;*
28 *SOURCE: <http://famguardian.org/Publications/BouvierMaximsOfLaw/BouviertsMaxims.htm>]*

29 _____
30 *"Silence can only be equated with fraud where there is a legal or moral duty to speak or where an inquiry left*
31 *unanswered would be intentionally misleading."*
32 *[U.S. v. Prudden, 424 F.2d. 1021 (5th Cir. 1970)]*
33 _____

34 *"Silence can be equated with fraud where there is a legal or moral duty to speak, or where an inquiry left*
35 *unanswered would be intentionally misleading. . . We cannot condone this shocking behavior by the IRS. Our*
36 *revenue system is based on the good faith of the taxpayer and the taxpayers should be able to expect the same*
37 *from the government in its enforcement and collection activities."*
38 *[U.S. v. Tweel, 550 F.2d. 297, 299 (5th Cir. 1977)]*

39 Lastly, if you don't have a duty to obey and enforce the laws and violations of the laws documented herein, then NO ONE
40 does, because we are all equal and all your authority came from we the people, so I must have that authority to. That's what
41 a government of delegated powers means: If you can be lawless, so can I. Thank you for setting the example on how to be
42 a lawless, criminal, anarchist by refusing to respond WITH EVIDENCE and prosecution of the wrongdoers.

43 *"Decency, security, and liberty alike demand that **government officials shall be subjected to the same rules of***
44 ***conduct that are commands to the citizen.** In a government of laws, existence of the government will be*
45 *imperiled if it fails to observe the law scrupulously. **Our government is the potent, the omnipresent teacher.***
46 ***For good or for ill, it teaches the whole people by its example. Crime is contagious. If the government***
47 ***becomes a lawbreaker, it breeds contempt for law; it invites every man to become a law unto himself; it***
48 ***invites anarchy.** To declare that in the administration of the criminal law the end justifies the means-to declare*
49 *that the government may commit crimes in order to secure the conviction of a private criminal-would bring*
50 *terrible retribution. Against that pernicious doctrine this court should resolutely set its face."*

2 In conclusion, any attempt to respond in the manner documented above shall constitute an admission of guilt of the crimes
3 documented above of:

- 4 1. Criminal fraud. You claim to BE a government but refuse to ACT like one, or worst yet, only act when it benefits or
5 protects you FIRST and to HELL with the REAL people you are supposed to be protecting.
- 6 2. Criminal obstruction of justice.
- 7 3. Criminal witness tampering.
- 8 4. Solicitation of a bribe (income tax) to procure an elective or appointive public office called “taxpayer”.
- 9 5. Impersonating a public officer.
- 10 6. Identity theft.
- 11 7. Terrorism, where collection notices directed at a public office that doesn’t lawfully exist are misdirected to those not
12 lawfully filling said office.
- 13 8. Simulating legal process, where you are simulating me as the subject of civil statutes and a judicial forum that I am
14 NOT the proper subject of.
- 15 9. An unconstitutional subornation of your oath by invoking the equivalent of a Fifth Amendment response. No response
16 is a Fifth Amendment response.

17 **1.5. Why you in particular received this communication**

18 A very important reason I am sending this document to the so-called “Department of Justice” is because “justice” as legally
19 defined is the right to be LEFT ALONE:

20 ***“Justice, as a moral habit, is that tendency of the will and mode of conduct which refrains from disturbing the***
21 ***lives and interests of others, and, as far as possible, hinders such interference on the part of others.*** This virtue
22 *springs from the individual’s respect for his fellows as ends in themselves and as his co equals. The different*
23 *spheres of interests may be roughly classified as follows: body and life; the family, or the extended individual*
24 *life; property, or the totality of the instruments of action; honor, or the ideal existence; and finally freedom, or*
25 *the possibility of fashioning one’s life as an end in itself. The law defends these different spheres, thus giving rise*
26 *to a corresponding number of spheres of rights, each being protected by a prohibition. . . . To violate the rights,*
27 *to interfere with the interests of others, is injustice. All injustice is ultimately directed against the life of the*
28 *neighbor; it is an open avowal that the latter is not an end in itself, having the same value as the individual’s own*
29 *life. The general formula of the duty of justice may therefore be stated as follows: Do no wrong yourself, and*
30 *permit no wrong to be done, so far as lies in your power; or, expressed positively: Respect and protect the right.”*
31 *[Readings on the History and System of the Common Law, Roscoe Pound, Second Edition, 1925, p. 2]*

32 The Constitution recognizes but not creates my RIGHT, not my PRIVILEGE, to be left alone, and it costs you nothing to
33 leave me alone.

34 *“The makers of our Constitution undertook to secure conditions favorable to the pursuit of happiness. They*
35 *recognized the significance of man’s spiritual nature, of his feelings and of his intellect. They knew that only a*
36 *part of the pain, pleasure and satisfactions of life are to be found in material things. They sought to protect*
37 *Americans in their beliefs, their thoughts, their emotions and their sensations. **They conferred, as against the***
38 ***Government, the right to be let alone - the most comprehensive of rights and the right most valued by civilized***
39 ***men.**”*
40 *[Olmstead v. United States, 277 U.S. 438, 478 (1928) (Brandeis, J., dissenting); see also Washington v. Harper,*
41 *494 U.S. 210 (1990)]*

42 The main and only thing I need protection from is a **CORRUPTED DE FACTO GOVERNMENT**, which positively refuses
43 its constitutional duty to recognize my right of PRIVATE property and my right to be LEFT ALONE. Instead, I and others
44 who know the truth and have carefully read, studied, and obeyed the laws that PREVENT this criminal mafia protection
45 racket are being:

- 46 1. Illegally and perpetually harassed be de facto officers. This constitutes duress. See:
- 47 2. Made the illegal target of “selective enforcement” that denies equal protection and equal treatment that is the
48 foundation of the United States Constitution.
- 49 3. Slandered and intimidated using information I provide on government forms.
- 50 4. Fraudulently deceived using words of art. See:

[Legal Deception, Propaganda, and Fraud, Form #05.014](#)
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

- 51 5. LIED to in government publications about what the law requires. See:

Reasonable Belief About Income Tax Liability, Form #05.007

<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

6. Made the target of FALSE and FRAUDULENT information return reports connecting me to a public office. See:

Correcting Erroneous Information Returns, Form #04.001

<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

Collectively, the above tactics amount to acts of INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM in a legislatively foreign state, the states of the Union. It amounts to the equivalent of a Stalinist purge and financial genocide of all political dissent. That sort of terrorism is also communist, because the essence of what it means to be a communist is an absolute failure and refusal by those in government to recognize ANY legal constraints on the nature of their activities. See 50 U.S.C. §841.

TITLE 50 > CHAPTER 23 > SUBCHAPTER IV > Sec. 841.
Sec. 841. - Findings and declarations of fact

The Congress finds and declares that the Communist Party of the United States [consisting of the IRS, DOJ, and a corrupted federal judiciary], although purportedly a political party, is in fact an instrumentality of a conspiracy to overthrow the [de jure] Government of the United States [and replace it with a de facto government ruled by the judiciary]. It constitutes an authoritarian dictatorship [IRS, DOJ, and corrupted federal judiciary in collusion] within a [constitutional] republic, demanding for itself the rights and privileges [including immunity from prosecution for their wrongdoing in violation of Article 1, Section 9, Clause 8 of the Constitution] accorded to political parties, but denying to all others the liberties [Bill of Rights] guaranteed by the Constitution. Unlike political parties, which evolve their policies and programs through public means, by the reconciliation of a wide variety of individual views, and submit those policies and programs to the electorate at large for approval or disapproval, the policies and programs of the Communist Party are secretly [by corrupt judges and the IRS in complete disregard of the tax laws] prescribed for it by the foreign leaders of the world Communist movement [the IRS and Federal Reserve]. Its members [the Congress, which was terrorized to do IRS bidding recently by the framing of Congressman Traficant] have no part in determining its goals, and are not permitted to voice dissent to party objectives. Unlike members of political parties, members of the Communist Party are recruited for indoctrination [in the public schools by homosexuals, liberals, and socialists] with respect to its objectives and methods, and are organized, instructed, and disciplined [by the IRS and a corrupted judiciary] to carry into action slavishly the assignments given them by their hierarchical chieftains. Unlike political parties, the Communist Party [thanks to a corrupted federal judiciary] acknowledges no constitutional or statutory limitations upon its conduct or upon that of its members. The Communist Party is relatively small numerically, and gives scant indication of capacity ever to attain its ends by lawful political means. The peril inherent in its operation arises not from its numbers, but from its failure to acknowledge any limitation as to the nature of its activities, and its dedication to the proposition that the present constitutional Government of the United States ultimately must be brought to ruin by any available means, including resort to force and violence [or using income taxes]. Holding that doctrine, its role as the agency of a hostile foreign power [the Federal Reserve and the American Bar Association (ABA)] renders its existence a clear present and continuing danger to the security of the United States. It is the means whereby individuals are seduced into the service of the world Communist movement, trained to do its bidding, and directed and controlled in the conspiratorial performance of their revolutionary services. Therefore, the Communist Party should be outlawed

The result of this INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM is that I am being compelled in effect to LIE about my status on government forms and BRIBE you to procure a public office in a corrupted government under various unconstitutionally administered franchises. The status I am being compelled to procure under these unconstitutionally administered franchises is identified by various words of art such as “citizen”, “resident”, “taxpayer”, “driver” (under the vehicle code), “spouse” (under the family code), etc. and if I refuse to procure these statuses, I am being made the target of illegal enforcement, selective enforcement, being denied remedies and equal protection, and being financially penalized by high legal fees of the priesthood of thieves who administer these franchises in the government church called “court”. The nature of that duress is documented in:

Affidavit of Duress: Illegal Enforcement by De Facto Officers, Form #02.005

<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

If you REALLY, SINCERELY, GENUINELY care about “justice”, meaning the protection of PRIVATE RIGHTS by simply LEAVING THEM ALONE AND NOT CONVERTING THEM INTO PUBLIC RIGHTS OR OFFICES, then you will protect my right to be left alone WITH THE CONSTITUTION AS YOUR ONLY BASIS WITHOUT forcing me to bribe a mafia protection racket with bribes called “taxes” that really aren’t taxes as legally defined, unless paid to a REAL public officer. I am NOT a public officer, it is a CRIME to impersonate a public officer per 18 U.S.C. §912, and I won’t falsify government documents to misrepresent myself as such a party in order to indemnify criminal government coworkers from liability for their organized extortion.

1 Even the U.S. Supreme Court recognizes that de facto governments can and do illegally CREATE or enforce public officers,
2 and that such acts are UNCONSTITUTIONAL, when it held:

3 *"An unconstitutional act is not a law; it confers no rights; it imposes no duties; it affords no protection; **it creates***
4 ***no office; it is in legal contemplation, as inoperative as though it had never been passed."***
5 *[Norton v. Shelby County, 118 U.S. 425 (1885)]*

6 I remind you that the reason that all governments are created, according to the Declaration of Independence, is to protect
7 ONLY PRIVATE rights. The very first step in protecting PRIVATE rights is to prevent such rights from being converted
8 into PUBLIC rights, PUBLIC offices, or franchises. A government that:

- 9 1. Won't recognize or protect such rights. OR
- 10 2. Forces the owner to donate the right to a public office or franchise before they will protect it. OR
- 11 3. Turns the status of "citizen", "resident", or "inhabitant" into a public office and a franchise within the national
12 government.
- 13 4. Forces you to bribe them to become a public officer called a "taxpayer" before they will leave you alone. OR
- 14 5. Removes all PRIVATE statuses from options on government forms so that the only choice you have is to accept a
15 public office. OR

16 . . . is NO GOVERNMENT AT ALL, but mafia protection ring that does not deserve and is not entitled to my allegiance and
17 especially financial support. If the so-called "government" won't protect me from its OWN abuses and violations of law,
18 they certainly don't deserve to be hired to protect me from anyone else. The nature of such a de facto mafia government and
19 the criminal nature of your employer is exhaustively documented and proven in the following document:

[De Facto Government Scam, Form #05.043
http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm](http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm)

20 **1.6. Request for correction-violation of fiduciary duty NOT to correct**

21 If you believe that I have sent this document in error to an improper party, then please promptly notify me of same and
22 provide the following information necessary to direct it to the proper parties:

- 23 1. The department or agency, address, and name of the improper party appearing at the beginning of this correspondence.
- 24 2. The department or agency, address, phone, email, and name of the proper party to replace the improper party.
- 25 3. The statute and implementing regulation that delegates authority to the agency or bureau you are directing me to for
26 assistance.
- 27 4. The government publication and delegation of authority order that delegates authority to the agency or bureau you are
28 directing me to for assistance

29 Please do NOT leave me hanging, by telling me that you can't service this request, without ALSO telling me WHO can within
30 the governmental unit you are part of. Such an indifferent response certainly could not be truthfully classified as "public
31 service" in relation to a member of the public, such as myself.

32 I furthermore remind the recipients that they have sworn an oath as "public officials" to support and defend the Constitution,
33 and pursuant to that oath, they are fiduciaries and trustees of the public trust and I am the beneficiary of the trust as a member
34 of the public. They therefore have a fiduciary duty prescribed by oath to put my best interests, who is the "public", ahead of
35 their own, and to read and obey everything that I, the Sovereign and their master as "public servants" ask them to do that is
36 a lawful exercise of my constitutionally protected rights.

37 *"As expressed otherwise, the powers delegated to a public officer are held in trust for the people and are to be*
38 *exercised in behalf of the government or of all citizens who may need the intervention of the officer. ¹⁵*
39 ***Furthermore, the view has been expressed that all public officers, within whatever branch and whatever level***
40 ***of government, and whatever be their private vocations, are trustees of the people, and accordingly labor under***
41 ***every disability and prohibition imposed by law upon trustees relative to the making of personal financial gain***

¹⁵ State ex rel. Nagle v. Sullivan, 98 Mont. 425, 40 P.2d. 995, 99 A.L.R. 321; Jersey City v. Hague, 18 N.J. 584, 115 A.2d. 8.

1 from a discharge of their trusts. ¹⁶ That is, a public officer occupies a fiduciary relationship to the political
2 entity on whose behalf he or she serves. ¹⁷ and owes a fiduciary duty to the public. ¹⁸ It has been said that the
3 fiduciary responsibilities of a public officer cannot be less than those of a private individual. ¹⁹ Furthermore,
4 it has been stated that any enterprise undertaken by the public official which tends to weaken public confidence
5 and undermine the sense of security for individual rights is against public policy.²⁰
6 [63C American Jurisprudence 2d, Public Officers and Employees, §247 (1999)]

7 This document shall also constitute my formal request for a "Certificate of non-citizen national status" in accordance with [8](#)
8 [U.S.C. §1452](#)(b). Additionally, this document constitutes my formal oath of allegiance to the United States of America.

9 **1.7. Intended effect of this communication upon the government**

10 Thomas Paine, author of the book [Common Sense](#), which is credited with starting the American Revolution, said the
11 following:

12 *"That government is best which governs least."*
13 [[Thomas Paine](#)]

14 That government governs least which has no "subjects" or "jurisdiction" over the people it governs because they fired the
15 government and decided instead to govern and support themselves:

16 *"The words 'people of the United States' and 'citizens,' are synonymous terms, and mean the same thing. They*
17 *both describe the political body who, according to our republican institutions, form the sovereignty, and who*
18 *hold the power and conduct the government through their representatives. **They are what we familiarly call the***
19 ***'sovereign people,' and every citizen [of HEAVEN] is one of this people, and a constituent member of this***
20 ***sovereignty. ..."***
21 [[Boyd v. State of Nebraska](#), [143 U.S. 135](#) (1892)]

22 Within our system of government, federalism is the official policy or method by which limited constitutional government is
23 ensured and self-government is preserved and expanded. This was described by the President of the United States as follows:

24 *Executive Order 12612*
25 *Sec. 2. Fundamental Federalism Principles.*

26 *In formulating and implementing policies that have federalism implications, Executive departments and*
27 *agencies shall be guided by the following fundamental federalism principles:*

28 (a) Federalism is rooted in the knowledge that our political liberties are best assured by limiting the size and
29 scope of the national government.

30 (b) *The people of the States created the national government when they delegated to it those enumerated*
31 *governmental powers relating to matters beyond the competence of the individual States. All other*
32 *sovereign powers, save those expressly prohibited the States by the Constitution, are reserved to the States*
33 *or to the people.*

34 (c) *The constitutional relationship among sovereign governments, State and national, is formalized in and*
35 *protected by the Tenth Amendment to the Constitution.*

36 (d) The people of the States are free, subject only to restrictions in the Constitution itself or in constitutionally
37 authorized Acts of Congress, to define the moral, political, and legal character of their lives.

38 (e) *In most areas of governmental concern, the States [and the individuals within them] uniquely possess the*
39 *constitutional authority, the resources, and the competence to discern the sentiments of the people and to*
40 *govern accordingly. In Thomas Jefferson's words, the States are "the most competent administrations for*
41 *our domestic concerns and the surest bulwarks against antirepublican tendencies."*

¹⁶ Georgia Dep't of Human Resources v. Sistrunk, 249 Ga. 543, 291 S.E.2d. 524. A public official is held in public trust. Madlener v. Finley (1st Dist), 161 Ill.App.3d. 796, 113 Ill.Dec. 712, 515 N.E.2d. 697, app gr 117 Ill.Dec. 226, 520 N.E.2d. 387 and revd on other grounds 128 Ill.2d. 147, 131 Ill.Dec. 145, 538 N.E.2d. 520.

¹⁷ Chicago Park Dist. v. Kenroy, Inc., 78 Ill.2d. 555, 37 Ill.Dec. 291, 402 N.E.2d. 181, appeal after remand (1st Dist) 107 Ill.App.3d. 222, 63 Ill.Dec. 134, 437 N.E.2d. 783.

¹⁸ United States v. Holzer (CA7 Ill), 816 F.2d. 304 and vacated, remanded on other grounds 484 U.S. 807, 98 L.Ed. 2d 18, 108 S.Ct. 53, on remand (CA7 Ill) 840 F.2d. 1343, cert den 486 U.S. 1035, 100 L.Ed. 2d 608, 108 S.Ct. 2022 and (criticized on other grounds by United States v. Osser (CA3 Pa) 864 F.2d. 1056) and (superseded by statute on other grounds as stated in United States v. Little (CA5 Miss) 889 F.2d. 1367) and (among conflicting authorities on other grounds noted in United States v. Boylan (CA1 Mass), 898 F.2d. 230, 29 Fed.Rules.Evid.Serv. 1223).

¹⁹ Chicago ex rel. Cohen v. Keane, 64 Ill.2d. 559, 2 Ill.Dec. 285, 357 N.E.2d. 452, later proceeding (1st Dist) 105 Ill.App.3d. 298, 61 Ill.Dec. 172, 434 N.E.2d. 325.

²⁰ Indiana State Ethics Comm'n v. Nelson (Ind App), 656 N.E.2d. 1172, reh gr (Ind App) 659 N.E.2d. 260, reh den (Jan 24, 1996) and transfer den (May 28, 1996).

- 1 (f) *The nature of our constitutional system encourages a healthy diversity in the public policies adopted by the*
2 *people of the several States according to their own conditions, needs, and desires. In the search for*
3 *enlightened public policy, individual States and communities are free to experiment with a variety of*
4 *approaches to public issues.*
- 5 (g) *Acts of the national government--whether legislative, executive, or judicial in nature--that exceed the*
6 *enumerated powers of that government under the Constitution violate the principle of federalism*
7 *established by the Framers.*
- 8 (h) *Policies of the national government should recognize the responsibility of--and should encourage*
9 *opportunities for--individuals, families, neighborhoods, local governments, and private associations to*
10 *achieve their personal, social, and economic objectives through cooperative effort.*
- 11 (i) *In the absence of clear constitutional or statutory authority, the presumption of sovereignty should rest with*
12 *the individual States. Uncertainties regarding the legitimate authority of the national government should*
13 *be resolved against regulation at the national level.*
14 *[Executive Order 12612, Oct. 26, 1987]*

15 The best way to limit the size and scope of government is to entirely withdraw our political and financial support for it and
16 to cease to participate in any of its franchises, and it is our constitutional right to do so. The obligation to financially support
17 the government comes from our voluntary choice of legal domicile, and therefore the way to exercise our legal right to
18 withdraw financial and political support is to change our domicile and thereby dis-associate politically and civilly and
19 financially.

20 *"Thus, the Court has frequently held that domicile or residence, more substantial than mere presence in transit*
21 *or sojourn, is an adequate basis for taxation, including income, property, and death taxes. Since the Fourteenth*
22 *Amendment makes one a citizen of the state wherein he resides, the fact of residence creates universally*
23 *reciprocal duties of protection by the state and of allegiance and support by the citizen. The latter obviously*
24 *includes a duty to pay taxes, and their nature and measure is largely a political matter. Of course, the situs of*
25 *property may tax it regardless of the citizenship, domicile, or residence of the owner, the most obvious illustration*
26 *being a tax on realty laid by the state in which the realty is located."*
27 *[Miller Brothers Co. v. Maryland, 347 U.S. 340 (1954)]*

28 The Founding Fathers said the best method of ensuring accountability of government to the people is for the government to
29 be dependent on the voluntary consent of the people, and that is why both citizenship and domicile must be voluntary and
30 cannot be coerced:

31 *"A dependence on the [consent of and financial support by the] people is, no doubt, the primary control on the*
32 *government;"*
33 *[Federalist Paper #51, Alexander Hamilton]*

34 *"This power over the purse may, in fact, be regarded as the most complete and effectual weapon with which any*
35 *constitution can arm the immediate representatives of the people, for obtaining a redress of every grievance, and*
36 *for carrying into effect every just and salutary measure."*
37 *[Federalist Paper #58, James Madison]*

38 *"If money is wanted by rulers who have in any manner oppressed the People, they may retain it until their*
39 *grievances are redressed, and thus peaceably procure relief, without trusting to despised petitions or disturbing*
40 *the public tranquility."*
41 *["Continental Congress To The Inhabitants Of The Province Of Quebec." Journals of the Continental Congress.*
42 *1774 -1789. Journals 1: 105-13.]*

43 The above is consistent with our Declaration of Independence, which says that all just powers of government derive from the
44 voluntary consent of the people, which implies that anything not entirely consensual and voluntary is UNJUST. The only
45 departure from this requirement for consent is found in the criminal laws and the common law, whereby persons who commit
46 crimes may be deprived of their life, liberty, and property without their consent as a punishment for the impairment of the
47 EQUAL rights of their fellow men.

48 The United States government is a creature of law and everything that it does is a consequence of executing law.²¹ One of
49 the purposes of this document is to destroy all the government's civil statutory jurisdiction over the Submitter in order to

²¹ "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 upon the exercise of the authority which it gives." 106 U.S., at 220. "Shall it be said... that the courts cannot give remedy when the Citizen has been deprived of his property by force, his estate seized and converted to the use of the government without any lawful authority, without any process of law, and without any compensation, because the president has ordered it and his officers are in possession? If such be the law of this country, it sanctions a tyranny which has no existence in the monarchies of Europe, nor in any other government which has a just claim to well-regulated liberty and the protection of personal rights." 106 U.S., at 220, 221.

1 restore complete and unimpaired self-government to the Submitter, while not destroying Constitutional or criminal or
2 common law protections. All such civil statutory jurisdiction derives from my voluntary choice of domicile per Federal Rule
3 of Civil Procedure 17 and the equivalent state rules. This right of self-government is protected by the Ninth and Tenth
4 Amendments to the Constitution of the United States, as indicated above. In that sense, it's main goal is to restore "good
5 government" and "limited government" and personal responsibility to America. The recipient will note that the main goal of
6 the Constitution, according to the U.S. Supreme Court was to preserve unimpaired self-government to everyone. To wit:

7 "The determination of the Framers Convention and the ratifying conventions to preserve complete and
8 unimpaired state [and personal] self-government in all matters not committed to the general government is
9 one of the plainest facts which emerges from the history of their deliberations. And adherence to that
10 determination is incumbent equally upon the federal government and the states. State powers can neither be
11 appropriated on the one hand nor abdicated on the other. As this court said in Texas v. White, 7 Wall. 700,
12 725, 'The preservation of the States, and the maintenance of their governments, are as much within the design
13 and care of the Constitution as the preservation of the Union and the maintenance of the National government.
14 The Constitution, in all its provisions, looks to an indestructible Union, composed of indestructible States.' Every
15 journey to a forbidden end begins with the first step; and the danger of such a step by the federal government in
16 the direction of taking over the powers of the states is that the end of the journey may find the states so despoiled
17 of their powers, or-what may amount to the same thing-so [298 U.S. 238, 296] relieved of the responsibilities
18 which possession of the powers necessarily enjoins, as to reduce them to little more than geographical
19 subdivisions of the national domain. It is safe to say that if, when the Constitution was under consideration, it
20 had been thought that any such danger lurked behind its plain words, it would never have been ratified. "
21 [Carter v. Carter Coal Co., 298 U.S. 238 (1936)]

22 **1.8. Consequences of interfering with the filing of or government action related to this** 23 **communication**

24 Those public dis-servants who would willfully interfere with this attempt by the Submitter of this document at unimpaired
25 self-government are at war with the legislative intent of the Constitution, are interfering with the principles of Federalism,
26 and are guilty of TREASON in violation of 18 U.S.C. §2381. Treason is punishable by DEATH. No man or group of men
27 such as yourself deserves the right to call itself a "government" which maliciously deprives other men the EQUAL right to
28 self-government. To deny this fact would be hypocrisy of the highest order. Furthermore, no public servant can truthfully
29 claim to be pursuing the "public good" while at the same time interfering with or preventing personal responsibility of any
30 kind. This document represents the highest, most mature exercise of personal responsibility, which is to completely FIRE
31 the government CIVILLY from my life and pursue unimpaired self-government.

32 The First Amendment protects my right to associate and my freedom from compelled association, even WITHOUT a domicile
33 within the civil jurisdiction of any government. I need only be present on land protected by the constitution to be eligible for
34 that protection. ²² The way I "associate" is choosing absent duress whatever civil status I want within your jurisdiction,
35 including whether I want to be a statutory "citizen", "resident", inhabitant, "person", "individual", or "taxpayer". The
36 foundation of all civil law in America is "consent of the governed", according to the Declaration of Independence. My
37 civil/legal status and how I describe myself defines and circumscribes what I will and will not consent to. The first, most
38 important duty of government is to protect the requirement for my consent in ALL human interactions, and especially between
39 the government and those under its care and protection.

40 "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator
41 with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.--That to secure
42 these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed,
43 --"
44 [Declaration of Independence]

45 Anything not based on express consent, or which assigns a CIVIL status to me that I do not choose to have, is, ipso facto,
46 UNJUST. This reality, is, in fact, the very essence of what it means to be sovereign.

47 Just as there is freedom to speak, to associate, and to believe, so also there is freedom not to speak, associate, or
48 believe. "The right to speak and the right to refrain from speaking [on a government tax return, and in
49 violation of the Fifth Amendment when coerced, for instance] are complementary components of the broader
50 concept of 'individual freedom of mind.'" Wooley v. Maynard [430 U.S. 703] (1977). Freedom of conscience
51 dictates that no individual may be forced to espouse ideological causes with which he disagrees:

[United States vs. Lee, 106 U.S. 196, 1 S.Ct. 240 (1882)]

²² "It is locality that is determinative of the application of the Constitution, in such matters as judicial procedure, and not the status of the people who live in it." [Balzac v. Porto Rico, 258 U.S. 298 (1922)]

1 "[A]t the heart of the [First Amendment](#) is the notion that the individual should be free to believe as he will, and
2 that in a free society one's beliefs should be shaped by his mind and by his conscience rather than coerced by the
3 State [through illegal enforcement of the revenue laws]." [Abood v. Detroit Board of Education \[431 U.S. 209\]](#)
4 (1977)

5 **Freedom from compelled association is a vital component of freedom of expression.** Indeed, freedom from
6 compelled association illustrates the significance of the liberty or personal autonomy model of the [First](#)
7 [Amendment](#). **As a general constitutional principle, it is for the individual and not for the state to choose one's**
8 **associations and to define the persona which he holds out to the world."**
9 [[First Amendment Law In A Nutshell](#), Second Edition, Barron-Dienes, West Publishing, ISBN 0-314-22677-X,
10 pp. 266-267]

11 Anyone who changes my civil status without my consent, and especially on government forms or as part of a government
12 franchise is, in fact:

- 13 1. Practicing law on my behalf without my consent.
- 14 2. Engaging in involuntary servitude in violation of the Thirteenth Amendment by making me into involuntary surety for
15 his choices and actions.
- 16 3. Tampering with a witness in violation of 18 U.S.C. §1512.
- 17 4. Engaging in a conspiracy against rights in criminal violation of 18 U.S.C. §241.
- 18 5. Engaging in a conspiracy to commit perjury, because all government forms are signed under penalty of perjury.
- 19 6. Committing perjury in violation of 18 U.S.C. §1001, 18 U.S.C. §1542, 18 U.S.C. §1621.
- 20 7. Suborning perjury in violation of 18 U.S.C. §1622.

21 2. **WHAT THIS DOCUMENT IS NOT**

22 It is quite common for malicious and malingering public servants to try to:

- 23 1. Invent reasons why they cannot or should not do the things requested in this correspondence, as a way to deflect
24 personal responsibility in violation of their fiduciary duty as public officers.
- 25 2. Misconstrue the purpose of this communication in order to slander, intimidate, or injure people they are hired
26 INSTEAD to protect and help.
- 27 3. Misconstrue words in this communication in order to benefit themselves personally or commercially in criminal
28 violation of 18 U.S.C. §208.

29 The simple purpose of this communication is to restore the proper relationship between the submitter and the government in
30 which the government is the SERVANT, the submitter is the MASTER.

31 **"Sovereignty is the right to govern; a nation or State-sovereign is the person or persons in whom that resides.**
32 **In Europe the sovereignty is generally ascribed to the Prince; here it rests with the people; there, the sovereign**
33 **actually administers the Government; here, never in a single instance; our Governors are the agents**
34 **[fiduciaries] of the people, and at most stand in the same relation to their sovereign, in which regents in Europe**
35 **stand to their sovereigns. Their Princes have personal powers, dignities, and pre-eminences, our rulers have**
36 **none but official; nor do they partake in the sovereignty otherwise, or in any other capacity, than as private**
37 **citizens." at 472."**
38 [Justice Wilson, *Chisholm, Ex'r. v. Georgia*, [2 Dall. \(U.S.\) 419](#), 1 L.Ed. 454, 457, 471, 472 (1794)]

39 The mission of the SERVANT government is to protect PRIVATE property and PRIVATE rights by:

- 40 1. Recognizing their existence.
- 41 2. Recognizing the right of all to NOT contract with any government and NOT be party to a social compact and the
42 CIVIL statutes that implement it WITHOUT expatriating.
- 43 3. NOT enforcing the social compact and the civil statutory law that implements it extraterritorially in a legislatively but
44 not constitutionally foreign state, such as a state of the Union.
- 45 4. Providing administrative remedies for their protection, and thus equal protection to both FRANCHISEES and NON-
46 FRANCHISEES.
- 47 5. NOT converting them to PUBLIC RIGHTS, OFFICES, OR FRANCHISES without the EXPRESS consent of the
48 owner.
- 49 6. NOT converting their ownership from ABSOLUTE to QUALIFIED by tricking the owner with "words of art" into
50 volunteering for franchises, and especially those they are not eligible for.

1 7. Recognizing and protecting the right of the owner of PRIVATE property and PRIVATE rights to NOT CONSENT and
2 NOT PARTICIPATE in any government franchise. All franchises are contracts. Franchises, include Social Security,
3 the income tax, Medicare, Obamacare, driver licensing, marriage licensing, professional licensing, etc.

4 Imputing anything more than the above is FRAUD, MISREPRESENTATION, THEFT, a CONSPIRACY AGAINST
5 PRIVATE RIGHTS protected by the CONSTITUTION, and TERRORISM. Stopping terrorism BEGINS with stopping
6 GOVERNMENT terrorism. It is truly ironic that those who expect and require that government satisfy the ONLY purpose
7 for its creation, being that of protecting PRIVATE rights as the Declaration of Independence requires, should be branded as
8 anti-government, violent, or even a terrorist. If expecting a so-called “government” to ACT like a government is wrong, then
9 the government we have is NOT a government, but a band of international terrorists masquerading as a government whose
10 activities are thoroughly documented in:

De Facto Government Scam, Form #05.043

<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

11 This document simply converts ownership over my body and the fruit of my labor to EXCLUSIVELY PRIVATE civil status
12 and places it entirely beyond government CIVIL statutory control, regulation, or taxation.²³ This right is recognized by the
13 U.S. Supreme Court in the following quote. Keep in mind that by “citizen” they are referring to STATUTORY citizen,
14 meaning someone who CHOSE a domicile within the EXCLUSIVE jurisdiction of the government in question, and thereby
15 elected a “protector”. It does NOT mean CONSTITUTIONAL citizenship by birth or naturalization, but DOMICILE.
16 Domicile is the method by which one nominates and subsidizes a SPECIFIC “protector” called government and thereby
17 becomes party to the civil “social compact”. The right to choose a civil domicile and thereby contract with the government
18 for CIVIL protection implies an EQUAL right not to be protected and NOT to have to pay for protection that one does not
19 want or need. The purpose of establishing government is to protect the right not only to CONTRACT, but also the right to
20 NOT CONTRACT with those who are harmful or inefficient, such as the present de facto state and federal governments.

21 *When one becomes a member of society, he necessarily parts with some rights or privileges which, as an*
22 *individual not affected by his relations to others, he might retain. "A body politic," as aptly defined in the*
23 *preamble of the Constitution of Massachusetts, "is a social compact by which the whole people covenants with*
24 *each citizen, and each citizen with the whole people, that all shall be governed by certain laws for the common*
25 *good." This does not confer power upon the whole people to control rights which are purely and exclusively*
26 *private, Thorpe v. R. & B. Railroad Co., 27 Vt. 143; but it does authorize the establishment of laws requiring*
27 *each citizen to so conduct himself, and so use his own property, as not unnecessarily to injure another.*
28 *[Munn. v. Illinois, 94 U.S. 113 (1876),*
29 *SOURCE: http://scholar.google.com/scholar_case?case=6419197193322400931]*

30 The nature of the “social compact” spoken of above is exhaustively described in Reference (1).

31 **2.1. Not an attempt to evade personal responsibility for myself or any of my actions or choices**

32 This communication does NOT represent an attempt to evade personal responsibility for any of my choices or actions, but
33 merely to define the legal significance of those actions and to accept complete, personal, and exclusive responsibility for all
34 such actions and choices. I am still accountable and even consent to be accountable under the criminal law and the common
35 law and the laws of my religion. Therefore this is not an attempt to promote any form of anarchy. The criminal law, the
36 common law, and biblical law do NOT require my consent to be enforceable and evading any of these is anarchy and
37 disobedience to the God of my religion.

38 Every JUST society must make it a policy to REWARD and ENCOURAGE virtuous behavior. Protecting religions from
39 state control through the First Amendment is the first step. But this end requires MORE, such as recognizing and rewarding
40 people who take the ULTIMATE form of personal responsibility by rejecting ALL of the “benefits” of the civil statutory
41 protection franchise. That reward must include the ability to avoid the obligation to pay for such “benefits” one is NOT
42 receiving and refuses to receive as a bare minimum. The ability to do so is a fundamental common law right:

43 *Commodum ex injuri su non habere debet.*
44 *No man ought to derive any benefit of his own wrong. Jenk. Cent. 161.*

²³ “Every man has a natural right to the fruits of his own labor, is generally admitted; and no other person can rightfully deprive him of those fruits, and appropriate them against his will...”

[The Antelope, 23 U.S. 66, 10 Wheat 66, 6 L.Ed. 268 (1825)]

1 *Invito beneficium non datur.*
2 *No one is obliged to accept a benefit against his consent. Dig. 50, 17, 69. But if he does not dissent he will be*
3 *considered as assenting. Vide Assent.*

4 *Potest quis renunciare pro se, et suis, juri quod pro se introductum est.*
5 *A man may relinquish, for himself and his heirs, a right which was introduced for his own benefit. See 1 Bouv.*
6 *Inst. n. 83.*

7 *Quilibet potest renunciare juri pro se inducto.*
8 *Any one may renounce a law introduced for his own benefit. To this rule there are some exceptions. See 1 Bouv.*
9 *Inst. n. 83.*

10 [*Bouvier's Maxims of Law, 1856;*
11 *SOURCE: <http://famguardian.org/Publications/BouvierMaximsOfLaw/BouviersMaxims.htm>]*

12 As proof that I do not seek to evade the obligations associated with a benefit for an ACTUAL time period of tax reporting,
13 the following agreement attached to this communication invites the government to prove that I have personally asked for and
14 received a “benefit” under the common law and equity, and if I have, I agree to pay for it in advance, with or WITHOUT a
15 civil or legal status, PROVIDED that the government follows exactly the same rules if they are receiving the “benefit” of my
16 services, rights, or property:

Injury Defense Franchise and Agreement, Form #06.027, Section 11
<https://sedm.org/Forms/06-AvoidingFranch/InjuryDefenseFranchise.pdf>

17 **2.2. Not an attempt to abandon Constitutional citizenship**

18 This document does not constitute an attempt to abandon any type of constitutional citizenship, but rather to abandon
19 STATUTORY citizenship per 8 U.S.C. §1401 and *not* constitutional citizenship as exhaustively described in Enclosure (5).
20 There is no question that a human being born or naturalized in a state of the Union is a Fourteenth Amendment citizen and
21 therefore a Constitutional citizen, whether they want to be or not.

22 *“It is impossible to construe the words 'subject to the jurisdiction thereof,' in the opening sentence, as less*
23 *comprehensive than the words 'within its jurisdiction,' in the concluding sentence of the same section; or to hold*
24 *that persons 'within the jurisdiction' of one of the states of the Union are not 'subject to the jurisdiction of the*
25 *United States[***].”*
26 [*U.S. v. Wong Kim Ark, 169 U.S. 649, 18 S.Ct. 456, 42 L.Ed. 890 (1898), emphasis added*]

27 The status of being a statutory “U.S. citizen” per 8 U.S.C. §1401, however, is a franchise, because it is associated with
28 “privileges”. All privileges, in turn, attach to offices in the government:

29 *“The privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States do not necessarily include all the rights*
30 *protected by the first eight amendments to the Federal Constitution against the powers of the Federal*
31 *Government.*
32 [*Maxwell v. Dow, 176 U.S. 581 (1899)*]

33 I seek to avoid privileges and franchises associated with office in the government or domicile on federal territory. To compel
34 me to accept the duties of any civil office furthermore constitutes involuntary servitude in violation of the Thirteenth
35 Amendment. The cite below proves that those domiciled on federal territory have no rights, but only privileges, and that
36 these people also are not protected by the Constitution. As explained in Downes below, I don’t want to be associated with
37 any jurisdiction that behaves like a “British Crown Colony” rather than a “republican state of America”, which is the status
38 of those who claim the status of being statutory “U.S. citizens” per 8 U.S.C. §1401.

39 *“Indeed, the practical interpretation put by Congress upon the Constitution has been long continued and uniform*
40 *to the effect [182 U.S. 244, 279] that the Constitution is applicable to territories acquired by purchase or*
41 *conquest, only when and so far as Congress shall so direct. Notwithstanding its duty to 'guarantee to every*
42 *state in this Union a republican form of government' (art. 4, 4), by which we understand, according to the*
43 *definition of Webster, 'a government in which the supreme power resides in the whole body of the people, and*
44 *is exercised by representatives elected by them,' Congress did not hesitate, in the original organization of the*
45 *territories of Louisiana, Florida, the Northwest Territory, and its subdivisions of Ohio, Indiana, Michigan,*
46 *Illinois, and Wisconsin and still more recently in the case of Alaska, to establish a form of government bearing*
47 *a much greater analogy to a British Crown colony than a republican state of America, and to vest the legislative*
48 *power either in a governor and council, or a governor and judges, to be appointed by the President. It was not*
49 *until they had attained a certain population that power was given them to organize a legislature by vote of the*
50 *people. In all these cases, as well as in territories subsequently organized west of the Mississippi, Congress*

1 thought it necessary either to extend to Constitution and laws of the United States over them, or to declare that
2 the inhabitants should be entitled to enjoy the right of trial by jury, of bail, and of the privilege of the writ of
3 habeas corpus, as well as other privileges of the bill of rights.”
4 [Downes v. Bidwell, [182 U.S. 244](#) (1901)]

5 **2.3. Not an act of allegiance to a “foreign” human ruler or man-made government**

6 “Those people who are not governed by GOD will be ruled by tyrants.”
7 [William Penn (after which Pennsylvania was named)]

8 This document also does not constitute an oath or expression of allegiance to any other earthly man-made government or
9 “state”, which [8 U.S.C. §1481](#)(a)(2) indicates causes a loss of nationality:

10 [TITLE 8 > CHAPTER 12 > SUBCHAPTER III > Part III > § 1481](#)
11 [§ 1481. Loss of nationality by native-born or naturalized citizen; voluntary action; burden of proof; presumptions](#)

12 (a) A person who is a national of the United States whether by birth or naturalization, shall lose his nationality
13 by voluntarily performing any of the following acts with the intention of relinquishing United States nationality—

14 [. . .]

15 (2) taking an oath or making an affirmation or other formal declaration of allegiance to a foreign state or a
16 political subdivision thereof, after having attained the age of eighteen years; or

17 The actions of the current American government reveal that it is definitely hostile and “foreign” in relation to God and His
18 holy laws found in the Bible, but the First Amendment, the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, [42 U.S.C. Chapter 21B](#), and
19 22 U.S.C. §2721 also prohibit making allegiance to God into a basis for discrimination or denial of a passport because doing
20 so would:

- 21 1. Interfere with my religious exercise, which is based on supreme allegiance to God.
- 22 2. Violate the first four commandments of the Ten Commandments by causing me to serve or worship “other Gods”,
23 which include governments or civil rulers. The essence of religious worship is obedience to the laws and dictates of a
24 superior being, and that superior being CANNOT be a civil ruler or government without violating my religion.

25 “I am the LORD your God, who brought you out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage.
26 “You shall have no other gods before Me.
27 [Exodus 20:2-3, Bible, NKJV]

- 28 3. Disestablish a religion, by interfering with my religious exercise.
- 29 4. Establish a pagan religion that places allegiance to government and civil rulers ABOVE that of allegiance to my
30 Creator. The Bible says it is a sin to have anyone in government ABOVE me. They must SERVE me from below and
31 may not govern me from above:

32 But Jesus called them to Himself and said to them, “You know that those who are considered rulers over the
33 Gentiles lord it over them, and their great ones exercise authority over them. Yet it shall not be so among you;
34 but whoever desires to become great among you shall be your servant. “ And whoever of you desires to be first
35 shall be slave of all. For even the Son of Man did not come to be served, but to serve, and to give His life a
36 ransom for many.”
37 [Matt. 10:42-45, Bible, NKJV]

38 **2.4. Not an attempt to “simulate legal process” or threaten any person or government with** 39 **violence**

40 This document is not intended as an attempt to simulate legal process, but rather an attempt to simply give the requisite legal
41 notice of WHICH of the two mutually exclusive political and legal jurisdictions that I am a member of, which are described
42 in the following:

43 “It is clear that Congress, as a legislative body, exercise two species of legislative power: the one, limited as to
44 its objects, but extending all over the Union: the other, an absolute, exclusive legislative power over the District
45 of Columbia. The preliminary inquiry in the case now before the Court, is, by virtue of which of these authorities
46 was the law in question passed?”
47 [Cohens v. Virginia, [19 U.S. 264](#), [6 Wheat. 265](#); [5 L.Ed. 257](#) (1821)]

1 *"The idea prevails with some, indeed it has found expression in arguments at the bar, that we have in this country*
2 *substantially two national governments; one to be maintained under the Constitution, with all of its*
3 *restrictions; the other to be maintained by Congress outside the independently of that instrument, by exercising*
4 *such powers [of absolutism] as other nations of the earth are accustomed to.. I take leave to say that, if the*
5 *principles thus announced should ever receive the sanction of a majority of this court, a radical and*
6 *mischievous change in our system of government will result. We will, in that event, pass from the era of*
7 *constitutional liberty guarded and protected by a written constitution into an era of legislative absolutism.. It*
8 *will be an evil day for American liberty if the theory of a government outside the supreme law of the land finds*
9 *lodgment in our constitutional jurisprudence. No higher duty rests upon this court than to exert its full*
10 *authority to prevent all violation of the principles of the Constitution."*

11 [*Downes v. Bidwell, 182 U.S. 244 (1901)*]

12 Any attempt to continue compelling me to accept any of the obligations associated with membership in the community that
13 includes federal territory or government franchises as a human being protected by the Constitution therefore represents a
14 criminal act of:

- 15 1. Involuntary servitude in violation of the Thirteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution and a theft of his/her
16 property.
- 17 2. Compelled association in violation of the First Amendment.
- 18 3. Identity theft.

19 This document also does not in any way represent any effort to condone, endorse, or participate in any acts of violence,
20 terrorism, or unlawful activity. I do not and will not condone, subsidize, sanction, or tolerate any such activities. Do not put
21 me on any "terrorist blacklist" simply because I want you to do what the Constitution requires, which is to respect my
22 sovereignty and simply leave me alone to worship my God, which the U.S. Supreme Court has held is the main right
23 established by the Constitution.

24 *"The makers of our Constitution undertook to secure conditions favorable to the pursuit of happiness. They*
25 *recognized the significance of man's spiritual nature, of his feelings and of his intellect. They knew that only a*
26 *part of the pain, pleasure and satisfactions of life are to be found in material things. They sought to protect*
27 *Americans in their beliefs, their thoughts, their emotions and their sensations. They conferred, as against the*
28 *Government, the right to be let alone - the most comprehensive of rights and the right most valued by civilized*
29 *men."*

30 [*Olmstead v. United States, 277 U.S. 438, 478 (1928) (Brandeis, J., dissenting); see also Washington v. Harper,*
31 *494 U.S. 210 (1990)*]

32 Any attempt to threaten, harass, detain, or otherwise make the Submitter of this legal notice the target of "selective
33 enforcement" because of the unlawful government activities it exposes shall constitute and be treated as:

- 34 1. Obstruction of justice.
- 35 2. Tampering with a witness of criminal activities documented herein.
- 36 3. International terrorism, because the states of the Union are "nations" within the meaning of international law.
- 37 4. Extortion.
- 38 5. Racketeering.
- 39 6. Slavery and involuntary servitude in violation of the Thirteenth Amendment.

40 **2.5. Not an act of expatriation or abandonment of "nationality" under 8 U.S.C.**

41 This document does not describe an act of expatriation, which is legally defined as an act of "abandoning nationality and
42 allegiance". To wit:

43 *"Expatriation is the voluntary renunciation or abandonment of nationality and allegiance."*
44 [*Perkins v. Elg, 307 U.S. 325; 59 S.Ct. 884; 83 L.Ed 1320 (1939)*]

45 Expatriation is only one of two possible lawful methods for becoming a "stateless person" and a "transient foreigner". The
46 other method is to abandon domicile in the country of one's birth or domicile and to re-associate with a state or political or
47 religious group which is "foreign" with respect to one's state or nation of birth. The U.S. Supreme Court described the result
48 of not having a domicile within any state of the Union or within the country of one's birth as causing them to become stateless,
49 when it said:
50

51 *In order to be a citizen of a State within the meaning of the diversity statute, a natural person must both be a*
52 *citizen of the United States and be domiciled within the State. See Robertson v. Cease, 97 U.S. 646, 648-649*

(1878); *Brown v. Keene*, 8 Pet. 112, 115 (1834). The problem in this case is that Bettison, although a United States citizen, has no domicile in any State. **He is therefore "stateless" for purposes of § 1332(a)(3). Subsection 1332(a)(2), which confers jurisdiction in the District Court when a citizen of a State sues aliens only, also could not be satisfied because Bettison is a United States [citizen under the Fourteenth Amendment but NOT under 8 U.S.C. §1401] citizen. [490 U.S. 829]**

When a plaintiff sues more than one defendant in a diversity action, the plaintiff must meet the requirements of the diversity statute for each defendant or face dismissal. *Strawbridge v. Curtiss*, 3 Cranch 267 (1806).{1} **Here, Bettison's "stateless" status destroyed complete diversity under § 1332(a)(3), and his United States citizenship destroyed complete diversity under § 1332(a)(2).** Instead of dismissing the case, however, the Court of Appeals panel granted Newman-Green's motion, which it had invited, to amend the complaint to drop Bettison as a party, thereby producing complete diversity under § 1332(a)(2). 832 F.2d. 417 (1987). The panel, in an opinion by Judge Easterbrook, relied both on 28 U.S.C. §1653 and on Rule 21 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure as sources of its authority to grant this motion. The panel noted that, because the guarantors are jointly and severally liable, Bettison is not an indispensable party, and dismissing him would not prejudice the remaining guarantors. 832 F.2d. at 420, citing Fed.Rule Civ.Proc. 19(b). The panel then proceeded to the merits of the case, ruling in Newman-Green's favor in large part, but remanding to allow the District Court to quantify damages and to resolve certain minor issues.{2}

[[Newman-Green v. Alfonso Larrain](#), 490 U.S. 826 (1989)]

You will note that Mr. Bettison in the above styled case was domiciled outside of every state of the Union, and that he was a constitutional citizen, which means a “national” under [8 U.S.C. §1101\(a\)\(21\)](#), but not a statutory “citizen” pursuant to [8 U.S.C. §1401](#). This is further explained in Enclosure (5). He could not be a statutory citizen because he was not domiciled within the “United States” at the time and therefore was a statutory “non-resident non-person”. This is precisely the status that this correspondence shall document on my part in the context of all future legal or business dealings we may have.

This document is NOT an attempt to abandon nationality or *constitutional* CITIZENSHIP allegiance pursuant to [8 U.S.C. §1481](#). Therefore, please do NOT respond with LAME statements like the following, because they are NOT RESPONSIVE to what I am asking you for in this letter:

“We have received your letter of _____. It appears that you are attempting to renounce your United States citizenship. In addition to this letter, please read carefully the enclosed flyer, which in detail outlines the procedure and effects of renouncing U.S. citizenship.

Generally, United States citizens have the right to remain citizens until they intend to give up citizenship. Renunciation is the most unequivocal way in which a person can manifest an intention to relinquish U.S. citizenship. In order for a renunciation to be effective, all of the conditions of the statute must be met. Most significantly, a person may not renounce U.S. citizenship while present in the United States, unless the United States is in a state of war. Since the United States is not currently in a state of war, U.S. citizenship must be renounced abroad.

Loss of citizenship only occurs when a Certificate of Loss of Nationality is issued. The certificate may only be issued by the Department of State, after a careful review in which it is determined whether the person (1) has voluntarily performed an act made potentially expatriating by statute and (2) did so with the intention of relinquishing U.S. citizenship.

Persons who are considering renouncing U.S. citizenship should carefully review the enclosed information. We hope that this information will be helpful to you.

Instead, this document abandons *all political and legal allegiance* originating through choice of domicile AND “residence” and exercise of political rights that arise from them *only within federal territory under the exclusive or general sovereignty of the federal government*. Therefore, please *do NOT* respond to this correspondence by telling me how to abandon **CONSTITUTIONAL** CITIZENSHIP or NATIONALITY, because I don’t seek to do this. I want to abandon **STATUTORY** “U.S. citizen” status pursuant to [8 U.S.C. §1401](#), but NOT my **CONSTITUTIONAL** citizenship pursuant to Section 1 of the Fourteenth Amendment. The distinctions between **CONSTITUTIONAL** citizenship and **STATUTORY** citizenship are described in detail in Enclosure (5). If you do not understand these distinctions, please carefully read and rebut, if necessary, this enclosure so that you can properly and timely respond to this request.

2.6. Not an act of “expatriation” under the I.R.C.

This document does not constitute the act of expatriation described in 26 U.S.C. §877 because:

1. I am not a “taxpayer” and the only thing the Internal Revenue Code, Subtitle A can pertain to is “taxpayers”.

1 *"Revenue Laws relate to taxpayers [officers, employees, and elected officials of the Federal Government] and*
2 *not to non-taxpayers [American Citizens/American Nationals not subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the*
3 *Federal Government]. The latter are without their scope. No procedures are prescribed for non-taxpayers and*
4 *no attempt is made to annul any of their Rights or Remedies in due course of law. With them[non-taxpayers]*
5 *Congress does not assume to deal and they are neither of the subject nor of the object of federal revenue laws."*
6 *[Economy Plumbing & Heating v. U.S., 470 F.2d. 585 (1972)]*

- 7 2. I am NOT a statutory "individual" or a statutory "nonresident alien individual", but rather a statutory "non-resident non-
8 person" who is NOT an statutory "individual". The only party described in 26 U.S.C. §877 are "nonresident alien
9 *individuals*". All such "individuals" are government officers and employees and not private parties. This is exhaustively
10 demonstrated by the following:

Why Your Government is Either a Thief or You are a "Public Officer" for Income Tax Purposes, Form #05.008
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

- 11 3. The Courts are without authority to declare me or assign to me any civil status other than what I assign myself under the
12 terms of the Internal Revenue Code, Subtitle A franchise agreement, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §2201(a). This is another
13 way of saying that I am the "customer", the customer is always right, and the customer has the right to choose whether
14 he wants to hire the protection racket called "government". Those who don't are called nonresident nontaxpayers,
15 "transient foreigners", "stateless persons", etc.

16 *Specifically, Rowen seeks a declaratory judgment against the United States of America with respect to "whether*
17 *or not the plaintiff is a taxpayer pursuant to, and/or under 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(14)." (See Compl. at 2.) **This***
18 ***Court lacks jurisdiction to issue a declaratory judgment "with respect to Federal taxes other than actions***
19 ***brought under section 7428 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986," a code section that is not at issue in the***
20 ***instant action. See 28 U.S.C. §2201; see also Hughes v. United States, 953 F.2d. 531, 536-537 (9th Cir. 1991)***
21 *(affirming dismissal of claim for declaratory relief under § 2201 where claim concerned question of tax liability).*
22 *Accordingly, defendant's motion to dismiss is hereby GRANTED, and the instant action is hereby DISMISSED.*
23 *[Rowen v. U.S., 05-3766MMC. (N.D.Cal. 11/02/2005)]*

24 **2.7. Not connected with the "sovereign citizen movement"**

25 The submitter of this correspondence is not connected with the so called "sovereign citizen movement". Being "sovereign"
26 and being a statutory "citizen" pursuant to 8 U.S.C. §1401, are, in fact, mutually exclusive and therefore the status of being
27 a "sovereign" and a "citizen" simultaneously is an oxymoron that only morons use or associate with themselves. For the
28 reasons, see:
29

Policy Document: Rebutted False Arguments About Sovereignty, Form #08.018, Sections 6.1 through 6.4
FORMS PAGE: <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
DIRECT LINK: <http://sedm.org/Forms/08-PolicyDocs/RebFalseArgSovereignty.pdf>

30 **2.8. Not associated with any known flawed argument advanced by the government**

31 *"For this is the will of God, that by doing good you may put to silence the ignorance of foolish men— as free, yet*
32 *not using liberty as a cloak for vice, **but as bondservants of God.**"*
33 *[1 Peter 2:15-16, Bible, NKJV]*

34 Neither I nor this notice is associated with any flawed tax or freedom arguments or deranged groups who advance them that
35 are presently identified or documented by the government. In fact, I denounce the use of stereotypes of any kind and insist
36 that everyone should be treated respectfully, with dignity, and consistent with every aspect of who and why they provably
37 are. The relationship of this request to all known and published government guidance documents on the subject of freedom
38 or tax arguments is found in the following. Failure to rebut the rebuttals to the government's publications in the following
39 shall constitute consent that we are not in conflict with the government and that you agree with our position:
40

Resources to Rebut Government, Legal, and Tax Profession Deception and False Propaganda
<http://sedm.org/LibertyU/LibertyU.htm>

41 **2.9. Not an act of "paper terrorism"**

42 This document is NOT an act of "paper terrorism". In fact, it is intended to PREVENT YOUR terrorism and paper terrorism.
43 That terrorism is exhaustively described in:

The reason you keep communicating with me and enforcing against me is obviously because you FALSELY think I am a “customer” of your protection racket called a “citizen”, “resident”, “inhabitant”, “domiciliary”, “person”, or “individual”. I AM NOT any of these entities and I don’t want your protection, because you only protect YOURSELF as the mafia that you are. In fact, the only thing I need protection from is YOU. YOU are the terrorist. I simply want to be LEFT ALONE by you, which can’t be turned into a franchise and which the Constitution gives me the right to FOR FREE:

*"The makers of our Constitution undertook to secure conditions favorable to the pursuit of happiness. They recognized the significance of man's spiritual nature, of his feelings and of his intellect. They knew that only a part of the pain, pleasure and satisfactions of life are to be found in material things. They sought to protect Americans in their beliefs, their thoughts, their emotions and their sensations. **They conferred, as against the Government, the right to be let alone - the most comprehensive of rights and the right most valued by civilized men.**"*

[Olmstead v. United States, 277 U.S. 438, 478 (1928) (Brandeis, J., dissenting); see also Washington v. Harper, 494 U.S. 210 (1990)]

Stop deluding yourself that people need you or want you anymore. God says you have outlived your usefulness because the only thing you protect anymore is your own CRIMINAL wrongdoing of your own fellow public officers while they are terrorizing and enslaving and stealing from me without my consent.

"Come out of her, my people, lest you share in her sins, and lest you receive her plagues.

For her [our corrupted de facto WHORE government] sins have reached to heaven, and God has remembered her iniquities."

[Rev. 18:1-8, Bible, NKJV]

It’s the height of hypocrisy and arrogance to:

1. Call that kind of “public service” a “benefit” or make it into a franchise.
2. Charge me for the “privilege” of being the object of it.
3. PRESUME (in violation of due process of law) that I consent to it by calling me a “citizen”, “resident”, “inhabitant”, “domiciliary”, “person”, “individual”, “taxpayer”, etc. I don’t authorize you to represent me or determine my legal status at all.
4. Force me to consent to it by not providing any forms or administrative remedies to INDICATE my NON-CONSENT to it.
5. Interfere with efforts to correct false information return reports that connect me with consent to it. That’s a conspiracy to file or perpetuate false returns and COMPUTER fraud.
6. Interfere with efforts on government forms to correctly describe my status as a non-consenting party, thus FORCING me to commit perjury on government forms in order to exercise my unalienable rights granted not by you, but by God.

Avoiding Traps in Government Forms Course, Form #12.023
<https://sedm.org/LibertyU/AvoidingTrapsGovForms.pdf>

2.10. Not an attempt to promote “anarchy”, lawlessness, or violence of any kind

This document also does not represent an attempt to promote anarchy, meaning lawlessness, or violence of any kind. I personally deplore violence and use it only as a last resort in defending myself from equal physical violence by others.

I do not ever say or advocate any of the following:

1. That I am above “the law”.
2. That I am not subject to “law” as legally defined in the following:

What Is “law”?, Form #05.048

<https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

3. That I am “better” or “superior” to any other “person” or human being or government.
4. That I am not subject to the criminal laws of the place I physically am at any given time.

In fact, I seek to enforce the Constitutional requirement established in the Declaration of Independence that:

1. "all men are created equal" by the "Creator".
2. All "persons", including governments, are treated equally IN EVERY RESPECT. That means I am equal to YOU in every respect, which means I should be able to prosecute you criminally for the crimes of your coworkers documented herein without your participation or consent.
3. Consistent with the Clearfield Doctrine, there is no sovereign, official, or judicial immunity whenever a government attempts to do any of the following PRIVATE business activities inside of constitutional state, because these are ANTI-governmental functions, not GOVERNMENTAL functions:
 - 3.1. Seeks to offer civil statuses or civil statuses or privileges within constitutional states. See:

Challenge to Income Tax Enforcement Authority Within Constitutional States of the Union, Form #05.052
<https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
 - 3.2. Seeks to alienate rights that are supposed to be unalienable. See:

Unalienable Rights Course, Form #12.038
<https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
 - 3.3. Seeks to convert PRIVATE property protected by the Constitution to PUBLIC property, privileges, and franchises. The MOST IMPORTANT function of any real government is to protect PRIVATE property from being converted to PUBLIC property. See:

Separation Between Public and Private Course, Form #12.025
<https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
 - 3.4. Offering Social Security, Medicare, income tax, or any other federal program within a constitutional state certainly fits within the above. This is proven in:

Why You Aren't Eligible for Social Security, Form #06.001
<https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
4. The only way anyone, whether human or artificial, can become UNEQUAL or inferior in any way to any other person or human being is to LAWFULLY CONSENT in a manner that they and no one else prescribes and defines, and to do so ONLY in geographical places outside the states of the Union where constitutional rights are NOT unalienable, such as federal territory or abroad. See:

Requirement for Consent, Form #05.003
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
5. That any attempt to establish or enforce franchises or civil statutory privileges within the constitutional states is a direct attack on the equality of those it is targeted against and an "invasion" of the states in violation of Article 4, Section 4 of the Constitution if the franchise is offered within a constitutional state. See:

Government Instituted Slavery Using Franchises, Form #05.030
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

The implication of the above is that no creation of men, including a government of delegated powers, can have any more authority or powers than a single man. The United States government is a government of delegated power ALONE, as declared by the U.S. Supreme Court, and The People CANNOT delegate any authority that they themselves do not INDIVIDUALLY also possess.

"The question is not what power the federal government ought to have, but what powers, in fact, have been given by the people... The federal union is a government of delegated powers. It has only such as are expressly conferred upon it, and such as are reasonably to be implied from those granted. In this respect, we differ radically from nations where all legislative power, without restriction or limitation, is vested in a parliament or other legislative body subject to no restriction except the discretion of its members." (Congress) [U.S. v. William M. Butler, 297 U.S. 1 (1936)]

Equality of rights is the foundation of ALL of your freedom, as held by the U.S. Supreme Court. Anyone who insists that they SHOULD NOT be treated equally IN EVERY RESPECT to a government in a civil court is essentially admitting that they DO NOT want to be "free" as the U.S. Supreme Court defines it:

"But arbitrary selection can never be justified by calling it classification. The equal protection demanded by the fourteenth amendment forbids this. No language is more worthy of frequent and thoughtful consideration than these words of Mr. Justice Matthews, speaking for this court, in Yick Wo v. Hopkins, 118 U.S. 356, 369, 6 S. Sup. Ct. 1064, 1071: 'When we consider the nature and the theory of our institutions of government, the principles upon which they are supposed to rest, and review the history of their development, we are constrained to conclude that they do not mean to leave room for the play and action of purely personal and arbitrary power.' The first official action of this nation declared the foundation of government in these words: 'We hold these truths to be self-evident, [165 U.S. 150, 160] that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.' While such declaration of principles may not have the force of organic law, or be made the basis of judicial decision as to the limits of right and duty, and while in all cases reference must be had to the organic law of the nation for such

1 *limits, yet the latter is but the body and the letter of which the former is the thought and the spirit, and it is always*
2 *safe to read the letter of the constitution in the spirit of the Declaration of Independence. **No duty rests more***
3 ***imperatively upon the courts than the enforcement of those constitutional provisions intended to secure that***
4 ***equality of rights which is the foundation of free government.***
5 [*Gulf, C. & S. F. R. Co. v. Ellis, [165 U.S. 150](#) (1897)*]

6 No government can or should therefore have any more authority than a single man. Anyone who insists otherwise is:

7 1. Establishing a state-sponsored religion in violation of the First Amendment. See:

Socialism: The New American Civil Religion, Form #05.016
<https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

8 2. Imputing “supernatural powers” to government, because the ONLY “natural” source are the people protected by said
9 government from whom all the powers of the government derive.

10 3. Committing paganism and idolatry towards governments and/or civil rulers. The foundation of this idolatry are the
11 “supernatural powers” that form the basis for establishing a state-sponsored civil religion that worships, serves, and
12 obeys corrupt governments or civil rulers instead of the one and only living God.

13 *“**Religion.** Man's relation to Divinity, to reverence, **worship**, obedience, and **submission to mandates and***
14 ***precepts** of supernatural or superior beings. In its broadest sense includes all forms of **belief in the existence of***
15 ***superior beings exercising power over human beings by volition, imposing rules of conduct, with future***
16 ***rewards and punishments. Bond uniting man to God, and a virtue whose purpose is to render God worship***
17 ***due him as source of all being and principle of all government of things.** Nikulnikoff v. Archbishop, etc., of*
18 *Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church, 142 Misc. 894, 255 N.Y.S. 653, 663.”*
19 [*Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 1292*]

20 4. An elitist.

21 5. A fool.

22 6. What the soviets called a “Useful Idiot” for socialist tyrants.

23 Consistent with the above, the franchise protecting me and mentioned in Enclosure (3) later confirms that its main purpose is
24 to ensure the EQUALITY of all rights in every respect between a single human being and an entire government. This could
25 hardly be referred to as elitist in any respect, unless of course YOU are the elitist who wants a big government that acts as a
26 nanny state and has rights above ALL:

Injury Defense Franchise and Agreement, Form #06.027
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

27 The implication of COMPLETE equality between each separate human being and an entire government is that if a government
28 claims “sovereign immunity” and insists that it cannot be sued without its express written consent, then the government, in
29 turn, when it is enforcing any civil liability against ANY American, has the EQUAL burden to produce evidence of consent
30 IN WRITING to be sued. That consent must, in turn, be given by a person domiciled in a place OTHER than that protected
31 by the Constitution, because the Declaration of Independence says the rights of people in states of the Union are “unalienable”,
32 which means they CANNOT be sold, bargained away, or transferred by ANY process, including a franchise or contract.

33 *“We hold these truths to be self-evident, that **all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator***
34 ***with certain unalienable Rights**, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.--That to secure*
35 *these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed,*
36 *--“*
37 [*Declaration of Independence*]

38 *“Unalienable. Inalienable; incapable of being aliened, that is, sold and transferred.”*
39 [*Black's Law Dictionary, Fourth Edition, p. 1693*]

40 Therefore, the only people who can lawfully “alienate” any Constitutional right in relation to a real, de jure government by
41 exercising their right to contract, are those **NOT** protected by the Constitution and who therefore are either domiciled on
42 federal territory or situated abroad, which also is not protected by the Constitution.

43 To me, there is ONLY ONE law, which is the two Great Commandments spoken of by Jesus:

44 *Then one of the scribes came, and having heard them reasoning together, perceiving that He had answered them*
45 *well, asked Him, "Which is the first commandment of all?"*

1 *Jesus answered him, "The first of all the commandments is: "Hear, O Israel, the LORD our God, the LORD is*
2 *one. And you shall love the LORD your God with all your heart, with all your soul, with all your mind, and*
3 *with all your strength. This is the first commandment. And the second, like it, is this: "You shall love your*
4 *neighbor as yourself. There is no other commandment greater than these."*

5 *So the scribe said to Him, "Well said, Teacher. You have spoken the truth, for there is one God, and there is no*
6 *other but He. And to love Him with all the heart, with all the understanding, with all the soul, and with all the*
7 *strength, and to love one's neighbor as oneself, is more than all the whole burnt offerings and sacrifices."*
8 [[Mark 12:28-33](#), Bible, NKJV]

9 I fulfill the above commandments by educating people about law and helping them obey and enforce it so as to help them
10 honor the two main requirements of the common law, which are:

- 11 1. Do not harm the equal rights of your neighbor. The term "neighbor" includes "government", which is just an artificial
12 entity created by men. This is a fulfillment of the second Great Commandment above to love your neighbor as
13 yourself.
- 14 2. Honor all contracts and commitments you make.

15 Therefore, my mission, when you merge the requirements of God's Law and Man's law is:

- 16 1. Do not harm the equal rights of your neighbor. The term "neighbor" includes "government", which is just an artificial
17 entity created by men. This is a fulfillment of the second Great Commandment above to love your neighbor as
18 yourself.
- 19 2. Honor all contracts and commitments you make.
- 20 3. Enforce the requirement for consent in all interactions between everyone, including between any government or civil
21 ruler and "the governed". Emphasize that the MAIN purpose of government is to prosecute those who injure others
22 without the consent of the injured:

Requirement for Consent, Form #05.003
FORMS PAGE: <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
DIRECT LINK: <http://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/Consent.pdf>

- 23 4. Do not respect, subsidize, or cooperate with any effort to enforce or impute any more rights to a government or civil
24 ruler than the people individually themselves have. Otherwise, the first Great Commandment above has been violated
25 because idolatry and a state sponsored religion has been established. This is described in:

Socialism: The New American Civil Religion, Form #05.016
FORMS PAGE: <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
DIRECT LINK: <http://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/SocialismCivilReligion.pdf>

- 26 5. Do not allow the government to make those protected, meaning "citizens" and "residents", into a public officer, and
27 therefore to serve TWO masters, because this is not only idolatry, but a violation of the [separation of powers](#) between
28 what is public and what is private.

29 *"No servant [or religious ministry or biological person] can serve **two masters**; for either he will hate the one*
30 *and love the other, or else he will be loyal to the one and despise the other. **You cannot serve God and mammon***
31 ***[government]."***
32 [[Luke 16:13](#), Bible, NKJV]

33 *The origin of the great divide between the Civil law and Criminal law is the requirement for "consent of the*
34 *governed". Criminal law does not require consent while Civil law does. One becomes subject to the civil law by*
35 *voluntarily choosing a domicile within a specific jurisdiction. This process of choice is called "animus manendi"*
36 *and it cannot be compelled. Its purpose is to politically associate with a specific group and to procure the*
37 *protection of that group and it is an exercise of your First Amendment right to politically associate.*

38 *"The rights of the individuals are restricted only to the extent that they have been voluntarily surrendered by the*
39 *citizenship to the agencies of government."*
40 [*City of Dallas v. Mitchell*, 245 S.W. 944]

41 *"Undoubtedly no single nation can change the law of the sea. That law is of universal obligation, and no statute*
42 *of one or two nations can create obligations for the world. **Like all the laws of nations, it rests upon the common***
43 ***consent of civilized communities."***
44 [*The Scotia*, 81 U.S. (14 Wall.) 170 (1871)]

45 All civil laws passed by the government are an implementation of what the courts call the "social compact".

1 *"In Europe, the executive is synonymous with the sovereign power of a state...where it is too commonly acquired*
2 *by force or fraud, or both...In America, however the case is widely different. **Our government is founded upon***
3 ***compact [consent expressed in a written contract called a Constitution or in positive law]. Sovereignty was,***
4 ***and is, in the people [as individuals: that's you!]."***
5 *[Glass v. The Sloop Betsy, 3 (U.S.) Dall 6]*

6 A "compact" is the equivalent of a contract.

7 *"**Compact**, n. An agreement or contract between persons, nations, or states. Commonly applied to working*
8 *agreements between and among states concerning matters of mutual concern. A contract between parties, which*
9 *creates obligations and rights capable of being enforced and contemplated as such between the parties, in their*
10 *distinct and independent characters. A mutual consent of parties concerned respecting some property or right*
11 *that is the object of the stipulation, or something that is to be done or forborne. See also Compact clause;*
12 *Confederacy; Interstate compact; Treaty."*
13 *[Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 281]*

14 You become a party to the "social compact" by voluntarily choosing a civil domicile within the jurisdiction of a specific
15 government. This choice makes you a consenting party to the "social compact" and is an exercise of your First Amendment
16 right to politically associate. One's domicile is the civil law you consent to be subject to. The Declaration of Independence
17 says that ALL the just authority of government derives from the consent of the governed.

18 Implicit in the exercise of the right to associate is the right NOT to associate with ANY group if one so chooses. Those who
19 never choose such a domicile and never politically and legally associate are not subject to the civil laws of that jurisdiction
20 and instead are described by any of the following names:

- 21 1. "nonresidents"
- 22 2. "transient foreigners"
- 23 3. "stateless persons"
- 24 4. "in transitu"
- 25 5. "transient"
- 26 6. "sojourner"

27 Hence, you can be governed CIVILLY only if you consent to be governed. Obviously, the criminal law does not require
28 consent of the governed, but the civil law DOES. The vast majority of law published by government is civil law and even
29 tax crimes are really PENAL rather than CRIMINAL in nature, and therefore are voluntary for those who are nonresident.

30 Some laws are civil in nature while others are criminal. Criminal laws apply to EVERYONE physically present on the
31 territory of the government whether they consent or not, while civil laws only apply to those who choose a domicile on that
32 territory. All franchises and the excise taxes that implement them are civil in nature and therefore "activate" or "acquire the
33 force of law" ONLY by your voluntary choice of domicile. Even the criminal provisions of the tax laws, for instance, are in
34 fact civil franchises that are penal rather than criminal in nature. An example of this are the so-called "criminal" provisions
35 of the Internal Revenue Code. All income taxes are civil franchises and a civil liabilities that attach to one's VOLUNTARY
36 choice of civil domicile. This is covered in:

<p><i>The "Trade or Business" Scam</i>, Form #05.001 http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm</p>
--

37 Hence, the criminal provisions of the I.R.C. in fact are CIVIL and PENAL provisions that acquire the "force of law" based
38 on domicile on federal territory not within the jurisdiction of any state of the Union. Furthermore, you CANNOT lawfully
39 acquire a domicile in a place you have never been physically present in and most Americans have never been physically
40 present on federal territory.

41 I am therefore not saying that I am ABOVE any law, but simply that a large component of what most Americans think of as
42 "law" is really just a voluntary franchise or what the courts call a "compact" that you FIRST must volunteer for before you
43 can be subject to. It is NOT a crime to NOT volunteer for the "benefits" of such franchises or compacts. The courts have
44 routinely held, in fact, that the exercise of any right cannot be penalized or criminalized if the result does not harm the equal
45 rights of any specific person:

46 *"It is an unconstitutional deprivation of due process for the government to penalize a person merely because he*
47 *has exercised a protected statutory or constitutional right. United States v. Goodwin, [457 U.S. 368](#), 372 , 102*
48 *S.Ct. 2485, 2488, 73 L.Ed.2d. 74 (1982)."*

1 [People of Territory of Guam v. Fegurgur, 800 F.2d. 1470 (9th Cir. 1986)]

2 "Where rights secured by the Constitution there can be no rule making or legislation which would abrogate
3 them."

4 [Miranda v. Arizona, 384 U.S. 436, 491 (1966)]

5 A classic book on the common law written by a Harvard Law professor admits that all franchises, in fact, are not "law" in a
6 classical sense, but rather "compacts". The implication is that anyone who calls a franchise "law" is LYING to you, keeping
7 in mind that the income tax is a franchise:

8 "Municipal law, thus understood, is properly defined to be "a rule of civil conduct prescribed by the supreme
9 power in a state, commanding what is right and prohibiting what is wrong."

10 [. . .]

11 It is also called a rule to distinguish it from a compact or agreement; for a compact is a promise proceeding
12 from us, law is a command directed to us. The language of a compact is, "I will, or will not, do this"; that of a
13 law is, "thou shalt, or shalt not, do it." It is true there is an obligation which a compact carries with it, equal
14 in point of conscience to that of a law; but then the original of the obligation is different. In compacts we
15 ourselves determine and promise what shall be done, before we are obliged to do it; in laws, we are obliged to
16 act without ourselves determining or promising anything at all. Upon these accounts law is defined to be "a
17 rule."

18 [*Readings on the History and System of the Common Law, Roscoe Pound, Second Edition, 1925, p. 4*]

19 The issue is NOT whether government should GOVERN and thereby satisfy the purpose of its creation, but rather whether:

- 20 1. Any government can civilly govern those who expressly do NOT consent. By "civilly govern", we mean enforce any
21 portion of the CIVIL statutory laws upon them. The Declaration of Independence specifically says NO, because it says
22 that all JUST powers of [CIVIL] government derive from the EXPRESS consent of the people.
- 23 2. A government that only protects PUBLIC property and refuses to recognize or PROTECT EXCLUSIVELY PRIVATE
24 property is really NOT a "government". Right now, the only way they will protect it is if you donate it to the
25 government and become the QUALIFIED owner rather than the ABSOLUTE owner.
- 26 3. Any CIVIL government should have a MONOPOLY on civilly governing. The Declaration of Independence says they
27 DO NOT and that we have a DUTY to provide "better safeguards for our future security" when rulers become corrupt
28 or the government ceases to protect PRIVATE rights.
- 29 4. Any government, by promoting a monopoly on "protection", can prohibit anyone else from CIVILLY governing any
30 aspect of their lives that they deem to be EXCLUSIVELY PRIVATE, and thereby beyond the control of government.
- 31 5. By civilly governing, any government can abuse its authority to enact CIVIL law to impose any kind of duty, regulation,
32 or tax upon the populace that EXPLICITLY and EMPHATICALLY REFUSE to be "club members" called "citizens",
33 "residents", or "domiciliaries."
- 34 6. Whether a so-called "government" must recognize and protect the First Amendment right to NOT legally or politically
35 associate with the government where they are at from a civil perspective and not be subject to the civil statutory "rules"
36 established by that group, but only to the common law and the constitution.
- 37 7. It is a violation of the legislative intent of the Constitution or constitutes duress to implement any of the following:
38 7.1. Ensure that NO POWERS are delegated or reserved to the people to govern their own lives as required by the
39 Ninth and Tenth Amendment by destroying all such authority by illegally enforced or imposed franchises.
- 40 7.2. Compel people to be subject to a "social compact" and therefore contract that they don't consent to.
41 Governments are created to protect your right to both contract and not be compelled to contract.
- 42 7.3. Interfere with self-government by the people.

43 "The determination of the Framers Convention and the ratifying conventions to preserve complete and
44 unimpaired state self-government in all matters not committed to the general government is one of the plainest
45 facts which emerges from the history of their deliberations. And adherence to that determination is incumbent
46 equally upon the federal government and the states. State powers can neither be appropriated on the one hand
47 nor abdicated on the other. As this court said in Texas v. White, 7 Wall. 700, 725, 'The preservation of the
48 States, and the maintenance of their governments, are as much within the design and care of the Constitution
49 as the preservation of the Union and the maintenance of the National government. The Constitution, in all its
50 provisions, looks to an indestructible Union, composed of indestructible States.' Every journey to a forbidden end
51 begins with the first step; and the danger of such a step by the federal government in the direction of taking over
52 the powers of the states is that the end of the journey may find the states so despoiled of their powers, or-what
53 may amount to the same thing-so [298 U.S. 238, 296] relieved of the responsibilities which possession of the
54 powers necessarily enjoins, as to reduce them to little more than geographical subdivisions of the national
55 domain. It is safe to say that if, when the Constitution was under consideration, it had been thought that any such
56 danger lurked behind its plain words, it would never have been ratified.

1 And the Constitution itself is in every real sense a law-the lawmakers being the people themselves, in whom
2 under our system all political power and sovereignty XE "SOVEREIGNTY: Political power and sovereignty"
3 primarily resides, and through whom such power and sovereignty primarily speaks. It is by that law, and not
4 otherwise, that the legislative, executive, and judicial agencies which it created exercise such political authority
5 as they have been permitted to possess. The Constitution speaks for itself in terms so plain that to
6 misunderstand their import is not rationally possible. 'We the People of the United States,' it says, 'do ordain
7 and establish this Constitution.' Ordain and establish! These are definite words of enactment, and without more
8 would stamp what follows with the dignity and character of law. The framers of the Constitution, however, were
9 not content to let the matter rest here, but provided explicitly-'This Constitution, and the Laws of the United
10 States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof; ... shall be the supreme Law of the Land.' (Const. art. 6, cl.
11 2.) The supremacy of the Constitution as law is thus declared without qualification. That supremacy is
12 absolute; the supremacy of a statute enacted by Congress is not absolute but conditioned upon its being made
13 in pursuance of the Constitution. And a judicial tribunal, clothed by that instrument with complete judicial
14 power, and, therefore, by the very nature of the power, required to ascertain and apply the law to the facts in
15 every case or proceeding properly brought for adjudication, must apply the supreme law and reject the inferior
16 stat- [298 U.S. 238, 297] ute whenever the two conflict. In the discharge of that duty, the opinion of the lawmakers
17 that a statute passed by them is valid must be given great weight, Adkins v. Children's Hospital, 261 U.S. 525,
18 544, 43 S.Ct. 394, 24 A.L.R. 1238; but their opinion, or the court's opinion, that the statute will prove greatly or
19 generally beneficial is wholly irrelevant to the inquiry. Schechter Poultry Corp. v. United States, 295 U.S. 495,
20 549, 550 S., 55 S.Ct. 837, 97 A.L.R. 947. "

21 [Carter v. Carter Coal Co., 298 U.S. 238 (1936)]

22 I think the very definition of "anarchy" is governments and/or civil rulers who:

- 23 • Claim and protect their own sovereign immunity, but refuse to recognize the same EQUAL
- 24 immunity of the people from whom that power was delegated to begin with. Hypocrites.
- 25 • Are not directly accountable to the people or the law. They prohibit the PEOPLE from
- 26 criminally prosecuting their own crimes, reserving the right to prosecute to their own fellow
- 27 criminals. Who polices the police? THE CRIMINALS.
- 28 • Have a monopoly on anything, INCLUDING "protection", and who turn that monopoly into a
- 29 mechanism to force EVERYONE to become uncompensated public officers in exchange for the
- 30 "privilege" of being able to even exist or earn a living to support oneself.
- 31 • Can tax and spend any amount or percentage of the people's earnings over the OBJECTIONS of
- 32 the people.
- 33 • Can print, meaning illegally counterfeit, as much money as they want to fund their criminal
- 34 enterprise, and thus to be completely free from accountability to the people.
- 35 • Impute to themselves more rights or method of acquiring rights than the people themselves have.
- 36 In other words, who are the object of PAGAN IDOL WORSHIP because they possess
- 37 "supernatural" powers. By "supernatural", we mean that which is superior to the "natural",
- 38 which is ordinary human beings.
- 39 • Only enforce the law against others and NOT themselves, as a way to protect their own criminal
- 40 activities by persecuting dissidents. This is called "selective enforcement". In the legal field it
- 41 is also called "professional courtesy". Never kill the goose that lays the STOLEN golden eggs.
- 42 • Deceive and/or lie to the public with impunity by telling you that you can't trust anything they
- 43 say, but force YOU to sign everything under penalty of perjury when you want to talk to them.
- 44 26 U.S.C. §6065.
- 45 • Can enact or enforce any law that they themselves are not subject to. This is a violation of the
- 46 Constitutional requirement for equal protection and equal treatment.

47 The above type of "lawlessness" by de facto government actors is the SAME "lawlessness" that Jesus criticized the Pharisees
48 (lawyers) for in the Holy Bible.

49 *"Woe to you, scribes [religious leaders] and Pharisees [lawyers], hypocrites! For you cleanse the outside of the*
50 *cup and dish [OTHER people], but inside they are full of extortion and self-indulgence. Blind [to their own sin]*
51 *Pharisee, first cleanse the inside of the cup and dish, that the outside of them may be clean also.*

52 "Woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! For you are like whitewashed tombs which indeed appear
53 beautiful outwardly, but inside are full of dead men's bones and all uncleanness. Even so you also outwardly
54 appear righteous to men, but inside you are full of hypocrisy and lawlessness.
55 [Matt. 23:1-36, Bible, NKJV]

1 The ONLY thing Jesus and God ever got visibly angry at was the hypocrisy, inequity, and irresponsibility of the Pharisees,
2 so it MUST be important for you who are lawyers to understand and eliminate this hypocrisy.

3 If you would like to know more about how the government is LYING TO YOU by calling any franchise such as the income
4 tax “law” when in fact it is NOT “law” in order to deceive people into obeying it who in fact can choose NOT to be subject
5 to it, please read:

Government Instituted Slavery Using Franchises, Form #05.030

<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

6 **3. DETAILS OF CHANGE IN MY LEGAL DOMICILE/CITIZENSHIP AND PERSONAL** 7 **ALLEGIANCE RECORDS**

8 Ref. (1) contains facts and evidence that explains that choosing a domicile is an entirely voluntary act that cannot lawfully be
9 compelled, because it amounts to an exercise of the protected [First Amendment](#) right of free political association. Domicile
10 is not simply a by-product of physical presence somewhere, but has two criteria in order to establish it:

- 11 1. Physical presence in a place either currently or in the past. AND
- 12 2. An intent to not only remain there, but to have voluntary, consensual political allegiance to the people and the laws of
13 that place.

14 The above is consistent with the requirement that minors and incompetent persons may not declare a domicile, but take on
15 the domicile of their caregivers: Because they are incapable of giving informed consent. The allegiance and “intention”
16 (consent) to make a place one’s domicile cannot be compelled. This was confirmed by the U.S. Supreme Court when it said:

17 *“The [domiciled] citizen cannot complain [about the civil laws or the tax system], because he has voluntarily*
18 *submitted himself to such a form of government [by choosing a domicile therein]. He owes allegiance to the*
19 *two departments, so to speak, and within their respective spheres must pay the penalties which each exacts for*
20 *disobedience to its laws. In return, he can demand protection from each within its own jurisdiction.”*

21 *[United States v. Cruikshank, 92 U.S. 542 (1875) (emphasis added)]*

22 If the choice of domicile is compelled, if the requirement for consent and intent is removed from domicile so that only physical
23 presence determines it, then those instituting the duress or making the false presumption of domicile inconsistent with the
24 wishes of the subject or with stare decisis on this subject are:

- 25 1. Engaging in criminal racketeering and extortion, by forcing me to nominate you as my protector and pay “protection
26 money” at gunpoint called “taxes”. In effect, you are compelling me, under threat of illegal actions directed against my
27 life, liberty, and property, to pay “protection money” to a terrorist de facto private corporation masquerading as a lawful
28 government in violation of [18 U.S.C. §1951](#). This is a RICO violation of the highest order.
- 29 2. Interfering with local and personal self-government, which was and is central to the legislative intent of the United States
30 Constitution:

31 *“The determination of the Framers Convention and the ratifying conventions to preserve complete and*
32 *unimpaired state [and personal] self-government in all matters not committed to the general government is*
33 *one of the plainest facts which emerges from the history of their deliberations. And adherence to that*
34 *determination is incumbent equally upon the federal government and the states.”*

35 *[Carter v. Carter Coal Co., 298 U.S. 238 (1936)]*

- 36 3. Instituting slavery and involuntary servitude, by expecting the target of the presumption to satisfy the obligations of a
37 legal status and relation that he never consented to. This violates the [Thirteenth Amendment](#), [42 U.S.C. §1994](#), and [18](#)
38 [U.S.C. §1581](#).
- 39 4. Violating due process of law by prejudicing constitutionally protected rights of the person who is the object of the
40 presumption.

41 *(1) [8:4993] Conclusive presumptions affecting protected interests:*

42 *A conclusive presumption may be defeated where its application would impair a party's constitutionally-protected*
43 *liberty or property interests. In such cases, conclusive presumptions have been held to violate a party's due*
44 *process and equal protection rights. [Vlandis v. Kline (1973) 412 U.S. 441, 449, 93 S.Ct. 2230, 2235; Cleveland*

1 *Bed. of Ed. v. LaFleur (1974) 414 U.S. 632, 639-640, 94 S.Ct. 1208, 1215-presumption under Illinois law that*
2 *unmarried fathers are unfit violates process]*
3 *[Federal Civil Trials and Evidence, Rutter Group, paragraph 8:4993, p. 8K-34]*

- 4 5. Engaging in “compelled association” in violation of the [First Amendment](#), by compelling a person to associate with a
5 “state” and/or a government that he does not wish to associate with.
6 6. Interfering with my private right to contract. The Bible identifies itself as a covenant, promise, and “protection” contract
7 between me and my God. I have every right to choose who my EXCLUSIVE protector is.

8 *"For the LORD is our Judge, the LORD is our Lawgiver, the LORD is our King; He will save [and protect] us."*
9 *[Isaiah 33:22, Bible, NKJV]*

10 The U.S. Constitution says in Article 1, Section 10 that states may not interfere with the enforcement of contracts. The
11 U.S. Supreme Court has said that the federal government may not either:

12 *"Independent of these views, there are many considerations which lead to the conclusion that the power to*
13 *impair contracts [either the Constitution or the Holy Bible], by direct action to that end, does not exist with the*
14 *general [federal] government. In the first place, one of the objects of the Constitution, expressed in its*
15 *preamble, was the establishment of justice, and what that meant in its relations to contracts is not left, as was*
16 *justly said by the late Chief Justice, in Hepburn v. Griswold, to inference or conjecture. As he observes, at the*
17 *time the Constitution was undergoing discussion in the convention, the Congress of the Confederation was*
18 *engaged in framing the ordinance for the government of the Northwestern Territory, in which certain articles of*
19 *compact were established between the people of the original States and the people of the Territory, for the*
20 *purpose, as expressed in the instrument, of extending the fundamental principles of civil and religious liberty,*
21 *upon which the States, their laws and constitutions, were erected. By that ordinance it was declared, that, in the*
22 *just preservation of rights and property, 'no law ought ever to be made, or have force in the said Territory, that*
23 *shall, in any manner, interfere with or affect private contracts or engagements bona fide and without fraud*
24 *previously formed.'* *The same provision, adds the Chief Justice, found more condensed expression in the*
25 *prohibition upon the States [in Article 1, Section 10 of the Constitution] against impairing the obligation of*
26 *contracts, which has ever been recognized as an efficient safeguard against injustice; and though the prohibition*
27 *is not applied in terms to the government of the United States, he expressed the opinion, speaking for himself and*
28 *the majority of the court at the time, that it was clear 'that those who framed and those who adopted the*
29 *Constitution intended that the spirit of this prohibition should pervade the entire body of legislation, and that*
30 *the justice which the Constitution was ordained to establish was not thought by them to be compatible with*
31 *legislation [or judicial precedent] of an opposite tendency.'* *8 Wall. 623. [99 U.S. 700, 765] Similar views are*
32 *found expressed in the opinions of other judges of this court."*
33 *[Sinking Fund Cases, 99 U.S. 700 (1878)]*

34 I am a Christian, and as a Christian, my God says that it amounts to idolatry to put myself under any king, ruler, or earthly
35 government. I must be served from below, not ruled from above as the King and Priest God appointed me to be per Rev. 5:9-
36 10. Either you put me in charge of the government as the Sovereign fiduciary and ambassador of my Lord, or you can take
37 your pagan socialist government that worships and glorifies men and money and power and remove it and yourself to a
38 country where you will not be violating God's law, the people's rights and the Constitution of the United States of America.
39 Therefore, my religious beliefs and practices compel me to:

- 40 1. Claim the same sovereign immunity as you do. In America, the government is a government of delegated powers alone
41 that came from the people as individuals. The sovereign People cannot delegate an authority they don't have, nor can
42 the government they created for their own protection claim any right or authority that they themselves do not ALSO
43 possess, including sovereign immunity. Therefore, if you are going to insist on any obligation, you will have to produce
44 an express written waiver of sovereign immunity signed both by me AND the government, and prove that I am domiciled
45 on federal territory outside of the protection of the Constitution for the waiver to be effective. On land protected by the
46 Constitution, rights are “unalienable” so that even if I did contract them away, the act would be a nullity and not surrender
47 any rights. An “unalienable right” is one that cannot be sold, bargained away, or transferred by any commercial process,
48 including a franchise.

49 *"The Government of the United States is one of delegated powers alone. Its authority is defined and limited by*
50 *the Constitution. All powers not granted to it by that instrument are reserved to the States or the people."*
51 *[United States v. Cruikshank, 92 U.S. 542 (1875)]*

52
53 *"Whatever these Constitutions and laws validly determine to be property, it is the duty of the Federal Government,*
54 *through the domain of jurisdiction merely Federal, to recognize to be property.*

1 "*And this principle follows from the structure of the respective Governments, State and Federal, and their*
2 *reciprocal relations. **They are different agents and trustees of the people of the several States, appointed with***
3 ***different powers and with distinct purposes, but whose acts, within the scope of their respective jurisdictions,***
4 ***are mutually obligatory.**"*
5 [*Dred Scott v. Sandford, 60 U.S. 393 (1856)*]

6

7 "*You [Jesus] are worthy to take the scroll,*
8 *And to open its seals;*
9 *For You were slain,*
10 ***And have redeemed us to God by Your blood***
11 *Out of every tribe and tongue and people and nation,*
12 ***And have made us kings and priests to our God;***
13 ***And we shall reign on the earth.***
14 [[Rev. 5:9-10](#), Bible, NKJV]

- 15 2. Completely disassociate with all earthly governments and rulers and to accept ONLY God as my King, Lawgiver, and
16 Judge.

17 "*For the LORD is our Judge,*
18 *The LORD is our Lawgiver,*
19 *The LORD is our King;*
20 *He will save [and protect] us."*
21 [[Isaiah 33:22](#), Bible, NKJV]

- 22 3. Formally change my domicile to that of the Kingdom of God and not within any man-made government.
23 4. Recognize, obey, and cooperate ONLY with the enforcement of God's Holy Law and the Holy Bible and not any civil
24 law system. God's law therefore forms the only basis for "choice of law" within the context of all civil litigation that
25 involves me pursuant to:
26 4.1. God's Laws found in the memorandum of law below:
27 [Laws of the Bible, Form #13.001](#)
28 <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
29 4.2. [Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 17\(b\)](#)
30 4.3. [Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 44.1](#)
31 5. Follow the example of Jesus, who declared that he had no domicile within any man-made government and was a
32 "transient foreigner". See the following:

33 "*Then a certain scribe came and said to Him, "Teacher, I will follow You wherever You go." And Jesus said to*
34 *him, "Foxes have holes and birds of the air have nests, but the Son of Man has nowhere to lay His head [NO*
35 *domicile]."*
36 [[Matt. 8:19-20](#), Bible, NKJV]

- 37 6. Follow the leadings of the spirit, and thereby escape the dictates of the civil but not criminal law:

38 "*But if you are led by the Spirit, you are not under the law [man's law, because you have no domicile]."*
39 [[Gal. 5:18](#), Bible, NKJV]

- 40 7. Follow the example of my Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ, by adopting anarchy as my only form of *self-government*. See:

[Jesus Is an Anarchist, James Redford](#)
<http://famguardian.org/Subjects/Spirituality/ChurchvState/JesusAnarchist.htm>

41 To practice of anarchy is not harmful or chaotic, but instead implies to live without any earthly ruler by surrendering
42 governance of my life to God Himself and becoming His fiduciary, and relying only on God's Laws in the Holy Bible
43 and other believers as the method of settling disputes:

44 "*Main Entry: **an-ar-chy***
45 *Function: noun*

46 *Etymology: Medieval Latin anarchia, from Greek, from anarchos **having no [earthly] ruler,***
47 *from an- + archos ruler -- more at [ARCH](#)."*
48 [Source: Merriam Webster Dictionary]

1 8. Become a fiduciary of God, who is a "[nontaxpayer](#)", and therefore becoming a "nontaxpayer". My legal status takes on
2 the character of the sovereign who I represent pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 17(b). Therefore, I become a
3 "[foreign diplomat](#)".

4 "***For God is the King of all the earth; Sing praises with understanding.***"
5 [[Psalm 47:7](#), Bible, NKJV]

6 "*For the LORD is our Judge, the LORD is our Lawgiver, the LORD is our King; He will save [and protect] us.*"
7 [[Isaiah 33:22](#), Bible, NKJV]

8 9. Become or restore my lawful civil legal status as a statutory "[Non-resident non-person](#)" and a CONSTITUTIONAL but
9 not STATUTORY "citizen" pursuant to federal law. The reason this must be so is that a *statutory* "[citizen of the United](#)
10 [States](#)" (who are all born in and residing within or domiciled within exclusive federal jurisdiction under [8 U.S.C. §1401](#))
11 may not be classified as an instrumentality of a foreign state under [28 U.S.C. §1332](#)(c) and (d) and [28 U.S.C. §1603](#)(b).
12 I am a "citizen" under the Fourteenth Amendment because I was born within a state of the Union, but not a "citizen"
13 under [8 U.S.C. §1401](#) because not born on federal territory. States of the Union and federal territories are part of two
14 separate, mutually exclusive jurisdictions and I cannot permit them to be confused.
15 10. Correct government records to reflect the fact that I am not, and cannot be a statutory "[resident](#)" of any earthly jurisdiction
16 without having a conflict of interest in executing my fiduciary duty to God and violating the first four Commandments
17 of the [Ten Commandments](#) found in [Exodus 20](#). Heaven is my exclusive legal "[domicile](#)", and my "permanent place of
18 abode", and the source of **ALL** of my permanent protection and security. I cannot and should not rely upon man's vain
19 earthly laws as an idolatrous substitute for Gods sovereign laws found in the Bible. Instead, only God's Laws and the
20 Common law, which is derived from God's Law, are the only suitable protection for my God-given rights.

21 "*For I was ashamed to request of the king an escort of soldiers and horsemen to help us against the enemy on*
22 *the road, because we had spoken to the king, saying 'The hand of our God is upon all those for good who seek*
23 *Him, but His power and His wrath are against all those who forsake Him.' So we fasted and entreated our God*
24 *for this, and He answered our prayer.*"
25 [[Ezra 8:21-22](#), Bible, NKJV]

26 11. Become a "Foreign Ambassador" and "Minister of a [Foreign State](#)" called Heaven. The U.S. Supreme Court said in U.S.
27 v. Wong Kim Ark below that "ministers of a foreign state" may not be statutory "citizens of the United States".

28 "***For our citizenship is in heaven [and not earth], from which we also eagerly wait for the Savior, the Lord Jesus***
29 ***Christ***"
30 [[Philippians 3:20](#), Bible, NKJV]

31 "***I am a stranger in the earth; Do not hide Your commandments [laws] from me.***"
32 [[Psalm 119:19](#), Bible, NKJV]

33 "***I have become a stranger to my brothers, and an alien to my mother's children; because zeal for Your [God's]***
34 ***house has eaten me up, and the reproaches of those who reproach You have fallen on me.***"
35 [[Psalm 69:8-9](#), Bible, NKJV]

36 "*And Mr. Justice Miller, delivering the opinion of the court [legislating from the bench, in this case], in analyzing*
37 *the first clause [of the [Fourteenth Amendment](#)], observed that "***the phrase 'subject to the jurisdiction thereof'****
38 ***was intended to exclude from its operation children of ministers, consuls, and citizens or subjects of foreign***
39 ***states, born within the United States.***"
40 [*U.S. v. Wong Kim Ark*, [169 U.S. 649](#), 18 S.Ct. 456; 42 L.Ed. 890 (1898)]

41 12. Turn my dwelling into a "Foreign Embassy". Notice I didn't say "residence", because only "[residents](#)" can have a
42 "residence". See Ref. (1) for details on this SCAM.
43 13. You are required by [18 U.S.C. §112](#) and the [Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act of 1976](#) to treat me as a "protected
44 foreign official" of a foreign government called Heaven.
45 14. Become a "[stateless person](#)" immune from the jurisdiction of federal courts. I am "stateless" because I do not maintain
46 a domicile anywhere within any of the "States" YOU have identified as federal territories in [28 U.S.C. §1332](#)(d).
47 Pursuant to [Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 17](#)(b), the only law that may be applied to a "stateless person" is the law of
48 the state where he maintains domicile, which in this case are the laws of God documented in the Holy Bible. These laws
49 are summarized at the address below:
50 http://famguardian.org/Subjects/LawAndGovt/ChurchVState/BibleLawIndex/bl_index.htm
51 15. Terminate participation in any and all commercial franchises offered by any and every government, including marriage
52 licenses, driver's licenses, social security, income taxes, etc. See:

16. Immediately cease all "[commerce](#)" or "intercourse" with the government by sending to it our money or receiving benefits we did not earn. Black's Law Dictionary defines "[commerce](#)" as "intercourse". The Bible defines "the Beast" as the "kings of the earth"/political rulers in Rev. 19:19:

*"And I saw the beast, the kings [heathen political rulers and the unbelieving democratic majorities who control them] of the earth [controlled by Satan], and their armies, gathered together to make war against Him [God] who sat on the horse and against His army."
[Revelation 19:19, Bible, NKJV]*

This is consistent with the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act found in [28 U.S.C. §1605\(a\)\(2\)](#), which says that those who conduct "[commerce](#)" with the "[United States](#)" federal corporation within its legislative jurisdiction thereby surrender their sovereignty. See the following for details: http://travel.state.gov/law/info/judicial/judicial_693.html

My Lord, God, King, and Lawgiver agreed with the above conclusions when He said:

*"Adulterers and adulteresses! Do you now know that friendship [and "citizenship"] with the world [or the governments of the world] is enmity with God? **Whoever therefore wants to be a friend ["citizen" or "taxpayer" or "resident" or "inhabitant"] of the world makes himself an enemy of God.**"
[James 4:4, Bible, NKJV]*

If you would like to know why some pastors agree that I must do this, please listen to the following messages confirming the above:

1. Newbreak Fellowship, Pastor D.J. Marx, July 16, 2013
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=e5kWXvKICcs>
2. Pastor Mike Macintosh of [Horizon Christian Fellowship](#) given on 5/14/2006. He uses the word "aliens", but what he really means is "foreigners". A person who is a "non-resident non-person" is a "foreigner" but not a "foreign person", statutory "alien", or "individual" in relation to the national government.
<http://sedm.org/Aliens-20060514-Macintosh-MothDay.mp3>

The U.S. Supreme Court also ruled that I am ENTITLED to do this, when it said the following when speaking about a person with conflicting allegiances between God and the Government:

*"Much has been said of the paramount duty to the state, a duty to be recognized, it is urged, even though it conflicts with convictions of duty to God. Undoubtedly that duty to the state exists within the domain of power, for government may enforce obedience to laws regardless of scruples. When one's belief collides with the power of the state, the latter is supreme within its sphere and submission or punishment follows. But, in the forum of conscience, duty to a moral power higher than the state has always been maintained. The reservation of that supreme obligation, as a matter of principle, would unquestionably be made by many of our conscientious and law-abiding citizens. The essence of religion is belief in a relation to God involving duties superior to those [283 U.S. 605, 634] arising from any human relation. As was stated by Mr. Justice Field, in Davis v. Beason, [133 U.S. 333, 342](#), 10 S.Ct. 299, 300: 'The term 'religion' has reference to one's views of his relations to his Creator, and to the obligations they impose of reverence for his being and character, and of obedience to his will.' One cannot speak of religious liberty, with proper appreciation of its essential and historic significance, without assuming the existence of a belief in supreme allegiance to the will of God. Professor Macintosh, when pressed by the inquiries put to him, stated what is axiomatic in religious doctrine. And, putting aside dogmas with their particular conceptions of deity, freedom of conscience itself implies respect for an innate conviction of paramount duty. The battle for religious liberty has been fought and won with respect to religious beliefs and practices, which are not in conflict with good order, upon the very ground of the supremacy of conscience within its proper field. What that field is, under our system of government, presents in part a question of constitutional law, and also, in part, one of legislative policy in avoiding unnecessary clashes with the dictates of conscience. There is abundant room for enforcing the requisite authority of law as it is enacted and requires obedience, and for maintaining the conception of the supremacy of law as essential to orderly government, without demanding that either citizens or applicants for citizenship shall assume by oath an obligation to regard allegiance to God as subordinate to allegiance to civil power. The attempt to exact such a promise, and thus to bind one's conscience by the taking of oaths or the submission to tests, has been the cause of many deplorable conflicts. The Congress has sought to avoid such conflicts in this country by respecting our happy tradition. In no sphere of legislation has the intention to prevent such clashes been more conspicuous than in relation to the bearing of arms. It would require strong evidence [283 U.S. 605, 635] that the Congress intended a reversal of its policy in prescribing the general terms of the naturalization oath. I find no such evidence."
[U.S. v. Macintosh, 283 U.S. 605 (1931)]*

Note that this RETROACTIVE declaration of new domicile and allegiance does not constitute or imply:

- 1 1. An abandonment of allegiance to the “state” as a “national” born in a state of the Union, which is a “foreign state”, and
2 a “foreign country” pursuant to [8 U.S.C. §1101](#)(a)(21) and 28 U.S.C. §297(a) and (b).
3 2. A decision of expatriation from the state pursuant to any part of [8 U.S.C. §1481](#)(a)(2) or by any other provision of this
4 section.

5 [TITLE 8 > CHAPTER 12 > SUBCHAPTER III > Part III > § 1481](#)
6 [§ 1481. Loss of nationality by native-born or naturalized citizen; voluntary action; burden of proof; presumptions](#)

7 (a) A person who is a national of the United States whether by birth or naturalization, shall lose his nationality
8 by voluntarily performing any of the following acts with the intention of relinquishing United States nationality—

9 (1) obtaining naturalization in a foreign state upon his own application or upon an application filed by a duly
10 authorized agent, after having attained the age of eighteen years; or

11 (2) taking an oath or making an affirmation or other formal declaration of allegiance to a foreign state or a
12 political subdivision thereof, after having attained the age of eighteen years; or

13 Since this voluntary decision of mine is a fulfillment of my religious beliefs and an exercise of religious liberty protected by
14 the [First Amendment](#), you cannot lawfully punish me in said exercise by, for instance, taking away my citizenship by birth
15 or naturalization because my allegiance to God (heavenly citizenship) or His laws (heavenly domicile) assumes a role
16 SUPERIOR to that of the state. You will note that my religion COMMANDS me to take oaths to my Lord and Savior and
17 ONLY to Him. To wit:

18 “You shall fear the LORD your God and serve Him, and shall take oaths [to Him and] in His name.”
19 [[Deut. 6:13](#), Bible, NKJV]

20
21 “Again you have heard that it was said to those of old, ‘You shall not swear falsely, but shall perform your oaths
22 to the Lord.’

23 “But I say to you, **do not swear at all: neither by heaven, for it is God’s throne; nor by the earth, for it is His**
24 **footstool; nor by Jerusalem, for it is the city of the great King.**

25 “Nor shall you swear by your head, because you cannot make one hair white or black.

26 “But let your ‘Yes’ be ‘Yes,’ and your ‘No,’ ‘No.’ For whatever is more than these is from the evil one.
27 [Jesus in [Matt. 5:33-37](#), Bible, NKJV]

28 An important requirement in changing one’s domicile is that the person changing domicile must reside on the territory of the
29 sovereign either presently or in the past. Well, the Lord owns the entire earth and I am physically present on earth at the time
30 of this formal declaration.

31 “**For God is the King of all the earth;** Sing praises with understanding.”
32 [[Psalm 47:7](#), Bible, NKJV]

33
34 The heavens are Yours [God’s], the earth also is Yours;
35 The world and all its fullness, You have founded them.
36 The north and the south, You have created them;
37 Tabor and Hermon rejoice in Your name.
38 You have a mighty arm;
39 Strong is Your hand, and high is Your right hand.”
40 [[Psalm 89:11-13](#), Bible, NKJV]

41
42 “I have made the earth,
43 And created man on it.
44 I—My hands—stretched out the heavens,
45 And all their host I have commanded.”
46 [[Isaiah 45:12](#), Bible, NKJV]

47
48 “Indeed heaven and the highest heavens belong to the Lord your God, also the earth with all that is in it.”
49 [[Deuteronomy 10:14](#), Bible, NKJV]

1 For you to declare that I am not physically present within the territory of my Sovereign Lord to whom I have shifted my
2 domicile and primary legal allegiance is to unlawfully:

3 Exceed your delegated authority.
4 Establish or disestablish a religion.

5 *A problem common to both religion clauses of the First Amendment is the dilemma of defining religion. To define*
6 *religion is in a sense to establish it--those beliefs that are included enjoy a preferred constitutional status. For*
7 *those left out of the definition, the definition may prove coercive. Indeed, it is in this latter context, which roughly*
8 *approximates the area covered by the free exercise clause, where the cases and discussion of the meaning of*
9 *religion have primarily centered. Professor Kent Greenawalt challenges the effort, and all efforts, to define*
10 *religion: "No specification of essential conditions will capture all and only the beliefs, practices, and*
11 *organizations that are regarded as religious in modern culture and should be treated as such under the*
12 *Constitution". Greenawalt, Religion As a Concept in Constitutional Law, 72 Cal. L.Rev. 753 (1984)*
13 *[First Amendment Law in a Nutshell, Second Edition, pp. 266-267, Jerome A Barron, West Group]*

14 Interfere with my the free exercise of my religion in violation of the First Amendment to the United States Constitution.
15 Unconstitutionally involve the courts and the government in religious and political matters, which it has no jurisdiction to
16 do without violating the First Amendment and the separation of powers doctrine. See:

[Government Conspiracy to Destroy the Separation of Powers](http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm), Form #05.023
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

17 Declare that God does not exist.
18 Declare that God is not Sovereign, which is to make the state formally and officially an atheist state which I definitely have
19 good cause to want to disassociate with.
20 Contradict the Bible, which says that the earth belongs to the Lord, and NOT to any man or government. This deprives
21 Him of the use and control of His private property.

22 With respect to my citizenship status, I declare all previous Affidavits, Declarations, etc., either made by me or in my name
23 by another, which are in conflict with this document to be null and void ab initio.

24 I further Declare that it is a fact that I pledge my complete allegiance to Christ Jesus, my King, and I am an Ambassador for
25 Christ as per [2nd Corinthians 5:20](#) of the Holy Scriptures. Hence, I have entered into the jurisdiction of the Lord's Kingdom
26 as a Citizen thereof in fulfillment of the following Scriptures:

27 *"It is better to trust in the Lord*
28 *Than to put confidence in man*
29 *It is better to trust in the Lord*
30 *Than to put confidence in princes [or government, or bureaucrats, or judges, or lawyers]."*
31 *[Psalm 118:8-9, Bible, NKJV]*

32
33
34 *"I am the Lord your God, who brought you out of Egypt, out of the house of bondage. **You shall have no other***
35 ***gods [or a government or materialism or love of money or earthly laws] before Me.** You shall not make for*
36 *yourself a carved image...**you shall not bow down to them nor serve them** [including your government, because*
37 *you are the sovereign, not the government]. For I, the Lord your God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of*
38 *the fathers upon the children of the third and fourth generations of those who hate Me, but showing mercy to*
39 *thousands to those who love me and keep my commandments."*
40 *[Exodus 20:2-6, Bible, NKJV]*

41 I likewise declare that it is a fact that I pledge my secondary allegiance (below that of God but above that of any other
42 ephemeral nation or state) to the United States of America and to the REPUBLIC [based on individual rights and freedom],
43 for which it stands one nation, under GOD, indivisible, with liberty, and justice and freedom for all. God bless America!
44 That allegiance, in turn, is to INDIVIDUAL PEOPLE in their PRIVATE and not PUBLIC capacity, who are my neighbors
45 and "the state" as legally defined. That allegiance is NOT to a "government", which in fact is a fiction of law akin to a civil
46 religion.

47 *"**State.** A people permanently occupying a fixed territory bound together by common-law habits and custom*
48 *into one body politic exercising, through the medium of an organized government, independent sovereignty and*
49 *control over all persons and things within its boundaries, capable of making war and peace and of entering into*
50 *international relations with other communities of the globe. United States v. Kusche, D.C.Cal., 56 F.Supp. 201*
51 *207, 208. The organization of social life which exercises sovereign power in behalf of the people. Delany v.*
52 *Moralitis, C.C.A.Md., 136 F.2d 129, 130. In its largest sense, a "state" is a body politic or a society of*
53 *men. Beagle v. Motor Vehicle Acc. Indemnification Corp., 44 Misc.2d 636, 254 N.Y.S.2d 763, 765. A body of*
54 *people occupying a definite territory and politically organized under one government. State ex re. Maisano v.*

Mitchell, 155 Conn. 256, 231 A.2d 539, 542. A territorial unit with a distinct general body of law. Restatement, Second, Conflicts, §3. Term may refer either to body politic of a nation (e.g. United States) or to an individual government unit of such nation (e.g. California).

[...]

The people of a state, in their collective capacity, considered as the party wronged by a criminal deed; the public; as in the title of a cause, “The State vs. A.B.”

[Black’s Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 1407]

“Fiction of law. An assumption or supposition of law that something which is or may be false is true, or that a state of facts exists which has never really taken place. **An assumption [PRESUMPTION], for purposes of justice, of a fact that does not or may not exist. A rule of law which assumes as true, and will not allow to be disproved, something which is false,** but not impossible. Ryan v. Motor Credit Co., 30 N.J.Eq. 531, 23 A.2d. 607, 621. These assumptions are of an innocent or even beneficial character, and are made for the advancement of the ends of justice. They secure this end chiefly by the extension of procedure from cases to which it is applicable to other cases to which it is not strictly applicable, the ground of inapplicability being some difference of an immaterial character. See also Legal fiction.”
[Black’s Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 623]

The allegiance I have to my neighbor in his INDIVIDUAL and PRIVATE capacity, personified in the term “United States OF AMERICA” is NOT of the following type either, because it is not towards any GOVERNMENT:

“Allegiance. Obligation of **fidelity and obedience to government** in consideration for protection that government gives. U.S. v. Kyh, D.C.N.Y., 49 F.Supp 407, 414. See also Oath of allegiance or loyalty.”
[Black’s Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 74]

The reason why this must be so is made clear by God Himself:

“Owe no one anything [including ALLEGIANCE], except to love one another; for he who loves his neighbor has fulfilled the law.”
[Romans 13:8, Bible, NKJV]

In keeping with the content of this section, I have terminated any state driver’s license and revoked registration to vote, both of which create a “presumption” of domicile within a state which now is “foreign” with respect to a “transient foreigner” and “stateless person” such as myself.

I remind you that the U.S. Supreme Court has ruled that as an American National, it is my right to be “left alone”, and especially by the government.

*“The makers of our Constitution undertook to secure conditions favorable to the pursuit of happiness. They recognized the significance of man’s spiritual nature, of his feelings and of his intellect. They knew that only a part of the pain, pleasure and satisfactions of life are to be found in material things. They sought to protect Americans in their beliefs, their thoughts, their emotions and their sensations. **They conferred, as against the Government, the right to be let alone - the most comprehensive of rights and the right most valued by civilized men.**”*
[Olmstead v. United States, 277 U.S. 438, 478 (1928) (Brandeis, J., dissenting); see also Washington v. Harper, 494 U.S. 210 (1990)]

This right is the most comprehensive of rights recognized but not created by the Constitution. The Constitution, likewise, is law for YOU and not for me, and it attaches not to me or my status, but to the LAND I stand on.

“It is locality that is determinative of the application of the Constitution, in such matters as judicial procedure, and not the status of the people who live in it.”
[Balzac v. Porto Rico, 258 U.S. 298 (1922)]

Changing or at least correctly and unambiguously describing my municipal domicile so as to civilly “divorce the state” is the most effective and expedient way I know of to accomplish that end.

I also remind the recipient of this notice that it costs NOTHING for the government to simply LEAVE ME ALONE in the context of civil statutes, and that the exercise of EXCLUSIVELY PRIVATE rights cannot be taxed or regulated. Therefore,

1 it is entirely inappropriate to attempt to induct me into any kind of “scheme” to assert any liability to pay taxes for “protection”
2 that I don’t want and don’t need and actually regard as harmful to my interests. You are OFFICIALLY AND
3 PERMANENTLY FIRED as my “protector”. You are inefficient, wasteful, disobedient to the law, and not only don’t protect
4 me but INJURE me.

5 ***“Similarly, when a person is prevented from leaving his domicile by circumstances not of his doing and beyond***
6 ***his control, he may be relieved of the consequences attendant on domicile at that place.*** In *Roboz* (USDC D.C.
7 1963) [*Roboz v. Kennedy*, 219 F.Supp. 892 (D.D.C. 1963), p. 24], a federal statute was involved which precluded
8 the return of an alien’s property if he was found to be domiciled in Hungary prior to a certain date. It was found
9 that Hungary was Nazi-controlled at the time in question and that the persons involved would have left Hungary
10 (and lost domicile there) had they been able to. Since they had been precluded from leaving because of the
11 political privations imposed by the very government they wanted to escape (the father was in prison there), the
12 court would not hold them to have lost their property based on a domicile that circumstances beyond their control
13 forced them to retain.”
14 [*Conflicts in a Nutshell*, David D. Siegel and Patrick J. Borchers, West Publishing, p. 24]

15 Of those politicians, lawyers, and judges who would attempt to ridicule, penalize, or interfere with the exercise of religious
16 rights protected by the First Amendment, our first President and most revered founding father, George Washington, said the
17 following:

18 *“Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, Religion and morality are indispensable*
19 *supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of Patriotism who should labour to subvert these great Pillars*
20 *of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of Men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the*
21 *pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections with private and*
22 *public felicity. Let it simply be asked, “where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of*
23 *religious obligation desert the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice?” And let us*
24 *with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded*
25 *to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to*
26 *expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.”*
27 [*George Washington, Farewell Address*]

28 Along the above lines, our Second President of the United States said the following:

29 *“We have no government armed with the power capable of contending with human passions unbridled by morality*
30 *and religion. Avarice [greed], ambition, revenge, or gallantry [debauchery], would break the strongest cords of*
31 *our Constitution as a whale goes through a net. **Our Constitution was made only for a moral and religious [and***
32 ***a well educated and self-governing] people. It is wholly inadequate to the government of any other.**”*
33 [*John Adams, 2nd President*]

34 May the judgment of God be upon you for your sins if you attempt to illegally penalize me using an unconstitutional Bill of
35 Attainder in violation of Article 1 Section 10 of the Constitution, remove my citizenship, or otherwise terrorize me for the
36 free exercise of my religious rights protected by the [First Amendment](#) as documented in this correspondence:

37 *“It is an unconstitutional deprivation of due process for the government to penalize a person merely because he*
38 *has exercised a protected statutory or constitutional right. *United States v. Goodwin*, [457 U.S. 368](#), 372, 102*
39 *S.Ct. 2485, 2488, 73 L.Ed.2d. 74 (1982).”*
40 [*People of Territory of Guam v. Fegurgur*, 800 F.2d. 1470 (9th Cir. 1986)]

41 *“A judgment rendered in violation of due process is void in the rendering State and is not entitled to full faith and*
42 *credit elsewhere.*
43 [*Penmoyer v. Neff*, [95 U.S. 714](#), 732-733 (1878)]

44 *“Due process of law is violated when the government vindictively attempts to penalize a person for exercising a*
45 *protected statutory or constitutional right.”*
46 [*United States v. Conkins*, 9 F.3d. 1377, 1382 (9th Cir. 1993)]

47 **4. CONTRACTUAL AND COMMERCIAL DIVORCE FROM THE STATE AND UNITED** 48 **STATES**

49 **4.1. Constraints upon my right to contract**

50 From the date of my birth to my death, I declare and give “reasonable notice” to all interested parties in the government that
51 I cannot and will not be bound by any exercise of my right to contract that:

1. Is between me and any government, including any state government or the national government.

1.1. The Declaration of Independence, which is the organic law of this country, asserts unequivocally that our rights are “unalienable” in relation to the government, which means that they cannot be bargained away through any commercial process, including a franchise agreement or government “benefit” program.

*“We hold these truths to be self-evident, that **all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights**, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.--That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed,*
-“
[Declaration of Independence]

*“Unalienable. Inalienable; incapable of being aliened, that is, sold and transferred.”
[Black’s Law Dictionary, Fourth Edition, p. 1693]*

Therefore, the only people who can bargain away rights under civil law are those domiciled on federal territory not protected by the Constitution and therefore where such rights DO NOT exist. I am NOT such a person:

*“Indeed, the practical interpretation put by Congress upon the Constitution has been long continued and uniform to the effect [182 U.S. 244, 279] that **the Constitution is applicable to territories acquired by purchase or conquest, only when and so far as Congress shall so direct. Notwithstanding its duty to ‘guarantee to every state in this Union a republican form of government’ (art. 4, 4), by which we understand, according to the definition of Webster, ‘a government in which the supreme power resides in the whole body of the people, and is exercised by representatives elected by them,’ Congress did not hesitate, in the original organization of the territories of Louisiana, Florida, the Northwest Territory, and its subdivisions of Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Illinois, and Wisconsin and still more recently in the case of Alaska, to establish a form of government bearing a much greater analogy to a British Crown colony than a republican state of America**, and to vest the legislative power either in a governor and council, or a governor and judges, to be appointed by the President. It was not until they had attained a certain population that power was given them to organize a legislature by vote of the people. In all these cases, as well as in territories subsequently organized west of the Mississippi, Congress thought it necessary either to extend to Constitution and laws of the United States over them, or to declare that the inhabitants should be entitled to enjoy the right of trial by jury, of bail, and of the privilege of the writ of habeas corpus, as well as other privileges of the bill of rights.”
[Downes v. Bidwell, [182 U.S. 244](#) (1901)]*

1.2. The Founding Fathers assert that we should not enter into any contracts or alliances with foreign powers, which includes the foreign jurisdiction of federal territory. This is the legislative intent of all founding documents, including the Constitution, and I intend to give full force and effect to that legislative intent:

*“My ardent desire is, and my aim has been...to comply strictly with all our engagements foreign and domestic; **but to keep the United States free from political connections with every other Country. To see that they may be independent of all, and under the influence of none. In a word, I want an American character, that the powers of Europe may be convinced we act for ourselves and not for others** [as “public officers”]; this, in my judgment, is the only way to be respected abroad and happy at home.”
[George Washington, (letter to Patrick Henry, 9 October 1775);
Reference: *The Writings of George Washington*, Fitzpatrick, ed., vol. 34 (335)]*

*“About to enter, fellow citizens, on the exercise of duties which comprehend everything dear and valuable to you, it is proper that you should understand what I deem the essential principles of our government, and consequently those which ought to shape its administration. I will compress them within the narrowest compass they will bear, stating the general principle, but not all its limitations. Equal and exact justice to all men, of whatever state or persuasion, religious or political; **peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations – entangling alliances [contracts, treaties, franchises] with none;**”
[Thomas Jefferson, First Inaugural Address, March 4, 1801]*

1.3. The Bible forbids me to contract with any government and I am acting as a fiduciary, public officer, and trustee of the God under the terms of the Bible trust indenture 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. I take my sincerely held religious faith and practice very seriously.

*“You shall have no other gods [including political rulers, judges, governments, or earthly laws] before Me [or [My commandments](#)].”
[[Exodus 20:3](#), Bible, NKJV]*

*“Do not walk in the [statutes of your fathers](#) [the heathens], nor observe their judgments, nor defile yourselves with their idols. I am the LORD your God: Walk in [My statutes](#), keep My judgments, and do them; hallow My Sabbaths, and they will be a sign between Me and you, that you may know that I am the LORD your God.”
[[Ezekial 20:10-20](#), Bible, NKJV]*

1 *“Take heed to yourself, lest you make a covenant or mutual agreement [contract, franchise agreement] with the*
2 *inhabitants of the land to which you go, lest it become a snare in the midst of you.”*
3 *[Exodus 34:12, Bible, Amplified version]*

4 *“You shall make no covenant [contract or franchise] with them [foreigners, pagans], nor with their [pagan*
5 *government] gods [laws or judges]. They shall not dwell in your land [and you shall not dwell in theirs by*
6 *becoming a “resident” in the process of contracting with them], lest they make you sin against Me [God]. For*
7 *if you serve their gods [under contract or agreement or franchise], it will surely be a snare to you.”*
8 *[Exodus 23:32-33, Bible, NKJV]*

9 See also:

Delegation of Authority Order from God to Christians, Form #13.007
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

- 10 2. Does not contain the signature of all parties to whom the rights are surrendered. For instance, no government form
11 signed by other than a contracting officer of the government can convey any rights to the government over my life,
12 liberty, property whatsoever. You will note that no tax forms are signed by any representative or contracting officer of
13 the government, and therefore convey no rights to the government nor establish any valid contract or enforceable right.
14 You also do not have my consent to treat any such forms as negotiable securities which create any right for any third
15 party either. It is also worthy of noting that the only parties who can contract on behalf of the government serve in the
16 Legislative and not Executive Branch of the government. To wit:

17 *“But the short answer to this contention is that since no official of the government could have rendered it liable*
18 *for this work by an express contract, none can by his acts or omissions create a valid contract implied in fact.*
19 *The limitation upon the authority to impose contract obligations upon the United States is as applicable to*
20 *contracts by implication as it is to those expressly made.”*
21 *[Sutton v. U.S., 256 U.S. 575 (1921)]*

- 22 3. Is not expressed solely in writing. The U.S. Government in the act of June 2, 1862, 12 Stat. 411 passed a law requiring
23 that all contracts **MUST** be expressed in writing and are of no force and effect if they are not. In our system of
24 government, all powers of the government derive from the sovereign people and are delegated from and by them to the
25 government. If the government can pass such an act, I too can demand the same in all my interactions with any and all
26 governments. This is a requirement of equal protection of the laws mandated by the Fourteenth Amendment, Section 1.
27 For details on this exercise of government power, see *Clark v. United States*, 94 U.S. 539 (1877):

28 *“Every man is supposed to know the law. A party who makes a contract with an officer [of the government]*
29 *without having it reduced to writing is knowingly accessory to a violation of duty on his part. Such a party aids*
30 *in the violation of the law.”*
31 *[Clark v. United States, 95 U.S. 539 (1877)]*

- 32 4. Does not both contain and completely describe ALL of the obligations arising out of it directly within the document
33 itself. No obligation arising out of any transaction made with the government may be *implied* or *assumed*, but must
34 instead be expressly stated in the application or form itself which creates said obligation. Any obligation alleged to arise
35 out of signing a government document must be completely described directly in the document itself or it shall be
36 presumed to not exist. For such a circumstance, it is not and shall not be enough for the government or any court of law
37 to simply claim “every citizen of the United States is supposed to know the law” and use this as a justification for the
38 method by which the person signing the document received the requisite “reasonable notice” of the terms he would be
39 bound by. Since the enforcement of private rights created by private contracts requires full disclosure of all rights
40 conveyed, the government can claim no less of an obligation in relation to me, the Sovereign whom it exists and was
41 created exclusively to serve and protect. This will prevent attempts by the government to engage in the equivalent of
42 “invisible contracts” and it is the only way to ensure that surrenders of Constitutional rights are knowing, voluntary,
43 fully-informed, explicit acts of the citizen who is allegedly surrendering his or her rights:

44 *“There is an element of fiction in the presumption that every citizen is charged with a responsibility to know what*
45 *the law is. But the array of government executives, judges, and legislators who have been accused, and convicted,*
46 *of mail fraud under the well-settled construction of the statute that the Court renounces today are people who*
47 *unquestionably knew that their conduct was unlawful. Cf. Nash v. United States, 229 U.S. 373, 377 (1913).”*
48 *[Mcnelly v. United States, 483 U.S. 350 (1987)]*

49 *“Waivers of Constitutional rights not only must be voluntary, but must be knowing, intelligent acts done with*
50 *sufficient awareness of the relevant circumstances and likely consequences.”*
51 *[Brady v. U.S., 397 U.S. 742 (1970)]*

1 *"The question of a waiver of a federally guaranteed constitutional right is, of course, a federal question controlled*
2 *by federal law. There is a presumption against the waiver of constitutional rights, see, e.g. Glasser v. United*
3 *States, 315 U.S. 60, 70-71, 86 L.Ed. 680, 699, 62 S.Ct. 457, and for a waiver to be effective it must be clearly*
4 *established that there was "an intentional relinquishment or abandonment of a known right or*
5 *privilege." Johnson v. Zerbst, 304 U.S. 458, 464, 82 L.Ed. 1461, 1466; 58 S.Ct. 1019, 146 A.L.R. 357."*
6 *[Brookhart v. Janis, 384 U.S. 1; 86 S.Ct. 1245, 16 L.Ed.2d. 314 (1966)]*

7 *"Where rights secured by the Constitution there can be no rule making or legislation [or government forms]*
8 *which would abrogate them."*
9 *[Miranda v. Arizona, 384 U.S. 436, 491 (1966)]*

10 *"Where administrative action may result in loss of both property and life, or of all that makes life worth living,*
11 *any doubt as to the extent of power delegated to administrative officials is to be resolved in citizen's favor, and*
12 *court must be especially sensitive to the citizen's rights where proceeding is non-judicial."*
13 *[United States v. Minker, 350 U.S. 179, 76 S.Ct. 281 (1956)]*

14 If the government believes that there exists any contractual obligations or agreements towards it on my part which are *not*
15 specifically invalidated by this document, it is specifically demanded to produce court-admissible evidence of same within
16 30 days of receipt of this notice or forever be estopped from asserting any future civil claims against me, the Submitter.

17 **4.2. Reservation of rights**

18 Pursuant to U.C.C. §1-207 and its successor, U.C.C. §1-308, I reserve ALL my inalienable constitutional and natural rights
19 at all times in the context of any interactions with any man-made government of any state of the Union or the federal
20 government. I also demand, pursuant to U.C.C. §3-308, that the government present the signed contract:

21 *Uniform Commercial Code*
22 *§ 3-308. PROOF OF SIGNATURES AND STATUS AS HOLDER IN DUE COURSE.*

23 *(a) In an action with respect to an instrument, the authenticity of, and authority to make, each signature on the*
24 *instrument is admitted unless specifically denied in the pleadings. If the validity of a signature is denied in the*
25 *pleadings, the burden of establishing validity is on the person claiming validity, but the signature is presumed*
26 *to be authentic and authorized unless the action is to enforce the liability of the purported signer and the signer*
27 *is dead or incompetent at the time of trial of the issue of validity of the signature. If an action to enforce the*
28 *instrument is brought against a person as the undisclosed principal of a person who signed the instrument as a*
29 *party to the instrument, the plaintiff has the burden of establishing that the defendant is liable on the instrument*
30 *as a represented person under Section 3-402(a).*

31 *(b) If the validity of signatures is admitted or proved and there is compliance with subsection (a), a plaintiff*
32 *producing the instrument is entitled to payment if the plaintiff proves entitlement to enforce the instrument under*
33 *Section 3-301, unless the defendant proves a defense or claim in recoupment. If a defense or claim in recoupment*
34 *is proved, the right to payment of the plaintiff is subject to the defense or claim, except to the extent the plaintiff*
35 *proves that the plaintiff has rights of a holder in due course which are not subject to the defense or claim.*

36 **4.3. Perpetual abandonment of all statutory "employment", agency, or "public office" on behalf** 37 **of the U.S. government or any State government**

38 I declare that it is a fact that from my date of birth to the present day, and for all perpetuity, I, the Submitter, do hereby
39 withdraw my consent to act on behalf of or as an agent for the United States and any of its agents, such as the United States
40 corporate agents presiding over its federal enclaves within the states of the Union, heretofore known as "State of ____" under
41 the auspices of the Buck Act of 1940, codified in 4 U.S.C. §106 and 5 U.S.C. §5517. You will note that all "public offices"
42 are voluntary employments from which anyone may resign. Anyone who has not resigned from said office may reserve the
43 right not to engage in such an office within the context of any aspect of their private employment or private lives, as confirmed
44 by numerous prior rulings of the U.S. Supreme Court, to wit:

45 *"Every man has a natural right to the fruits of his own labor, is generally admitted; and no other person can*
46 *rightfully deprive him of those fruits, and appropriate them against his will ..."*
47 *[The Antelope, 23 U.S. 66; 10 Wheat 66; 6 L.Ed. 268 (1825)]*

48 I declare that it is a fact that I do not now and never have consented to act as a "public officer" engaged in a "trade or business"
49 as defined in 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(26), and I do not now nor have I ever been voluntarily engaged in a "trade or business" as
50 heretofore defined. Receipt by you of any evidence contrary to the facts and evidence contained in this document and the
51 attachments hereto shall constitute evidence of unlawful activity by my public servants or their pretended agents and the

1 existence of duress directed against the Submitter. For all such instances of duress and unlawful activity, I demand that the
2 submitter of said false documents be investigated and prosecuted by the government, pursuant to [26 U.S.C. §7434](#) and [18](#)
3 [U.S.C. §872](#). Such evidence of duress is reflected in, for example, the following IRS documents:

- 4 1. Information returns submitted under the authority of [26 U.S.C. §6041](#), including but not limited to:
 - 5 1.1. IRS Form K-1
 - 6 1.2. IRS Form W-2
 - 7 1.3. IRS Form W-4
 - 8 1.4. IRS Form 1098
 - 9 1.5. IRS Form 1099
 - 10 1.6. IRS Form 1042-SSee the following for evidence why the above forms are filled out illegally and falsely in the vast majority of cases:
11 <http://sedm.org/Forms/04-Tax/DmdVerEvOfTradeOrBusiness-IR.pdf>
- 12 2. IRS Form 8300 Currency Transaction Reports, which may only lawfully be filled out for those engaged in a “trade or
13 business”, which the submitter is NOT. See the following:
14 <http://sedm.org/Forms/04-Tax/DmdVerEvOfTradeOrBusiness-CTR.pdf>
- 15 3. Federal tax returns, including any variant of the 1040, such as 1040, 1040-EZ, 1040A, 104NR, 1040NR-EZ.
- 16 4. State income tax returns of any kind.
- 17 5. Penalty and tax assessments, such as Substitute For Returns conducted under the alleged authority of [26 U.S.C. §6020\(b\)](#).
18 All such assessments are ILLEGAL against me, who is not the “person” defined in 26 U.S.C. §6671(b) or 26 U.S.C.
19 §7343. See the following for proof:
 - 20 5.1. *Why the Government Can't Lawfully Assess Human Beings With an Income Tax Liability Without Their Consent*,
21 Form #05.011:
22 <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
 - 23 5.2. *Why Penalties are Illegal for Anything But Federal Employees, Contractors, and Agents*, Form #05.010:
24 <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
- 25 6. Use by the government of any federally issued identifying numbers against me, a private person, including Social
26 Security Numbers and Taxpayer Identification Numbers. See section 8.7 later for all presumptions established in this
27 document about the illegal use of such numbers against me.
28

29 I similarly declare that it is a fact that according to God’s Laws and prior U.S. Supreme Court decisions, it is to no avail on
30 your part and an act of criminal fraud, extortion, and breach of fiduciary duty as a “public official” for you to try to abuse the
31 word “includes” found within the definition of “trade or business” or any other term used in the Internal Revenue Code or
32 other statute within the U.S. Code as a means to unlawfully enlarge federal jurisdiction beyond the clear bounds established
33 in the Constitution. All such activities simply prove the depths of corruption within your organization and the government
34 in general and the lengths to which you will go to defend and protect the fundamentally criminal nature of your unscrupulous
35 love for other people’s money.

36 *“For the love of money is a root of all kinds of evil, for which some have strayed from the faith in their greediness,*
37 *and pierced themselves through with many sorrows.”*
38 *[1 Tim. 6:10, Bible, NKJV]*

39 *“Getting treasures by a lying tongue Is the fleeting fantasy of those who seek death. The violence of the wicked*
40 *will destroy them. Because they refuse to do justice.”*
41 *[Prov. 21:6-7, Bible, NKJV]*

42 Such futile efforts on your part serve no purpose other than to prove that you are engaging in a criminal conspiracy against
43 my Constitutional rights in violation of [18 U.S.C. §241](#), and intending to destroy the separation of powers that is at the heart
44 of the United States Constitution. This type of abuse of the rules of statutory construction on your part, for selfish economic
45 reasons is exhaustively briefed and described in the following resources, which I demand that you rebut the evidence and
46 admissions at the end within 30 days or forever thereafter admit the truthfulness of:

- 47 1. *Legal Deception, Propaganda, and Fraud*, Form #05.014:
48 <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
- 49 2. *Presumption: Chief Weapon for Unlawfully Enlarging Federal Jurisdiction, Form #05.017*:
50 <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
- 51 3. *Requirement for Reasonable Notice*, Form #05.022: Proves that laws which do not give reasonable notice of
52 EVERYTHING that is included or which compel presumption on the part of the reader violate due process.
53 <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

1 In addition to the above conclusive legal treatises on this subject, the U.S. Supreme Court has unequivocally stated the
2 following:

3 *"It is axiomatic that the statutory definition of the term excludes unstated meanings of that term. Colautti v.*
4 *Franklin, 439 U.S. 379, 392, and n. 10 (1979). Congress' use of the term "propaganda" in this statute, as indeed*
5 *in other legislation, has no pejorative connotation.[19] As judges, it is our duty to [481 U.S. 485] construe*
6 *legislation as it is written, not as it might be read by a layman, or as it might be understood by someone who*
7 *has not even read it."*

8 [*Meese v. Keene, 481 U.S. 465, 484 (1987)*]

9
10 **"When a statute includes an explicit definition, we must follow that definition, even if it varies from that term's**
11 **ordinary meaning.** *Meese v. Keene, 481 U.S. 465, 484-485 (1987) ("It is axiomatic that the statutory definition*
12 *of the term excludes unstated meanings of that term"); Colautti v. Franklin, 439 U.S. at 392-393, n. 10 ("As a*
13 *rule, "a definition which declares what a term "means" . . . excludes any meaning that is not stated"); Western*
14 *Union Telegraph Co. v. Lenroot, 323 U.S. 490, 502 (1945); Fox v. Standard Oil Co. of N.J., 294 U.S. 87, 95-96*
15 *(1935) (Cardozo, J.); see also 2A N. Singer, Sutherland on Statutes and Statutory Construction § 47.07, p. 152,*
16 *and n. 10 (5th ed. 1992) (collecting cases). That is to say, the statute, read "as a whole," post at 998 [530 U.S.*
17 *943] (THOMAS, J., dissenting), leads the reader to a definition. That definition does not include the Attorney*
18 *General's restriction -- "the child up to the head." Its words, "substantial portion," indicate the contrary."*
19 [*Stenberg v. Carhart, 530 U.S. 914 (2000)*]

20 For additional information about the deceptive use of the word "trade or business" within IRS and Treasury publications,
21 laws, and forms, see the following and rebut the admissions and evidence at the end if you disagree within 30 days or forever
22 be estopped from challenging it later:

[The "Trade or Business" Scam, Form #05.001](http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm)
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

23 I declare that it is a fact that I am, always have been, and always will be a statutory "non-resident non-person" who:

- 24 1. Is not the "person" defined in 26 U.S.C. §6671(b) and 26 U.S.C. §7343 subject to penalties or criminal enforcement,
25 because not a public officer or agent of the national government.
- 26 2. Is NOT an "individual" as that term is currently defined in 26 U.S.C. §7701(b)(1)(B) and
- 27 3. Is not, never has been, and never will be involved in a "trade or business" as defined in 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(26) or a
28 public office in any government.
- 29 4. Has no "gross income" pursuant to 26 C.F.R. §1.872-2(f).

30 Since I am and always have been a statutory "non-resident non-person" and a "national" of the "United States*** of America"
31 pursuant to 8 U.S.C. §1101(a)(21) but not a statutory "citizen" pursuant to 8 U.S.C. §1401, then the proper tax form for me
32 to file, if any, has always been only the 1040NR or 1040NR-EZ if I have "gross income" as a PUBLIC OFFICER or if my
33 private sector employer incorrectly withheld monies from my remuneration. I have not voluntarily ever made an election
34 pursuant to 26 U.S.C. §6013(g) or (h), or 26 U.S.C. §7701(b)(4)(B) as a "nonresident alien" to be treated as a "resident".
35 Any evidence you might now have or which you will receive in the future of such an election is simply evidence that I am
36 under unlawful duress, for which I demand that you investigate and prosecute those responsible for the duress and unlawful
37 extortion. If you disagree, rebut the evidence and admissions contained in Enclosure (5) within 30 days or forever be estopped
38 from challenging it in the future.

39 The only reason any other form such as the IRS Form 1040 may have been submitted in the past, is because of unlawful
40 enforcement activities by the IRS and deception and false information found in the IRS publications and IRS phone support,
41 which the IRS conspicuously disavows any responsibility for but should be prosecuted and enjoined for like every other
42 promoter of tax fraud schemes:

43 *"IRS Publications, issued by the National Office, explain the law in plain language for taxpayers and their*
44 *advisors... While a good source of general information, publications should not be cited to sustain a position."*
45 [*Internal Revenue Manual (I.R.M.), Section 4.10.7.2.8 (05-14-1999)*]

46 The fact that the Courts hypocritically refuse to hold the IRS just as responsible for its publications as they hold those engaged
47 in tax shelters dispensing false information pursuant to 26 U.S.C. §6700 is simply proof that the IRS and Courts and the
48 government in general are corrupt beyond belief, completely unaccountable and that the judges have a conflict of interest as

1 “taxpayers” who are just as terrorized by the illegal operations of the IRS as the rest of us, in violation of [18 U.S.C. §872](#), [18](#)
2 [U.S.C. §208](#), and [28 U.S.C. §455](#).

3 *“He [including judges] who justifies the wicked, and he who condemns the just, both of them alike are an*
4 *abomination to the Lord.”*
5 *[Prov. 17:15, Bible, NKJV]*

6 *“If a ruler pays attention to lies, All his servants become wicked.”*
7 *[Prov. 29:12, Bible, NKJV]*

8 *“And you shalt take no bribe, for a bribe blinds the discerning and perverts the words of the righteous.”*
9 *[Exodus 23:8, Bible, NKJV]*

10 *“Under a government which imprisons any unjustly, the true place for a just man is also a prison.”*
11 *[Henry David Thoreau]*

12 For a truly remarkable expose on the full extent of the corruption within the U.S. government and especially the federal
13 courts, I encourage you to read the following:

14 What Happened to Justice? , Form #06.012 15 http://sedm.org/ItemInfo/Ebooks/WhatHappJustice/WhatHappJustice.htm

16 If you refuse to take responsibility for the consequences of injuries arising from your own corruption as documented here, I
17 reserve the right to show the jury assembled to prosecute you for your corruption all 5,900+ pages of hard core evidence of
18 government fraud and conspiracy against rights included with the CD version of the above book, should you force me to end
19 up in court to litigate this matter to hold you accountable for your crimes against Americans and humanity documented
20 therein. My religious beliefs forbid me from participating in, associating with, subsidizing, or condoning ALL activities of
the present unlawful, de facto, criminal government that presently rules because of the corruption that has infected and
contaminated it.

21 *“Come out from among them*
22 *And be separate, says the Lord.*
23 *Do not touch what is unclean,*
24 *And I will receive you.”*
25 *[2 Cor. 6:17, Bible, NKJV]*

26 *And I heard another voice from heaven saying, “Come out of her [the Totalitarian, Socialist Legislative*
27 *Democracy that is a Corporation instead of a government], my people, lest you share in her sins, and lest you*
28 *receive of her plagues. For her sins have reached to heaven, and God has remembered her iniquities. Render to*
29 *her just as she rendered to you, and repay her double according to her works; in the cup which she has mixed,*
30 *mix double for her. In the measure that she glorified herself and lived luxuriously, in the same measure give her*
31 *torment and sorrow; for she says in her heart, ‘I sit as queen, and am no widow, and will not see sorrow.’*
32 *Therefore her plagues will come in one day—death and mourning and famine. And she will be utterly burned*
33 *with fire, for strong is the Lord God who judges her.*
34 *[Rev. 18:4-8, Bible, NKJV]*

35 **4.4. Perpetual Abandonment of all “benefits”, privileges, and “public rights” arising under** 36 **Titles 26 and 42 of the United States Code**

37 *Mr. Logan: “...Natural laws cannot be created, repealed, or modified by legislation. Congress should know there*
38 *are many things which it cannot do...”*

39 *“It is now proposed to make the Federal Government the guardian of its citizens. If that should be done, the*
40 *Nation soon must perish. There can only be a free nation when the people themselves are free and administer the*
41 *government which they have set up to protect their rights. Where the general government must provide work, and*
42 *incidentally food and clothing for its citizens, freedom and individuality will be destroyed and eventually the*
43 *citizens will become serfs to the general government...”*
44 *[Congressional Record-Senate, Volume 77- Part 4, June 10, 1933, Page 12522]*

45 This document also constitutes an abandonment of all right, title, and benefit originating from any of the following federal
46 “social insurance” programs:

- 47 1. [Social Security, Title 42, Chapter 7.](#)

- 1 2. [Unemployment Compensation, Title 42, Chapter 7, Subchapter III.](#)
- 2 3. [Medicare, Title 42, Chapter 7, Subchapter XVIII.](#)
- 3 4. Every other type of federal insurance.

4 I am not now, never have been, and never will be eligible to receive benefits under any of the above programs of federal
5 insurance. In fact, most of those who participate do so illegally because they do not meet the requirements if they do not
6 reside in the “State” as defined in the Social Security Act, which says:

7 ORIGINAL 1935 ACT DEFINITION:

8 *“The term State (except when used in section 531) includes Alaska, Hawaii [only when they were territories] and
9 the District of Columbia.”*

10 CURRENT DEFINITION: 42 U.S.C. §1301(a)(1)

11 *“(1) The term ‘State’, except where otherwise provided, includes the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth
12 of Puerto Rico, and when used in titles IV, V, VII, XI, XIX, and XXI includes the Virgin Islands and Guam. Such
13 term when used in titles III, IX, and XII also includes the Virgin Islands. Such term when used in title v. and in
14 part B of this title also includes American Samoa, the Northern Mariana Islands, and the Trust Territory of the
15 Pacific Islands. Such term when used in titles XIX and XXI also includes the Northern Mariana Islands and
16 American Samoa. In the case of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam, titles I, X, and XIV, and title XVI (as
17 in effect without regard to the amendment made by section 301 of the Social Security Amendments of 1972⁽¹⁾)
18 shall continue to apply, and the term ‘State’ when used in such titles (but not in title XVI as in effect pursuant to
19 such amendment after December 31, 1973) includes Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam. Such term when
20 used in title XX also includes the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Northern Mariana Islands.
21 Such term when used in title IV also includes American Samoa.”*

22 Based upon, in part, the written evidence contained in [42 U.S.C. §1301\(a\)\(1\)](#), the Social Security Administration can only
23 lawfully administer the program by offering benefits and participation to those who live in federal territories, possessions,
24 and federal enclaves and not within states of the Union, which are collectively called the “federal zone”. In practice, SSA
25 and other federal agencies routinely violate these requirements of the law all the time, and should be fired or prosecuted for
26 this by the Dept. of Justice. Their decision to accept new applicants must be based on where the applicants ACTUALLY
27 LIVE and not where they SAY they live. The ignorance about the law that is manufactured by the government in public
28 schools is the reason why Americans are deceived into basically committing perjury under penalty of perjury on most of the
29 federal government forms they filled out is the only reason this type of fraud and destruction of the separation of powers
30 between state and federal government continues. The fact that agencies flagrantly and tacitly “look the other way”, acquiesce
31 to, tolerate, and condone such violations of written law makes most federal employees who administer these programs into
32 accessories after the fact to the making of false claims to the U.S. Government in violation of the False Claims Act, [31 U.S.C.
33 §3729](#). Such fraudulent acts cannot lawfully give rise to any rights, benefits, or liabilities against those who unlawfully
34 participate in the program but who do not meet the residency requirements.

35 If you disagree with any part of the foregoing analysis, I challenge you to rebut any part of the research or facts that it is based
36 on, as found at:

[Resignation of Compelled Social Security Trustee, Form #06.002](#)
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

37 In the absence of a serious written rebuttal within 30 days containing nothing but evidence admissible in a court of law under
38 the [Federal Rules of Evidence](#), signed under penalty of perjury and submitted by a person with demonstrated delegated
39 authority to do so, you agree to everything stated in this document and are permanently estopped from later challenging it.

40 **5. EFFECT ON MY CITIZENSHIP AND LEGAL STATUS**

41 *“The rights of the individuals are restricted only to the extent that they have been voluntarily surrendered by the
42 [choice of] citizenship to the agencies of government.”
43 [City of Dallas v. Mitchell, 245 S.W. 944]*

44 As a consequence of this amendment to government documentation describing legal domicile and allegiance documented in
45 this affidavit, my citizenship is significantly affected, and this change must be reflected in all of your government records.
46 This section will document all the changes so that you may properly reflect my status in all of your records. If you want
47 further details on the basis for these changes, see Ref. (1).

1 As a result of this abandonment of domicile and change in allegiance to make allegiance to the state “secondary” to allegiance
2 to God, my status is now described as follows:

- 3 1. I am and always have been:
 - 4 1.1. A Fourteenth Amendment, Constitutional Citizen.
 - 5 1.2. A “national” of the “United States*** of America” rather than the “United States**” pursuant to [8 U.S.C. §1101\(a\)\(21\)](#).
 - 6 1.3. A statutory “non-resident non-person”.
 - 7 1.4. A human and not statutory “person” not engaged in a “trade or business” as defined in [26 U.S.C. §7701\(a\)\(26\)](#) and
8 who earns no “gross income” as defined in 26 C.F.R. §1.872-2(f) (except those who work or have worked as “public
9 officials” for the federal government).
- 10 2. I am NOT and never have been:
 - 11 2.1. A statutory “alien” as defined in 8 U.S.C. §1101(a)(3). I was born in the COUNTRY “United States*” but not in
12 the FEDERAL “United States***”. I am therefore NOT subject to the federal and state presence tests found in 26
13 U.S.C. §7701(b)(1) and corresponding state civil statutes, which only apply to such ALIENS. See the following
14 for details on the ILLEGALL application of federal and state presence tests to those who are “nationals” and not
15 “aliens”:
16

<i>Why Domicile and Becoming a “Taxpayer” Require Your Consent</i> , Form #05.002, Section 13.1 https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/Domicile.pdf
--
 - 17 2.2. An “individual” as defined in [5 U.S.C. §552a\(a\)\(2\)](#). All “individuals” who the government can keep records about
18 and legislate for in their “codes” and “statutes” are public employees and public officials, *not* private citizens. You
19 will note that Title 5 of the U.S. code is “Government Organization and Employees” and that it contains no
20 definition for any term that refers to “private individuals”. The ability to legislate for private citizens is, according
21 to the U.S. Supreme Court, “repugnant to the Constitution” and therefore forbidden:

22 *“The power to “legislate generally upon” life, liberty, and property, as opposed to the “power to provide modes*
23 *of redress” against offensive state action, was “repugnant” to the Constitution. Id., at 15. See also United States*
24 *v. Reese, 92 U.S. 214, 218 (1876); United States v. Harris, 106 U.S. 629, 639 (1883); James v. Bowman, 190 U.S.*
25 *127, 139 (1903). Although the specific holdings of these early cases might have been superseded or modified, see,*
26 *e.g., Heart of Atlanta Motel, Inc. v. United States, 379 U.S. 241 (1964); United States v. Guest, 383 U.S. 745*
27 *(1966), their treatment of Congress’ §5 power as corrective or preventive, not definitional, has not been*
28 *questioned.”*
29 *[City of Boerne v. Flores, Archbishop of San Antonio, 521 U.S. 507 (1997)]*
 - 30 2.3. A STATUTORY “U.S. national” or “non-citizen national” as defined in [8 U.S.C. §1101\(a\)\(22\)\(B\)](#) and [8 U.S.C.](#)
31 [§1408](#).
 - 32 2.4. A statutory “citizen and national of the United States” as described in [8 U.S.C. §1401](#).
 - 33 2.5. A “resident” as described in [26 U.S.C. §7701\(b\)\(1\)\(A\)](#).
 - 34 2.6. A “U.S. person” as described in [26 U.S.C. §7701\(a\)\(30\)](#).

35 Since my status is that of a “national” of the “United States*** of America” and not the STATUTORY “United States” as
36 defined in [8 U.S.C. §1101\(a\)\(21\)](#) and a statutory “non-resident non-person”, then I am not required to be registered as an
37 “alien” pursuant to [8 U.S.C. §1302](#) or to have a “green card”. I am a “transient foreigner” because I do not politically or
38 legally associate with the people here, but I am not an “alien” because I was born in this country.

39 If you attempt to interfere with or prevent this change in my domicile and try to compel me to maintain domicile within any
40 man-made state, then the federal courts say that you must relieve me of all the obligations arising from that choice of domicile
41 because it is compelled:

42 *“Similarly, when a person is prevented from [politically, legally, and commercially] leaving his domicile by*
43 *circumstances not of his doing and beyond his control, he may be relieved of the consequences attendant on*
44 *domicile at that place. In Roboz (USDC D.C. 1963) [Roboz v. Kennedy, 219 F.Supp. 892 (D.D.C. 1963), p. 24],*
45 *a federal statute was involved which precluded the return of an alien’s property if he was found to be domiciled*
46 *in Hungary prior to a certain date. It was found that Hungary was Nazi-controlled at the time in question and*
47 *that the persons involved would have left Hungary (and lost domicile there) had they been able to. Since they*
48 *had been precluded from leaving because of the political privations imposed by the very government they wanted*
49 *to escape (the father was in prison there), the court would not hold them to have lost their property based on a*
50 *domicile that circumstances beyond their control forced them to retain.”*
51 *[Conflicts in a Nutshell, David D. Siegel and Patrick J. Borchers, West Publishing, p. 24]*

1 My correct citizenship status is that of an “American National.” and *not* a statutory “U.S. citizen” under [8 U.S.C. §1401](#). An
2 American National is:

3 *“A sovereign human being, not to be confused with the term ‘person’ as used anywhere in the Internal Revenue*
4 *Code, who under the Constitution and the laws of the united States or of a particular state, is entitled to the*
5 *enjoyment of full civil rights. The rights are those as enumerated in the Bill of Rights to the Constitution for the*
6 *united States of America and because of these rights this man is not subject to the exclusive or sovereign*
7 *jurisdiction of the U.S. government at birth under Article 1, Section 8, Clause 17 of the U.S. Constitution.”*

8 The rights guaranteed by the Constitution are absolute and natural rights derived from *birth*, and they cannot and should not,
9 by operation of law, be turned into a taxable government privilege by coercing me into becoming a type of citizen that I do
10 not choose to be or by coercing me and conspiring to trick me to participate in an illegal and unethical state or federal income
11 tax system, in clear violation of my God-given inalienable rights found in the Declaration of Independence, which reads in
12 pertinent part:

13 *“We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that **they are endowed by their Creator***
14 ***with certain unalienable Rights**, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.—“*

15 Notice it didn’t say “*by their government*” or “*by their citizenship*”, or “*by operation of law*” but rather “*by their Creator*”?
16 Here is what the author of the above, Thomas Jefferson, said privately about this subject:

17 *“A free people [claim] their rights as derived from the laws of nature, and not as the gift of their chief magistrate.”*
18 *[Thomas Jefferson: Rights of British America, 1774. ME 1:209, Papers 1:134]*

19 *“Can the liberties of a nation be thought secure when we have removed their only firm basis, a conviction in the*
20 *minds of the people that these liberties are of the gift of God? That they are not to be violated but with His wrath?”*
21 *[Thomas Jefferson: Notes on Virginia Q.XVIII, 1782. ME 2:227]*

22 Additional justification and authority for this change in your records of my citizenship status derives in part from [26 C.F.R.](#)
23 [§301.6109-1\(g\)](#):

24 [26 C.F.R. §301.6109-1\(g\)](#)

25 (g) *Special rules for taxpayer identifying numbers issued to foreign persons—*

26 (1) *General rule—*

27 (i) *Social security number.*

28 *A social security number is generally identified in the records and database of the Internal Revenue Service as a*
29 *number belonging to a U.S. citizen or resident alien individual. **A person may establish a different status for the***
30 ***number by providing proof of foreign status with the Internal Revenue Service under such procedures as the***
31 ***Internal Revenue Service shall prescribe, including the use of a form as the Internal Revenue Service may***
32 ***specify. Upon accepting an individual as a nonresident alien individual, the Internal Revenue Service will***
33 ***assign this status to the individual's social security number.***

34 The U.S. Supreme Court has declared in the case of *Hooven and Allison v. Evatt*, [324 U.S. 652](#) (1945) that:

35 *The term ‘United States’ may be used in any one of several senses. It may be merely*

36 *[1] the name of a sovereign occupying the position analogous to that of other sovereigns in the family of nations*
37 *[hereafter referred to as “U.S.*”].*

38 *[2] It may designate the territory over which the sovereignty of the United States extends [324 U.S. 652, 672],*
39 *[hereafter referred to as “U.S.**”] or*

40 *[3] it may be the collective name of the states which are united by and under the Constitution. [hereafter referred*
41 *to as “U.S.***”]*

42 Be advised that I am *not* disassociating with the “United States*” *the country (the first definition)*, nor with “United
43 States***”, the collective name of the states which are united under the constitution (third definition) but simply the municipal
44 corporation (U.S.***) located in the District of Columbia and federal territories *only*, which is the second definition identified
45 above and whose citizenship derives from [8 U.S.C. §1401](#) and NOT section 1 of the 14th Amendment, which states:

1 Fourteenth Amendment

2 Section 1. All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens
3 of the United States and of the state wherein they reside. No state shall make or enforce any law which shall
4 abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any state deprive any person of
5 life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal
6 protection of the laws.

7 To remove all doubt, the municipal corporation to which I am disassociating with is described below:

8 *United States Code*
9 *TITLE 28 - JUDICIARY AND JUDICIAL PROCEDURE*
10 *PART VI - PARTICULAR PROCEEDINGS*
11 *CHAPTER 176 - FEDERAL DEBT COLLECTION PROCEDURE*
12 *SUBCHAPTER A - DEFINITIONS AND GENERAL PROVISIONS*

13 Sec. 3002. Definitions

14 (15) "United States" means -

15 (A) a Federal corporation;

16 (B) an agency, department, commission, board, or other entity of the United States; or

17 (C) an instrumentality of the United States.

18 Be advised that in all future interaction with the government, if the term "U.S. CITIZEN" appears in all capital letters on any
19 form or application, such as, for example voter registration form, driver's license application, etc., then the meaning attributed
20 to such ambiguity (given the three definitions of "United States" above) by me and by implication also you, shall be NOT
21 that of statutory "citizen" pursuant to 8 U.S.C. §1401, or a "U.S.** citizen", but a Constitutional but not Statutory citizen
22 pursuant to the 14th Amendment until or unless a contrary intent is clearly expressed by the government to remove all
23 ambiguity created by the use of all capital letters. This also applies retroactively to any government forms I may have
24 completed in the past. Thus, I will not be jeopardizing the citizenship status established in this document by any interaction
25 with the government either in the past or in the future. The government is chargeable with a full knowledge of this reality in
26 all its dealings with me as an American National. Such a play on words is not unlike the chicanery found throughout the
27 Internal Revenue Code, which is rife with deceit and should have been declared "void for vagueness" a long time ago.

28 I have provided Enclosure (2): Affidavit of Citizenship, Domicile, and Tax Status, which is incorporated by reference and
29 mandatorily attached and inseparable from any and every government form I have ever filled out or will fill out. It documents
30 all the details of the status described in this section. Government forms or correspondence that become the subject of legal
31 discovery MUST be accompanied by this form, and especially those dealing with a tax liability.

32 Even though I am not and never have been a statutory "U.S. citizen" or "citizen of the United States" pursuant to 8 U.S.C.
33 §1401, on the assumption that your records reflect this incorrect status, you will note that in accordance with 8 U.S.C.
34 §1101 (a)(22), statutory "citizens of the United States" are also "nationals". Furthermore, pursuant to *Afroyim v. Rusk*, 387
35 U.S. 254 (1967), the government may not remove any aspect of my citizenship or nationality without my consent and
36 voluntary and willful participation, which I now give in the case only of any alleged status as a statutory but not constitutional
37 "citizen of the United States" or "U.S. citizen" but not "national" status.

38 "In our country the people are sovereign and the Government cannot sever its relationship to the people by
39 taking away their citizenship. Our Constitution governs us and we must never forget that our Constitution limits
40 the Government to those powers specifically granted or those that are necessary and proper to carry out the
41 specifically granted ones. The Constitution, of course, grants Congress no express power to strip people of their
42 citizenship, whether in the exercise of the implied power to regulate foreign affairs or in the exercise of any
43 specifically granted power.

44 [...]

45 "The entire legislative history of the 1868 Act makes it abundantly clear that there was a strong feeling in the
46 Congress that the only way the citizenship it conferred could be lost was by the voluntary renunciation or
47 abandonment by the citizen himself. And this was the unequivocal statement of the Court in the case of United
48 States v. Wong Kim Ark, 169 U.S. 649."
49 [*Afroyim v. Rusk*, 387 U.S. 253; 87 S.Ct. 1660 (1967)]

6. EFFECT ON FEDERAL JURISDICTION

[Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 17](#)(b) states that the law to be used in any civil case is the law deriving from the domicile of the party.

Federal Rules of Civil Procedure
IV. PARTIES > Rule 17.
[Rule 17. Parties Plaintiff and Defendant; Capacity](#)

(b) *Capacity to Sue or be Sued.*

Capacity to sue or be sued is determined as follows:

(1) *for an individual who is not acting in a representative capacity, by the law of the individual's domicile;*

(2) for a corporation [the "United States", in this case, or its officers on official duty representing the corporation], by the law under which it was organized; and

(3) *for all other parties, by the law of the state where the court is located, except that:*

(A) *a partnership or other unincorporated association with no such capacity under that state's law may sue or be sued in its common name to enforce a substantive right existing under the United States Constitution or laws; and*

(B) *28 U.S.C. §§754 and 959(a) govern the capacity of a receiver appointed by a United States court to sue or be sued in a United States court.*

[SOURCE: <http://www.law.cornell.edu/rules/frcp/Rule17.htm>]

It should also be pointed out that even if the government tries to declare that I am on its territory, which is a lie because God owns and controls the ENTIRE earth pursuant to Psalm 47:7 and Deut. 10:14, I still retain the First Amendment right to act FULL TIME, 24 hours a day, as a fiduciary for my God and the corporate Kingdom of God, in which case the only law that can apply is the laws where the incorporation occurred, which is the Holy Bible and Heaven. To declare otherwise is to again violate my First Amendment right of freedom to associate ALL of my time, effort, and labor to the service of a Sovereign being higher than any man or government. Since the government makes me a "taxpayer" by compelling me into a fiduciary role as a "public official" engaged in a "trade or business" and its "agent", then it is denying me equal protection of the law if it attempts to interfere with my right to choose to be an agent and fiduciary of another party other than it, and to associate and devote all of my time, labor, and property to that competing cause.

"He who has [understands and learns] My commandments [laws in the Bible] and keeps [obeys] them, it is he who loves Me. And he who loves Me will be loved by My Father, and I will love him and manifest Myself [in, through, and] to him [as My fiduciary]."
[John 14:21, Bible, NKJV]

"And we have known and believed the love that God has for us. God is love, and he who abides in love [obedience to God's Laws] abides in [and is a FIDUCIARY of] God, and God in him."
[1 John 4:16, Bible, NKJV]

Since my new domicile is the Kingdom of God/Heaven on Earth, and not within the jurisdiction of any man-made government, the only civil laws which apply to any litigation in federal court are those of the Holy Bible, which is the only law that I choose or volunteer to be subject to. The method of providing notice that these laws apply is documented in Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 44.1, which notice I now give. These foreign laws are exhaustively summarized below:

Laws of the Bible, Form #13.001
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

As a man or woman with no domicile within the "United States" or any federal territory, federal possession, or federal area within any state of the Union, I am not subject to federal law. I am a "transient foreigner" in relation to these jurisdictions, in fact. To wit:

"Transient foreigner. One who visits the country, without the intention of remaining."
[Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 1498]

I am also a "stateless person" who is not subject to federal law and may not become subject because I do not meet any of the criteria established in [28 U.S.C. §1332](#) for a diversity of citizenship action. I am not "stateless" for the purposes of Article III, Section 2 of the United States Constitution, because the "State" referred to there is a state of the Union, which is mutually exclusive to the "State" referenced in [28 U.S.C. §1332](#)(d). Since there are no Article III Courts, then there is no federal court

1 which could have jurisdiction over a diversity case documented in Article III, Section 2 of the United States Constitution,
2 which puts me outside of the jurisdiction of every federal circuit and district court. To wit:

3 *In order to be a citizen of a State within the meaning of the diversity statute, a natural person must both be a*
4 *citizen of the United States and be domiciled within the State. See Robertson v. Cease, 97 U.S. 646, 648-649*
5 *(1878); Brown v. Keene, 8 Pet. 112, 115 (1834). **The problem in this case is that Bettison, although a United***
6 *States citizen, has no domicile in any State. He is therefore "stateless" for purposes of § 1332(a)(3). Subsection*
7 *1332(a)(2), which confers jurisdiction in the District Court when a citizen of a State sues aliens only, also*
8 *could not be satisfied because Bettison is a United States citizen. [490 U.S. 829]*

9 *When a plaintiff sues more than one defendant in a diversity action, the plaintiff must meet the requirements of*
10 *the diversity statute for each defendant or face dismissal. Strawbridge v. Curtiss, 3 Cranch 267 (1806).{1} **Here,***
11 *Bettison's "stateless" status destroyed complete diversity under § 1332(a)(3), and his United States citizenship*
12 *destroyed complete diversity under § 1332(a)(2). Instead of dismissing the case, however, the Court of Appeals*
13 *panel granted Newman-Green's motion, which it had invited, to amend the complaint to drop Bettison as a party,*
14 *thereby producing complete diversity under § 1332(a)(2). 832 F.2d. 417 (1987). The panel, in an opinion by*
15 *Judge Easterbrook, relied both on 28 U.S.C. § 1653 and on Rule 21 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure as*
16 *sources of its authority to grant this motion. The panel noted that, because the guarantors are jointly and severally*
17 *liable, Bettison is not an indispensable party, and dismissing him would not prejudice the remaining guarantors.*
18 *832 F.2d. at 420, citing Fed.Rule Civ.Proc. 19(b). The panel then proceeded to the merits of the case, ruling in*
19 *Newman-Green's favor in large part, but remanding to allow the District Court to quantify damages and to*
20 *resolve certain minor issues.{2}*
21 *[Newman-Green v. Alfonso Larrain, 490 U.S. 826 (1989)]*

22 The only other method for asserting jurisdiction is under the [Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act \(F.S.I.A.\), 28 U.S.C.](#)
23 [§1605\(a\)\(2\)](#).

24 [TITLE 28 > PART IV > CHAPTER 97 > § 1605](#)
25 [§ 1605. General exceptions to the jurisdictional immunity of a foreign state](#)

26 (a) A foreign state shall not be immune from the jurisdiction of courts of the United States or of the States in any
27 case—

28 [. . .]

29 (2) in which the action is based upon a commercial activity carried on in the United States by the foreign state;
30 or upon an act performed in the United States in connection with a commercial activity of the foreign state
31 elsewhere; or upon an act outside the territory of the United States in connection with a commercial activity of
32 the foreign state elsewhere and that act causes a direct effect in the United States;

33 Since I have formally, officially, and repeatedly abandoned all actual and presumed commercial ties with the federal
34 government and its agents earlier in section 4 and in several earlier correspondences sent to the state and federal governments,
35 then that method of establishing jurisdiction may not be asserted by the government in my case. It is also insufficient to say
36 that I am not authorized to abandon all such ties. You will note that the U.S. Supreme Court said that the social security
37 system is not “coercive”.

38 *“Even though it be assumed that the exercise of a sovereign power by a state, in other respects valid, may be*
39 *rendered invalid because of the coercive effect of a federal statute enacted in the exercise of a power granted to*
40 *the national government, such coercion is lacking here. It is unnecessary to repeat now those considerations*
41 *which have L.Ed. to our decision in the Chas. C. Steward Machine Co. Case, that **the Social Security Act has no***
42 ***such coercive effect.** As the Social Security Act is not coercive in its operation, the Unemployment Compensation*
43 *Act cannot be set aside as an unconstitutional product of coercion.”*
44 *[Carmichael v. Southern Coal and Coke Co, 301 U.S. 495 (1937)]*

45 The only way the Social Security Act cannot be coercive is if it is not contractual AND those who joined not only this
46 program, but any other federal program, can quit at any time. This is especially true if their consent was procured or presumed
47 to have been procured before they reached adulthood or if that consent was procured through fraud.

48 *“... railroad benefits, like social security benefits, are not contractual and may be altered or even eliminated at*
49 *any time.”*
50 *[United States Railroad Retirement Board v. Fritz, 449 U.S. 166 (1980); See also Hisquierdo v. Hisquierdo, 439*
51 *U.S. 572, 575 (1979); Flemming v. Nestor, 363 U.S. 603, 608-611 (1960)]*

1 Should the government decide to proceed against me, then it must therefore do so under the Foreign Sovereign Immunities
2 Act, and in so doing, must satisfy all of the criteria that are part of the Minimum Contacts Doctrine elucidated by the Ninth
3 Circuit Court of Federal Appeals, when it held the following:²⁴

4 *In International Shoe Co. v. Washington*, 326 U.S. 310 (1945), the Supreme Court held that a court may exercise
5 personal jurisdiction over a defendant consistent with due process only if he or she has "certain minimum
6 contacts" with the relevant forum "such that the maintenance of the suit does not offend 'traditional notions of
7 fair play and substantial justice.'" *Id.* at 316 (quoting *Milliken v. Meyer*, 311 U.S. 457, 463 (1940)). Unless a
8 defendant's contacts with a forum are so substantial, continuous, and systematic that the defendant can be deemed
9 to be "present" in that forum for all purposes, a forum may exercise only "specific" jurisdiction - that is,
10 jurisdiction based on the relationship between the defendant's forum contacts and the plaintiff's claim. The parties
11 agree that only specific jurisdiction is at issue in this case.

12 **In this circuit, we analyze specific jurisdiction according to a three-prong test:**

13 **(1) The non-resident defendant must purposefully direct his activities or consummate some transaction with the**
14 **forum or resident thereof; or perform some act by which he purposefully avails himself of the privilege of**
15 **conducting activities in the forum, thereby invoking the benefits and protections of its laws;**

16 **(2) the claim must be one which arises out of or relates to the defendant's forum-related activities; and**

17 **(3) the exercise of jurisdiction must comport with fair play and substantial justice, i.e. it must be reasonable.**

18 *Schwarzenegger v. Fred Martin Motor Co.*, 374 F.3d. 797, 802 (9th Cir. 2004) (quoting *Lake v. Lake*, 817 F.2d.
19 1416, 1421 (9th Cir. 1987)). The first prong is determinative in this case. We have sometimes referred to it, in
20 shorthand fashion, as the "purposeful availment" prong. *Schwarzenegger*, 374 F.3d. at 802. Despite its label, this
21 prong includes both purposeful availment and purposeful direction. It may be satisfied by purposeful availment
22 of the privilege of doing business in the forum; by purposeful direction of activities at the forum; or by some
23 combination thereof.

24 We have typically treated "purposeful availment" somewhat differently in tort and contract cases. In tort cases,
25 we typically inquire whether a defendant "purposefully direct[s] his activities" at the forum state, applying an
26 "effects" test that focuses on the forum in which the defendant's actions were felt, whether or not the actions
27 themselves occurred within the forum. See *Schwarzenegger*, 374 F.3d. at 803 (citing *Calder v. Jones*, 465 U.S.
28 783, 789-90 (1984)). By contrast, in contract cases, we typically inquire whether a defendant "purposefully avails
29 itself of the privilege of conducting activities" or "consummate[s] [a] transaction" in the forum, focusing on
30 activities such as delivering goods or executing a contract. See *Schwarzenegger*, 374 F.3d. at 802. However, this
31 case is neither a tort nor a contract case. Rather, it is a case in which Yahoo! argues, based on the **First**
32 **Amendment**, that the French court's interim orders are unenforceable by an American court.

33 *LICRA and UEJF* contend that we must base our analysis on the so-called "effects" test of *Calder v. Jones*, 465
34 U.S. 783 (1984), which is normally employed in purposeful direction cases. See, e.g., *CE Distrib., LLC v. New*
35 *Sensor Corp.*, 380 F.3d. 1107, 1111 (9th Cir. 2004); *Schwarzenegger*, 374 F.3d. at 803; *Dole Food Co. v. Watts*,
36 303 F.3d. 1104, 1111 (9th Cir. 2002). In *Calder*, a California-based entertainer sued the National Enquirer and
37 various individual defendants for an allegedly defamatory article published in the Enquirer. The article had been
38 written and edited in Florida, and the defendants had few contacts with California. The Court nonetheless upheld
39 the exercise of personal jurisdiction in California because the defendants knew that the article would have an
40 effect in that state. In the words of the Court, the defendants had not engaged in "mere untargeted negligence";
41 rather, their "intentional, and allegedly tortious, actions were expressly aimed at California." 465 U.S. at 789.

42 In this circuit, we construe *Calder* to impose three requirements: "the defendant allegedly [must] have

43 (1) committed an intentional act,
44 (2) expressly aimed at the forum state,
45 (3) causing harm that the defendant knows is likely to be suffered in the forum state." *Schwarzenegger*, 374 F.3d.
46 at 803 (quoting *Dole Food*, 303 F.3d. at 1111).

47 In some of our cases, we have employed a slightly different formulation of the third requirement, specifying that
48 the act must have "caused harm, the brunt of which is suffered and which the defendant knows is likely to be
49 suffered in the forum state." *Bancroft & Masters, Inc. v. Augusta Nat'l Inc.*, 223 F.3d. 1082, 1087 (9th Cir. 2000)
50 (emphasis added). The "brunt" of the harm formulation originated in the principal opinion in *Core-Vent Corp. v.*
51 *Nobel Indus. AB*, 11 F.3d. 1482 (9th Cir. 1993). That opinion required that the "brunt" of the harm be suffered
52 in the forum state; based on that requirement, it concluded that there was no purposeful availment by the
53 defendant. *Id.* at 1486. A dissenting judge would have found purposeful availment. Relying on the Supreme Court's
54 opinion in *Keeton v. Hustler Magazine*, 465 U.S. 770 (1984), he specifically disavowed the "brunt" of the harm
55 formulation. *Core-Vent*, 11 F.3d. at 1492 (Wallace, C.J., dissenting) ("[T]he Supreme Court has already rejected

²⁴ NOTE: The approach of other circuits is similar, though not necessarily identical.

1 the proposition that the brunt of the harm must be suffered in the forum."). Without discussing the disputed "brunt"
2 of the harm formulation, a concurring judge agreed with the dissenter that purposeful availment could be found.
3 *Id.* at 1491 (Fernandez, J., concurring) ("I agree with Chief Judge Wallace that purposeful availment can be
4 found in this case."). Later opinions picked up the "brunt" of the harm formulation of the principal opinion in
5 *Core-Vent* without noting that at least one, and possibly two, of the judges on the panel disagreed with it. See,
6 e.g., *Bancroft & Masters*, 223 F.3d. at 1087; *Panavision*, 141 F.3d. at 1321; *Caruth v. Int'l Psychoanalytical*
7 *Ass'n*, 59 F.3d. 126, 128 (9th Cir. 1995).

8 We take this opportunity to clarify our law and to state that the "brunt" of the harm need not be suffered in the
9 forum state. If a jurisdictionally sufficient amount of harm is suffered in the forum state, it does not matter that
10 even more harm might have been suffered in another state. In so stating we are following *Keeton*, decided the
11 same day as *Calder*, in which the Court sustained the exercise of personal jurisdiction in New Hampshire even
12 though "[i]t is undoubtedly true that the bulk of the harm done to petitioner occurred outside New Hampshire."
13 465 U.S. at 780.
14 [[Yahoo! Inc. v. La Ligue Contre Le Racisme Et L'Antisemitisme](#), 433 F.3d. 1199 (9th Cir. 01/12/2006)]

15 **7. EFFECT ON STATE JURISDICTION**

16 The effect on state jurisdiction of this action to terminate domicile with the government having jurisdiction where I am
17 temporarily present includes the following:

- 18 1. Anyone who sues me in a state Court is suing a "nonresident defendant" and as such:
19 1.1. Must treat me as a "foreign sovereign" and satisfy the requirements of the [Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act](#)
20 [\(F.S.I.A.\)](#), [28 U.S.C. §1602](#) et seq., or the Minimum Contacts Doctrine in order to bring me within the jurisdiction
21 of the Court:

22 *The Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment limits the power of a state court to render a valid*
23 *personal judgment against a nonresident defendant. *Kulko v. California Superior Court*, 436 U.S. 84, 91*
24 *(1978). A judgment rendered in violation of due process is void in the rendering State and is not entitled to full*
25 *faith and credit elsewhere. *Pennover v. Neff*, 95 U.S. 714, 732 -733 (1878). Due process requires that the*
26 *defendant be given adequate notice of the suit, *Mullane v. Central Hanover Trust Co.*, 339 U.S. 306, 313 -314*
27 *(1950), and be subject to the personal jurisdiction of the court, *International Shoe Co. v. Washington*, 326 U.S.*
28 *310 (1945). In the present case, it is not contended that notice was inadequate; the only question is whether these*
29 *particular petitioners were subject to the jurisdiction of the Oklahoma courts.*

30 *As has long been settled, and as we reaffirm today, a state court may exercise personal jurisdiction over a*
31 *nonresident defendant only so long as there exist "minimum contacts" between the defendant and the forum*
32 *State. *International Shoe Co. v. Washington*, supra, at 316. The concept of minimum contacts, in turn, can be*
33 *seen to perform two related, but [444 U.S. 286, 292] distinguishable, functions. It protects the defendant*
34 *against the burdens of litigating in a distant or inconvenient forum. And it acts to ensure that the States,*
35 *through their courts, do not reach out beyond the limits imposed on them by their status as coequal sovereigns*
36 *in a federal system.*

37 *The protection against inconvenient litigation is typically described in terms of "reasonableness" or "fairness."*
38 *We have said that the defendant's contacts with the forum State must be such that maintenance of the suit "does*
39 *not offend traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice."* *International Shoe Co. v. Washington*, supra,
40 *at 316, quoting *Milliken v. Meyer*, 311 U.S. 457, 463 (1940). The relationship between the defendant and the*
41 *forum must be such that it is "reasonable . . . to require the corporation to defend the particular suit which is*
42 *brought there."* [326 U.S., at 317](#). Implicit in this emphasis on reasonableness is the understanding that the burden
43 on the defendant, while always a primary concern, will in an appropriate case be considered in light of other
44 relevant factors, including the forum State's interest in adjudicating the dispute, see *McGee v. International Life*
45 *Ins. Co.*, [355 U.S. 220, 223](#) (1957); the plaintiff's interest in obtaining convenient and effective relief, see *Kulko*
46 *v. California Superior Court*, supra, at 92, at least when that interest is not adequately protected by the plaintiff's
47 power to choose the forum, cf. *Shaffer v. Heitner*, [433 U.S. 186, 211](#), n. 37 (1977); the interstate judicial system's
48 interest in obtaining the most efficient resolution of controversies; and the shared interest of the several States in
49 furthering fundamental substantive social policies, see *Kulko v. California Superior Court*, supra, at 93, 98.
50 [[World-Wide Volkswagen Corp. v. Woodson](#), 444 U.S. 286 (1980)]

- 51 1.2. May not cite anything but the law from my chosen domicile, which is the Holy Bible and the common law, in
52 resolving the dispute. This is consistent with [Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 17\(b\)](#), which says that the law from
53 the person's domicile or the law of the "state" to which he is a member, both of which are synonymous in the case
54 of a citizen and domiciliary of the Kingdom of God, govern the choice of law in the trial.
55 2. The state Family Courts no longer have any in personam jurisdiction over me or my property in the context of marriage
56 or divorce. All family law, like most civil law, is based on domicile, also called "residence", and no court can have
57 jurisdiction over a non-domiciled person.

1 Under our system of law, judicial power to grant a divorce -- jurisdiction, strictly speaking -- is founded on
2 domicil. *Bell v. Bell*, 181 U.S. 175; *Andrews v. Andrews*, 188 U.S. 14. The framers of the Constitution were
3 familiar with this jurisdictional prerequisite, and, since 1789, neither this Court nor any other court in the
4 English-speaking world has questioned it. Domicil implies a nexus between person and place of such permanence
5 as to control the creation of legal relations and responsibilities of the utmost significance. The domicil of one
6 spouse within a State gives power to that State, we have held, to dissolve [325 U.S. 230] a marriage wheresover
7 contracted. In view of *Williams v. North Carolina*, supra, the jurisdictional requirement of domicil is freed from
8 confusing refinements about "matrimonial domicil," see *Davis v. Davis*, 305 U.S. 32, 41, and the like. Divorce,
9 like marriage, is of concern not merely to the immediate parties. It affects personal rights of the deepest
10 significance. It also touches basic interests of society. Since divorce, like marriage, creates a new status, every
11 consideration of policy makes it desirable that the effect should be the same wherever the question arises.

12 [. . .]

13 *If a finding by the court of one State that domicil in another State has been abandoned were conclusive upon the*
14 *old domiciliary State, the policy of each State in matters of most intimate concern could be subverted by the policy*
15 *of every other State. This Court has long ago denied the existence of such destructive power. The issue has a far*
16 *reach. **For domicil is the foundation of probate jurisdiction, precisely as it is that of divorce.***
17 [*Williams v. North Carolina*, 325 U.S. 226 (1945)]

- 18 3. I am no longer eligible to obtain or hold a driver's license in any state of the Union because domicile in the "State" is a
19 prerequisite to being issued one. Therefore, this correspondence shall also constitute a formal request to rescind my state
20 driver's license, if any and purge all records of same. Every state of the Union:
21 3.1. Requires a "residence" or "domicile" in order to issue a driver's license.
22 3.2. Cannot lawfully issue driver's licenses to non-domiciled persons.
23 3.3. Cannot enforce the vehicle code against non-domiciled persons.
24 3.4. Requires everyone being issued a state driver's license to surrender all other driver's licenses before being issued a
25 new one, because a person can only have domicile in ONE place at a time.

26 *California Vehicle Code*

27 12805. The department shall not issue a driver's license to, or renew a driver's license of, any person:

28 [. . .]

29 (f) Who holds a valid driver's license issued by a foreign jurisdiction unless the license has been surrendered to
30 the department, or is lost or destroyed.

31 [<http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/waisgate?WAISdocID=5072529233+0+0+0&WAISSaction=retrieve>]

32
33 "A person may have more than one residence but only one domicile."
34 [*Black's Law Dictionary*, Sixth Edition, p. 485 under "domicile"]

35 By way of example, California requires domicile or "residence" as a prerequisite to issuing a driver's license:

36 *California Vehicle Code*

37 12505. (a) (1) For purposes of this division only and notwithstanding Section 516, residency shall be determined
38 as a person's state of domicil. "State of domicil" means the state where a person has his or her true, fixed,
39 and permanent home and principal residence and to which he or she has manifested the intention of returning
40 whenever he or she is absent.

41 Prima facie evidence of residency for driver's licensing purposes includes, but is not limited to, the following:

42 (A) Address where registered to vote.

43 (B) Payment of resident tuition at a public institution of higher education.

44 (C) Filing a homeowner's property tax exemption.

45 (D) Other acts, occurrences, or events that indicate presence in the state is more than temporary or transient.

46 (2) California residency is required of a person in order to be issued a commercial driver's license under this
47 code.

48 (b) The presumption of residency in this state may be rebutted by satisfactory evidence that the licensee's
49 primary residence is in another state.

50 (c) Any person entitled to an exemption under Section 12502, 12503, or 12504 may operate a motor vehicle in
51 this state for not to exceed 10 days from the date he or she establishes residence in this state, except that he or

1 she shall obtain a license from the department upon becoming a resident [domiciliary] before being employed
2 for compensation by another for the purpose of driving a motor vehicle on the highways.
3 [<http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/waisgate?WAISdocID=49860512592+2+0+0&WAIAction=retrieve>]

4 The “State” they are talking about in the California Vehicle Code above, incidentally, is a “federal State” or federal area
5 within the exterior limits of the Republic of California. This is the *only* area within that state not protected by the
6 Constitution and in which the government may therefore license or make into a privilege the exercise of a Constitutional
7 right to travel. In that sense, the entire state vehicle code is “private law” that applies only to those who, through
8 exercising their private right to contract, place their “res” or legal identity in a virtual place not protected by the Bill of
9 Rights. Other states of the Union implement their vehicle codes by EXACTLY the same mechanisms.

10 **8. FACTS AND PRESUMPTIONS ESTABLISHED BY THIS LEGAL NOTICE**

11 The only legitimate use of any kind of presumption is the protection of Constitutionally guaranteed rights. Examples of why
12 this is an absolute requirement of American Jurisprudence are described below:

- 13 1. The presumption in criminal jurisprudence that a criminal defendant is innocent until proven guilty beyond a
14 reasonable doubt.

15 *The presumption of innocence plays a unique role in criminal proceedings. As Chief Justice Burger explained in*
16 *his opinion for the Court in Estelle v. Williams, 425 U.S. 501 (1976): [507 U.S. 284]*

17 *The presumption of innocence, although not articulated in the Constitution, is a basic*
18 *component of a fair trial under our system of criminal justice. Long ago this Court stated:*

19 *The principle that there is a presumption of innocence in favor of the accused is the*
20 *undoubted law, axiomatic and elementary, and its enforcement lies at the foundation of the*
21 *administration of our criminal law.*

22 *Coffin v. United States, 156 U.S. 432, 453 (1895).*
23 [[Delo v. Lashely, 507 U.S. 272 \(1993\)](#)]

- 24 2. The rule that conclusive presumptions which injure constitutionally protected rights are impermissible.

25 (1) [8:4993] *Conclusive presumptions affecting protected interests:*

26 *A conclusive presumption may be defeated where its application would impair a party's constitutionally-protected*
27 *liberty or property interests. In such cases, conclusive presumptions have been held to violate a party's due*
28 *process and equal protection rights. [Vlandis v. Kline (1973) 412 U.S. 441, 449, 93 S.Ct. 2230, 2235; Cleveland*
29 *Bed. of Ed. v. LaFleur (1974) 414 U.S. 632, 639-640, 94 S.Ct. 1208, 1215-presumption under Illinois law that*
30 *unmarried fathers are unfit violates process]*
31 [[Federal Civil Trials and Evidence, Rutter Group, paragraph 8:4993, p. 8K-34](#)]

- 32 3. The presumption that only laws which specifically identify the conduct that is prohibited unambiguously are
33 enforceable. This is called the “void for vagueness” doctrine.

34 *“Law fails to meet requirements of due process clause if it is so vague and standardless that it leaves public*
35 *uncertain as to conduct it prohibits or leaves judges and jurors free to decide, without any legally fixed standards,*
36 *what is prohibited and what is not in each particular case.”*
37 [[Giaccio v. State of Pennsylvania, 382 U.S. 399; 86 S.Ct. 518 \(1966\)](#)]

- 38 4. The fact that presumption may not be used as a substitute for evidence in any legal proceeding.

39 *A presumption is an assumption of fact that the law requires to be made from another fact or group of facts found*
40 *or otherwise established in the action. A presumption is not evidence. A presumption is either conclusive or*
41 *rebuttable. Every rebuttable presumption is either (a) a presumption affecting the burden of producing evidence*
42 *or (b) a presumption affecting the burden of proof. Calif.Evid.Code, §600.*
43 [[Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 1185](#)]

44 The following subsections and this document in general will therefore create presumptions about my status and my intentions
45 which shall: 1. Protect my Constitutional rights; 2. Form a basis in all legal proceedings between me, the sovereign human
46 being, and the government. If you would like to know more about why presumptions which do anything *but* protect
47 constitutional rights are impermissible in any court of law, see:

Presumption: Chief Weapon for Unlawfully Enlarging Federal Jurisdiction, Form #05.017
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

8.1. Presumptions about the meaning of terms in this document

Throughout this document, all terms shall have the definitions indicated in the following document, which is incorporated herein by reference:

Injury Defense Franchise and Agreement, Form #06.027, Section 4
<https://sedm.org/Forms/06-AvoidingFranch/InjuryDefenseFranchise.pdf>

8.2. Presumptions about Meaning of words in all correspondence to or from the government before or after this correspondence is sent

Any federal forms submitted by me or sent to me by the government:

1. Are considered untrustworthy and unreliable, pursuant to the rulings of the federal courts. See section 4 of the document below:

Reasonable Belief About Income Tax Liability, Form #05.007:
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

2. Shall *not* be made factual or trustworthy or actionable in any manner under any civil statutory law even by a signature of me under penalty of perjury. An affidavit of the truthfulness or reliability of any tax form that the IRS itself positively refuses to vouch for the accuracy of shall *not* make it any more accurate or truthful than a blank form. Holding me any more accountable for my statements than employees of the government is a violation of the equal protection of the laws. The implication of this is that any perjury statement appearing on any federal form pursuant to [28 U.S.C. §1746](#) shall not be actionable and shall create no obligation on my part unless I specifically state otherwise.
3. Such forms and all attachments shall NOT be construed as a consent or acceptance of any proposed government “benefit”, any proposed relationship, or any civil status under any government law per U.C.C. §2-206.
4. Such forms and all attachments shall constitute a COUNTER-OFFER and a SUBSTITUTE relationship that nullifies and renders unenforceable the original government OFFER and ANY commercial, contractual, or civil relationship OTHER than the one described herein between the Submitter and the Recipient. See U.C.C. §2-209. Parties stipulate that the ONLY “Merchant” (per U.C.C. §2-104(1)) in their relationship is the Submitter of this form and that the government or its agents and assigns is the “Buyer” per U.C.C. §2-103(1)(a).

Injury Defense Franchise and Agreement, Form #06.027, Section 4
<https://sedm.org/Forms/06-AvoidingFranch/InjuryDefenseFranchise.pdf>

8.3. Privacy Act Warning, License Agreement, and “Shrink Wrap” License applying to all correspondence sent to government

The content of this section establishes every submission to the government as licensed, privileged, copyrighted, and protected information.

1. The information contained in all such submissions is protected by the [Privacy Act, 5 U.S.C. §552a](#).
2. [5 U.S.C. §552a](#)(b) indicates that the government MUST have my consent to use or transmit or store any information about me and I DO NOT give said consent.
3. Recipient is warned that the Submitter **DOES NOT GIVE** his consent to store, use, or transmit any of the information contained herein in electronic form, and especially is not authorized to share any of this information with any other federal or state agency, bureau, instrumentality of any description. All form or information submissions to the government are licensed and copyrighted and may not be used for ANY commercial or governmental purpose.
4. Any unauthorized use of information pertaining to the Submitter and contained on any submission to the government, any attached form, or previously submitted to the government is subject to a \$100,000 penalty per incident plus any tax or penalty liability that might result from the unauthorized use of said information.

8.4. Penalty of Perjury and jurat statements on government forms submitted

The perjury statement appearing on all government forms to which this form is attached is not materially modified in symbolic form, but regardless of what it says, the following meaning is intended and is the ONLY meaning that may be enforced or admitted as evidence in any court of law.

“Under penalties of perjury from without the United States and from within the United States of America pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1746(1), I declare that the attached correspondence, facts, and statements are true, correct, and complete to the best of my knowledge and ability. This perjury statement may only be enforced in a court of a state of the Union where neither the judge nor any member of the jury is a “taxpayer” or in receipt of any pecuniary benefit which derives from Subtitle A of the Internal Revenue Code in order to ensure that there is no conflict of interest which might violate 18 U.S.C. §208 or 28 U.S.C. §455.” All alleged “taxes” paid UNDER PROTEST presumptions

8.5. All alleged “taxes” paid UNDER PROTEST presumptions

Treasury Decision 3445 establishes that taxes which are voluntarily paid are nonrefundable and may not be recouped. Here is the text:

The principle that taxes voluntarily paid cannot be recovered back is thoroughly established. It has been so declared in the following cases in the Supreme Court: *United States v. New York & Cuba Mail Steamship Co.* (200 U.S. 488, 493, 494); *Chesebrough v. United States* (192 U.S. 253); *Little v. Bowers* (134 U.S. 547, 554); *Wright v. Blakeslee* (101 U.S. 174, 178); *Railroad Co. v. Commissioner* (98 U.S. 541, 543); *Lamborn v. County Commissioners* (97 U.S. 181); *Elliott v. Swartwout* (10 Pet. 137). And there are numerous like cases in other Federal courts: *Procter & Gamble Co. v. United States* (281 Fed. 1014); *Vaughan v. Riordan* (280 Fed. 742, 745); *Beer v. Moffatt* (192 Fed. 984, affirmed 209 Fed. 779); *Newhall v. Jordan* (160 Fed. 661); *Christie Street Commission Co. v. United States* (126 Fed. 991); *Kentucky Bank v. Stone* (88 Fed. 383); *Corkie v. Maxwell* (7 Fed. Cas. 3231).

And the rule of the Federal courts is not at all peculiar to them. It is the settled general rule of the State courts as well that no matter what may be the ground of the objection to the tax or assessment if it has been paid voluntarily and without compulsion it cannot be recovered back in an action at law, unless there is some constitutional or statutory provision which gives to one so paying such a right notwithstanding the payment was made without compulsion.—*Adams v. New Bedford* (155 Mass. 317); *McCue v. Monroe County* (162 N.Y. 235); *Taylor v. Philadelphia Board of Health* (31 P.St. 73); *Williams v. Merritt* (152 Mich. 621); *Gould v. Hennepin County* (76 Minn. 379); *Martin v. Kearney County* (62 Minn. 538); *Gar v. Hurd* (92 Ills. 315); *Slimmer v. Chickasaw County* (140 Iowa, 448); *Warren v. San Francisco* (150 Calif. 167); *State v. Chicago & C. R. Co.* (165 No. 597).

And it has been many times held, in the absence of a statute on the subject, that mere payment under protest does not save a payment from being voluntary, in the sense which forbids a recovery back of the tax paid, if it was not made under any duress, compulsion, or threats, or under the pressure of process immediately available for the forcible collection of the tax.—*Dexter v. Boston* (176 Mass. 247); *Flower v. Lance* (59 N.Y. 603); *Williams v. Merritt* (152 Mich. 621); *Oakland Cemetery Association v. Ramsey County* (98 Minn. 404); *Robins v. Latham* (134 No. 466); *Whitbeck v. Minch* (48 Ohio St. 210); *Peebles v. Pittsburgh*. (101 Pa.St. 304); *Montgomery v. Cowlitz County* (14 Wash. 230); *Cincinnati & C. R. Co. v. Hamilton County* (120 Tenn. 1).

The principle that a tax or an assessment voluntarily paid cannot be recovered back is an ancient one in the common law and is of general application. See Cooley on Taxation (vol. 2, 3d ed. p. 1495). That eminent authority also points out that every man is supposed to know the law, and if he voluntarily makes a payment which the law would not compel him to make he cannot afterwards assign his ignorance of the law as a reason why the State should furnish him with legal remedies to recover it back. And he adds:

Especially is this the case when the officer receiving the money, who is chargeable with no more knowledge of the law than the party making payment, is not put on his guard by any warning or protest, and the money is over to the use of the public in apparent acquiescence in the justice of the exaction. Mistake of fact can scarcely exist in such a case except in connection with negligence; as the illegalities which render such a demand a nullity must appear from the records, and the taxpayer is just as much bound to inform himself what the records show, or do not show, as are the public authorities. The rule of law is a rule of sound public policy also; it is a rule of quiet as well as of good faith, and precludes the courts being occupied in undoing the arrangements of parties which they have voluntarily made, and into which they have not been drawn by fraud or accident, or by any excusable ignorance of their legal rights and liabilities.

*But the question presented must be decided upon the language of section 252 hereinbefore set forth in this opinion. In the cases within the purview of the section the right of the taxpayer to so much of the tax as he has paid in excess of that properly due is not made to depend upon whether it was paid under protest. The nature of the section must be regarded, as in the case of the statute before the court in *United States v. Hvoslef* (237 U.S. 1,*

12), and so regarded it negatives any intent that a protest should be necessary. In this case as in that the right of repayment is established by the express terms of the statute itself.

The section is intended to give the Commissioner of Internal Revenue power to credit or refund overpayments when no claim for a refund is filed by the taxpayer. Prior to that enactment the commissioner had no authority to credit or refund overpayments of taxes unless appeal was duly made to him in the manner prescribed by section 3220 of the Revised Statutes.

Section 252 of the act of 1918 has nothing whatever to do with the collector of internal revenue or with an action against him. The power or duty to make refunds under the section is vested not in the collector but in the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. The commissioner, prior to the enactment of section 252, had no authority to credit or refund overpayments of taxes unless appeal was duly made to him in the manner prescribed by section 3220 of the Revised Statutes, which read: "The Commissioner of Internal Revenue * * * is authorized, on appeal to him made, to remit, refund, and pay back all taxes erroneously or illegally assessed or collected * * *." And the appeal had to be made within two years after the cause of action accrued, as required by section 3228.

That being the condition of the law Congress enacted section 252 of the act of 1918. The primary purpose of that enactment was to permit the commissioner of his own volition upon discovery of any overpayment to credit or refund the same notwithstanding the provision of section 3228 of the Revised Statutes, and to limit the time within which he could make such credit or refund to "five years from the date the return was made. The section does not in express terms purport to give the taxpayer a right to sue for the recovery of the excess in the tax paid. It simply defines the powers and duties of the commissioner in correcting overpayments which he finds have been made. It was intended to protect the commissioner in making refunds which ought to be made prescribed by section 3228 had expired. .

Taxes erroneously paid or illegally exacted may be recovered-

1. From the Commissioner of Internal Revenue under section 3220 of the Revised Statutes heretofore referred to.

2. Through an action at law brought against the United States. This is by virtue of the so-called Tucker Act (Judicial Code, sec. 24, par. 20, ch. 397, 24 Stat. 635).being held that a suit may be maintained directly against the United States for the recovery of taxes wrongfully assessed and collected.-Emery, Bird, Thayer, Realty Co. v. United States (198 Fed. 242, 249); Christie Street Commission Co. v. United States (136 Fed. 326).

3. Through an action against a collector who wrongfully exacted the tax and who may be sued for such money as he is not entitled to retain.--Smietanka v. Indiana Steel Co. (257 U.S. 1); Sage v. United States (250 U.S. 33).

But in Elliott v. Swartwout (10 Pet. 137), the court held that the collector was not liable in an action to recover the excess duties mistakenly collected unless protest was made at the time of payment or notice was given to him not to pay the money over to the Treasury. The principle applied was the one applied to agents in private transactions- that a voluntary payment to an agent without notice of objection would not subject the agent to liability he having paid it over to his principal, but that payment with notice or with a protest might make the agent liable if in despite of the notice or protest he paid the money over to his principal. But after an act of Congress required collectors to pay over much moneys it has held that the personal liability was gone.- Cary v. Curtis (3 How. 236). But later statutes, as pointed out in Smietanka v. Indiana Steel Co., supra, recognize suits against collectors in such cases.

In our opinion section 252 of the act of 1918 was apparently designed to counteract the effect of section 3228 of the Revised Statutes which limited refunds to a period of two years after the tax had been paid, and it relates to the matter of obtaining a credit or a refund from the commissioner. If it impliedly gives a cause of action, about which we are not now called upon to express an opinion, it is a cause of action against the United States. It does not confer a right to bring an action against the collector in cam in which no Liability otherwise existed. [Treasury Decision 3445, February 27, 1923; SOURCE: <http://famguardian.org/TaxFreedom/CitesByTopic/Voluntary-TD3445.pdf>]

This correspondence establishes the inferences that may be drawn from my behavior in the context of all monies paid to the U.S. government under the auspices of any statute within the Internal Revenue Code. The following presumptions are hereby established:

1. That all PAST, PRESENT, and FUTURE monies paid to the U.S. government and any state of the Union by me:
 - 1.1. Are paid UNDER PROTEST and duress, and NOT voluntarily.

"An agreement [consent] obtained by duress, coercion, or intimidation is invalid, since the party coerced is not exercising his free will, and the test is not so much the means by which the party is compelled to execute the agreement as the state of mind induced.²⁵ Duress, like fraud, rarely becomes material, except where a contract

²⁵ Brown v. Pierce, 74 U.S. 205, 7 Wall. 205, 19 L.Ed. 134

1 or conveyance has been made which the maker wishes to avoid. As a general rule, duress renders the contract
2 or conveyance voidable, not void, at the option of the person coerced,²⁶ and it is susceptible of ratification. Like
3 other voidable contracts, it is valid until it is avoided by the person entitled to avoid it.²⁷ However, duress in the
4 form of physical compulsion, in which a party is caused to appear to assent when he has no intention of doing so,
5 is generally deemed to render the resulting purported contract void.²⁸
6 [American Jurisprudence 2d, Duress, §21 (1999)]

7 1.2. Are NOT “gifts” as defined in [31 U.S.C. §3113](#).

8 1.3. Are withheld or paid “under color but without actual authority” of law and therefore constitute a FRAUDULENT
9 transaction or payment or conveyance and an illegal bribe to the public officials who will expend them in
10 violation of [18 U.S.C. §201](#).

11 1.4. Constitute FRAUD, because they do not represent or indicate the fact that they were not paid voluntarily. The
12 existence of the duress indicated later is why they willfully do NOT indicate the duress that is the cause of them
13 being paid.

14 *American Jurisprudence, 2d [legal encyclopedia]*
15 *Fraud and Deceit*
16 §8 *Effect*

17 ***Fraud vitiates every transaction and all contracts.***²⁹ *Indeed, the principle is often stated, in broad and sweeping*
18 *language, that fraud destroys the validity of everything into which it enters, and that it vitiates the most solemn*
19 *contracts, documents, and even judgments.*³⁰ *Fraud, as it is sometimes said, vitiates every act, which statement*
20 *embodies a thoroughly sound doctrine when it is properly applied to the subject matter in controversy and to the*
21 *parties thereto and in a proper forum.*³¹ *As a general rule, fraud will vitiate a contract notwithstanding that it*
22 *contains a provision to the effect that no representations have been made as an inducement to enter into it, or*
23 *that either party shall be bound by any representation not contained therein, or a similar provision attempting to*
24 *nullify extraneous representations. Such provisions do not, in most jurisdictions, preclude a charge of fraud*
25 *based on oral representations.*³²

26 ***It is a general rule in the law of contracts, however, that an agreement induced by fraud is voidable***³³ ***and***
27 ***not void.***³⁴ *although the rule laid down in some cases is that fraud in the factum or execution renders the*
28 *agreement void, whereas fraud in the treaty or inducement renders it merely voidable.*³⁵ ***Fraudulent***
29 ***representations, to avoid a contract, need not be such as would sustain an indictment for false pretenses.***³⁶ *In*
30 *preventing actual consent, fraud may be as effectual as mistake or a want of capacity; and where such is the fact*
31 *in dealing with ordinary contracts, its effect is to vitiate and invalidate them.*³⁷ *Ordinarily, however, a contract*

²⁶ *Barnette v. Wells Fargo Nevada Nat'l Bank*, 270 U.S. 438, 70 L.Ed. 669, 46 S.Ct. 326 (holding that acts induced by duress which operate solely on the mind, and fall short of actual physical compulsion, are not void at law, but are voidable only, at the election of him whose acts were induced by it); *Faske v. Gershman*, 30 Misc.2d. 442, 215 N.Y.S.2d. 144; *Glennay v. Crane* (Tex Civ App Houston (1st Dist)), 352 S.W.2d. 773, writ ref n r e (May 16, 1962); *Carroll v. Fetty*, 121 W.Va. 215, 2 S.E.2d. 521, cert den 308 U.S. 571, 84 L.Ed. 479, 60 S.Ct. 85.

²⁷ *Faske v. Gershman*, 30 Misc.2d. 442, 215 N.Y.S.2d. 144; *Heider v. Unicum*, 142 or 416, 20 P.2d. 384; *Glennay v. Crane* (Tex Civ App Houston (1st Dist)), 352 S.W.2d. 773, writ ref n r e (May 16, 1962)

²⁸ Restatement 2d, Contracts § 174, stating that if conduct that appears to be a manifestation of assent by a party who does not intend to engage in that conduct is physically compelled by duress, the conduct is not effective as a manifestation of assent.

²⁹ *Jackson v. State*, 210 App.Div. 115, 205 N.Y.S. 658, affd 241 N.Y. 563, 150 N.E. 556; *Trowbridge v. Oehmsen*, 207 App.Div. 740, 202 N.Y.S. 833, affd 241 N.Y. 564, 150 N.E. 556.

³⁰ *Johnson v. Waters*, 111 U.S. 640, 28 L.Ed. 547, 4 S.Ct. 619; *United States v. Throckmorton*, 98 U.S. 61, 25 L.Ed. 93; *Nudd v. Burrows*, 91 U.S. 426, 23 L.Ed. 286; *Stoddard v. Chambers*, 2 How (U.S.) 284, 11 L.Ed. 269; *United States v. The Amistad*, 15 Pet (U.S.) 518, 10 L.Ed. 826; 99 *Pratt Street Corp. v. Stand Realty Corp.*, 27 Conn Supp 101, 230 A.2d. 613; *Rathbun v. Baumel*, 196 Iowa 1233, 191 N.W. 297, 30 A.L.R. 216; *Taylor v. State*, 73 Md. 208, 20 A. 914; *Aspinwall v. Sabin*, 22 Neb. 73, 34 N.W. 72; *Berry v. Stevens*, 168 Okla. 124, 31 P.2d. 950; *Alder v. Crosier*, 50 Utah 437, 168 P. 83; *Re Ernst*, 179 Wis. 646, 192 N.W. 65, 30 A.L.R. 681; *Baylies v. Vanden Boom*, 40 Wyo. 411, 278 P. 551, 70 A.L.R. 924.

³¹ *Field v. Seabury*, 19 How (US) 323, 15 L.Ed. 650; *Re Ernst*, 179 Wis. 646, 192 N.W. 65, 30 A.L.R. 681.

³² See 17 *American Jurisprudence 2d*, Contracts §191 (1999).

³³ *Joseph Martinelli & Co. v. Simon Siegel Co.* (CA1 Mass) 176 F.2d. 98, 13 A.L.R.2d. 1243; *Manly v. Ohio Shoe Co.* (CA4), 25 F.2d. 384, 59 A.L.R. 413; *Pocatello Secur. Trust Co. v. Henry*, 35 Idaho 321, 206 P. 175, 27 A.L.R. 337; *Commissioner of Banks v. Cosmopolitan Trust Co.*, 253 Mass. 205, 148 N.E. 609, 41 A.L.R. 658; *Salter v. Aviation Salvage Co.* 129 Miss 217, 91 So 340, 26 A.L.R. 987.

³⁴ *Commissioner of Banks v. Cosmopolitan Trust Co.*, 253 Mass. 205, 148 N.E. 609, 41 A.L.R. 658; *Ettlinger v. National Surety Co.*, 221 N.Y. 467, 117 N.E. 945, 3 A.L.R. 865.

³⁵ See 17 *American Jurisprudence 2d*, Contracts §151 (1999).

³⁶ *Nichols v. Michael*, 23 N.Y. 264; *McNair v. Southern States Finance Co.*, 191 N.C. 710, 133 S.E. 85.

³⁷ *Brown v. Scott*, 140 Md. 258, 117 A. 114, 22 A.L.R. 810.

1 induced by fraud is voidable at the option of the person defrauded, who must take affirmative action for relief.³⁸
2 Generally speaking, the right to avoid a contract induced by fraud must be exercised before the rights of third
3 parties have intervened.³⁹

4 *Fraudulent misrepresentations may operate as an estoppel in pais, whereby the fraudulent person is precluded*
5 *from denying a statement which another has relied upon to his injury.*⁴⁰ *As respects fraud in law, that is,*
6 *constructive fraud as contradistinguished from fraud in fact, or actual fraud, where that which is valid can be*
7 *separated from that which is invalid without defeating the general intent, the maxim, "void in part, void in toto,"*
8 *does not necessarily apply, and the transaction may be sustained notwithstanding the invalidity of a particular*
9 *provision. If an original transaction is valid, it cannot be rendered fraudulent by subsequent events, as by the*
10 *mere nonperformance of a contract,*⁴¹ *unless, under the rule in force in the majority of jurisdictions, there is a*
11 *coexisting intention not to perform.*⁴² *In the event of a controversy between the parties regarding fraud in the*
12 *contract, a "valid" contract is what a court acting with jurisdiction says it is.*⁴³

13 *A person does not, by attempting to defraud another, forfeit his property to the latter.*⁴⁴
14 [*37 American Jurisprudence 2d, Fraud and Deceit, §8 (1999)*]

- 15 1.5. Constitute STOLEN PROPERTY for which this document constitutes a formal ADVANCED CRIMINAL
16 COMPLAINT against the payer or withholder, who shall be regarded as the THIEF or EXTORTIONER, if he is
17 not me, the submitter.
- 18 1.6. That the receiving government is willfully acting as a money launderer for the STOLEN money or property for
19 the period during which it is acting as bailee over it. It may not lawfully possess, spend, or use such proceeds for
20 any public purpose absent my consent, which I do not, never have, and never will give. Money laundering is a
21 criminal violation of 18 U.S.C. §1956.
- 22 1.7. That I demand the IMMEDIATE RETURN of all monies paid, withheld, or otherwise extorted from me or any of
23 the business entities of which I am a part.

24 *"A claim against the United States is a right to demand money from the United States.*⁴⁵ *Such claims are*
25 *sometimes spoken of as gratuitous in that they cannot be enforced by suit without statutory consent.*⁴⁶ *The*
26 *general rule of non-liability of the United States does not mean that a citizen cannot be protected against the*
27 *wrongful governmental acts that affect the citizen or his or her property.*⁴⁷ *If, for example, money or property*
28 *of an innocent person goes into the federal treasury by fraud to which a government agent was a party, the*
29 *United States cannot hold the money or property against the claim of the injured party.*⁴⁸
30 [*American Jurisprudence 2d, United States, §45 (1999)*]

- 31 2. That all monies paid to the government do not constitute "taxes" as legally defined, but a temporary loan whereby the
32 government is the BAILEE but not OWNER in TEMPORARY custody. Consequently, it cannot lawfully assert
33 sovereign immunity or deny its consent to return said STOLEN property in order to preserve its illegal custody of said
34 laundered funds or property.
- 35 3. That the duress was instituted against me by the following sources:

³⁸ Ettliger v. National Surety Co., 221 N.Y. 467, 117 N.E. 945, 3 A.L.R. 865; Adams v. Gillig, 199 N.Y. 314, 92 N.E. 670.

³⁹ See 17 American Jurisprudence 2d, Contracts §509 (1999).

⁴⁰ Block v. Block, 165 Ohio.St. 365, 60 Ohio.Ops. 1, 135 N.E.2d. 857; McAfferty v. Conover, 7 Ohio.St. 99.

⁴¹ Crane v. Conklin, 1 N.J.Eq. 346.

⁴² §§ 68 et seq., infra.

⁴³ Angelina v. Euclid Concrete Corp. 280 App.Div. 405, 113 N.Y.S.2d. 537, affd 306 N.Y. 606, 115 N.E.2d. 831.

⁴⁴ Blue v. Blue, 38 Ill 9.

⁴⁵ United States ex rel. Angarica v. Bayard, 127 U.S. 251, 32 L.Ed. 159, 8 S.Ct. 1156, 4 A.F.T.R. 4628 (holding that a claim against the Secretary of State for money awarded under a treaty is a claim against the United States); Hobbs v. McLean, 117 U.S. 567, 29 L.Ed. 940, 6 S.Ct. 870; Manning v. Leighton, 65 Vt. 84, 26 A. 258, motion dismd 66 Vt. 56, 28 A. 630 and (disapproved on other grounds by Button's Estate v. Anderson, 112 Vt 531, 28 A.2d. 404, 143 A.L.R. 195).

As to the False Claims Act, see 32 American Jurisprudence 2d, False Pretenses §§88-96 (1999).

As to the jurisdiction of the United States Court of Federal Claims, see 32B American Jurisprudence 2d, Federal Courts §§2266 et seq. (1999)

⁴⁶ Blagge v. Balch, 162 U.S. 439, 40 L.Ed. 1032, 16 S.Ct. 853.

⁴⁷ Wilson v. Shaw, 204 U.S. 24, 51 L.Ed. 351, 27 S.Ct. 233.

⁴⁸ Bull v. United States, 295 U.S. 247, 79 L.Ed. 1421, 55 S.Ct. 695, 35-1 U.S.T.C. ¶ 9346, 15 A.F.T.R. 1069; United States v. State Bank, 96 U.S. 30, 96 Otto 30, 24 L.Ed. 647.

- 3.1. My private employer, who either threatened to fire or to not hire me if I did not submit an IRS Form W-4 authorizing INVOLUNTARY withholding.
- 3.2. False Information Returns, such as IRS Forms W-2, 1098, 1099, etc., were filed against my earnings. These information returns connected me to a “trade or business” and a “public office” pursuant to [26 U.S.C. §6041](#) and [26 U.S.C. §7701\(a\)\(26\)](#) which I was NOT, in fact, engaged in.
- 3.3. The above FALSE information Returns constituted a criminal infraction against [26 U.S.C. §7207](#) and FALSE claims against the United States cognizable under the False Claims Act, 31 U.S.C. §3729, as well as a civil tort pursuant to [26 U.S.C. §7434](#), and that the U.S. Department of Justice practiced prejudicial and injurious “selective enforcement” by willfully and criminally refusing to prosecute the submitters criminally and civilly for these infractions.
4. That the above sources of duress against me, the Submitter caused all withholdings and payments to be involuntary.
5. That I reserve all rights over all monies, alleged “taxes”, and other payment made by me or on my behalf in the context of any financial arrangement I may have with any third party, pursuant to U.C.C. §1-207 and its successor, U.C.C. §1-308.
6. That should the government receive any monies from me, they constitute a temporary loan at 20% interest compounded annually and payable on a pro-rata basis when the monies are returned.
7. That acceptance of all withholdings and payments from my pay or financial assets by the U.S. government constitutes an implied contract for which the United States waives sovereign immunity pursuant to the Tucker Act, [28 U.S.C. §1491](#), and agrees to be responsible to honor the terms of this document.

CALIFORNIA CIVIL CODE
 DIVISION 3. OBLIGATIONS
 PART 2. CONTRACTS
 CHAPTER 3. CONSENT
[Section 1589](#)

1589. A voluntary acceptance of the benefit of a [government benefit] transaction is equivalent to a consent to all the obligations [and legal liabilities] arising from it, so far as the facts are known, or ought to be known, to the person accepting.

The “benefit” referred to above which gives rise to the “constructive consent” is the temporary use of STOLEN property and the authority to act as temporary bailee over said property until it is returned to its rightful owner, which is me, subject to the payment of interest at the rates indicated above for the period of bailment. The government may not on the one hand ASSUME that I consented to be bound by the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code by virtue of using the “benefits” of it, such as the SSN, without applying the SAME rules to itself in reverse. To do otherwise is a denial of equal protection of the law and hypocrisy.

8. I remind the recipient that the First Amendment gives me a right not only to communicate or not communicate with the federal government, but to define the legal significance of all of my words, actions, and behaviors so that they are understood in the light that I wish them to be understood. To do otherwise is to violate my First Amendment rights. We can’t have a First Amendment right to communicate, if we can’t even define the meaning and significance of our words and actions and what we intend for them to convey to the government.

8.6. Presumptions Against the existence of Federal Jurisdiction in States of the Union

This document shall create a presumption AGAINST the existence of any kind of legislative jurisdiction of the federal government and its municipal laws within any state of the Union. The authorities for this presumption are as follows:

1. The Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 54(c), prior to year 2002 asserted that all Acts of Congress are applicable in the District of Columbia and federal territory only. Removing the rule and making it unrecognizable during the revision process hides that fact but STILL does not change that jurisdictional fact.

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54(c), prior to Dec. 2002

"Act of Congress" includes any act of Congress locally applicable to and in force in the District of Columbia, in Puerto Rico, in a territory or in an insular possession."

2. The Internal Revenue Code defines and limits the term “United States” to include only the District of Columbia and nowhere expands the term to include any state of the Union. Consequently, states of the Union are not included.

[TITLE 26](#) > [Subtitle F](#) > [CHAPTER 79](#) > [Sec. 7701](#).

1 [Sec. 7701. - Definitions](#)

2 (a) When used in this title, where not otherwise distinctly expressed or manifestly incompatible with the intent
3 thereof—

4 (9) United States

5 The term "United States" when used in a geographical sense includes only the [States](#) and the District of Columbia.

6 (10) State

7 The term "State" shall be construed to include the District of Columbia, where such construction is necessary to
8 carry out provisions of this title.

- 9 3. [Article 1](#), Section 8, Clause 17 of the Constitution expressly limits the territorial jurisdiction of the federal government
10 to the ten square mile area known as the District of Columbia. Extensions to this jurisdiction arose at the signing of the
11 Treaty of Peace between the King of Spain and the United States in Paris France, which granted to the United States
12 new territories such as Guam, Cuba, the Philippines, etc.
- 13 4. [4 U.S.C. §72](#) limits the exercise of all "public offices" and the application of their laws to the District of Columbia and
14 NOT elsewhere except as expressly provided by Congress.

15 [TITLE 4 > CHAPTER 3 > § 72](#)
16 [§72. Public offices: at seat of Government](#)

17 All offices attached to the seat of government shall be exercised in the District of Columbia, and not elsewhere,
18 except as otherwise expressly provided by law.

- 19 5. The Internal Revenue Code, Subtitle A places the income tax primarily upon a "trade or business". The U.S. Supreme
20 Court expressly stated that Congress may not establish a "trade or business" in a state of the Union and tax it.

21 "Congress cannot authorize a **trade or business** within a State in order to tax it."
22 [*License Tax Cases*, [72 U.S. 462](#), 18 L.Ed. 497, 5 Wall. 462, 2 A.F.T.R. 2224 (1866)]

- 23 6. A "trade or business" is defined as the "functions of a public office" in [26 U.S.C. §7701\(a\)\(26\)](#). Pursuant to [4 U.S.C.](#)
24 [§72](#) above, all "public offices", all of which may by law *only* be exercised within the District of Columbia and not
25 elsewhere except as "expressly" provided by an enactment of Congress. See:

[The "Trade or Business" Scam](#), Form #05.001
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

- 26 7. [48 U.S.C. §1612](#) expressly extends the enforcement of the criminal provisions of the Internal Revenue Code to the
27 Virgin Islands and is the only enactment of Congress that extends enforcement of any part of the Internal Revenue
28 Code to any place outside the District of Columbia.
- 29 8. There is no provision of law which expressly extends the enforcement of Subtitle A of the Internal Revenue Code to
30 any state of the Union. Therefore, jurisdiction does not exist there.

31 "*Expressio unius est exclusio alterius*. A maxim of statutory interpretation meaning that **the expression of one**
32 **thing is the exclusion of another**. *Burgin v. Forbes*, 293 Ky. 456, 169 S.W.2d. 321, 325; *Newblock v. Bowles*,
33 170 Okl. 487, 40 P.2d. 1097, 1100. Mention of one thing implies exclusion of another. **When certain persons or**
34 **things are specified in a law, contract, or will, an intention to exclude all others from its operation may be**
35 **inferred**. Under this maxim, if statute specifies one exception to a general rule or assumes to specify the effects
36 of a certain provision, other exceptions or effects are excluded."
37 [*Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 581*]

- 38 9. [26 U.S.C. §7601](#) authorizes enforcement of the Internal Revenue Code and discovery related to the enforcement *only*
39 within the bounds of internal revenue districts.
- 40 10. [Treasury Order 150-02](#) abolished all internal revenue districts *except* that of the District of Columbia.
- 41 11. [26 U.S.C. §7621](#) authorizes the President of the United States to define the boundaries of all internal revenue districts.
42 He delegated that authority to the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to Executive Order 10289. The President may
43 NOT establish internal revenue districts outside of the United States, which is then defined in [26 U.S.C. §7701\(a\)\(9\)](#)
44 and (a)(10), [26 U.S.C. §7701\(a\)\(39\)](#), and [26 U.S.C. §7408\(c\)](#) to mean ONLY the District of Columbia.
- 45 12. IRS is delegate of the Secretary in insular possessions, as "delegate" is defined at [26 U.S.C. §7701\(a\)\(12\)\(B\)](#), but NOT
46 in states of the Union.
- 47 13. The U.S. Supreme Court commonly refers to states of the Union as "foreign states". To wit:

We have held, upon full consideration, that although under existing statutes a circuit court of the United States has jurisdiction upon habeas corpus to discharge from the custody of state officers or tribunals one restrained of his liberty in violation of the Constitution of the United States, it is not required in every case to exercise its power to that end immediately upon application being made for the writ. 'We cannot suppose,' this court has said, 'that Congress intended to compel those courts, by such means, to draw to themselves, in the first instance, the control of all criminal prosecutions commenced in state courts exercising authority within the same territorial limits, where the accused claims that he is held in custody in violation of the Constitution of the United States. The injunction to hear the case summarily, and thereupon 'to dispose of the party as law and justice require' [R. S. 761], does not deprive the court of discretion as to the time and mode in which it will exert the powers conferred upon it. That discretion should be exercised in the light of the relations existing, under our system of government, between the judicial tribunals of the Union and of the states, and in recognition of the fact that the public good requires that those relations be not disturbed by unnecessary conflict between courts equally bound to guard and protect rights secured by the Constitution. When the petitioner is in custody by state authority for an act done or omitted to be done in pursuance of a law of the United States, or of an order, process, or decree of a court or judge thereof; or where, being a subject or citizen of a foreign state, and domiciled therein, he is in custody, under like authority, for an act done or omitted under any alleged right, title, authority, privilege, protection, or exemption claimed under the commission, or order, or sanction of any foreign state, or under color thereof, the validity and effect whereof depend upon the law of nations; in such and like cases of urgency, involving the authority and operations of the general government, or the obligations of this country to, or its relations with, foreign nations, [180 U.S. 499, 502] the courts of the United States have frequently interposed by writs of habeas corpus and discharged prisoners who were held in custody under state authority. So, also, when they are in the custody of a state officer, it may be necessary, by use of the writ, to bring them into a court of the United States to testify as witnesses.' Ex parte Royall, 117 U.S. 241, 250, 29 S.L.Ed. 868, 871, 6 Sup.Ct.Rep. 734; Ex parte Fonda, 117 U.S. 516, 518, 29 S.L.Ed. 994, 6 Sup.Ct.Rep. 848; Re Duncan, 139 U.S. 449, 454, sub nom. Duncan v. McCall, 35 L.Ed. 219, 222, 11 Sup.Ct.Rep. 573; Re Wood, 140 U.S. 278, 289, Sub nom. Wood v. Bursh, 35 L.Ed. 505, 509, 11 Sup.Ct.Rep. 738; McElvaine v. Brush, 142 U.S. 155, 160, 35 S.L.Ed. 971, 973, 12 Sup.Ct.Rep. 156; Cook v. Hart, 146 U.S. 183, 194, 36 S.L.Ed. 934, 939, 13 Sup.Ct.Rep. 40; Re Frederick, 149 U.S. 70, 75, 37 S.L.Ed. 653, 656, 13 Sup.Ct.Rep. 793; New York v. Eno, 155 U.S. 89, 96, 39 S.L.Ed. 80, 83, 15 Sup.Ct.Rep. 30; Pepke v. Cronan, 155 U.S. 100, 39 L.Ed. 84, 15 Sup.Ct.Rep. 34; Re Chapman, 156 U.S. 211, 216, 39 S.L.Ed. 401, 402, 15 Sup.Ct.Rep. 331; Whitten v. Tomlinson, 160 U.S. 231, 242, 40 S.L.Ed. 406, 412, 16 Sup.Ct.Rep. 297; Iasigi v. Van De Carr, 166 U.S. 391, 395, 41 S.L.Ed. 1045, 1049, 17 Sup.Ct.Rep. 595; Baker v. Grice, 169 U.S. 284, 290, 42 S.L.Ed. 748, 750, 18 Sup.Ct.Rep. 323; Tinsley v. Anderson, 171 U.S. 101, 105, 43 S.L.Ed. 91, 96, 18 Sup.Ct.Rep. 805; Fitts v. McGhee, 172 U.S. 516, 533, 43 S.L.Ed. 535, 543, 19 Sup.Ct.Rep. 269; Markuson v. Boucher, 175 U.S. 184, 44 L.Ed. 124, 20 Sup.Ct.Rep. 76. [*State of Minnesota v. Brundage*, 180 U.S. 499 (1901)]

14. The U.S. Supreme Court has stated repeatedly that the United States federal government is without ANY legislative jurisdiction within the exterior boundaries of a sovereign state of the Union:

"The difficulties arising out of our dual form of government and the opportunities for differing opinions concerning the relative rights of state and national governments are many; but for a very long time this court has steadfastly adhered to the doctrine that the taxing power of Congress does not extend to the states or their political subdivisions. The same basic reasoning which leads to that conclusion, we think, requires like limitation upon the power which springs from the bankruptcy clause. *United States v. Butler*, supra."
[*Ashton v. Cameron County Water Improvement District No. 1*, 298 U.S. 513, 56 S.Ct. 892 (1936)]

"It is no longer open to question that the general government, unlike the states, *Hammer v. Dagenhart*, 247 U.S. 251, 275, 38 S.Ct. 529, 3 A.L.R. 649, Ann.Cas.1918E 724, possesses no inherent power in respect of the internal affairs of the states; and emphatically not with regard to legislation."
[*Carter v. Carter Coal Co.*, 298 U.S. 238, 56 S.Ct. 855 (1936)]

15. The Uniform Commercial Code defines the term "United States" as the District of Columbia:

Uniform Commercial Code (U.C.C.)
§ 9-307. LOCATION OF DEBTOR.

(h) [Location of United States.]

The United States is located in the District of Columbia.
[SOURCE:
<http://www.law.cornell.edu/ucc/search/display.html?terms=district%20of%20columbia&url=/ucc/9/article9.htm#s9-307>]

Based on all the above authorities, there is no basis to believe that any part of the federal government enjoys any legislative jurisdiction within any state of the Union, including in its capacity as a lawmaker for the general government. This was confirmed by one attorney who devoted his life to the study of Constitutional law below:

1 “§79. [. . .]There cannot be two separate and independent sovereignties within the same limits or jurisdiction;
2 nor can there be two distinct and separate sources of sovereign authority within the same jurisdiction. The right
3 of commanding in the last resort can be possessed only by one body of people inhabiting the same territory, and
4 can be executed only by those intrusted with the execution of such authority.”
5 [*Treatise on Government*, Joel Tiffany, p. 49, Section 78;
6 SOURCE: <http://famguardian.org/Publications/TreatiseOnGovernment/TreatOnGovt.pdf>]

7 **8.7. Federal Identifying Number Presumptions**

8 In all past and future correspondence to or from the government, any use of any identifying numbers in the context of me
9 shall be governed by the following presumptions:

- 10 1. The terms “Social Security Number”, “SSN”, “Employer Identification Number”, “EIN”, “Taxpayer Identification
11 Number”, or “TIN” as used on all attached government forms means “Nontaxpayer Identification Number (NIN)”,
12 signifying that the Submitter is a “nontaxpayer” who does not meet the definition of “taxpayer” found in [26 U.S.C.](#)
13 [§7701\(a\)\(14\)](#), who is not subject to any provision within the Internal Revenue Code, who is a statutory “non-resident
14 non-person” not engaged in a “trade or business” as described in 26 C.F.R. §1.871-1(b)(1)(i), who is Not an
15 “individual” as legally defined because not domiciled on federal territory, and who has no earnings from within the
16 “United States” as described in [26 U.S.C. §871](#).
- 17 2. The term “Social Security Number” or “SSN” as used on the attached government forms ***IS NOT*** the number issued
18 under the authority of 20 C.F.R. §422.104, which can only lawfully be issued to federal employees, agents, and benefit
19 recipients, none of which describe the Submitter. See and rebut the following if you disagree:

<p>20 <i>Resignation of Compelled Social Security Trustee</i>, Form #06.002 21 http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm</p>
--

- 22 3. The term “Employer Identification Number” or “EIN” as used on the attached government forms ***IS NOT*** the number
23 issued under the authority of [26 U.S.C. §6109](#) or any other Act of Congress. Instead, it means a “Nontaxpayer
24 Identification Number” or “NIN” as defined above.
- 25 4. The term “Taxpayer Identification Number” or “TIN” as used on the attached government form ***IS NOT*** the number
26 issued under the authority of either [26 U.S.C. §6109](#) or any other Act of Congress. Instead it means a “Nontaxpayer
27 Identification Number” or “NIN” as defined above.
- 28 5. All “Nontaxpayer Identification Numbers” or “NINs”, or any other synonym described in items 2 through 4 of this
29 section and included in any form or attachment included herein or submitted on any previous government form are the
30 exclusive, licensed, copyrighted intellectual property of the Submitter. They are protected by the Copyright Act
31 codified in [Title 17 of the U.S. Code](#) and this license agreement. Any use by the government of this property for any
32 commercial or government purpose, including tax collection, is STRICTLY PROHIBITED. Each unauthorized use is
33 punishable by a penalty of \$100,000 per incident plus any tax or penalty assessment associated with the unauthorized
34 use.
- 35 6. The presumption is established by the ACTA Agreements between the Secretary of the Treasury and the states of the
36 Union, by [4 U.S.C. §106](#), and 5 U.S.C. §5517 that those who use a Social Security Number are identified in the IRS
37 records and databases as instrumentalities of the Federal government. See 26 C.F.R. §301.6109-1(g). In the context of
38 me, who by this document establishes he or she is not a federal instrumentality, these presumptions are inapplicable.
- 39 7. Any federal identifying number provided, regardless of what it is identified as, shall ***NOT*** be a Social Security Number
40 or the number issued under the authority of 20 C.F.R. §422.104 because:
 - 41 7.1. All Social Security Numbers belong and are the public property of the Social Security Administration (SSA)
42 pursuant to 20 C.F.R. §422.103(d) and therefore could not lawfully belong to me unless I am a federal
43 instrumentality, agent, or employee, which section 4.3 earlier makes a statutory and legal impossibility.
 - 44 7.2. It is illegal to use “public property” such as Social Security Numbers for a private use, and since I am a “private
45 person” and not a “public employee” or federal agent or instrumentality, then I would be committing
46 embezzlement to have or to use such numbers and would also be falsely impersonating a federal employee in
47 violation of the following:
 - 48 7.2.1. [18 U.S.C. §641](#): Embezzlement of public money, property, or records. Punishment is ten years in jail.
 - 49 7.2.2. [18 U.S.C. §912](#): Impersonating an officer or employee of the United States. Punishment is three years in
50 jail.
 - 51 Any attempt on your part to facilitate the above crimes makes you an accessory after the fact and guilty of
52 misprision of felony in violation of [18 U.S.C. §§3](#) and [4](#) respectively.
 - 53 7.3. The fact that Social Security Numbers (SSNs) are the property of the U.S. government that can only be used or
employed in the context of a public purpose means that they cannot lawfully be used by a human such as myself,
who has explicitly and carefully and clearly, as in this document, cited the legal and statutory boundaries that

1 separate his/her private life and actions from the highly limited jurisdiction of the federal government over public
2 property, offices, and territory.

3 7.4. I have sent correspondence to the Social Security Administration evidencing duress in the context of any alleged
4 participation in Social Security Scam pursuant to the following:

Resignation of Compelled Social Security Trustee, Form #06.002
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

- 5 8. The Identifying Number is *not* a Taxpayer Identification Number (TIN) assigned pursuant to [26 U.S.C. §6109](#). All
6 such numbers can only lawfully be assigned to statutory “aliens” pursuant to the following and it is therefore
7 ILLEGAL (42 U.S.C. §408(a)(8)) to assign a TIN to those who are “non-resident non-persons” and who have made no
8 elections to be a “resident” and it is evidence of duress if the IRS does so:
- 9 8.1. 26 C.F.R. §1.1441-1(c)(3) defines an “individual” as either an “alien” or “nonresident alien”.
10 8.2. 26 C.F.R. §301.6109-1(d)(3) and 26 C.F.R. §1.1-1(a)(2)(ii) says that IRS individual Taxpayer Identification
11 Numbers may only lawfully be assigned to “aliens”.
12 8.3. 26 C.F.R. §1.1-1(a)(2)(ii) defines a “married individual” and an “unmarried individual” as an alien engaged in a
13 “trade or business”.
14 8.4. The definitions of “nonresident alien” in [26 U.S.C. §7701\(b\)\(1\)\(B\)](#) and “alien” in [26 U.S.C. §7701\(b\)\(1\)\(A\)](#)
15 overlap but are not equivalent. A person who is a “nonresident alien” and a “national” but not a “citizen”
16 pursuant to 8 U.S.C. §1101(a)(21) and 8 U.S.C. §1452 can be a “nonresident alien” without also being an “alien”.
17 8.5. I do not choose at any time in the future nor have I ever voluntarily or knowingly made an election in the past as a
18 “nonresident alien” pursuant to [26 U.S.C. §6013\(g\)](#) and (h) or [26 U.S.C. §7701\(b\)\(4\)\(B\)](#) to be treated as a
19 “resident alien” as defined in [26 U.S.C. §7701\(b\)\(1\)\(A\)](#).
- 20 9. The presumption is also established in 20 C.F.R. §422.103(d) that the only persons who can have or use Social
21 Security Numbers are federal employees. You will note, for instance, that 20 C.F.R. is entitled “employee benefits”
22 and that the only type of employee activity which may be regulated under federal law is that of federal employees.
23 This document shall establish the OPPOSITE presumption, which is that I am not, never have been, and never will be a
24 federal statutory “employee”, “public officer”, or instrumentality.
- 25 10. 26 C.F.R. §301.6109-1(g) also establishes that a person who uses a Social Security Number is a “U.S. person” pursuant
26 to [26 U.S.C. §7701\(a\)\(30\)](#). It identifies the holder as either a statutory U.S. citizen pursuant to 8 U.S.C. §1401 or a
27 statutory “resident” pursuant to [26 U.S.C. §7701\(b\)\(1\)\(A\)](#). This document establishes the OPPOSITE presumption,
28 which is that I am neither a “U.S. person” pursuant to [26 U.S.C. §7701\(a\)\(30\)](#), a statutory “U.S. citizen” pursuant to [8](#)
29 [U.S.C. §1401](#) or a statutory “U.S. resident” pursuant to [26 U.S.C. §7701\(b\)\(1\)\(A\)](#).
- 30 11. There is a common de facto presumption created by political and social custom that everyone is required to have and to
31 use a Social Security Number or other federal identifying number. This document establishes the presumption that
32 there is no such law and places the burden of proof upon the government to produce such a law which has generally
33 applicability and legal effect within states of the Union. It also establishes that the Social Security Administration has
34 admitted repeatedly to all who ask that there is no law requiring one to obtain or use federal identifying numbers. See:
Letter from Social Security Administration, Exhibit #07.004
<http://sedm.org/Exhibits/ExhibitIndex.htm>
- 35 12. Regardless of the label or name assigned by the government to such a number on any government form or
36 correspondence, all such numbers shall constitute ONLY a “Nontaxpayer Identification Numbers” (NIN). A NIN
37 identifies a statutory “non-resident non-person” not engaged in the “trade or business” public office franchise as
38 described in 26 C.F.R. §1.871-1(b)(1)(i), who is NOT an “individual” as defined in 26 C.F.R. §1.1441-1(c)(3), and
39 whose estate is a “foreign estate” as described in [26 U.S.C. §7701\(a\)\(31\)](#).

40 **8.8. Facts about Penalties for submission of this form**

41 Penalties may only lawfully be instituted against federal employees, instrumentalities, agents, and benefit recipients, all of
42 whom are involved in federal franchises of one kind or another. For Internal Revenue Code Subtitle A, the franchise described
43 therein is a “trade or business”, which is defined in [26 U.S.C. §7701\(a\)\(26\)](#) as “the functions of a public office”. Those who
44 are not involved in said franchises:

- 45 1. If they are penalized in connection with the submission of this form, are being subjected to illegal witness tampering in
46 violation of [18 U.S.C. §1512\(b\)](#) punishable by a fine and/or imprisonment for up to ten years.
47 2. Are protected by the Constitutional prohibition against “[Bills of Attainder](#)” found in [Article 1, Section 10](#).
48 3. Are protected against administrative penalties of all kinds, which constitute “[Bills of Attainder](#)” in the case of persons
49 who are not franchisees.
50 4. May not lawfully have any provision of federal civil statutory law cited against them *without* enforcement implementing
51 regulations published in the Federal Register which allow or permit enforcement against persons who are not in receipt

of federal franchises. This requirement is found in 26 C.F.R. §601.702(a)(2)(ii) and [5 U.S.C. §552\(a\)](#). See and rebut the questions at the end of the following if you disagree or forever be estopped from challenging later:

[Federal Enforcement Authority Within States of the Union](http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm), Form #05.032
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

5. Any Recipient of this form who attempts to institute or successfully institutes a penalty for use of this form is demanded to answer the following Admissions in the correspondence or penalty notice they send in response to this correspondence. Failure to answer the question shall constitute a default of “Admit” in response to every question. Recipient waives his right to contradict his answers beyond 30 days from mailing of this notice.

5.1. Admit that a person who is NOT “resident” or present within the “United States” as legally defined, according to [28 U.S.C. §1746](#), cannot sign any variation of the following perjury statement without either committing perjury under penalty of perjury or electing to be treated as a resident:

*“Under penalties of perjury, I declare that I have examined this return and accompanying schedules and statements, and to the best of my knowledge and belief, **they are true, correct, and complete.** Declaration of preparer (other than taxpayer) is based on all information of which preparer has any knowledge.”*
[IRS Forms 1040 and 1040NR jurat/perjury statement]

5.2. Admit that a person who is not a “taxpayer” as defined in [26 U.S.C. §7701\(a\)\(14\)](#) and instead who is a “nontaxpayer” not subject to any part of the Internal Revenue Code cannot sign the above perjury statement without committing perjury under penalty of perjury.

5.3. Admit that the IRS Mission Statement found in Internal Revenue Manual (I.R.M.), Section 1.1.1.1 says the IRS serves ONLY “taxpayers” and that the word “nontaxpayers” are nowhere identified as being entitled to anything from the IRS.

*Internal Revenue Manual (I.R.M.), Section [1.1.1.1 \(02-26-1999\)](#)
IRS Mission and Basic Organization*

1. The IRS Mission: Provide America’s [taxpayers](#) [not “nontaxpayers”] top quality service by helping them understand and meet their tax responsibilities and by applying the tax law with integrity and fairness to all [taxpayers only].

5.4. Admit that the Internal Revenue Code Subtitle A describes a franchise agreement that pertains to persons either engaged in a “public office” which is described in [26 U.S.C. §7701\(a\)\(26\)](#) as a “[trade or business](#)”, or those in receipt of payment from or on behalf of the U.S. government pursuant to [26 U.S.C. §871](#).

“The revenue laws are a code or system in regulation of tax assessment and collection. They relate to taxpayers, and not to nontaxpayers. The latter are without their scope. No procedure is prescribed for nontaxpayers, and no attempt is made to annul any of their rights and remedies in due course of law. With them Congress does not assume to deal, and they are neither of the subject nor of the object of the revenue laws...”
[Long v. Rasmussen, 281 F. 236 (1922)]

“Revenue Laws relate to taxpayers [instrumentalities, officers, employees, and elected officials of the Federal Government] and not to non-taxpayers [American Citizens/American Nationals not subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the Federal Government]. The latter are without their scope. No procedures are prescribed for non-taxpayers and no attempt is made to annul any of their Rights or Remedies in due course of law. With them [non-taxpayers] Congress does not assume to deal and they are neither of the subject nor of the object of federal revenue laws.”
[Economy Plumbing & Heating v. U.S., 470 F.2d. 585 (1972)]

5.5. Admit that no provision of the I.R.C. may lawfully be cited against persons who are “nontaxpayers”.

5.6. Admit that no federal court ruling involving a “[taxpayer](#)” may lawfully be cited as authority against a person who is a “nontaxpayer”.

5.7. Admit that the IRS [Internal Revenue Manual \(I.R.M.\), Section 4.10.7.2.9.8](#) says that no ruling below the U.S. Supreme Court may be cited against anyone other than the individual “taxpayer” who was party to the suit.

Internal Revenue Manual (I.R.M.), Section [4.10.7.2.9.8 \(05/14/99\)](#)

1 “Decisions made at various levels of the court system are considered to be interpretations of tax laws and may be used by either examiners or taxpayers to support a position.

*2. Certain court cases lend more weight to a position than others. **A case decided by the U.S. Supreme Court becomes the law of the land and takes precedence over decisions of lower courts.** The Internal Revenue Service*

1 must follow Supreme Court decisions. For examiners, Supreme Court decisions have the same weight as the
2 Code.

3 3. Decisions made by lower courts, such as Tax Court, District Courts, or Claims Court, are binding on the
4 Service only for the particular taxpayer and the years litigated. Adverse decisions of lower courts do not require
5 the Service to alter its position for other taxpayers."

6 5.8. Admit that the reason for the above section of the IRS Internal Revenue Manual is that there is no federal common
7 law within states of the Union.

8 *"There is no Federal Common Law, and Congress has no power to declare substantive rules of Common Law*
9 *applicable in a state. Whether they be local or general in their nature, be they commercial law or a part of the*
10 *Law of Torts"*
11 *[Erie Railroad v. Tompkins, [304 U.S. 64](#) (1938)]*

12 6. Any Recipient of this form who attempts to institute or successfully institutes a penalty for use of this form is demanded
13 to answer the following open-ended interrogatories in the correspondence or penalty notice they send in response to this
14 correspondence. Recipient waives his right to contradict his answers beyond 30 days from mailing of this notice.

15 6.1. Please describe which government or IRS Forms would be suitable for use by "nontaxpayers" as a substitute for
16 the standard government forms you received, in order to avoid perjuring myself in signing the perjury statement
17 consistent with the entire content of this form and all attachments.

18 6.2. The [First Amendment](#) gives me a right to communicate, to NOT communicate, and to define the significance OF
19 said communication when interacting with the government. How can you order me to say something to the
20 government that I know is clearly inconsistent with the truth without violating the [First Amendment](#)?

21 6.3. Please show me the statute and implementing regulation published in the Federal Register that prohibits alteration
22 of forms.

23 6.4. How can a person who does not reside in the "United States" and instead who is located in the "United States of
24 America" sign a perjury statement consistent with [28 U.S.C. §1746\(2\)](#) *without* committing perjury under penalty
25 of perjury?

26 6.5. How can a person who is a "nontaxpayer" not subject to any provision of the Internal Revenue Code sign any
27 government form which uses the word "taxpayer" and is signed under penalties of perjury *without* committing
28 perjury under penalty of perjury?

29 6.6. Will the IRS accept a form with the portion "signature of taxpayer" crossed off?

30 6.7. How can a person who has no "Social Security Number" and who never personally or lawfully applied for one be
31 required to accept all the obligations and disabilities associated with participation in the Social Security Program
32 without violating the prohibition against involuntary servitude found in the [Thirteenth Amendment, 42 U.S.C.](#)
33 [§1994](#), and [18 U.S.C. §1589](#)?

34 6.8. Will the IRS accept a form with the words "of taxpayer" struck thru? [in other words leaving just the word
35 "Signature" showing.]

36 6.9. Will the IRS accept a form with the portion signature of taxpayer replaced with "signature of non-taxpayer"?

37 6.10. Will the IRS accept a form with the portion "signature of taxpayer" replaced with "signature of non-filer"? [The
38 term non-filer is a permitted designation by the IRS]

39 6.11. Will the IRS accept a form with a separate declaration printed on the bottom attesting to non-taxpayer or non-filer
40 status?

41 6.12. Will the IRS accept a form with an attachment and the statement in the signature block, "invalid without
42 attachment".?

43 6.13. Please provide court-admissible evidence under penalty of perjury that I am the "person" defined in [26 U.S.C.](#)
44 [§6671\(b\)](#) as "an officer or employee of a corporation or partnership", which is the only person against whom IRS
45 penalties may be instituted.

46 6.14. You may allege that the IRS prohibits alteration of forms. Please explain how can I fill in ANYTHING on the form
47 prior to submission without altering it? Do you want me to send you ONLY blank forms with no information added
48 to them?

49 6.15. How can I submit the attached government forms and omit this form WITHOUT committing subornation of
50 perjury? The exclusion of the information contained on this form renders the remaining information the incomplete
51 truth which is susceptible to misinterpretation because it uses terms that are nowhere defined in the law and even if
52 they were defined on the IRS website or in an IRS publication, that definition would be untrustworthy pursuant to
53 [Internal Revenue Manual \(I.R.M.\), Section 4.10.7.2.8](#):

54 [Internal Revenue Manual \(I.R.M.\), Section 4.10.7.2.8 \(01-01-2006\)](#)
55 *IRS Publications*

1 *1. IRS Publications explain the law in plain language for taxpayers and their advisors. They typically highlight*
2 *changes in the law, provide examples illustrating Service positions, and include worksheets. Publications are*
3 *nonbinding on the Service and do not necessarily cover all positions for a given issue. While a good source of*
4 *general information, publications should not be cited to sustain a position.*

5 6.16. Explain why any sane, rational American in their right mind would want to sign a form under penalty of perjury
6 that the IRS itself DEFIANTLY REFUSES to guarantee the accuracy and completeness of similarly under penalty
7 of perjury as required by [26 U.S.C. §6065](#)? See [Internal Revenue Manual \(I.R.M.\), Section 4.10.7.2.8](#) above.

8 **8.9. Fair Debt Collection Practices Act (FDCPA) Presumptions**

9 In the context of any attempt to assert any financial liability by the federal government or its agents pursuant to the [Fair Debt](#)
10 [Collection Practices Act, Title 15, Chapter 41, Subchapter V](#), the following constraints shall apply to all past, present, and
11 future interactions:

- 12 1. All such debts are automatically disputed by me.
- 13 2. I demand ahead of time, pursuant to [15 U.S.C. §1692g](#) that the disputed debt collection presentment shall and MUST
14 be accompanied by the original debt instrument in each such presentment. When challenged, you are required by law
15 to produce evidence of the alleged debt within 20 days.
- 16 3. The original debt instrument provided must contain my original signature as required by [15 U.S.C. §1692g\(b\)](#). In other
17 words, you must prove that it was a debt which I consented to explicitly.
- 18 4. If the alleged debt is a tax debt, the collection notice:
 - 19 1. Must be accompanied by all the original assessment documents signed by an Assessment Officer under penalty of
20 perjury per 26 U.S.C. §6065 and who agrees to take full legal and personal responsibility for the accuracy of his
21 assessment and its compliance with the law.
 - 22 2. Must identify me and only me as the debtor. Aggregated assessments of multiple “taxpayers” are unacceptable and do
23 not constitute proof of consent or lawful assessment. All such aggregated assessments, such as IRS Form RACS006
24 report, are simply a means to evade liability for false assessment by the Assessment Officer.
 - 25 3. Must contain answers/rebuttals to all the admissions found at the end of forms 05.001 through 05.028 below. These
26 documents clearly establish that the government has no authority to collect income taxes under Subtitle A of the I.R.C.
27 within the 50 states of the Union:
28 <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

29 Any debt collection communication with me by the government which fails to comply completely with all the above
30 requirements shall constitute a binding admission by the sender of the debt collection correspondence that:

- 31 1. There is no actual debt.
- 32 2. The collection is fraudulent and illegal.
- 33 3. The sender of the fraudulent notice agrees to assume all liabilities it falsely attributes to me.
- 34 4. The sender agrees to compensate me for my personal time in responding to and litigating the cessation of false notices
35 and collection actions at the billable rate of \$1,000 per hour.
- 36 5. The answers to all the Memorandums of Law, Forms 05.001 through 05.099 at the address below is stipulated by both
37 parties as “Admit” in the context of any litigation arising out the debt collection and the parties furthermore stipulate to
38 admit these memorandums as evidence in any litigation between them pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 29.
39 <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

40 **8.10. Federal Court Litigation Presumptions**

41 For the purposes of all litigation in which the Submitter of this document is involved, the following presumptions shall be
42 established:

- 43 1. Submitter reserves all rights without prejudice in relation to all federal tribunals pursuant to U.C.C. §1-207 and its
44 successor, [U.C.C. §1-308](#).
- 45 2. Submitter does not submit to the jurisdiction of the court and all instances in which he physically shows up in the court
46 building constitute “special visitations” and not “appearances” as legally defined:

47 ***appearance.** A coming into court as a party to a suit, either in person or by attorney, whether as plaintiff or*
48 *defendant. The formal proceeding by which a defendant submits himself to the jurisdiction of the court. The*
49 ***voluntary submission** to a court's jurisdiction.*

In civil actions the parties do not normally actually appear in person, but rather through their attorneys (who enter their appearance by filing written pleadings, or a formal written entry of appearance). Also, at many stages of criminal proceedings, particularly involving minor offenses, the defendant's attorney appears on his behalf. See e.g., Fed.R.Crim.P. 43.

An appearance may be either **general** or **special**; the former is a simple and unqualified or unrestricted submission to the jurisdiction of the court, the latter is a submission to the jurisdiction for some specific purpose only, not for all the purposes of the suit. A special appearance is for the purpose of testing or objecting to the sufficiency of service or the jurisdiction of the court over defendant without submitting to such jurisdiction; a general appearance is made where the defendant waives defects of service and submits to the jurisdiction of court. *Insurance Co. of North America v. Kunin*, 175 Neb. 260, 121 N.W.2d. 372, 375, 376.
[Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 97]

3. If a plea is demanded from a federal court in connection with a criminal matter, Submitter enters no plea because federal criminal law only applies within federal territory and Submitter does not maintain a domicile or abode on federal territory and did not commit any of the alleged acts on federal territory:

"Territory: A part of a country separated from the rest, and subject to a particular jurisdiction. Geographical area under the jurisdiction of another country or sovereign power.

A portion of the United States not within the limits of any state, which has not yet been admitted as a state of the Union, but is organized with a separate legislature, and with executive and judicial powers appointed by the President.
[Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 1473]

"Territories' or 'territory' as including 'state' or 'states." While the term 'territories of the' United States may, under certain circumstances, include the states of the Union, as used in the federal Constitution and in ordinary acts of congress "territory" does not include a foreign state.
[Corpus Juris Secundum (C.J.S.), Territories, §1 (2003)]

The criminal provisions of the Internal Revenue Code are not exception to the above.

4. Submitter DOES NOT, under any circumstances, consent to the jurisdiction of any Magistrate Judge.
4.1. Federal Magistrates only preside by mutual consent of BOTH parties, pursuant to [28 U.S.C. §636\(b\)\(2\)](#).
4.2. Pursuant to [Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72\(b\)](#), this document shall constitute formal notice to the government that Submitter hereby disputes any and all rulings of any Magistrate on any and all dispositive issues.
5. All submissions to the court relating to motions shall constitute protected First Amendment petitions for redress of grievances and NOT "motions". One can only "motion" a court by making an appearance and submitting to the jurisdiction of said court.
6. The terms and conditions appearing on the Federal Pleading Attachment apply to every past, present, or future petition or pleading of the Submitter before any federal court. This document is available below:

[Federal Petition/Pleading/Motion Attachment](#), Litigation Tool #01.002
<http://sedm.org/Litigation/LitIndex.htm>

8.11. NONConsent to an extension of time to file presumptions

This document shall constitute proof that I do not consent to any extension of time to file or to perform an assessment pursuant to IRS Form 4868, which is indicated in the IRS Individual Master File (IMF) as Transaction Code (TC) 460. Any entries in the Individual Master File (IMF) which indicate my consent to an extension of the time for filing absent the ORIGINAL, SIGNED IRS Form 4868 constitute criminal computer fraud in violation of [18 U.S.C. §1030](#). The reason for this presumption is the following language relating to the admissibility of "public records" pursuant to Federal Rule of Evidence 803(8)(A):

(1) Records of public agency's own activities (FRE 803(8)(A)): Subsection (A) allows admissibility of a public office's records to prove its own activities in either civil or criminal litigation. [See FRE 803(8)(A)]

(a) Application:

[. . .]

1. Printout of IRS database pertaining to Taxpayer's account containing a code signifying receipt of Taxpayer's consent to an extension of the statute of limitations was sufficient to prove such consent had been given. [Malkin v. United States (2nd Cir.2001), 243 F.3d. 120, 124]

9. AFFIDAVIT OF DURESS

It is a fact that government, financial institutions, and private employers within your jurisdiction universally require ID of some kind in order to authenticate those they do business with. There is nothing fundamentally wrong with this general practice in and of itself. HOWEVER, this practice has been unlawfully perverted and abused by state and federal governments alike to criminally promote their financial gain to the extreme, unlawful, and unconstitutional detriment of those in the public they are supposed to be protecting by the following methods:

1. You have transformed the process of issuance of state ID into a privilege and a franchise that causes not only a surrender of rights, but of ALL rights, as a precondition of being able to conduct commerce within your jurisdiction, such as banking, private employment, etc.

*"It has long been established that a State may not impose a penalty upon those who exercise a right guaranteed by the Constitution." Frost & Frost Trucking Co. v. Railroad Comm'n of California, 271 U.S. 583. "Constitutional rights would be of little value if they could be indirectly denied," Smith v. Allwright, 321 U.S. 649, 644, or manipulated out of existence,' Gomillion v. Lightfoot, 364 U.S. 339, 345."
[Harman v. Forssenius, 380 U.S. 528 at 540, 85 S.Ct. 1177, 1185 (1965)]*

This is done by:

- 1.1. Compelling the use of Social Security Numbers and/or Taxpayer Identification Numbers as a precondition of obtaining ID. These numbers make the holder into a public officer and a federal instrumentality on official business and engaged in a federal franchise. People domiciled in a state of the Union are NOT eligible for these numbers. See:
 - 1.1.1. Resignation of Compelled Social Security Trustee, Form #06.002
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
 - 1.1.2. Why It is Illegal for Me to Request or Use a "Taxpayer Identification Number", Form #04.205
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
- 1.2. Requiring those applying and who are domiciled in the exclusive jurisdiction of a Constitutional but not Statutory "State" to falsely admit that they are statutory "U.S. citizens" (8 U.S.C. §1401) or "U.S. residents" (aliens pursuant to 26 U.S.C. §7701(b)(1)(A)) with a domicile on federal territory and therefore not protected by the Constitution. Those domiciled on federal territory have NO rights.

"Indeed, the practical interpretation put by Congress upon the Constitution has been long continued and uniform to the effect [182 U.S. 244, 279] that the Constitution is applicable to territories acquired by purchase or conquest, only when and so far as Congress shall so direct. Notwithstanding its duty to 'guarantee to every state in this Union a republican form of government' (art. 4, 4), by which we understand, according to the definition of Webster, 'a government in which the supreme power resides in the whole body of the people, and is exercised by representatives elected by them,' Congress did not hesitate, in the original organization of the territories of Louisiana, Florida, the Northwest Territory, and its subdivisions of Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Illinois, and Wisconsin and still more recently in the case of Alaska, to establish a form of government bearing a much greater analogy to a British Crown colony than a republican state of America, and to vest the legislative power either in a governor and council, or a governor and judges, to be appointed by the President. It was not until they had attained a certain population that power was given them to organize a legislature by vote of the people. In all these cases, as well as in territories subsequently organized west of the Mississippi, Congress thought it necessary either to extend to Constitution and laws of the United States over them, or to declare that the inhabitants should be entitled to enjoy the right of trial by jury, of bail, and of the privilege of the writ of habeas corpus, as well as other privileges of the bill of rights."
[Downes v. Bidwell, 182 U.S. 244 (1901)]

- 1.3. Refusing to issue state ID to those who claim to be "nonresidents" in relation to the following, in violation of the equal protection of the law, whereby the Constitution itself is the law in question that I am being protected by.
 - 1.3.1. Federal territory.
 - 1.3.2. The "United States" as defined in 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(9) and (a)(10).and who instead are domiciled in the de jure state that has no jurisdiction over federal territory,
- 1.4. Making all those applying for state driver's licenses into "residents" (aliens), meaning privileged aliens with a domicile on federal territory not protected by the Constitution.
2. You have tried to conceal and protect the illegal and criminal acts associated with the government ID and identity theft scam by:
 - 2.1. Not providing definitions of the word "resident" in the vehicle code so that it can conveniently and wrongfully be confused with a "resident" in the revenue code.

1 "The truth about the income tax is so precious to the government that it must be surrounded by a bodyguard of
2 lies."
3 [Unknown]

- 4 2.2. Confusing a "resident" within the vehicle code with a "resident" in the state or federal revenue code. The two are
5 NOT the same. A "resident" in the revenue code is, in fact, a resident alien and NOT a statutory "U.S. citizen"
6 pursuant to 8 U.S.C. §1401 or a constitutional "citizen of the United States" as described in Section 1 of the
7 Fourteenth Amendment.
8 2.3. Interfering with or prosecuting efforts such as this to remove the duress described in this section.
9 2.4. Harassing those domiciled within a de jure state of the Union who lawfully apply for USA passports as
10 Constitutional but not Statutory citizens by impeding issuance without explanation and demanding further
11 information that is not authorized by law and using that information to engage in "selective enforcement" against
12 those who demand their rights. See:

Getting A USA Passport as a "state national", Form #09.007
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

- 13 3. You have abused and continue to willfully abuse private institutions that are not part of the government but who are
14 acting as "public officers" under your jurisdiction as a recruitment vehicle for non-consensually converting private
15 human beings into "public officers" engaged in federal franchises. Such methods include, but are not limited to the
16 following methods directed against those not in possession of government ID that falsely portrays their status as
17 domiciliaries of the federal zone called statutory "U.S. citizens" (8 U.S.C. §1401) or "U.S. residents" (aliens with a
18 domicile on federal territory pursuant to 26 U.S.C. §7701(b)(1)(A)):
19 3.1. Private institutions basically boycotting and refusing to provide private service for those without fraudulent
20 government ID. They are doing so in the alleged capacity as "withholding agents" pursuant to 26 U.S.C.
21 §7701(a)(16), and therefore are subject to the constitutional constraints applying to all government
22 instrumentalities.
23 3.2. State and federal governments refusing to publish or enforce standards for the issuance of lawful PRIVATE ID by
24 PRIVATE PARTIES not directly associated with the government or with government franchises.
25 3.3. State and federal governments refusing to prosecute financial institutions and employers who discriminate against
26 or deny service to those who form their own government and issue their own private ID, or who have "foreign
27 ID" that they don't want to recognize.

28 The end result of the illegal and unconstitutional government ID scam documented above is that people you are supposed to
29 be protecting the sovereignty and constitutional rights of are extorted and threatened with removal of all ability to participate
30 in commercial transactions and to support themselves and their families unless they:

- 31 1. Commit fraud on a government form by describing themselves as statutory "U.S. citizens" (8 U.S.C. §1401) or "U.S.
32 residents" (8 U.S.C. §1101(a)(3) and 26 U.S.C. §7701(b)(1)(A))
33 2. Conspire to defraud the U.S. government in criminal violation of 18 U.S.C. §371 by signing up for franchises that they
34 are not eligible for as nonresidents domiciled in a foreign state and not subject to the federal franchises. 20 C.F.R.
35 §422.104 says that only statutory but not constitutional "U.S. citizens" (8 U.S.C. §1401) and "permanent residents" are
36 eligible to participate, and those citizens and residents are domiciliaries of federal territory that is no part of any state of
37 the Union.
38 3. Subjecting themselves to involuntary servitude by donating everything they own to a public use, public purpose, and
39 public office by connecting it with government property (20 C.F.R. §422.103(d)) in the form of a TIN or SSN.
40 4. Aiding and abetting the state and federal governments to unconstitutionally break down the separation of powers
41 between them. This compels me to serve two masters who are part of one monolithic "U.S. Inc." corporation that isn't
42 even a government, but a private corporation. See:
43 4.1. Government Conspiracy to Destroy the Separation of Powers, Form #05.023
44 <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
45 4.2. Corporatization and Privatization of the Government, Form #05.024
46 <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

47 Such an approach and conspiracy against my Constitutional rights is:

- 48 1. Anathema to the whole notion of a free society.
49 2. Creates an unconstitutional "title of nobility" in public servants and the creation of a privileged class.

50 *United States Constitution*
51 *Article I, Section 9, Clause 8*

1 *No Title of Nobility shall be granted by the United States: And no Person holding any Office of Profit or Trust*
2 *under them, shall, without the Consent of the Congress, accept of any present, Emolument, Office, or Title, of any*
3 *kind whatever, from any King, Prince, or foreign State.*

- 4 3. Transforms a government based on individual rights and personal sovereignty into a “dulocracy”, whereby public
5 servants have so much license and privilege that they domineer over people that they are supposed to be serving and
6 protecting:

7 *“Dulocracy. A government where servants and slaves have so much license and privilege that they domineer.”*
8 *[Black’s Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 501]*

- 9 4. Compels sovereign Americans into becoming government public officers and instrumentalities without their consent
10 and without compensation.
11 5. Illegally and under threat and extortion compels the average American to contract with the government. All franchises
12 such as Social Security and the income tax are contracts between the grantor and the grantee.

13 *As a rule, franchises spring from contracts between the sovereign power and private citizens, made upon*
14 *valuable considerations, for purposes of individual advantage as well as public benefit,⁴⁹ and thus a franchise*
15 *partakes of a double nature and character. So far as it affects or concerns the public, it is publici juris and is*
16 *subject to governmental control. The legislature may prescribe the manner of granting it, to whom it may be*
17 *granted, the conditions and terms upon which it may be held, and the duty of the grantee to the public in*
18 *exercising it, and may also provide for its forfeiture upon the failure of the grantee to perform that duty. But*
19 *when granted, it becomes the property of the grantee, and is a private right, subject only to the governmental*
20 *control growing out of its other nature as publici juris.⁵⁰*
21 *[American Jurisprudence 2d, Franchises, §4: Generally (1999)]*

22 For further details, see:

23 5.1. *The “Trade or Business” Scam*, Form #05.001

24 <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

25 5.2. *Resignation of Compelled Social Security Trustee*, Form #06.002

26 <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

- 27 6. Causes identity theft whereby the legal identity of those domiciled in states of the Union is effectively kidnapped from
28 the protections of the Constitution and transported to a foreign jurisdiction and federal territory not protected by the
29 Constitution pursuant to 26 U.S.C. §7408(d) and 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(39). THIS is a very serious crime if the party
30 who is the victim, such as me, does not consent to the theft. Statutes making identity theft a criminal infraction and
31 which you are subject to include:

32 6.1. 18 U.S.C. §912: Impersonating a public officer.

33 6.2. [42 U.S.C. §405\(c\)\(2\)\(C\)\(i\)](#): Evidence, Procedure, and Certification for payments

34 6.3. [42 U.S.C. §408\(a\)\(7\)](#): Penalties

35 6.4. [18 U.S.C. §1028\(a\)\(7\)](#): Fraud and related activity in connection with identification documents, authentication
36 features, and information

37 6.5. [18 U.S.C. §1028A](#): Aggravated Identity Theft

38 6.6. [18 U.S.C. §654](#): Anyone who uses a public number in connection with your private property without your consent
39 is guilty of conversion.

40 To make things even worse, the Department of Homeland Security fraudulently and maliciously labels all those who are
41 aware of the Government ID Scam described herein as “terrorists” and “extremists”, as though knowledge of your unlawful
42 efforts to compel association, compel contracting, and compel fraudulent participation in your franchises is an illegal activity.
43 What a SICK JOKE. The real terrorists are any state and federal government that compels me to lie on a government form
44 about my status in order to procure the benefits of a franchise that I don’t want, don’t need, and which is actually harmful
45 and not protective of me.

46 *(U) sovereign citizen movement : (U//FOUO)*

47 *A rightwing extremist movement composed of groups or individuals who reject the notion of U.S. citizenship.*
48 *They claim to follow only what they believe to be God’s law or common law and the original 10 amendments (Bill*

⁴⁹ Georgia R. & Power Co. v. Atlanta, 154 Ga. 731, 115 S.E. 263; Lippencott v. Allander, 27 Iowa 460; State ex rel. Hutton v. Baton Rouge, 217 La 857, 47 So.2d. 665; Tower v. Tower & S. Street R. Co., 68 Minn 500, 71 N.W. 691.

⁵⁰ Georgia R. & Power Co. v. Atlanta, 154 Ga. 731, 115 S.E. 263; Lippencott v. Allander, 27 Iowa 460; State ex rel. Hutton v. Baton Rouge, 217 La 857, 47 So.2d. 665; Tower v. Tower & S. Street R. Co., 68 Minn 500, 71 N.W. 691.

1 of Rights) to the U.S. Constitution. They believe they are emancipated from all other responsibilities associated
2 with being a U.S. citizen, such as paying taxes, possessing a driver's license and motor vehicle registration, or
3 holding a social security number. They generally do not recognize federal or state government authority or laws.
4 Several sovereign citizen groups in the United States produce fraudulent documents for their members in lieu
5 of legitimate government-issued forms of identification. Members have been known to advocate or engage in
6 criminal activity and plot acts of violence and terrorism in an attempt to advance their extremist goals. They
7 often target government officials and law enforcement. (also: state citizens, freemen, preamble citizens, common
8 law citizens)

9 [Domestic Extremism Lexicon, Dept. of Homeland Security Document #IA-0233-09, p. 9;

10 SOURCE: <http://fmguardian.org/Subjects/Crime/Terrorism/DomeExtrLexicon.pdf>]

11 The reason the groups mentioned would even feel the need to produce their own ID's is because you have made it impossible
12 to procure ID or to engage in commerce to support themselves without committing fraud about their domicile or status on a
13 government form, and without signing up for government franchise in the process.

14 This section therefore constitutes an affidavit of duress against the unlawful and criminal forms of duress described herein.
15 The existence of such duress renders void and of no legal effect all evidence of consent or status derived from said consent,
16 including any and all government IDs in conflict with the status stated herein or implying a citizenship or domicile different
17 or inconsistent with that described herein.

18 "An agreement [including a franchise, because all franchises are contracts] obtained by duress, coercion, or
19 intimidation is invalid, since the party coerced is not exercising his free will, and the test is not so much the
20 means by which the party is compelled to execute the agreement as the state of mind induced.⁵¹ Duress, like
21 fraud, rarely becomes material, except where a contract or conveyance has been made which the maker wishes
22 to avoid. As a general rule, duress renders the contract or conveyance voidable, not void, at the option of the
23 person coerced,⁵² and it is susceptible of ratification. Like other voidable contracts, it is valid until it is avoided
24 by the person entitled to avoid it.⁵³ However, duress in the form of physical compulsion, in which a party is
25 caused to appear to assent when he has no intention of doing so, is generally deemed to render the resulting
26 purported contract void.⁵⁴"

27 [American Jurisprudence 2d, Duress, §21 (1999)]

28 I remind the recipient that any use of government ID, driver's licenses, and driver's license applications as proof of domicile,
29 because the product of the crimes documented herein, is not admissible as evidence pursuant to the fruit of a poisonous tree
30 doctrine. You cannot use the fruit of YOUR crime in kidnapping my identity and as evidence against me in any civil or
31 criminal proceeding.

32 If you as the recipient would like to investigate the Government ID Scam further and prosecute the perpetrators, see Ref. (1),
33 Section 13.

34 Lastly, the following affidavit of duress is hereby incorporated by reference into this document.

[Affidavit of Duress: Illegal Tax Enforcement by De Facto Officers](http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm), Form #02.005
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

35 **10. ACTIONS REQUESTED OF YOU AND YOUR RESPONSE**

36 The following subsections document specific actions requested of you to ensure that your records are not inaccurate, false,
37 or fraudulent and to thereby prevent the crimes documented in section 11 that result from a FAILURE to take the actions
38 indicated.

⁵¹ Brown v. Pierce, 74 U.S. 205, 7 Wall. 205, 19 L.Ed. 134

⁵² Barnette v. Wells Fargo Nevada Nat'l Bank, 270 U.S. 438, 70 L.Ed. 669, 46 S.Ct. 326 (holding that acts induced by duress which operate solely on the mind, and fall short of actual physical compulsion, are not void at law, but are voidable only, at the election of him whose acts were induced by it); Faske v. Gershman, 30 Misc.2d. 442, 215 N.Y.S.2d. 144; Glenney v. Crane (Tex Civ App Houston (1st Dist)), 352 S.W.2d. 773, writ ref n r e (May 16, 1962); Carroll v. Fetty, 121 W.Va. 215, 2 S.E.2d. 521, cert den 308 U.S. 571, 84 L.Ed. 479, 60 S.Ct. 85.

⁵³ Faske v. Gershman, 30 Misc.2d. 442, 215 N.Y.S.2d. 144; Heider v. Unicume, 142 or 416, 20 P.2d. 384; Glenney v. Crane (Tex Civ App Houston (1st Dist)), 352 S.W.2d. 773, writ ref n r e (May 16, 1962)

⁵⁴ Restatement 2d, Contracts § 174, stating that if conduct that appears to be a manifestation of assent by a party who does not intend to engage in that conduct is physically compelled by duress, the conduct is not effective as a manifestation of assent.

1 **10.1. Secretary of State of United States and Secretary of State of a state of the Union Must**
2 **Apostille both copies of this document they receive, return one copy, and record the other**
3 **copy**

4 If the recipient of this notice is either the Dept. of State of the United States or the Dept. of State of a State of the Union, then
5 pursuant to Volume 2 of the U.S. Department of State Foreign Affairs Manual (FAM), Section 1292.1 (2 Foreign Affairs
6 Manual (F.A.M.) 1292.1), I request that both of the two copies you received of the Certificate of Service for this document
7 be apostilled by you and then:

- 8 1. One of them be returned to me promptly.
- 9 2. The second copy you received be recorded in your system of records.

10 You can find a copy of Volume 2 of the U.S. Dept. of State Foreign Affairs Manual (FAM) at the address below, if you don't
11 have your own copy:

<p>12 <i>U.S. Department of State Website, Foreign Affairs Manual</i> http://foia.state.gov/REGS/Search.asp</p>

12 I have enclosed the requisite fees, if any, which I determined in advance prior to sending this notice.

13 **10.2. AMEND PAST and FUTURE USA Passport applications by appending Enclosure (6)**

14 Enclosure (6) is provided as a mandatory attachment to all PAST and FUTURE USA Passport applications. A USA Passport
15 application, Department of State Form DS-11 is NOT included because this exhibit modifies and is included by reference in
16 any and all PAST, PRESENT, and FUTURE applications submitted independently of this correspondence.

17 I certify that any DS-11 passport applications you receive are both FALSE and FRAUDULENT without this mandatory
18 attachment included by reference. A refusal on your part to amend these applications shall constitute the following crimes:

- 19 1. Impersonating a statutory U.S. citizen: 18 U.S.C. §911.
- 20 2. Perjury: 18 U.S.C. §1001, 18 U.S.C. §1542, 18 U.S.C. §1621.
- 21 3. Fraud: 18 U.S.C. §§1001, 1002, 1028, 1028A, 1029, 1039.
- 22 4. Misprision of felony: 18 U.S.C. §3.
- 23 5. Accessory after the fact: 18 U.S.C. §4.

24 **10.3. Update NUMIDENT status with the Social Security Administration**

25 Citizenship is recorded Social Security NUMIDENT records within the CSP field. This information is shared with the
26 Internal Revenue Service (IRS) and the Department of Homeland Security (DHS). Those who are statutory "nationals and
27 citizens of the United States" per 8 U.S.C. §1401 are identified with a value of "A" for the CSP field.

28 Please update the SSA NUMIDENT record to reflect OTHER than "A" and to correctly reflect my status as:

- 29 1. A Constitutional citizen per the Fourteenth Amendment.
- 30 2. A statutory "non-resident non-person".
- 31 3. NOT a "national and citizen of the United States** at birth" per 8 U.S.C. §1401, 26 U.S.C. §3121(e), and 26 C.F.R.
32 §1.1-1(c).

33 This request SUPERCEDES and is CONTROLLING over any past, present, or future government form or communication you
34 receive from either myself or any third party that might be in conflict. If you receive any government form, including the
35 above forms, in conflict with this request, then this request shall supersede it for the subjects it covers.

36 **10.4. Update all SS-5, IRS Form W-8, DOS Form I-9, and USCIS E-Verify Applications on file**

37 Please update my citizenship status on any and every one of the following government forms:

- 1 1. SSA Form SS-5.
- 2 2. IRS Form W-8.
- 3 3. Department of State Form I-9.
- 4 4. USCIS E-Verify Application.

5 The status I want indicated is that reflected in Item #3.1 in the table on the following page. This request SUPERCEDES and
6 is CONTROLLING over any past, present, or future government form or communication you receive from either myself or
7 any third party that might be in conflict. If you receive any government form, including the above forms, in conflict with this
8 request, then this request shall supersede it for the subjects it covers.

Table 2: Tabular Summary of Citizenship Status on Government Forms

#	Citizenship status	Place of birth	Domicile	Defined in	Social Security NUMIDEN T Status	Status on Specific Government Forms			
						Social Security SS-5 Block 5	IRS Form W-8 Block 3	Department of State I-9 Section 1	E-Verify System
1	“national and citizen of the United States** at birth” or “U.S.** citizen” or “Statutory U.S.** citizen”	Statutory “United States” pursuant to 8 U.S.C. §1101(a)(38), (a)(36) and 8 C.F.R. §215.1(f) or in the “outlying possessions of the United States” pursuant to 8 U.S.C. §1101(a)(29)	District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, Virgin Islands	8 U.S.C. §1401; 8 U.S.C. §1101(a)(22)(A)	CSP=A	”U.S. Citizen”	Can’t use Form W-8	”A citizen of the United States”	See Note 2.
2	“non-citizen national of the United States** at birth” or “U.S.** national”	Statutory “United States” pursuant to 8 U.S.C. §1101(a)(38), (a)(36) and 8 C.F.R. §215.1(f) or in the “outlying possessions of the United States” pursuant to 8 U.S.C. §1101(a)(29)	American Samoa; Swains Island; or abroad to U.S. national parents under 8 U.S.C. §1408(2)	8 U.S.C. §1101(a)(22)(B); 8 U.S.C. §1408; 8 U.S.C. §1452	CSP=B	”Legal alien authorized to work. (statutory)”	“Non-resident NON-person Nontaxpayer” if PRIVATE “Individual” if PUBLIC officer	”A non-citizen national of the United States**”	See Note 2.
3.1	“U.S.A.*** national” or “state national” or “Constitutional but not statutory citizen”	Constitutional Union state	State of the Union	8 U.S.C. §1101(a)(21); 14 th Amend., Sect. 1	CSP=D	“Other (8 U.S.C. §1101(a)(21))”	“Non-resident NON-person Nontaxpayer”	”A citizen of the United States***. Not a “citizen of the United States***” under 8 U.S.C. §1101(a)(22)(A) or 8 U.S.C. §1401”	See Note 2.
3.2	“U.S.A.*** national” or “state national” or “Constitutional but not statutory citizen”	Constitutional Union state	Foreign country	8 U.S.C. §1101(a)(21); 14 th Amend., Sect. 1	CSP=D	“Other (8 U.S.C. §1101(a)(21))”	“Non-resident NON-person Nontaxpayer”	”A citizen of the United States***. Not a “citizen of the United States***” under 8 U.S.C. §1101(a)(22)(A) or 8 U.S.C. §1401”	See Note 2.
3.3	“U.S.A.*** national” or “state national” or “Constitutional but not statutory citizen”	Constitutional Union state	Foreign country	8 U.S.C. §1101(a)(21); 14 th Amend., Sect. 1	CSP=D	“Other (8 U.S.C. §1101(a)(21))”	“Non-resident NON-person Nontaxpayer”	”A citizen of the United States***. Not a “citizen of the United States***” under 8 U.S.C. §1101(a)(22)(A) or 8 U.S.C. §1401”	See Note 2.

#	Citizenship status	Place of birth	Domicile	Defined in	Social Security NUMIDEN T Status	Status on Specific Government Forms			
						Social Security SS-5 Block 5	IRS Form W-8 Block 3	Department of State I-9 Section 1	E-Verify System
3.4	Statutory “citizen of the United States***” or Statutory “U.S.** citizen”	Constitutional Union state	Puerto Rico, Guam, Virgin Islands, American Samoa, Commonwealth of Northern Mariana Islands	8 U.S.C. §1101(a)(21); 14 th Amend., Sect. 1 8 U.S.C. §1101(a)(22)(A)	CSP=A	”U.S. Citizen”	Can’t use Form W-8	”A citizen of the United States***”	See Note 2.
4.1	“alien” or “Foreign national”	Foreign country	Puerto Rico, Guam, Virgin Islands, American Samoa, Commonwealth of Northern Mariana Islands	8 U.S.C. §1101(a)(21); 8 U.S.C. §1101(a)(3)	CSP=B	”Legal alien authorized to work. (statutory)”	“Non-resident NON-person Nontaxpayer” if PRIVATE “Individual” if PUBLIC officer	”A lawful permanent resident” OR “An alien authorized to work”	See Note 2.
4.2	“alien” or “Foreign national”	Foreign country	State of the Union	8 U.S.C. §1101(a)(21); 8 U.S.C. §1101(a)(3)	CSP=B	”Legal alien authorized to work. (statutory)”	“Non-resident NON-person Nontaxpayer”	”A lawful permanent resident” OR “An alien authorized to work”	See Note 2.
4.3	“alien” or “Foreign national”	Foreign country	State of the Union	8 U.S.C. §1101(a)(21); 8 U.S.C. §1101(a)(3)	CSP=B	”Legal alien authorized to work. (statutory)”	“Non-resident NON-person Nontaxpayer”	”A lawful permanent resident” OR “An alien authorized to work”	See Note 2.
4.4	“alien” or “Foreign national”	Foreign country	Foreign country	8 U.S.C. §1101(a)(21)	CSP=B	”Legal alien authorized to work. (statutory)”	“Non-resident NON-person Nontaxpayer”	”A lawful permanent resident” OR “An alien authorized to work”	See Note 2.
4.5	“alien” or “Foreign national”	Foreign country	Foreign country	8 U.S.C. §1101(a)(21)	CSP=B	”Legal alien authorized to work. (statutory)”	“Non-resident NON-person Nontaxpayer”	”A lawful permanent resident” OR “An alien authorized to work”	See Note 2.

1
2 **10.5. Update of all existing government records describing me**

3 Pursuant to 26 C.F.R. §301.6109-1(g)(1)(i), please change my status to that of a “non-resident” but NOT a “nonresident alien
4 INDIVIDUAL” not engaged in a “trade or business” as defined in 26 C.F.R. §1.871-1(b)(1)(i). Then remove my information
5 from all electronic systems as indicated in the next section.

6 Should you find this affidavit or the enclosures deficient or insufficient in any way to accomplish the changes in your
7 documentation necessary to correctly reflect my citizenship as a “National but not citizen”, **please promptly inform me within**
8 **10 days** of receipt of this Legal Notice of this condition and I will gladly provide to you any additional documentation you
9 might require to satisfy the requirements of applicable law and regulations. **Otherwise, under the Uniform Commercial Code**
10 **(UCC), Section 1-205, your failure to respond shall constitute an affirmative act of approval of and compliance with the**
11 **wishes expressed by me in this affidavit.** Should you respond with a request for additional information, please:

- 12 1 Include your full legal name, mailing address, phone number, position, organization, title, and email address.
13 2 Include a reference to the enacted positive law and corresponding implementing regulation that requires any additional
14 information or forms you might request.
15 3 Use an **OMB-approved document** which complies with the requirements of the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) by
16 stating whether disclosing the information is “mandatory” or “voluntary”, the code or regulation requiring disclosure if
17 mandatory, and by providing an OMB control number and expiration date clearly visible on the form.

18 **10.6. Removal of all information about me in all government records**

19 After you have accomplished the request in the previous section, you are requested to remove my name and all personal
20 information about me from all government electronic information system. That information is copyrighted, privileged, and
21 licensed information copyrighted by me and also protected from disclosure or use by the Privacy Act, 5 U.S.C. §552a.
22 Pursuant to the enacted positive law codified in the [Privacy Act, 5 U.S.C. §552a\(b\)](#):

- 23 1. You do **not** have my consent to store any information about me contained herein or already existing in your computer
24 systems in any electronic information system or share it with anyone outside of the immediate government you work for.
25 This means that if you work for the federal government, you may not share this information with any state of the Union
26 without my prior written consent.
27 2. You may not disclose or provide any information about me, either on this form or existing within your computer system,
28 to any foreign government.
29 3. You may not use or store any identifying number described as either a Social Security Number or Taxpayer Identifying
30 Number, in any electronic information system and are demanded to destroy and discontinue using any such number. Use
31 of such numbers violates my religious beliefs, and they may NOT be used without my consent pursuant to [5 U.S.C.](#)
32 [§552a\(b\)](#).

33 **10.7. Legal Requirements Imposed Upon Your Response**

34 Pursuant to the Administrative Procedures Act, [5 U.S.C. §556\(d\)](#) and [26 U.S.C. §7491](#), you as the moving party asserting a
35 position contrary to the law documented here have the burden of showing the facts and statements made are false, and you
36 must satisfy the following requirements of evidence in your challenge:

- 37 1. Must conform completely with the conclusions contained in:
38

Reasonable Belief About Income Tax Liability , Form #05.007 http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm
--

39 2. Must be admissible, non-prima facie evidence.
40 2.1. The 1939 code upon which the present internal revenue code was based has been REPEALED. See [53 Stat 1,](#)
41 [Section 4](#). Not only did it repeal itself, but it also repealed all prior revenue laws from the Statutes at large.
42 Therefore, nothing from the Statutes at large prior to 1939 can be cited as positive law.
43 2.2. [1 U.S.C. §204](#) legislative notes, the GPO website (<http://www.gpoaccess.gov/uscode/about.html>), and the House
44 of Representatives websites (<http://uscode.house.gov/about/info.shtml>) all say that the Internal Revenue Code was
not presently enacted into positive law. Therefore, if your evidence consists of cites from the I.R.C., you must prove

1 that every section of the code you cite is individually a [positive law](#), which is the only type of admissible, non-
2 presumptive evidence having to do with written law. The way to prove that is to cite a section of the Statutes at
3 Large AFTER 1939 which was enacted into positive law. We remind you that it is a religious sin for Christians
4 (see [Numbers 15:30](#)) and a violation of due process to "presume" or "assume" anything, and therefore the
5 government cannot compel us to "presume" that a section of the I.R.C. is enacted positive law without proving it.

- 6 3. If your evidence is from a witness, then the witness must agree on a notarized affidavit to be financially liable for making
7 a false statement and an address where that person may be served with legal process must be provided in case litigation
8 becomes necessary because of his or her misrepresentations.
- 9 4. Your evidence may not come from any IRS publication, because the IRS [Internal Revenue Manual says in section](#)
10 [4.10.7.2.8](#) that IRS publications may *not* be cited to sustain a position. See the link below for further details on this scam:
11 <http://famguardian.org/Subjects/Taxes/Articles/IRSNotResponsible.htm>
- 12 5. If the evidence relates to the liability of a person who does not reside on federal property, then any court cites must come
13 from a state court, because:
 - 14 5.1. The Supreme Court said in *Erie Railroad v. Tompkins*, [304 U.S. 64](#) (1938) that there is no federal common law in
15 a state of the Union.
 - 16 5.2. The Rules of Decision Act, [28 U.S.C. §1652](#) says that the law to be applied in the courts is state law and not federal
17 law, and especially when the domicile of the Defendant is on state property and not on federal property.
 - 18 5.3. The IRS [Internal Revenue Manual \(I.R.M.\), Section 4.10.7.2.9.8](#) says that courts below the Supreme Court may
19 only be cited as precedent for the particular person involved in the proceeding.
 - 20 5.4. [Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 17\(b\)](#) states that the capacity to sue or be sued is based on the domicile of the
21 Defendant. If that domicile is in a state and not on land ceded to the federal government or under general federal
22 jurisdiction, then no federal statute or no federal judicial precedent may be cited as authority in the case.
- 23 6. Your answer may *not* include or consist of either the IRS "[The Truth About Frivolous Tax Arguments](#)" or the
24 Congressional Research Report 97-59A entitled "[Frequently Asked Questions About the Federal Income Tax](#)". The
25 reasons for this are many, not the least of which consist of:
 - 26 6.1. The IRS document doesn't identify the IRS or anyone in the IRS as a source and is not signed or
27 authenticated. Under the [Federal Rules of Evidence](#), nothing can be used as evidence without at least the identity
28 of the author being known and the author being sworn under oath and held just as accountable as those who relied
29 on his statements.
 - 30 6.2. The Office of the Chief Counsel of the IRS (202-622-3300) positively refuses to either sign or take personal
31 responsibility in writing for publication of this document and thereby be held legally liable for false statements
32 contained therein, even though his administrative help indicated on the telephone that he was the author. How
33 ironic it is that anyone from the government would insist on calling anything "truth" that absolutely no one
34 conspicuously will claim legal responsibility for. How ironic also is it that the IRS would base all of its positions
35 against allegedly "frivolous" positions that it can't and won't take personal and legal responsibility for, even though
36 the people who argue against their unofficial position can and are held legally responsible for making "frivolous"
37 arguments by courts that demonstrably don't even have any jurisdiction. Therefore, both of these publications for
38 similar reasons are simply hearsay evidence that is excludible under the Hearsay Rule ([Federal Rule of Evidence](#)
39 [802](#)) and also amount essentially to "political propaganda" and "[false commercial speech](#)" unless and until they are
40 authenticated and the authors are identified and held liable for their dubious and deliberately vague and deceptive
41 statements therein.
 - 42 6.3. Federal courts have repeatedly said that one may not rely upon the statements of public servants in forming a
43 reasonable belief. See the link below:
44 <http://famguardian.org/Subjects/Taxes/Articles/reliance.htm>

45 **10.8. Significance of behaviors and responses to this correspondence**

46 I ask that you conform to the legal constraints imposed on your response which are documented in this section. The First
47 Amendment notices you of my right to communicate with the government as I see fit. Included within that right is the right
48 to define the meaning and significance of certain words and actions, which are "symbols" that communicate an intention on
49 your part. Therefore, for the purposes of your response:

- 50 1. Any use of the words "frivolous" in your response shall mean "correct, truthful". We have a [First Amendment](#) right to
51 communicate with the government as we see fit. This means you must communicate with me in a language I understand
52 and define. If people who speak Spanish are entitled to interpreters in court, I am entitled to a similar "interpreter". My
53 "language" does not include the word "frivolous" or any variation thereof as commonly used by the legal profession.
54 Those who want to identify anything that I say as incorrect must specify exactly what is incorrect and do so under the
55 rules of evidence established above using only legally admissible evidence consistent with that identified in the list above.

1 2. Any issue raised in this correspondence that you remain silent on or do not explicitly rebut with evidence consistent with
2 the Federal Rules of Evidence shall constitute an admission and estoppel in pais for all future litigation on this subject.
3 This is a requirement of [Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8\(b\)\(6\)](#), which says that failure to deny (with evidence rather
4 than just opinion) shall constitute an admission. Federal Courts have also said that when a criminal, which is you, is
5 confronted with evidence of his wrongdoing, and either responds with silence or claims the Fifth Amendment, that shall
6 constitute an admission and a negative inference against them to a jury or fact finder.

7 *"It is well established that in a criminal trial a judge or prosecutor may not suggest that the jury draw an
8 adverse inference from a defendant's failure to testify." United States v. Solano-Godines, 120 F.3d. 957, 962
9 (9th Cir. 1997). However, in civil proceedings adverse inferences can be drawn from a party's invocation of
10 this Fifth Amendment right. See SEC v. Colello, 139 F.3d. 674, 677 (9th Cir. 1998). The seminal case in this
11 area is [Baxter v. Palmigiano, 425 U.S. 308 \(1976\)](#). In Baxter, the Supreme Court was confronted with a prison
12 inmate who had been brought before a prison disciplinary board on charges of inciting a disturbance. When
13 informed that state criminal charges might be brought against him arising out of his conduct while in prison, the
14 inmate was advised that he could remain silent before the board, but that his silence would be used against him.
15 See *id.* at 312. During the hearing, the inmate was confronted with incriminating evidence, remained completely
16 silent, and as a consequence was given further punishment under the assumption that he perpetrated the acts for
17 which he was being questioned. See *id.* at 313, 317. **The Supreme Court held that the drawing of the adverse
18 inference from the inmate's silence was proper when incriminating evidence had also been presented, and
19 therefore no Fifth Amendment violation had taken place.** See *id.* at 317-18.*

20 **The Baxter holding is not a blanket rule that allows adverse inferences to be drawn from invocations of the
21 privilege against self-incrimination under all circumstances in the civil context. Rather, lower courts
22 interpreting Baxter have been uniform in suggesting that the key to the Baxter holding is that such adverse
23 inference can only be drawn when independent evidence exists of the fact to which the party refuses to answer.
24 See, e.g., [LaSalle Bank Lake View v. Seguban, 54 F.3d. 387, 391 \(7th Cir. 1995\)](#); [Peiffer v. Lebanon Sch. Dist.,
25 848 F.2d. 44, 46 \(3d Cir. 1988\)](#). Thus, an adverse inference can be drawn when silence is countered by
26 independent evidence of the fact being questioned, but that same inference cannot be drawn when, for example,
27 silence is the answer to an allegation contained in a complaint.** See *Nat'l Acceptance Co. v. Bathalter, 705 F.2d.
28 924, 930 (7th Cir. 1983)*. In such instances, when there is no corroborating evidence to support the fact under
29 inquiry, the proponent of the fact must come forward with evidence to support the allegation, otherwise no
30 negative inference will be permitted. See *LaSalle Bank, 54 F.3d. at 391*.
31 [[Doe v. Glanzer, 232 F.3d. 1258, 232 F.3d. 1258 \(9th Cir. 11/17/2000\)](#)]

32 3. If you provide a general answer rather than specifically address the issues raised herein about your coercive and illegal
33 conduct, then this shall constitute fraud, based on the following maxims of law:

34 *"Fraus latet in generalibus. Fraud lies hid in general expressions."*

35 *"Fraus est celare fraudem. It is a fraud to conceal a fraud. 1 Vern. 270."*

36 *"Lata culpa dolo aequiparatur. Gross negligence is equal to fraud."*

37 [*Bouvier's Maxims of Law, 1856; SOURCE:*

38 <http://famguardian.org/Publications/BouvierMaximsOfLaw/BouviereMaxims.htm>]

39 4. The expression of an personal or agency opinion rather than providing legal evidence under penalty of perjury supporting
40 your position shall constitute an admission of the truthfulness of everything not rebutted with such evidence. I am not
41 interested in opinions, rhetoric, agency "propaganda", or agency "policy", but **only facts and law that are relevant and
42 admissible in a legal proceeding involving the issues raised herein**. The U.S. Supreme Court has declared that we are a
43 "society of law and not men".

44 **"The government of the United States has been emphatically termed a government of laws, and not of men. It
45 will certainly cease to deserve that high appellation, if the laws furnish no remedy [against a public official such
46 as yourself] for the violation of a vested legal right."**
47 [*Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S. 137; 1 Cranch 137, 2 L.Ed. 60 (1803)*]

48 Therefore, I am not interested in what "men" such as you have to say, but what the law, the courts, and the legally
49 admissible evidence signed under penalty of perjury by someone in authority with personal knowledge and who agrees
50 to take legal responsibility in court for their statements. An opinion that is not legally "actionable" from a person who
51 is not responsible for what they say is meaningless and makes a very poor basis for belief. Whenever I communicate
52 with you on a government form, it usually must be under penalty of perjury. That is exactly what I expect from you,
53 because the [Fourteenth Amendment, Section 1](#) and [42 U.S.C. §1981](#) both say that I am legally entitled to the same "equal
54 protection". Any expression of policy rather than legally admissible, specific evidence of authority shall constitute an
55 off-point non-response and will also serve as an admission on your part that we are not a society of law, but of men and
56 the policies of men, and that we live in a totalitarian democracy based not on individual sovereignty and rights, but on

1 the totalitarian will of the socialist “collective” and those such as yourself who claim but cannot prove that they have
2 lawful authority to “represent” that socialist collective.

3 **11. CRIMINAL COMPLAINT**

4 This document constitutes a formal criminal complaint for the violations indicated in the following subsections.

5 **11.1. Request to criminally and civilly prosecute violations of law by Social Security and other** 6 **government personnel**

7 Pursuant to the massive instances of fraud and false claims filed with the U.S. Government documented in section 4.4 earlier,
8 I respectfully demand that the Dept. of Justice investigate the violations of law indicated and prosecute all those federal
9 employees and public officials who condone, tolerate, or participate in it under the [False Claims Act, 31 U.S.C. §3729](#), for
10 THREE TIMES the amount of fraud perpetrated against the United States government. If you do not, I am contemplating
11 initiating a qui tam action on your behalf to recover said damages.

12 **11.2. Criminal Complaint against those engaged in the Government ID Scam documented in** 13 **section 9**

14 Recipient of this legal notice is hereby formally requested to criminally prosecute all those in the state government, federal
15 government, financial institutions, and employers who have instituted, protected, sanctioned, or condoned the duress
16 documented in section 9 earlier against me personally under the following authorities relating to compelled participation in
17 government franchises and identity theft:

18 1. Compelled Participation in Government Franchises:

19 1.1. Thirteenth Amendment: Prohibition against involuntary Servitude. I am being asked to represent a public office
20 in the U.S. government as a franchisee, that I am not eligible to occupy, cannot lawfully occupy, and which I do
21 not consent to occupy FOR ANY AMOUNT OF COMPENSATION.

22 1.2. 18 U.S.C. §912: Impersonating a public officer. A private person in possession, use, or control of public property
23 and engaging in a “trade or business” (“public office” pursuant to 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(26) is guilty of impersonating
24 a public officer. Those who only offer government ID to public officers are indirectly compelling people to
25 impersonate such officers.

26 1.3. 18 U.S.C. §654: Anyone who uses or compels the use of a public number in connection with your private property
27 without your consent is guilty of conversion.

28 1.4. 42 U.S.C. §408(a)(8): Penalties

29 2. Government ID Available Only to “U.S. persons” domiciled on federal territory: Includes driver’s licenses and state ID 30 that connect me with domicile on federal territory and status as a statutory but not constitutional “U.S. citizen”.

31 2.1. 18 U.S.C. §911: Impersonating a statutory “U.S. citizen”. By compelling me to misrepresent my status as a
32 statutory and not constitutional “U.S. citizen” pursuant to 8 U.S.C. §1401 in exchange for the Privilege of being
33 able to conduct commerce using government ID, those responsible are compelling me illegally to impersonate a
34 statutory but not constitutional “U.S. citizen”.

35 2.2. 42 U.S.C. §405(c)(2)(C)(i): Evidence, Procedure, and Certification for payments.

36 2.3. 18 U.S.C. §1028(a)(7): Fraud and related activity in connection with identification documents, authentication
37 features, and information

38 2.4. 18 U.S.C. §1028A: Aggravated Identity Theft

39 2.5. 18 U.S.C. §1201: Kidnapping. Whether I am physically moved or my legal identity is moved to a foreign
40 jurisdiction without my consent, the result is the same and it is a crime.

41
42 If you need legal authorities and memorandums of law useful in prosecuting the compelled participation in government
43 franchises, the following should prove useful:

44 1. Government Instituted Slavery Using Franchises, Form #05.030

45 <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

46 2. Why You Aren’t Eligible for Social Security, Form #06.001

47 <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

48 3. Why It is Illegal for Me to Request or Use a “Taxpayer Identification Number”, Form #04.205

49 <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
50

- 1 4. Resignation of Compelled Social Security Trustee, Form #06.002`
2 <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

3 For information on how to prosecute identity theft crimes described herein, please see:

- 4 1. Property and Privacy Protection Page, Section 10: Identity Theft
5 <http://famguardian.org/Subjects/PropertyPrivacy/PropertyPrivacy.htm>
6 2. Prosecuting Social Security Number Misuse: Attacking Identity Theft at its Source, U.S. Attorney Bulletin, Vol. 53,
7 No. 1
8 3. Identity Theft Laws: State Penalties and Remedies and Pending Federal Bills, Congressional Research Service Report
9 [#RL34028 / 2007-08-06](#)

10 If you can't even protect me from your own usurpations, identity theft, and kidnapping, it would be ridiculous to hire you as
11 my "protector" against other less injurious parties by becoming a customer of your "protection racket" called a "citizen",
12 "resident", or "inhabitant". When you have demonstrated a sincere and ongoing desire to protect me from your own extortion
13 and adhesion contracts/franchises, and to place me and my identity back on land protected by the Constitution instead of on
14 federal territory devoid of rights and constitutional protections, then and only then will I consider politically and legally re-
15 associating with you by becoming a "citizen" or a "resident".

16 *"In a free society, government protects citizens from threats against their persons and property. In a police state,
17 government deploys its law enforcement assets to protect itself against the "threat" posed by its own subjects."
18 [W.N. Grigg]*

19 Until you quit acting like a de facto corporation⁵⁵, return us to lawful money, eliminate the Federal Reserve, and return to
20 your station as the servant of the true sovereign, which is We the People and NOT the government who serves them, then:

- 21 1. The Declaration of Independence says you need my consent to "govern" and that if you don't have it, you are a tyrant
22 and a terrorist. I remind you that you don't have my consent and therefore, the DHS ought to be protecting me against
23 you, not third parties. There are only two types of governments: 1. Governments by consent; 2. Terrorist
24 governments. Which one are you? The Declaration of Independence not only makes it my right, but my duty to
25 provide "better safeguards for my future security" because you obviously can't and won't. Refusing to recognize my
26 RIGHT and DUTY to do so by becoming a "foreign state" and an ambassador of the de jure constitutional republic
27 would simply be an interference with that right and DUTY imposed by the organic law that is the foundation of ALL
28 of your lawful authority.
29 2. I choose to be a "transient foreigner" and a "stateless person" in relation to the de facto state and federal corporations
30 that have usurped and destroyed the original constitutional republic.
31 3. All I want you to do is simply leave me alone, and not enforce your fraudulent Ponzi scheme franchises or civil law
32 against me. Since it costs you nothing to be left alone, then it's ridiculous to say that I'm not "paying my fair share"
33 for protection that I don't need, don't want, and which I regard as harmful and not protective. All that the present
34 government seem to be inclined to do with the money people send them now is protect their own criminal "protection
35 racket" enterprise.
36 4. My sincerely held constitutionally protected First Amendment religious convictions require me to separate from, not to
37 fornicate with, not participate in, nor do commerce with you until you reform your ways. In that sense, I become a
38 "church" and you become the "state", and the law must keep us separate.⁵⁶ The Bible in fact says my body is a temple,
39 and I cannot pollute or corrupt that temple by engaging in government harlotry.

40 *"Do you not know that **you are the temple of God** and that the Spirit of God dwells in you? **If anyone defiles the**
41 **temple of God, God will destroy him. For the temple of God is holy, which temple you are.**"
42 [[1 Cor. 3:16-17](#), Bible, NKJV]*

43 *And I heard another voice from heaven saying, "**Come out of her [the government BEAST, Rev. 19:19], my**
44 **people, lest you share in her sins, and lest you receive of her plagues. For her sins have reached to heaven,**
45 **and God has remembered her iniquities.** Render to her just as she rendered to you [THEFT, LIES, TERRORISM,
46 DECEIT, and KIDNAPPING], and repay her double according to her works; in the cup which she has mixed,
47 mix double for her. In the measure that she glorified herself and lived luxuriously [on STOLEN loot taken from
48 non-consenting "subjects"], in the same measure give her torment and sorrow; for she says in her heart, 'I sit as*

⁵⁵ See *Corporatization and Privatization of the Government*, Form #05.024; <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>.

⁵⁶ See: *We Are the Church, Family Guardian Fellowship*: <http://famguardian.org/Subjects/Spirituality/ChurchTaxation/WeAreTheChurch.htm>.

1
2
3
4

queen, and am no widow, and will not see sorrow.' Therefore her plagues will come in one day—death and mourning and famine. And she will be utterly burned with fire, for strong is the Lord God who judges her.
[[Rev. 18:4-8](#), Bible, NKJV]

1 **12. ADVANCE REBUTTAL OF GOVERNMENT LIES AND PROPAGANDA DESIGNED TO**
2 **DISCREDIT THE SUBMITTER OR THIS COMMUNICATION**

3 This section shall provide references that rebut any and every publication and statement by the government that might be
4 used or attempted to be used to discredit this communication or any portion thereof. The following list references all of the
5 publications that rebut all such LIES and PROPAGANDA you might use to discredit me, this communication, or any portion
6 therefore. You have 30 days to rebut all the documents on this list in a communication signed under penalty of perjury by
7 you personally. If you do not, you shall be deemed to consent and agree that everything listed is truthful, accurate, consistent
8 with prevailing law, and stipulated as admitted into evidence in any and every litigation that might arise from our relationship
9 or this communication:

- 10 1. *Policy Document: Rebutted False Arguments Against this Website*, Form #08.011
11 DIRECT LINK: <http://sedm.org/Forms/08-PolicyDocs/RebFalseArgAgWebsite.pdf>
12 FORMS PAGE: <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
- 13 2. *Policy Document: Rebutted False Arguments About Sovereignty*, Form #08.018
14 DIRECT LINK: <http://sedm.org/Forms/08-PolicyDocs/RebFalseArgSovereignty.pdf>
15 FORMS PAGE: <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
- 16 3. *Flawed Tax Arguments to Avoid*, Form #08.004
17 DIRECT LINK: <http://sedm.org/Forms/08-PolicyDocs/FlawedArgsToAvoid.pdf>
18 FORMS PAGE: <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
- 19 4. *Rebutted Version of the IRS "The Truth About Frivolous Tax Arguments"*, Form #08.005
20 DIRECT LINK: http://sedm.org/Forms/08-PolicyDocs/friv_tax_rebuts.pdf
21 FORMS PAGE: <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
- 22 5. *Rebutted Version of Congressional Research Service Report 97-59A: Frequently Asked Questions Concerning the*
23 *Federal Income Tax*, Form #08.006
24 DIRECT LINK: <http://sedm.org/Forms/08-PolicyDocs/CRS-97-59A-rebuts.pdf>
25 FORMS PAGE: <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
- 26 6. *Rebutted Version of "Tax Resister Frequently Asked Questions"*, Form #08.007
27 DIRECT LINK: <http://famguardian.org/Subjects/Taxes/FalseRhetoric/TRFAQ/TRFAQ.htm>
28 FORMS PAGE: <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
- 29 7. *Rebutted False Arguments About the Common Law*, Form #08.025
30 DIRECT LINK: <https://sedm.org/Forms/08-PolicyDocs/RebuttedFalseArgumentsAboutCommonLaw.pdf>
31 FORMS PAGE: <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
32

1 **13. AFFIRMATION**

2 In accordance with [28 U.S.C. §1746](#)(1), I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America
3 that the foregoing and the entire contents of this correspondence and all attachments are true and correct.

4 I also affirm, under the Common Law of America, from without the "United States**", that I am over 18 years of age and
5 that the contents of this correspondence are a true, correct, and accurate reflection of my *voluntary will* , and that I am in no
6 way under any kind of duress in signing this correspondence.

7 I now affix my own signature to all of the above affirmations WITH EXPLICIT RESERVATION OF ALL MY RIGHTS
8 AND WITHOUT PREJUDICE U.C.C. §1-207 (UCCA 1207), and its successor, U.C.C. §1-308.

Full name	
Signature	
Signature of witness	
Date	

9
10
11 **NOTARY PUBLIC'S JURAT**

12 BEFORE ME, the undersigned authority, a Notary Public, of the County of _____,
13 Republic of _____(statename), this _____ day of _____, 20____,
14 _____, the Signator did personally appear and was identified by (check all that apply):

- 15 1. ___Passport
- 16 2. ___Birth Certificate
- 17 3. ___Military ID
- 18 4. ___Other verified government id (e.g. notarized copy of picture and birth certificate with affidavit they belong to one
19 and the same person)

20 ..and who, upon first being duly sworn and/or affirmed, deposes and says that the foregoing asseveration is true to the best
21 of his/her knowledge and belief.

22 I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of _____ that the foregoing paragraph is true
23 and correct.

24 WITNESS my hand and official seal.

25
26
27 /s/ _____ SEAL
28 Notary Public

29
30 My Commission Expires On:

1
2

14. ENCLOSURE (1): CERTIFIED COPY OF BIRTH or NATURALIZATION CERTIFICATE

1 **15. ENCLOSURE (2): AFFIDAVIT OF CITIZENSHIP, DOMICILE, AND TAX STATUS**

2 This attachment defines my citizenship, domicile, and tax status from the date of my birth to the date of my death. It shall be
3 included automatically in any and every form I submit or have ever submitted to the government, even if not physically
4 attached. It is also a mandatory part of any civil or criminal discovery that might affect or enforce any tax liability under the
5 Internal Revenue Code or any state revenue code.

6

1 **16. ENCLOSURE (3): DECLARATION OF PERSONAL INDEPENDENCE**

2 This memorandum of law may also be downloaded from the following address. In the interest of shortening this submission,
3 it is included here BY REFERENCE rather than printed in its entirety:

Declaration of Personal Independence, Form #10.016

<https://sedm.org/Forms/10-Emancipation/DeclarationOfPersonalIndependence.pdf>

4

1 **17. ENCLOSURE (4): WHY YOU ARE A “NATIONAL”, “STATE NATIONAL”, AND**
2 **CONSTITUTIONAL BUT NOT STATUTORY CITIZEN**

3 This memorandum of law may also be downloaded from the following address. In the interest of shortening this submission,
4 it is included here BY REFERENCE rather than printed in its entirety:

<p><i>Why You are a “national”, “state national”, and Constitutional but not Statutory Citizen</i>, Form #05.006 http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm</p>
--

5

1 **18. ENCLOSURE (5): MANDATORY USA PASSPORT APPLICATION ATTACHMENT**

2 This section modifies and is included by reference as an attachment to any and all PAST USA passport applications, D.O.S.
3 Form DS-11 or DS-82, that you may now have on file and also serves as a mandatory attachment to any FUTURE USA
4 passport applications that you may receive from me. These forms are false, fraudulent, and perjurious WITHOUT this
5 attachment included in the records of all agencies who maintain such information.