**1st Brief in Support**

Assistant Prosecuting Attorney Kurt Asbury and=or Margret A. Leaming cannot responded to the Challenge of Jurisdiction with documentation under penalty of perjury evidence from the court file with any type of proof of service. No contents of the jurisdictional challenge have been answered in any way, shape, or form to date. Kurt Asbury and=or Margret A. Leaming cannot respond to the challenge of jurisdiction anyhow due to the fact they do not have any firsthand experience. **Trinsey v. Pagliaro, D.C. Pa. 1964, 229 F. Supp. 647** are they a First-Hand-Witness, or simply a "Statement of Counsel in Brief or Argument?” The prosecutor is not a witness; and he should not be permitted to add to the record any enlightenments**.**

**Trinsey v. Pagliaro, D.C. Pa. 1964, 229 F. Supp. 647** Prosecutor has no firsthand experience. Everything the prosecutor has touched is invalid. Therefore I object to the court’s order(S) dated February 25th 2013. Due to these facts and no fact supporting the judge’s opinion for the order dated February 25th 2013, therefore, for this objection to be overturned must be based upon facts from this case file as established so far and the case precedence set by both Federal and United States Supreme Court so far in this matter.

## The Sgt. Duchene and Deputy Rytlewski could have responded to the Challenge of Jurisdiction by advice of council in accordance with Trinsey v. Pagliaro, but has failed to do so in any way, shape, or form. Sgt. Duchene’s and Deputy Rytlewski’s statements, filings, and testimonies would fail to carry any weight of evidence due to Briscoe v. LaHue, 460 U.S. 325 (1983) No. 81-1404 says that officers testimony not be used in court. The STATE OF MICHIGAN being listed in this matter could have responded to the Challenge of Jurisdiction by advice of council in accordance with Trinsey v. Pagliaro, but has failed to do so in any way, shape, or form. STATE OF MICHIGAN being an entity that has statutes has failed to even prove joiner of parties by contract, duty, or obligation just like Will V. Michigan State Police, 491 US 58 - Supreme Court 1989 No. 87-1207 in that statutes do not apply to the common man. Therefore any response to the challenge of jurisdiction in any way, shape, or form would be not just illegal, but unlawful by those named above.