

**ALLOCATION:  
ALLEGED TAX CRIME**

Last revised: 2/14/2008

**1 Allocation .....3**  
**2 Tips for the accused on how to handle the allocation .....9**  
**3 Comments welcome.....10**  
**4 Resources for further study.....10**

---

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**Constitutional Provisions**

First Amendment.....3, 8  
Thirteenth Amendment.....9

**Statutes**

1 U.S.C. §204 .....3  
Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act, 28 U.S.C. §1605 .....4  
I.R.C. Subtitle A .....3  
Internal Revenue Code .....6  
Sherman Antitrust Act.....4

**Cases**

Boyd v. State of Nebraska, 143 U.S. 135 (1892) .....4  
Bradley v. Fisher, 13 Wall. (80 U. S.) 335, 351, 20 L. Ed. 646 .....5  
Budd v. People of State of New York, 143 U.S. 517 (1892).....7  
Chisholm v. Georgia, 2 Dall. (2 U.S.) 419, 1 L.Ed 440, 455 (1793).....6  
Chisholm v. Georgia, 2 U.S. (2 Dall.) 419, 1 L.Ed 440 (1793).....6  
DeCourcey v. Cox, 94 Cal. 665, 669, 30 P. 95.....5  
Everson v. Bd. of Ed., 330 U.S. 1, 15 (1947).....3  
Glazar v. Hubbard, 102 Ky. 68, 69, 42 S. W. 1114, 39 L. R. A. 210, 80 Am. St. Rep. 340 .....5  
Gulf, C. & S. F. R. Co. v. Ellis, 165 U.S. 150 (1897) .....5  
Manning v. Ketcham, 58 F.2d 948 (1932) .....5  
Olmstead v. United States, 277 U.S. 438, 478 (1928).....8  
Prell v. McDonald, 7 Kan. 266, 283, 12 Am. Rep. 423.....5  
Providence Bank v. Billings, 29 U.S. 514 (1830) .....7  
State ex rel. Egan v. Wolever, 127 Ind. 306, 26 N. E. 762, 763 .....5  
State v. Pruitt, Mo., 169 S.W.2d 399, 400.....9  
Truesdell v. Combs, 33 Ohio St. 186, 194 .....5  
United States v. Lanier, on certiorari No. 95-1717.....9  
VanHorne's Lessee v. Dorrance, 2 U.S. 304 (1795).....7  
Wallace v. Jaffree, 472 U.S. 69 (1985) .....3

**Other Authorities**

1 Sam. 15:22-23 .....3  
Daniel Webster, The Speeches and Orations of Daniel Webster, Edwin P. Whipple, Little Brown and Company, Boston,  
1914, p. 366.....7  
Exodus 20:3.....8  
Ezekial 20:10-20 .....8

F.R.C.P. Rule 9(h).....	9
Federal Pleading Attachment .....	4
Federal Sentencing Guidelines Manual.....	10
George Washington, Farewell Address .....	8
James 2:8-10.....	7
Legal Research Sources.....	10
Maritime Claims Rule E(8).....	9
Merriam Webster’s Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary, ISBN 0-87779-510-X, p. 1301 .....	6
SEDM Forms/Pubs Page .....	10
SEDM Litigation Tools Page .....	10
U.S. Attorney Manual Section 6-4.270 .....	3

1 **1 Allocution**

2 For the record on this day I, \_\_\_\_\_, the natural flesh and blood man/woman, a peaceful American  
3 National, on the land, do verily say that I do not consent to this alleged court nor do I consent to any of the goings on that I  
4 have experienced to date. To wit:

- 5 1. These proceedings have failed to produce competent evidence of an injured party.
- 6 2. These proceedings have failed to produce a single affidavit of verified complaint, or the existence of a real complaining  
7 party.
- 8 3. These proceedings have failed to produce an injured party as plaintiff onto the witness stand for testimony.
- 9 4. The information presented lacked competent fact witness under penalty of perjury.
- 10 5. The real party of interest is being concealed-not identified. The alleged plaintiff/libellant appear fictitious.
- 11 6. The U.S. attorney demonstrates no evidence of delegated authority to prosecute and therefore appears to be acting without  
12 authority. See U.S. Attorney Manual Section 6-4.270 for proof.
- 13 7. There appears no contract or franchise agreement or license in evidence compelling performance or connecting me to  
14 the "trade or business" franchise codified in I.R.C. Subtitle A.
- 15 8. The U.S. Attorney has withheld and is continuing to withhold material evidence.
- 16 9. The U.S. Attorney offers nothing of substance to this court.
- 17 10. The plaintiff has not produced any evidence of a legal liability or duty to pay a tax nor proven that any part of the Internal  
18 Revenue Code even constitutes evidence of such a duty.
- 19 11. I have read 1 U.S.C. §204 of your church bible and I have found it to say that the entire Internal Revenue Code is nothing  
20 more than "prima facie evidence". The term "prima facie" is legally defined as simply a presumption. Therefore, it  
21 appears to me that this court is practicing something akin to religion, rather than law, where presumption serves as the  
22 equivalent of religious faith and unsubstantiated hearsay evidence. This appears to be a violation of the establishment  
23 clause of the First Amendment. YOU KNOW that you can't establish a religion or force me to participate in your state  
24 sponsored church using a majority vote of "electors" on a jury. In my mind this proceeding is act of witchcraft by a  
25 satanic cabal.

26 *"Has the LORD as great delight in burnt offerings and sacrifices,*  
 27 *As in obeying the voice of the LORD?*  
 28 **Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice,**  
 29 **And to heed than the fat of rams.**  
 30 **For rebellion [of either the Constitution or the Bible] is as the sin of witchcraft,**  
 31 **And stubbornness is as iniquity and idolatry**  
 32 **Because you have rejected the word [and laws] of the [sovereign] LORD [or "We the People" in the**  
 33 **Constitution],**  
 34 **He also has rejected you from being king [and a sovereign over your government as a private citizen, or a**  
 35 **public servant]."**  
 36 **[1 Sam. 15:22-23, Bible, NKJV]**

37 12. Through this unlawful proceeding, I find that you are attempting to criminalize alleged non-payment of tithes to a state  
38 sponsored church.

39 *"The "establishment of religion" clause of the First Amendment means at least this: **neither a state nor the***  
 40 **Federal Government can set up a church.** *Neither can pass laws which aid one [state-sponsored political]*  
 41 *religion, aid all religions, or prefer one religion over another. Neither can force or influence a person to go to*  
 42 *or to remain away from church against his will, or force him to profess a belief or disbelief in any religion. No*  
 43 *person can be punished for entertaining or professing religious beliefs or disbeliefs, for church attendance or*  
 44 *non-attendance. **No tax in any amount, large or small, can be levied to support any religious activities or***  
 45 **institutions, whatever they may be called, or whatever form they may adopt to teach or practice religion.**  
 46 **Neither a state nor the Federal Government can, openly or secretly, participate in the affairs of any religious**  
 47 **organizations or groups and vice versa."**  
 48 *[Everson v. Bd. of Ed., 330 U.S. 1, 15 (1947)]*

50 **"[The Establishment Clause is infringed when the government makes adherence to a STATE-SPONSORED**  
 51 **PAGAN LEGAL] religion relevant to a person's standing in the political community.** *Direct government action*  
 52 *endorsing religion or a particular religious practice is invalid under this approach, because it sends a message*  
 53 *to nonadherents that they are outsiders, not full members of the political community, and an accompanying*  
 54 *message to adherents that they are insiders, favored members of the political community".*  
 55 *[Wallace v. Jaffree, 472 U.S. 69 (1985)]*

- 1 13. This court is NOT exercising its only affirmative responsibility-- a duty to protect me, but rather appears to be protecting
- 2 the retirement and paycheck of its own officers, including the U.S. attorney. It is abusing even the color of law to elevate
- 3 its own importance and effect involuntary servitude.
- 4 14. There appears no consent to this matter by me in evidence.
- 5 15. I have not knowingly, willingly and voluntarily contracted away my sovereignty. If I had, it would be deemed an
- 6 unconscionable contract and not enforceable by an honorable court. When I want to sue you, I must produce statutory
- 7 evidence that you consented or waived sovereign immunity. The same EQUAL requirement applies to you in respect to
- 8 me. There is no evidence on the record of these proceedings that I ever expressly waived sovereign immunity under the
- 9 Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act, 28 U.S.C. §1605, and therefore, I am immune from your jurisdiction.

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

15 16. In essence these proceedings have failed to produce and to state a claim upon which relief can be granted.

16 By the willful omission and silence of the Plaintiff and this court in dealing with the above issues, you have agreed with  
17 everything I have said and am now saying, and that this is an unlawful persecution of an innocent person. Calling such issues  
18 "frivolous" simply confirms that that this is a state sponsored church, that I am a heretic, and that you agree with everything  
19 that I have said and am now saying. The term "frivolous" is defined in the Federal Pleading Attachment attached to my  
20 pleadings in this court as "truthful, accurate, and consistent with prevailing law". Thank you for agreeing with me by  
21 remaining silent. If you want to be known as, or even referred to as, honorable, then you need to know and be fully aware  
22 that silence equates with fraud where there is a moral or legal duty to act, or where such an omission would cause a violation  
23 of rights and of the constitutional oaths of the officers of this federal church.

24 With all due respect, I, the man/woman, the non-defendant and non-taxpayer do not accept any sentence. I do not accept  
25 prison time. I do not accept probation or parole. I do not accept community service. I do not accept any fines, penalties,  
26 taxes, court costs. I do not accept any offer nor do I consent to probation, parole, pre- or post-trial release, or any other form  
27 of privilege induced slavery or supervision imposed for these proceedings or in association with these proceedings which  
28 may be attempted to be linked with or in causation with these proceedings. I do not consent to be placed twice in jeopardy  
29 for the same pretended crimes. I do not accept anything to do with me having to pay "tribute" to a private corporation  
30 fraudulently masquerading as a government. I have never asked for protection from you and I have expressly and officially  
31 and in writing FIRED you as my protector.

32 **OPTIONAL: FOR THOSE WHO HAD ATTORNEYS AND FIRED THEM**

33 It may have appeared that I was incompetent by virtue of hiring an attorney as counsel. I did attempt to follow his supposed  
34 advice, but doing so has caused nothing but injury to me thus far. He in no way protected my interests and instead conspired  
35 with the officers of this court to maintain the flow of plunder into the retirement account and checking account of the officers  
36 of this court. Some of my forefathers may have been unwittingly "sold down the river" but not me! **My ignorance in the**  
37 **past is not a contract to be stupid in the future.**

38 **END OF OPTION**

39 Overwhelming evidence suggests that you and this establishment are a private, for profit corporation, not a government, and  
40 the only product or service you may have lawful authority to deliver is "protection". I have a right to NOT procure your  
41 corporate "product" or services and to reserve, back to me, the powers I may have erroneously delegated to you by lawfully  
42 and timely withdrawing my domicile, allegiance, and support and becoming a nonresident and a transient foreigner. The  
43 Declaration of Independence makes this my DUTY. To wit:

44 *"But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same Object evinces a design to reduce*  
45 *them under absolute Despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such Government, and to provide*  
46 *new Guards for their future security."*  
47 *[Declaration of Independence, 1776]*

48 Who are YOU to interfere with that duty of organic law? Any effort to compel me to procure your only product or service is  
49 a usurpation and is unlawful under the Sherman Antitrust Act. It also constitutes what this court has called a RICO protection

1 racket which is engaging in systematic acts of racketeering. If you were a real government, you would provide ALL the  
2 services you offer to everyone equally and treat them ALL equally, including those who don't have government numbers and  
3 those who don't participate in your voluntary franchises—franchises carefully disguised to look mandatory. Equal treatment  
4 is the foundation of all free governments:

5 **"No duty rests more imperatively upon the courts than the enforcement of those constitutional provisions**  
6 **intended to secure that equality of rights which is the foundation of free government."**  
7 [*Gulf, C. & S. F. R. Co. v. Ellis*, [165 U.S. 150](#) (1897) ]

8 I am a Sovereign free-man/woman on the land. There is NO "consent of the governed" involved in any aspect of this unlawful  
9 proceeding. And further, as to consent – you know, or should know, that consent is the origin of all lawful authority on this  
10 planet and all of your delegated and lawful authority. In our republican form of government, the requirement of consent in  
11 all human interaction is the essence and foundation of all sovereignty as individuals. The consent requirement is also the  
12 foundation of our system of law beginning with the unanimous Declaration of the thirteen united States of America –also  
13 known as the Declaration of Independence in the year 1776.

14 **"That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent**  
15 **of the governed."**  
16 [*Declaration of Independence*, 1776]

17 *Consensus facit legem.*  
18 *Consent makes the law. A contract is a law between the parties, which can acquire force only by consent.*  
19 [*Bouvier's Maxims of Law*, 1856;  
20 SOURCE: <http://tamguardian.org/Publications/BouvierMaximsOfLaw/BouvierMaxims.htm>]

21 I never knowingly nominated you as my protector by unwittingly choosing a domicile or residence on federal territory within  
22 your alleged jurisdiction or by knowingly, willfully and voluntarily and with full disclosure participating in any alleged  
23 government franchise. You have been officially and formally and permanently fired as my protector because I have found  
24 that the only thing you protect is your own vain self—your retirement check, office, and importance. This court and the U.S.  
25 attorney as private individuals are clearly operating outside the bounds of their supposed jurisdiction and delegated authority  
26 and are mere trespassers who have surrendered judicial, official, and sovereign immunity and are simply acting as a private  
27 individuals managing a sham trust for their own personal benefit.

28 *An affirmance results. When a judge acts in the clear absence of all jurisdiction, i. e., of authority to act officially*  
29 *over the subject-matter in hand, the proceeding is coramnon iudice. **In such a case the judge has lost his judicial***  
30 *function, has become a mere private person, and is liable as a trespasser for the damages resulting from his*  
31 *unauthorized acts. Such has been the law from the days of the case of The Marshalsea, 10 Coke 68. It was*  
32 *recognized as such in Bradley v. Fisher, 13 Wall. (80 U. S.) 335, 351, 20 L. Ed. 646. In State ex rel. Egan v.*  
33 *Wolever, 127 Ind. 306, 26 N. E. 762, 763, the court said: 'The converse statement of it is also ancient. Where*  
34 *there is no jurisdiction at all there is no judge; the proceeding is as nothing.'*

35 [ . . . ]

36 **Honesty of purpose and sincere belief that appellant was acting in the discharge of his official duty under his**  
37 **oath of office and for the public welfare is not available as a defense further than in mitigation of damages.**  
38 See [Glazar v. Hubbard, 102 Ky. 68, 69, 42 S. W. 1114, 39 L. R. A. 210, 80 Am. St. Rep. 340; Prell v. McDonald,](#)  
39 [7 Kan. 266, 283, 12 Am. Rep. 423; DeCourcey v. Cox, 94 Cal. 665, 669, 30 P. 95; Truesdell v. Combs, 33 Ohio](#)  
40 [St. 186, 194.](#)  
41 [*Manning v. Ketcham*, 58 F.2d 948 (1932)]

42 I won't indemnify the clearly illegal and injurious conduct of officers of this court by offering my consent. That would cause  
43 me to lose standing to sue the usurping trespassers for clear violation of my protected rights because he who consents cannot  
44 claim an injury from what he consents to. As I see it, the only criminals in this courtroom are the officers of this de facto  
45 court. Therefore, I am the Court and I hereby dismiss this case for lack of Political Jurisdiction. That political jurisdiction  
46 originates from my voluntary choice of domicile, which then makes me a "protected person".

47 Shall I go on—through the actions of the players in this arena I find this to be a SHAM proceeding. Of the SHAM public  
48 trust that is administering this proceeding, I found that the U.S. Supreme Court has ruled the following:

49 **"The rights of individuals and the justice due to them, are as dear and precious as those of states. Indeed the**  
50 **later are founded upon the former; and the great end and object of them must be to secure and support the rights**  
51 **of individuals, or else vain is government."**

2 The term “vain” is defined as WORTHLESS and USELESS:

3 “vain. 1: having no real value: IDLE, WORTHLESS 2: marked by futility or ineffectualness: UNSUCCESSFUL,  
4 USELESS 3 archaic: FOOLISH, SILLY 4: having or showing undue or excessive pride in one’s appearance or  
5 achievements: CONCEITED syn see FUILE.”  
6 [Merriam Webster’s Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary, ISBN 0-87779-510-X, p. 1301]

7 I find that a “vain government” is a government that:

- 8 1. Establishes itself as a private corporation and a religion using franchises and private law.
- 9 2. Abuses “presumption” as a substitute for religious “faith” in the courtroom by removing discussions of law from trials.
- 10 3. Deceives everyone by using fraud in its publications and alleged court rulings into thinking that private law is public law  
11 that applies equally to everyone.
- 12 4. PRESUMES that everyone consents to join the religion and thereby become a “person” and a “citizen” or “resident”  
13 within its jurisdiction with an alleged domicile on federal territory.
- 14 5. PRESUMES that every man, woman, and artificial entity is a “public officer” or “employee” of the government who has  
15 a fiduciary duty toward the government and whose private property is donated to a public use by connecting it  
16 involuntarily with government franchises. Being a “public officer” and “employee”--this is where the REAL duty to file  
17 a return comes from and if one is not a “public officer” or “employee” then it is THEFT by presumption, plain and  
18 simple.
- 19 6. Commits perjury by calling a presumption such as the entire Internal Revenue Code a “law”.
- 20 7. Calls anyone who refuses to join its religion “frivolous”, which is the equivalent of the word “heretic” used in the early  
21 inquisitions of the Catholic church.
- 22 8. Doesn’t protect the natural rights of individual men and woman.
- 23 9. Elevates the state or the government above the individual man or woman in importance, and thus creates a dulocracy:

24 “Dulocracy. A government where servants and slaves have so much license and privilege that they domineer.”  
25 [Black’s Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition,, p. 501]

- 26 10. Abuses the color of law to protect and expand its own unlawful actions, usurpations, authority, and importance.
- 27 11. Violates the separation of powers doctrine by turning trials into political events whereby the discussion of law is removed  
28 from the courtroom and replaced with nothing but superstition, prejudice, ignorance, and presumption.
- 29 12. Unlawfully enforces federal statutory law pertaining only to officers and instrumentalities of the government against  
30 private persons. This is done using deceptive “words of art” which the courts refuse to recognize the true legal meaning  
31 of.
- 32 13. Criminalizes self-government and personal responsibility by forcing people to pay for government protection and  
33 services that they expressly don’t want, don’t need, and which are actually harmful to them.
- 34 14. Puts people in jail for refusing to commit perjury on government forms in the process of falsely declaring themselves to  
35 be a public officer called a “taxpayer” or a person with a domicile on federal territory called a “U.S. citizen” or “U.S.  
36 resident”.

37 This court and all of its offices and officers were created as a servant and protector of the sovereign people of this great land  
38 and now shows itself as having become a usurper by displaying a vanity that is not deserving of my domicile, allegiance,  
39 obedience, or support.

40 “Having thus avowed my disapprobation of the purposes, for which the terms, State and sovereign, are frequently  
41 used, and of the object, to which the application of the last of them is almost universally made; it is now proper  
42 that I should disclose the meaning, which I assign to both, and the application, [2 U.S. 419, 455] which I make  
43 of the latter. In doing this, I shall have occasion incidentally to evince, how true it is, that States and  
44 Governments were made for man; and, at the same time, how true it is, that his creatures and  
45 servants have first deceived, next vilified, and, at last, oppressed their  
46 master and maker.”

47 [Justice Wilson, Chisholm v. Georgia, 2 Dall. (2 U.S.) 419, 1 L.Ed 440, 455 (1793)]

48 I am not and never have been a “protected person” of this court or a “person” or “individual” within the meaning of federal  
49 law. The only thing you can lawfully protect or destroy without consent are your own creations. I am a child of my God- I  
50 am NOT your creation and I don’t consent to become your creation by voluntarily acting as a franchisee called “taxpayer”,



1 **a “public officer”, or a “defendant”, all of which are synonymous in this case.** You clearly know, or surely you must know  
2 this based on your willful silence and omission in dealing with this issue. The Constitution DOES NOT authorize you to  
3 destroy that which you did not create. GOD of nature, GOD of creation, GOD the beginning of all things created me, not  
4 you! You cannot legitimately destroy the very origin of all your authority, which is We the People!

5 **“The great principle is this: because the constitution will not permit a state to destroy, it will not permit a law**  
6 **including a tax law involving the power to destroy.”**  
7 [Providence Bank v. Billings, [29 U.S. 514](#) (1830)]

8 **“What is a Constitution? It is the form of government, delineated by the mighty hand of the people, in which**  
9 **certain first principles of fundamental laws are established. The Constitution is certain and fixed; it contains the**  
10 **permanent will of the people, and is the supreme law of the land; it is paramount to the power of the Legislature,**  
11 **and can be revoked or altered only by the authority that made it. **The life-giving principle and the death-doing****  
12 **stroke must proceed from the same hand.”**  
13 [VanHorne’s Lessee v. Dorrance, [2 U.S. 304](#) (1795)]

14 **“But, Sir, how are we to get through the first experiment, so as to be able to try that which is to be final and**  
15 **ultimate, that is to say, how are we to get rid of the State banks? How is this to be accomplished? Of the Bank of**  
16 **the United States, indeed, we may free ourselves [DESTROY it] readily; **but how are we to annihilate the State****  
17 **banks? We did not speak them into being; we cannot speak them out of being. They did not originate in any**  
18 **exercise of our power; nor do they owe their continuance to our indulgence. They are responsible to the States;**  
19 **to us they are irresponsible.”**  
20 [Daniel Webster, *The Speeches and Orations of Daniel Webster*, Edwin P. Whipple, Little Brown and Company,  
21 Boston, 1914, p. 366]

22 It is UNLAWFUL for you to even offer government franchises such as a “trade or business” to natural persons  
23 domiciled/resident outside of federal territory. That is what it means for my Constitutional rights to be “unalienable”: they  
24 can’t be bargained away through any commercial process, including a franchise. To do otherwise is to engage in act of  
25 treason, sedition, and war against We the People, who are the source of all of your authority!

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

35 I am my own property which is private in nature. This property has hurt NO ONE. Only by abusing my property and liberty  
36 to hurt someone can you lawfully take it away without my consent and without compensation. By sentencing me and taking  
37 away my liberty, you are STEALING—unlawfully converting my property without the only just cause you can have, which  
38 is the protection of the EQUAL rights of other fellow sovereigns. This is a criminal violation of 18 U.S.C. §654.

39 **“Love does no harm to a neighbor; therefore love is the fulfillment of the law.”**  
40 [Romans 13:9-10, Bible, NKJV]

42 **“Do not strive with [or try to regulate or control or enslave] a man without cause, **if he has done you no harm.**”**  
43 [Prov. 3:30, Bible, NKJV]

44 I have not violated my God’s law - I have not caused an injury to another living man or woman. This would be a violation  
45 of the Royal law to love your neighbor as yourself, (James 2:8-10) or man's interpretation

46 **“Do unto others as you would have them do unto you”.**

47 I have not committed a crime or violated this Royal law, and there is nothing on which to convict me. Thus the conviction is  
48 null and void. As I see it now each of you are private individuals, in conspiracy, trespassing against me, my property and my  
49 rights. This is a sham – do you treat everyone this way? Who do you think you are? Are you in some manner of denial?

1 I have asked for NOTHING from your corrupt private corporate employer but the right to be left alone, which is the  
2 FOUNDATION of the constitution! I don't want a handout or ANYTHING from you. It costs you NOTHING for my  
3 wanting to be LEFT ALONE and therefore there can be no just claim that I am not "paying my fair share".

4 *"The makers of our Constitution undertook to secure conditions favorable to the pursuit of happiness. They*  
5 *recognized the significance of man's spiritual nature, of his feelings and of his intellect. They knew that only a*  
6 *part of the pain, pleasure and satisfactions of life are to be found in material things. They sought to protect*  
7 *Americans in their beliefs, their thoughts, their emotions and their sensations. They conferred, as against the*  
8 *Government, the right to be let alone - the most comprehensive of rights and the right most valued by civilized*  
9 *men."*  
10 *[Olmstead v. United States, [277 U.S. 438, 478](#) (1928) (Brandeis, J., dissenting); see also Washington v. Harper,*  
11 *[494 U.S. 210](#) (1990)]*

12 Nor do I perceive any legal or moral duty to participate in the socialism franchise called a "trade or business" which is the  
13 subject of this unlawful proceeding. You are interfering with my right to contract by in any way forcing me to enter into the  
14 "trade or business" and public office franchise. You have thereby without my fully informed consent contractually made me  
15 a surety for your creation, the public office, that is the "res" or subject of this unlawful proceeding, because all franchises are  
16 contracts between the grantor and the grantee. The de facto officers of this court appear to have hijacked a legal proceeding  
17 and unconstitutionally abused it for political purposes in violation of the separation of powers doctrine. I believe this to be  
18 simulating legal process. You have abused a jury full of tax consuming socialists brainwashed in the government propaganda  
19 academy euphemistically called a public school to elect me into a public office without my consent and without compensation  
20 that I and not you determine to be a "benefit" to me. And did my then attorney do anything to alter the course—did he stand  
21 to protect and defend me? How about you Mister/Miss Judge--you witnessed the goings on here. Obviously you must be  
22 part of the conspiracy against me or you would have done something to stop it. Witnessing a crime and failing to do anything  
23 about it—for you Mister/Miss Judge, that is called misprision of felony. Why is this court biased against me? Didn't you  
24 take some manner of oath whereby you swore that you were going to protect me by obeying the Constitution? What has  
25 happened here to me right here and right now is sedition and TREASON of the highest order for which the perpetrators should  
26 be hanged from the nearest tree until dead.

27 As for me, my delegation of authority order is direct from God and I find proof of this in the Bible. That order requires that  
28 I cannot enter into any such contracts, franchises, or commercial dealings with you and I find that you are infringing on that  
29 contract and trust indenture:

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

35 *"You shall have no other gods [including governments or earthly laws] before me [or my commandments]."*  
36 *[Exodus 20:3, Bible, NKJV]*

37 *"Do not walk in the statutes of your fathers [by signing up for their franchises], nor observe their judgments, nor*  
38 *defile yourselves with their idols [of which GOVERNMENTS are a part]. I am the LORD your God: Walk in My*  
39 *statutes, keep My judgments, and do them; hallow My Sabbaths, and they will be a sign between Me and you, that*  
40 *you may know that I am the LORD your God."*  
41 *[Ezekial 20:10-20, Bible, NKJV]*

42 The founders of this once great country turned federal slave plantation also warned me not to contract with the government  
43 when they said:

44 *"It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliances [contracts/covenants] with any portion of the foreign*  
45 *world."*  
46 *[George Washington, Farewell Address]*

47 *"Peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations – entangling alliances [contracts, covenants,*  
48 *franchises, treaties] with none."*  
49 *[Thomas Jefferson, First Inaugural Address, March 4, 1801]*

50 You should be aware that I have a First Amendment right to disassociate with any and all commercial and legal dealings with  
51 this foreign tribunal and I have properly done so, as reflected in my filings in this court, by notifying you that I do not have



1 and never have lawfully had a domicile or residence on federal territory. This court is on notice: Anything beyond that point  
2 is a nullity and a usurpation.

3 I find that this court is obviously doing whatever it must to protect the statutory franchise scheme and the pocketbook of its  
4 officers by forcibly compelling association and commerce which I have not consented to and cannot consent to under my  
5 God’s laws. You have compelled me to part with my liberty under duress in responding to your vain presumptions and  
6 usurpations of authority under special law that does not apply to me and which you have not demonstrated with competent  
7 evidence ever applied to me. This is slavery and involuntary servitude, and it violates the Thirteenth Amendment! Don’t  
8 insult me further by asking for my consent or participation in your willful violations of the supreme law of the land or forcing  
9 me to participate further with the state sponsored church and private corporation that is executing them. I do not care to be a  
10 slave to this—thank you. And further, as for me, I find that there is nothing to apologize for. I am here and I have been here  
11 under threat, duress and coercion. I find that I am not the criminal in this case and you now have full knowledge of who the  
12 criminal is and it is your constitutional duty to immediately do something about it.

**NOTICE:** The court is now a Judicial, not an administrative, in the Admiralty proceeding, (pursuant to F.R.C.P. Rule 9(h)); and

FURTHER, BE NOTICED that I, \_\_\_\_\_ a man/woman, *sui juris*, a non-licensed attorney litigant intervenor pro hac vice, in restrictive appearance, a peaceful American Citizen National, one of the People, acting in good faith without prejudice, does claim and reserves all rights, remedies, defenses, statutory or procedural, retains full constitutionally secured rights, power, privileges and prerogatives and enjoys the benefits thereof, at all times - in all places; and be

FURTHER NOTICED that the non-belligerent man/woman, going with the appellation, \_\_\_\_\_ (pursuant to Maritime Claims Rule E(8)) reserves common law right not to be bound by or compelled to perform under any contract, indenture, commercial agreement or bankruptcy that He/She did not enter into knowingly, voluntarily and intentionally; He/She does not accept the liability of the “compelled benefit” of any unrevealed contract, commercial agreement or bankruptcy. He does waive the benefit privilege.

To all, consider this lawful and timely NOTICE, FAIR WARNING, NOT AS A THREAT, NOTICE, pursuant to United States v. Lanier, on certiorari No. 95-1717, this notice is hereby given each member of the prosecuting party; and

13 According to Black’s Law Dictionary, an allocution (aele kyuw shen) is the Formality of court’s inquiry of prisoner as to  
14 whether he/she has any legal cause to show why judgment should not be pronounced against him/her on verdict of conviction.  
15 State v. Pruitt, Mo., 169 S.W.2d 399, 400. Well I have given this court varied and sundry legal cause to show why any  
16 judgment, save dismissed, should not be pronounced against me. Anyone now moving against me will be doing so at their  
17 own peril.

18 **2 Tips for the accused on how to handle the allocution**

19 Sentencing is the final pronouncement of judgment in a case. Sentencing is all about contracts! The court will try its best to  
20 defang your anger by offering you options so that you get to choose. DO NOT choose one and consent to it! They will do  
21 this because this is how they diffuse Bivens actions for wrongful prosecution. How do they do this? Well, the common law  
22 says that what one who consents to a wrong cannot claim to be hurt by it. The foundation of filing an appeal or suing the  
23 judge or prosecutor for malicious prosecution is an injury. By accepting any option they offer, essentially you are waiving  
24 any right to claim an injury. It may be that the mugger is going to get your property regardless of what you may do but if  
25 you consent in any way you are essentially giving it away. One can just hear them say something like, “Well, he didn’t say  
26 that we couldn’t have it—or that we couldn’t do it. He appeared to have voluntarily consented to our actions.”

27 *Voluntii non fit injuria.*  
28 *He who consents cannot receive an injury. 2 Bouv. Inst. n. 2279, 2327; 4 T. R. 657; Shelf. on mar. & Div. 449.*

29 *Consensus tollit errorem.*  
30 *Consent removes or obviates a mistake. Co. Litt. 126.*

31 *Melius est omnia mala pati quam malo consentire.*  
32 *It is better to suffer every wrong or ill, than to consent to it. 3 Co. Inst. 23.*

1 *Nemo videtur fraudare eos qui sciunt, et consentiunt.*  
2 *One cannot complain of having been deceived when he knew the fact and gave his consent. Dig. 50, 17, 145.*  
3 *[Bouvier's Maxims of Law, 1856;*  
4 *SOURCE: <http://famguardian.org/Publications/BouvierMaximsOfLaw/BouvierMaxims.htm>]*

5 Below is the typical process of “contracting” that the judge will likely undertake in a criminal proceeding prior to and during  
6 sentencing.

- 7 1. The accused is found guilty by the jury. (Were you really expecting otherwise?)
- 8 2. The court makes an offer to release the accused until sentencing on the condition that the accused returns to sentencing.  
9 (How magnanimous of them.) This is an offer, and an acceptance, and a binding contract ensues. But here is where it  
10 gets interesting, because you see, all the accused did on the day he or she was found guilty was to agree to return for  
11 sentencing. He or she never agreed that they would *accept* the sentence. Remember, it's all about contracts!
- 12 3. On the sentencing date, the accused will come before this de-facto Court and the administrator (the de-facto Judge actor)  
13 is going to offer the accused a sentence of say, 2 to 4 years (just guessing) for willful failure to file. After or before the  
14 Administrator has read this sentence, there will come a time when the accused will have an opportunity to address the  
15 Court (again, before or after the sentence), and this is called allocution (what say you), and it is at this point where the  
16 accused has an opportunity to set the record straight and refuse the de facto court's offer—the contract that proposes a  
17 sentence of 2 to 4 years, for instance.
- 18 4. At sentencing, the administrator (de facto judge actor) is going to ask if the accused understands the sentence; again, the  
19 word “understand” means not only do you comprehend what was said, but you also agree to the terms of the contract!<sup>1</sup>  
20 As one [you] who under-stands means ones [your] willingness to “stand-under” or to submit to the word(s) or language  
21 and jurisdiction of a de facto rogue court. The accused should *never, ever agree* that they “understand” anything until  
22 [or even if] they get clear and complete clarification of how the word(s) is being defined in the sentence or contract as it  
23 is being applied and/or presented to the accused.
- 24 5. When the accused gets the opportunity to speak at the sentencing hearing, which is called allocution, in your own words,  
25 all you need to say is in section 1 earlier. Hey, have fun with it. After all, if you are going to be eaten by the beast, you  
26 might as well not go down easily.

### 27 **3 Comments welcome**

28 We would like to hear from people who have chosen to allocate and how it went for them. Please feel encouraged to share  
29 your experience with us and let us know if we can share it with others which we will then do on these pages.

### 30 **4 Resources for further study**

31 The following resources may be useful in handling sentencing and writing your own allocution or in improving this one:

- 32 1. *Federal Sentencing Guidelines Manual*  
33 <http://www.ussc.gov/guidelin.htm>
- 34 2. *SEDM Litigation Tools Page*-pleadings, forms, and practice guides  
35 <http://sedm.org/Litigation/LitIndex.htm>
- 36 3. *SEDM Forms/Pubs Page*-useful forms you can use in your allocution. See especially section 1.5  
37 <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
- 38 4. *Legal Research Sources*-free legal reference tools  
39 <http://famguardian.org/TaxFreedom/LegalRef/LegalResrchSrc.htm>

---

<sup>1</sup> Research the term “understand” as it relates to insurance.