

IMPORTANT NOTICE:

This file is only a SAMPLE of the FULL document. It provides the first few pages of the FULL document as a demonstration of the quality of the content of the original. Amazon.com does the same thing with their online ebooks as we do, by providing SAMPLE content.

If you like this SAMPLE and desire access to the WHOLE document, then you will need to sign up to our Member Subscriptions offering at the link below:

<http://sedm.org/Membership/Subscriptions.htm>

Please DO NOT contact us to complain about portions of the document being missing. This is DELIBERATE.

Legal Remedies that Protect PRIVATE Rights


Form #12.019

By:

Sovereignty Education and Defense Ministry (SEDM)

<http://sedm.org>

February 4, 2011



Course Materials

If you want a copy of this presentation after viewing the course, you can download it from:

- Liberty University, Item #7.3

<http://sedm.org/LibertyU/LibertyU.htm>

- Forms Page, Form #12.019

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



Disclaimer

- Information appearing in this presentation is educational in nature
- We make ***no promises or guarantees*** about the effectiveness or accuracy of anything presented
- The application of this information to your specific legal circumstances is entirely and exclusively your choice and responsibility
- Everything presented is based on:
 - Thousands of hours of research of scriptural and legal research
 - Review and use of the resulting research by the over 500,000 people who have visited and are currently using the [SEDM Website](http://sedm.org)
 - Exhaustive review of our website by the Federal Judiciary, the Dept. of Justice, and the IRS which did not find anything factually wrong with anything currently posted on this website. See: <http://famguardian.org/Subjects/Taxes/News/CHRuling-060615.htm>
 - Continuous feedback from our readers that have improved the quality of the information over time
- If you find anything wrong in this presentation, we would appreciate you pointing out the evidence upon which you base that conclusion so that we may continually improve our materials. Your evidence must be completely consistent with our presentation below:

Reasonable Belief About Income Tax Liability, Form #05.007

<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
- The information presented is copyrighted and subject to the copyright restrictions found at:

<http://sedm.org/disclaimer.htm>
- You may read our materials but may not “use” any of this information to interact with the government or the legal profession without consenting unconditionally to and complying fully with all the terms of our Member Agreement:

<http://www.sedm.org/MemberAgreement/MemberAgreement.htm>

Course Outline

- 1. Introduction**
- 2. Prerequisites**
- 3. Rights Defined**
- 4. Public Rights Defined**
- 5. Private Rights Defined**
- 6. References on Private Rights**
- 7. The Federal War on Private Rights**
- 8. Legal Limits on Franchises**
- 9. Important considerations in crafting a remedy**
- 10. Basis for Injury**
- 11. Establishing Standing to Sue**
- 12. Venues for legal redress**
- 13. The Common Law**
- 14. Attacking Franchises**
- 15. Important Limitations to Insist Upon in Litigation**
- 16. Unlawful Government Defensive Techniques**

Course Outline

- 17. Watch Your Language in Court!**
- 18. Conclusions**
- 19. Getting connected: resources**
- 20. Sovereignty Education and Defense Ministry**
- 21. SEDM Educational Curricula**
- 22. Questions?**

Introduction

- This presentation will describe legal remedies for the protection of PRIVATE rights from government abuses.
- Target Audience: Those who are Members in full compliance with the [SEDM Member Agreement, Form #01.001](#).
- The techniques described in this document will:
 - NOT WORK for those who are not compliant with the [SEDM Member Agreement, Form #01.001](#)
 - INJURE and undermine the effectiveness of the techniques described if used by those who are NOT compliant.

Prerequisites

- We **INSIST** that you read and complete the following **PRIOR** to implementing anything suggested herein:

Path to Freedom, Form #09.015, Section 2

DIRECT LINK: <http://sedm.org/Forms/Procs/PathToFreedom.pdf>

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

- We also **INSIST** that you download and read the following **BEFORE** you attempt any of the techniques described herein:

– *Government Franchises Course*, Form #12.012

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

DIRECT LINK: <http://sedm.org/LibertyU/GovFranchises.pdf>

– *Government Instituted Slavery Using Franchises*, Form #05.030

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

DIRECT LINK: <http://sedm.org/Forms/MemLaw/Franchises.pdf>

Why the Prerequisites?

- The reason for these prerequisites is that those who consensually participate in government franchises **have NO BASIS OR STANDING to complain or litigate for a violation of Constitutional** rights

BECAUSE:

1. You cannot participate in government franchises without your consent manifested by completing and signing an application.
2. It is a maxim of law that what you consent to cannot form the basis for an injury:
 - » *“Volunt non fit injuria.*
He who consents cannot receive an injury. 2 Bouv. Inst. n. 2279, 2327; 4 T. R. 657; Shelf. on mar. & Div. 449.
 - » *Consensus tollit errorem.*
Consent removes or obviates a mistake. Co. Litt. 126.
 - » *Melius est omnia mala pati quam malo concentire.*
It is better to suffer every wrong or ill, than to consent to it. 3 Co. Inst. 23.
 - » *Nemo videtur fraudare eos qui sciunt, et consentiunt.*
One cannot complain of having been deceived when he knew the fact and gave his consent. Dig. 50, 17, 145.”

[Bouvier's Maxims of Law, 1856;

SOURCE: <http://famguardian.org/Publications/BouvierMaximsOfLaw/BouviersMaxims.htm>]

3. The Brandeis rules of the U.S. Supreme Court forbid the courts to entertain disputes of those who avail themselves of a **government “benefit” and therefore franchise:**

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

[Ashwander v. Tennessee Valley Authority, 297 U.S. 288, 56 S.Ct. 466 (1936)]

Why the Prerequisites?

4. Those consensually participating in government franchises are public officers, and **the USA Constitution DOES NOT protect public officers:**

“The restrictions that the Constitution places upon the government in its capacity as lawmaker, i.e., as the regulator of private conduct, are not the same as the restrictions that it places upon the government in its capacity as employer. We have recognized this in many contexts, with respect to many different constitutional guarantees. Private citizens perhaps cannot be prevented from wearing long hair, but policemen can. Kelley v. Johnson, 425 U.S. 238, 247 (1976). Private citizens cannot have their property searched without probable cause, but in many circumstances government employees can. O’Connor v. Ortega, 480 U.S. 709, 723 (1987) (plurality opinion); *id.*, at 732 (SCALIA, J., concurring in judgment). Private citizens cannot be punished for refusing to provide the government information that may incriminate them, but government employees can be dismissed when the incriminating information that they refuse to provide relates to the performance of their job. Gardner v. Broderick, [497 U.S. 62, 95] 392 U.S. 273, 277 -278 (1968). With regard to freedom of speech in particular: Private citizens cannot be punished for speech of merely private concern, but government employees can be fired for that reason. Connick v. Myers, 461 U.S. 138, 147 (1983). Private citizens cannot be punished for partisan political activity, but federal and state employees can be dismissed and otherwise punished for that reason. Public Workers v. Mitchell, 330 U.S. 75, 101 (1947); Civil Service Comm’n v. Letter Carriers, 413 U.S. 548, 556 (1973); Broadrick v. Oklahoma, 413 U.S. 601, 616 -617 (1973).”

[Rutan v. Republican Party of Illinois, 497 U.S. 62 (1990)]

- **For further details on the above, please read:**
 - **Requirement for Consent, Form #05.003**
FORMS PAGE: <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
DIRECT LINK: <http://sedm.org/Forms/MemLaw/Consent.pdf>