Rowe regulatory Review

Only because I see a lot of familiars here, im going to take the time to clear up the confusion surrounding this I suffered from for nearly ten years.

Representative capacity. I can call myself a US citizen and assume that capacity any time I want. Its a uniform in my closet, like the license in my wallet. A uniform I was given at birth, that I cant get rid of, but I dont have to wear.

I have a license to fish. But if Im hiking, past some water, and a game warden in a bad mood decides to charge me wish fishing in an area off limits, he has to fucking prove I was fishing and not hiking.

You are born with states rights and immunities. You are then given US citizenship, which protects non of your states rights, but provides other protections. Just another badge. Means you can run to a consulate if you get into a mess outside the country. Inside the country, its the status of an officer. That officer status in side the country, requires a waiver of states rights to be effective, enlistment or government employment. You do not qualify to use your US citizenship status within the states without the waiver of states rights.

Just because you have a license to drive, to act in a commercial capacity, does not mean you are always acting in that capacity, especially when your just going to the corner store for a do-nut and some coffee. If you are charged with a driving offense while going to the corner store for a coffee and donuts, maybe the cop has to prove you were driving and not just traveling, you think?

Because you were given US citizenship, you have the privilege and benefit of using it. But you dont have to. You dont have to act in that capacity, which you are entitled to use if you choose to.

Now they have written all kinds of laws, rules and regulations, for the use of that capacity. And thats all good and fine.

A state citizen has a right to pick his nose in public, but a US citizen officer, wearing the uniform, acting in a REPRESENTATIVE CAPACITY can be court marshaled and sent to prison for picking his nose in public in uniform.

If Im charged with picking my nose in public, A crime of uniform and representative capacity, they are also charging me, subtly, with wearing the uniform while doing it. A conclusion of law hidden in the charge, for which they provide no evidence or cause.

try, real hard, to understand this.

and be sure and keep the uniform in the closet, unless you want the responsibility, obligations, and duties, that it attaches.

When you step into a state court, the judge will presume you were acting in a representative capacity, wearing that uniform, that is optional to you, because the prosecutor is charging you as having violated a rule of acting in that capacity, and if you dont bring up the fact that you weren't, and that theres no proof you put that uniform of a US citizen on before acting, then you are presumed to have been.

Representative capacity. I can call myself a US citizen and assume that capacity any time I want. Its a uniform in my closet, like the license in my wallet. A uniform I was given at birth, that I cant get rid of, but I dont have to wear.

But was I using it, when i engaged in those acts which are rights under state citizenship, but regulated as privileges that require permission under US citizenship?

There is no changing your status officially and permanently or any thing like that. Its bullshit.

You have the option of using these different hats, and if you are charged with wearing a hat wrong, when you weren't even wearing it, that is the issue you raise, and you walk, like me.

I suppose they will only get it right after twenty years of research.

I don't know if statements like these make it clearer for some, or more confusing for others.

Everything, every individual, whether created by god and nature, or created by government, has a personality - A persona.

Whether it's McDonalds, or the Native American Indian.

Natural persons are created and regulated by the natural law. Corporate personalities, and official titles of office are created and regulated by government.

Only some persons, those wearing a uniform of corporate personhood created by government, are subject to corporate regulation.

And the law, has always distinguished between two classes of persons and individuals.

But, most people do not.

And so, It is those who get it confused, the duties and obligations of these two, distinct classes of persons, who come to be exploited by corporations and governments, and made victims of their own ignorance, on a grand scale.

Essentially this means that I can always challenge for improper notice of nature and cause because there is no cause if I was not acting in representative capacity AND there was no victim?

No victim, and more importantly, no contract for performance of any statutory duty

Are these proceedings original pursuant to the common law, or special pursuant to equity, civil admiralty, or are they administrative?

Just ask, and their cobbled shit crumbles right before your eyes

The courts can handle cases that arise in various jurisdictions - commercial law, admiralty, common law, equity, family law,  
Traffic law, military law... Ect.  
  
Which one is the prosecution invoking ?  
So you know which rules to play by?  
He is required to provide you notice of the jurisdiction the claim arises from, so you know which rules apply.  
  
He can't. Cause it's all cobbled together with duct tape.  
  
Preemptory challenges can be to inadequate notice of nature and cause, jurisdiction, wrong jurisdiction, no notice of venue, wrong venue ect

Rowe Regulatory Review

Inadequate notice of nature and cause Is inadequate notice of jurisdiction, and of the rules that will govern a particular type of case.

Which rules apply? Common law Jurisdiction rules, the rules of equity, of civil admiralty, of administrative proceedings, or military court martial?

These are distinct jurisdictions of law, with different rules.

Nature is the law you are accused of violating. Cause refers to the standing of the parties to sue and be sued .

Both the law and the Standing arise from a particular jurisdiction and set of rules

An indictment or information must first give notice of the nature, being the formal charge and the law. It must also include a jurisdictional statement... Subtitled as such in the original charging papers... Which provides you notice of the cause.

Sample Jurisdictional Statement

"Because the accused is an officer enlisted in the military, subject to the rules of the military, and he stands accused of violating a military law, this military court exercises proper jurisdiction."

The foregoing is an example of a proper jurisdictional statement, and chances are, you will never see one. You almost have to kill someone on federal property to get a real prosecutor to write one correctly.

Even then, chances are, Required Written Notice of Nature and Cause will be inadequate, and service of process deficient, rendering the charging instrument fatally defective, in that it does not comport with the requirements of Due Process, or fully state a claim upon which relief may be granted.

You cannot make an INFORMED, intelligent, and voluntary plea, without first being provided proper written notice.

Because Notice is almost always inadequate, and does not provide the necessary jurisdiction facts or statement, they will rush you to plead, without taking the time to examine what the prosecutor has filed and served you with, in a preliminary or probable CAUSE hearing.

When ever you are asked to plead, it might be a good idea to demand a preliminary or probable cause hearing first, so you can obtain proper written notice, maybe, you think?

Once you have pled, you are presumed to have waived PREEMPTORY CHALLENGES to jurisdiction, and inadequate notice of those essential elements of the charge you must be provided adequate notice of to plea.

Rowe Regulatory Review

The Achilles Heel

I think, its important for everyone to understand the elements of the legal process. Initial notice, and service of process, or the lack there off, and the proper roles of the hearing officer and the state attorney.

Every one, it seems, wants to argue with the judge. When Its unnecessary, and counter productive, a trap. You have to Crucify, Roast, and Slam the prosecutor, and his offering, his lack of clarity, his deficient and substandard service of process and inadequate Notice. This is how I have always won.

And its frustrating to watch all these people get caught up in filing 30 page counter complaints against the court and the judge, while completely ignoring the accuser, the fraudster, the persecutor, the prosecutor, getting inn deeper and deeper with everything they file.

Almost like, they didn't read the book to locate the cheats and the secret passages before they attempted to beat all the levels and master the video game.

And this is no where near as complicated as Pong, Space invaders, or Donkey Kong.

Inadequate Initial Notice and Deficient Service of Process.

The issue you should be raising, Its right there, the secret to beating every case predicated on hot air, before you can even qualify to plea, at the very beginning and outset of the proceedings on day one, arraignment or initial appearance on a summons or warrant.

Accompanying what form of additional written process?

Providing adequate notice, of nature and cause, or the jurisdictional facts required to make an informed plea?

The Achilles Heel

A personal Note

So basically, after twenty years of research, I think Im ready to prepare my master thesis.

There was a time, in this country, when everyone was expected to follow the natural law, and public servants had to follow additional rules and regulations, but couldn't make additional rules and regulations, acts of limitation or that compel performance for you or the general public. Then they found that they could pass rules making it OK to presume that you are a public servant to, that they are your superior officer, a Public Official, and that you work for them, and they can pass all the rules they want for you, a subordinate corporate officer, civil service worker or government employee.

Stupid Questions For JackAss Judges #134

Judge - do you understand the charge/how do you plead?

Response - if the court cannot declare the law, identifying the venue and jurisdictional rules that will govern these proceedings, is it because the prosecution has not provided adequate written notice of the jurisdictional facts required to appear in the public record for the court to assume jurisdiction or for the respondent to make a reasonably informed response or plea ?

Stupid Questions For JackAss Judges # 131, 132, and 133

Judge - Do understand the charges/ How do you plead?

Response - Am I entitled to adequate written Notice of Nature and Cause before being required to plead?

Can you declare the law as to what constitutes adequate Notice of "Nature and Cause," or -

Are you professionally and legally incompetent and unqualified?

Stupid Questions For Jack Ass Judges # 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, and 130

Five Distinct Jurisdictions of Law (there are others)

Judge - Do you understand the charge/ How do you plead?

Response -

Are you beholden to public stakeholders or private stock holders?

Are the scales of justice in this court morally blind, or morally bankrupt?

Are you a public servant, or a private contractor?

Is this a court of general, or limited jurisdiction?

Are these proceedings original, or special?

To be conducted pursuant to the rules of Equity, Admiralty, the common Law, administrative rules and guidelines, or is this a court martial?  
(Five Distinct jurisdictions of law with diverse and often conflicting rules)

Which distinct set of jurisdictional rules will govern these proceedings and shall I proceed according to?

Stupid Questions For JackAss Judges #123

Judge - Do you understand the charge/ how do you plead?

Response - "Well, you see Judge, I very well might have been off duty, when I might have done that, I believe, Judge. Just exactly, what time of the day is this purported to have happened and O-curred again ?

And does the plaintiff or prosecution allege that on that day and at or about that time, I was acting in a representative, or public capacity, with actual agency relationship, as apposed to acting in my private capacity?

Liberty rights are unrestricted when not acting in a representative capacity under contract for specific or compelled performance in the execution of official duties or contractual obligations for compensation

The PROSTITUTION has failed, to specify."  
(Pun intended.)

Repeat after me:

Ah ha ha ha

Stupid Questions for JackAss Judges # 122

Judge - Do you understand the charge/ How do you plead?

Response - "Hold up. I'm entitled to initial written notice of the jurisdictional facts the court requires to assume personal jurisdiction, that further, I require to make an informed plea.

This citation meets none of the requirements of a true bill, an indictment, presentment or information.

Are you even paying attention to what this numb-skull over here has filed?"

FootNote to Reader :

- HOW MANY DIFFERENT WAYS DO I HAVE TO SAY THE SAME FUCKING THING, OVER AND OVER AGAIN FOR TWENTY YEARS NOW BEFORE YOU GET IT THROUGH YOUR HEAD, THAT YOU ARE BEING PLAYED BEFORE YOU EVEN STEP INTO THE COURT ROOM, AND THAT EVERYTHING THEY THROW AT YOU ARISES IN FRAUD, THROUGH DECEPTIVE TRADES AND PRACTICES, PROVIDING DISHONEST SERVICES?

Your "Shadow Government," is but a shadow of its former glory  
Welcome to Idiocrasy.

Stupid Questions For JackAss Judges # 121  
Short Version of Stupid Question #120

Judge - Do you understand the charge/ how do you plead?

Response - With regards to this inadequate written notice of the jurisdictional facts required for the court to assume jurisdiction or for me to make an informed plea, do I pose my questions directly to the prosecution, or are you gonna make his case and answer them for him?

Stupid Questions for Jackass Judges #120

Judge - Do you understand the charges/ how do you plead?

Response -

All official business shall be conducted in writing, for the record of these proceedings and nothing shall be presumed.

In observance of appropriate "decorum" befitting this "forum," I would like to extend to the prosecution the "courtesy" of an opportunity to amend his "substandard" and incomplete pleadings, error and grace, to provide adequate notice of the essential elements of the offense he has inadvertently failed to provide proper "written" service of.

You think he's up to proceeding, (lets go through these written instruments here and now line by line, till I understand how this garbage comports with the requirements of due process, shall we? I fail to see that any of these documents are entitled INFORMATION or INDICTMENT, or any reference to NATURE or CAUSE any where present in this service of process that is otherwise fatally defective)

Or... are you gonna take over, making his case for him for the record, prosecuting from the bench, and establishing, or substituting those jurisdictional facts he is required to provide to substantiate his cause of action before this court can even assume jurisdiction, but has failed to, and appoint another Judge who can preside in a fair and impartial manner demonstrating no vested or apparent conflict of interest?

("Now, Let me see you bare your teeth at me, like a vampire, in a black robe, that's had his fangs pulled out with a pair of pliers and a mirror thrown up in front of him.")

Stupid Questions For JackAss Judges # 119

Judge - Do you understand the charge/ How do you plead?

Response - Is that a dress you're wearing?

A uniform, or a costume? I dont understand the nature and cause, of, IT.

You work for the : church, or the State?

Stupid Questions For JackAss Judges # 118

J - do you, totally, and unconditionally, with all menace to for thought, comprehend, and understand, the accusation, claim, complaint and charges, as I have just annunciated them to you citing a canonized statute, and how so do you beg, plead, and beg some more for your trespass and dereliction of duty to perform?

Response : do you and the prosecution share an exclusive distinction, the bias and prejudice of a working class relationship, that I do not ?

Stupid Questions for JackAss Judges # 117

Judge - Do you understand the charge/ how do you plead?

Response : If your a natural person, one possessing a natural personality, or persona, charged with violating the terms and conditions, duties and obligations of a contract for performance to the state, and you do not wear a government created coperate uniform, being an official title of public office or 'corperate persona,' or personality, a uniform regulated by statute, that you the natural person are responsible for, then you are being framed, with duties and obligations that you, as a natural person, without affiliation or agency relationship, acting in a non representative capacity, are not responsible for.

True or not true?

Shall I rephrase the question for the prosecution, or will you as fair and impartial arbiter be making the prosecutions case for him ?

The uniform you both wear, and I do not, is your limitation and restriction, not mine.

Stupid Questions For JackAss Judges #116

As you have no authority except that which has been given you, who is the source of your authority?

The people, or the banks?

Stupid Questions For JackAss Juudges # !!5

Judge - Are you the person named in this complaint/ please state your name for the record.

Response - What is the status,or representative capacity of the person named in the complaint/ Please state your name for the record? "Your name."

What is your name, rank, and official title of office, for the record?

Judge : Do you understand the charge/ how do you plead?

Response : Can I understand the charge and make an informed plea without adequate notice of nature and cause/ and is inadequate notice a preemptory challenge to which the prosecution is required to respond before the court can except or enter any plea?

Stupid Questions for JackAss Judges #114

Judge - do you understand the charge/ how do you plead?

Response - can I make an informed plea without adequate notice of nature and cause or a bill of particulars?

Stupid Questions For JackAss Judges #

113? I can't remember.

Back to Basics.

Judge - so I've just read you the charge, do you understand... How do you plead?

Response - Where... Is... The "Written Notice" I'm entitled to?

The prosecution would never have graduated the law school I attended filing this garbage he's served me with.

This is "Inadequate Notice" to make an informed plea.

I don't see 'nature,' or 'cause," written any where on here.

No jurisdictional statement, no mention or reference to any contract for compelled performance of official duties or obligations, and no complaining party statement of injury, damages, or loss.

Maybe you can explain this, AND MAKE HIS CASE FOR HIM for the record, I certainly can't!

In the mean time I'll reserve my plea, and the right to exhaust all special pleas and preemptory challenges pending adequate written notice that comports with the formal rules and requirements of due process.

And if he can't substantiate this naked allegation with some jurisdictional facts, then he needs to get out his check book and compensate me for the trouble in having to respond to this spurious and frivolous action.

Stupid Questions For JackAss Judges #112

J - Do you understand the charge/ how do you plead?

A - That depends. Are you part of that criminal corrupt BAR monopoly?

Is this process lawful, or deceptive trades and practices, and dishonest services?

Are these proceedings 'Special,' or 'Original?'

Is this a court of 'limited,' or 'general' jurisdiction?

Is this about justice or profit?

A sham and a rip off, or authentic, and legitimate ?

I can't say as I've seen any adequate written notice or service of process yet.

Stupid Questions For JackAss Judges # 111

Defensive Position I

Judge : do you understand the charges/ how do you plead?

Response : I might be guilty. Before I plead Id like to first review the terms and conditions of the contract for performance or the original complaining real party of interest's statement of injury or damages.

Does any of that appear in the record conferring jurisdiction upon this court?

By chance, has the prosecution brought his check book, to compensate me for having to respond to this frivolous and spurious complaint?

.

Stupid Questions for JackAss Judges # 110

Defensive position II

Judge : do you understand the charge/ how do you plead?

Response : I have not recieved adequate notice of nature and cause from the prosecution as the rules require to make an informed, intelligent and voluntary plea.

Service of process is deficient.

Let's take a closer look at it, what the prosecution has filed, shall we?

Stupid Questions For JackAss Judges # 109

Rule I : Do not attack the Judge. Always attack the prosecutor's inadequate notice and insufficient service of process that would permit you to make an informed, intelligent, and voluntary plea FIRST, Giving the judge an escape route and a scapegoat to sacrifice where pleadings and proceedings do not comport with the requirements of due process.

Proper service of an indictment or information will include a jurisdictional statement setting forth all the jurisdictional facts required for the court to assume jurisdiction, you will rarely if ever receive.

Rule II : Immediately determine whether the Judge will attempt to excuse or justify the prosecutor's failure to provide fair notice, or prosecute from the bench. If it appears that the judge is assisting the prosecution once you have challenged the prosecution's failure to provide adequate written notice, or you witness the judge assisting the prosecution prior to your case being called, ignore rule one and skip to rule III.

Rule III : Go for the Judges throat immediately

Judge : Do you understand the charge/ how do you plead?

Response : Well that depends. Is your job performance driven? Aren't you one of those Judges with a quota, just like the police, your pension, benefits and retirement based on the fines and fees you assess, the number of innocent people you confine in private prison industry slave labor work camps, and the number of children you snatch for CPS to sell on the open market to get that federal funding? Does all this conflict of interest, bias and prejudice, Disqualify you from presiding fairly and impartially?

------------------------------------------------------------------------------

It is not uncommon for a judge to disqualify himself and pass the case to another judge, and call in a special prosecutor after I have made an initial appearance. I have had three judges in a row disqualify themselves in the same case without ever even seeing me after having a case against me dumped in their lap by a previous judge.

The only skill they have is intimidation, and the only power they have is fear.

Stupid Questions For JackAss Judges #108

Judge : Do you understand the charge/ how so you plead?

Response : Well... that depends.

(which direction you want me to take this in?)

See, Im familiar with the special rules for preemptory challenges to venue and jurisdiction for inadequate notice of nature and cause as provided for in cases that arise under the common law, in Equity, Civil Admiralty, and Administrative proceedings. But Im a little cloudy on the rules governing special pleadings in Court maritals, but I understand your required to give me sufficient information to correct or ammend any such pleadings... if the prosecution can just specify which set of rules, pursuant to which jurisdiction of law, he proposes shall govern these proceedings?

Stupid Questions For JackAss Judges #107

Judge : Do you understand the charge/ how so you plead?

Response : Well... that depends.

(which direction you want me to take this in?)

What law governs here? You serve the people, on behalf of Lucifer, Christ, Mohammad, or Darwin? Or are you just generating revenue?

You a public servant, or a private contractor?

LOL

Stupid Questions For JackAss Judges # 106

Judge : Do you understand the charge / how do you plead?

Response : No. I dont understand at all and would like to reserve the right and prerogative to exhaust all special pleas and preemptory challenges pending adequate notice and service of process I've not yet received.

Isn't this court part of a bankrupt corporate state?  
I was under the impression There hasn't been a republican form of government, a separation of powers or an independent judicial branch of state government since the civil war.

Are you guys just playing dress up?

...Simulating legal process, providing dishonest services, engaged in deceptive trades and practices?

Stupid Questions For JackAss Judges # 105

Gold Ribbon Edition

Judge : Do You understand the charge/ how do you plead?

Response :

"When acting to enforce a statute, the judge of the municipal court is acting as an administrative officer and not in a judicial capacity; courts in administrating or enforcing statutes do not act judicially. But, merely administerially." (Thompson v Smith. 155 Va. 376. l54 SE 583, 7l ALR 604 ( )).

"Ministerial officers are incompetent to receive grants of judicial power from the legislature, their acts in attempting to exercise such powers are necessarily nullities." (Burns v. Sup. Ct., SF, 140 Cal. 1.)

"Judges do not enforce statutes and codes... Executive Administrators [in their private person with no Immunity for their non judicial ministerial or administrative functions] enforce statutes and codes." (FRC vs. GE 281 U.S. 464; Keller vs. PE 261 U.S. 428, 1 Stat. 138-178)

"A judge ceases to sit as a judicial officer because the governing principle of administrative law provides that courts are prohibited from substituting their evidence, testimony, record, arguments, and rationale for that of the agency. Additionally, courts are prohibited from substituting their judgment for that of the agency. Courts in administrative issues are prohibited from even listening to or hearing arguments, presentation, or rational." (ASIS v. US, 568 F2d 284 ( ); (Steel v. United States, 568 F.2d 284.))

Administrative Law is not Common Law, Equity, or Admiralty, and therefore can not arise under the Constitution of the United States. (Bowen v. Department of Social Security et al., 127 P.2d 682, 685 (1942), State ex rel Nielson et al. v. Lindstrom, 191 P.2d 1009, 1015 (1948)).

"It is basic in our law that an administrative agency may act only within the area of jurisdiction marked out for it by law. If an individual does not come within the coverage of the particular agency's enabling legislation the agency is without power to take any action which affects him." (Endicott v Perkins, 317 US 501 ( ))

"[E]very man is independent of all laws, except those prescribed by nature. He is not bound by any institutions [ unions or licensing boards ] formed by his fellowman without his consent." (Cruden v. Neale, 2 N.C. 338, 2 S.E. (1796)

“The state citizen is immune from any and all government attacks and procedure, absent contract." (Dred Scott vs. Sanford, 60 U.S. 19 How. 393 (1856));

“Apparent agency creates an agency relationship that does not otherwise exist, while apparent authority expands the authority of an actual agent.” Miller, 150 Or App at 282 n 4.

“Anyone who voluntarily gives up his rights, gives up his free agency and admits to the jurisdiction of government [and the legislature, and by extension the courts and officers of government] .” (Wickard V. Wilburn 317 U.S. 111 ( )).

"[S]tatutes apply only to state created creatures known as corporations no matter whether state, local, or federal." (Colonial Pipeline Co. v. Traigle, 421 US 100. (1975) ). “A statute will not be presumed to have extraterritorial effect... outside the [territorial] jurisdiction of the legislature. ( Bond v Jay, 7 Cranch 350, 3 L Ed 367). "Particularly is true where the statute imposes a burden or limitation, as distinguished from conferring a benefit or advantage." (United States v. Knight 14 pet. 301, 315 (1840); Chisolm v Georgia 2 Dall 419; Penhallen v Doane v Administration 3 Dall 54; McCullogh v Maryland 4 Wheat 316; Hauenstein v Lynharm 100 US 483 (1879); Yick Wo v Hopkins and Woo Loo v Hopkins 188 US 356 (1886)).

"(S)tatutes apply only to state created creatures known as corporations [corporate persons (i.e. public offices), and not natural persons (i.e. private citizens)] no matter whether state, local, or federal." (Colonial Pipeline Co. v. Traigle, 421 US 100. (1975). "All codes, rules, and regulations are for government authorities only, not human/Creators in accordance with God's laws. All codes, rules, and regulations are unconstitutional and lacking due process…" (Rodriques v. Ray Donavan, U.S. Department of Labor, 769 F. 2d 1344, 1348 (1985)); “The common law is the real law, the Supreme Law of the land, the code, rules, regulations, policy and statutes are “not the law.” (Self v. Rhay, 61 Wn 2d 261);

"Accordingly, there was insufficient evidence before the trial court to support an exercise of personal jurisdiction over Defendant, and the trial court erred in denying Defendant’s motion to dismiss on that ground... In the absence of agency based on actual authority, plaintiff was required to produce evidence of apparent agency to support personal jurisdiction over (Defendant)... apparent authority is relevant only if actual agency already has been established..." (Miller v. McDonald’s Corp., 150 Or App 274, 282, 945 P2d 1107 (1997). See also (Kotera v. Daioh Int’l U.S.A. Corp,9509-06556; A100452 (Or. 01/30/2002) ).

"Agency, or party sitting for the agency, has no authority to enforce as to any licensee unless he is acting for compensation. Such an act is highly penal in nature, and should not be construed to include anything which is not embraced within its terms. (Where) there is no charge within a complaint that the accused was employed for compensation to do the act complained of, or that the act constituted part of a contract.” (Schomig v. Kaiser, 189 cal 596 )

[P]enal law and public policy, moves only by contract (Ashwander v TVA, 297 US 288, 323 and 325, (1936)); "[P]enal is civil." (STATE ex rel. McNAMEE et al. v. STOBIE , 92 SW 191, 213 & 213, (Mo. 1906)).

SO . . .

"ARE YOU ACTING IN AN ADMINISTRATIVE OR JUDICIAL CAPACITY ???

IF THIS IS ADMINISTRATIVE, SPECIAL PROCEEDINGS, WHAT EVIDENCE IS PRESENTED OF CONTRACT FOR PERFORMANCE, AND IF THIS IS JUDICIAL, ORIGINAL PROCEEDINGS, WHERE IS THE COMPLAINING PARTIES STATEMENT OF INJURIES OR DAMAGES?"

Watch for it.

(You suddenly look sickly...   
like someone just clipped your wings.   
Was it perhaps something you ate?)

Cross Examining Police Officers

Please state your name, official rank or department title and place of residence for the record...

Q : So you are employed as a law enforcement officer ?

A : yes

Q: So then, if you enforce the law, surely you know the law, and what it says... And You went to law school, to learn the law, so that you could enforce it... And in following policy or procedure, which I'm sure you learned at the academy, you would know if you were given orders, or policy instructions, that violate the super ceding law of the land?

Your familiar then with the golden rule... Distinctions between provisions of the Common law, civil law, family law, and admiralty law... Constitutional law and, The natural law?

Can you recite the limitations the law of the land, the constitution, places on public servants, government officials and your superiors, or are you legally incompetent, unqualified and poorly trained to enforce the law you don't know, and an idiot?

Do you know which liberty rights you are not permitted to interfere with?

Is a quota your golden rule on the job?

(This is why my cases are dismissed before I even get a  
Chance to make an appearance.

Hint: I think in terms of asking all the wrong questions. And I have a twenty year record with the judiciary of asking those COMMON SENSE questions.)

Do you have a presumption of jurisdiction that can be challenged by any rules you are bound by?

I'm a little confused about the grounds for the charge you just read...

I've heard the constitution, along with all judicial authority derived therefrom, has been suspended.

If the constitution doesn't apply in this court, then where do you derive the authority of your office from?

(Wait for it. Lol)

Does this court operate outside the law of the land?

And if so, by the authority of what foreign power or jurisdiction of law?

I would, of course, require proper notice, In all fairness, of the rules of that jurisdiction of law to know how properly to proceed.

Or Are you just some delusional person, thinking your a judge, simulating legal process, engaged in deceptive trades and practices providing dishonest services convening a kangaroo court outside the provisions of law for the queen of hearts in wonderland?

Stupid Dialog between JackAsses  
At The Side Of The Road

I'll need to see your license, insurance and registration.

Sure. The law says you have to identify yourself, and show me yours first. Am I under arrest or free to go?

Not yet, but if you wanna be a smart ass I can take you in. You wanna step out of the vehicle.

No. So, Are you ordering me to step out of the vehicle, or give you my personal papers without showing me yours first, and without articulated probable cause or reasonable suspicion I've been involved in a crime involving a victim, theft or damage to property, or a warrant, all in violation of my fourth amendment protection from unreasonable search and seizure?

Yes.

Is that a lawful order?

Yes

Show me the provision of law that makes it lawful and I'll comply.

Stupid Questions For JackAss Judges

So that I know how to properly address you, and this oh so honorable court...

Are you a public servant with a duty to me, or, a private contractor and corporate employee, with a commercial obligation to generate revenue and profit the plaintiff my adversary, and deny me a fair and impartial hearing in arbitrary and capricious proceedings...

being biased and prejudiced, or both, a conflict of interest, or,

... would it be reasonable to presume you are spied on, blackmailed and compromised or bought off and bribed, your retirement and pension being based on the fines and fees you assess, and the number of innocent debt slaves you confine to private prison industry work camps?

Just curious.

Certainly, You wouldn't mind clearing up this uncertainty for me, so I can make an informed, intelligent, and voluntary plea, now would you?

Id appreciate it, if you could.

Identify yourself and provide a job description?

Your license to practice law, and proof of public hazard insurance?

Giggle. Giggle.

Standing before you...  
In all your magnificent glory,

I feel, just like... a little girl,   
With pig tails, or curls.

So intimidated and impressed, I'm in awe, gasping for air trying to catch my breath, tongue tide, and speechless.

I can attest to the fact that I am not a slave, servant, or appearing in a representative capacity... as well as I can attest to the fact that I am a slave, a servant, a bondsmen, and representative, of Christ... yet, not of any temporal government, office or agency of such government.

Cant serve two masters. That is recognized in law, and by the courts as well.

Certain Sore Spot

Another student has gotten my attention! Its turning out to be a Glorious week for me. He sets the judge up from the start, with the RIGHT questions. Then he's not sure how to follow through. Discussion?

John Jacobs says :

I asked the judge...to be my own counsel, a verbal fereta motion, I was allowed...then I said: under the 6th amendment I have the right to know if this is civil or criminal. .. she said criminal. .. I said thank you mam, because there are two different criminal jurisdictions provided for under the 6th, common law and admiralty, which one of those two should I be preparing for

[**William Amelong Bey**](https://www.facebook.com/profile.php?id=100006793333993&fref=ufi) No corpus delicti, no injured body, therefore there's no one there to state a claim in which relief can be granted, either way you demand a dismissal of that case, for failure for anyone to state a claim in which relief can be granted, common law as well as a Admiralty law requires a body, an injured body for a crime to exist! Where's the injured party?

A court martial is administrative, and is predicated on a contract with the government for performance of official duties and obligations.

ROWE REGULATORY REVIEW

I'm totally not finished with this. You can see my editorial notes strewn throughout.  
I have so, so much more to add. But, In case I die of a heart attack or am assassinated in my sleep tonight...

NOTICE TO ALL DISTINCT CLASSES OF PERSON(S)

I Capitalization of Names - Harmless Error  
II Distinct Classes of Persons and Diversity of Citizenship - Capacity to sue and be sued

I Capitalization Of Names

It is essential to identify parties to court actions justly. If not suitably identified, all corresponding judgments are void, as outlined in Volume 46, American Jurisprudence 2d (Am. Jur. 2d) at Judgments; §100 'Parties,' it is stated that, Law revolves around how words are preciously defined and used. A Man should be defined by law as he is supposed to be defined and recognized. An ancient maxim of law states: "In order rightly to comprehend a thing, inquire first into the names, for a right knowledge of things depends upon their names."

57 Am. Jur. 2d © 200l West Group beginning on page 613 and continuing through page 675, deals with the subject, the NAME.  
§ 1 defines a name in relevant part as "the word or combination of words by which a person is distinguished from other individuals. .." Petition of Dengler, 246 N.W. 2d 758 (N.D. 1976).   
§ 2 relates the common law authority to adopt any name a man or woman wishes, providing it is not done for fraudulent purposes. In re: Adoption /Guardianship No. 3155 Circuit Court for Harford County, 103 Md. App. 300, 653 A. 2d 521, 525 (1995); Rappley v. Rappley, 183 Mich. App. 396, 454 N.W. 2d 231 (1990).

“Complaint must identify at least one plaintiff by true name; otherwise no action has been commenced.” Roe v New York (1970, SD NY) 49 F.R.D. 279, 14 FR Serv 2d 437, 8 ALR Fed 670.

With respect to capitalization of proper names, Blacks Law Dictionary – Revised 4th Edition 1968  
Capitis Diminutio Maxima; (meaning a maximum loss of status) – provides, that such capitalization invokes “The very highest, or most comprehensive loss of status, which occurs when a man's condition is changed from one of freedom to one of bondage, and sweeps away with it all rights of citizenship and al family rights. This action with respect to rendering a name, Capitis Diminutio Maxima, invokes CIVILITER MORTUUS meaning the man is to be considered civilly dead; one who is considered as if he were naturally dead, so far as his rights are concerned.

However, IDEM SONANS 14 C.J.S., Names, pg. 36. (a), provides, In general... "If names sound alike, they are usually regarded as the identical, although spelled differently, and the variance in their spelling is considered immaterial" with, respect to names, the phrase "idem sonans" means of the identical sound." "The general rule is that the law (Public) does not regard the spelling of names as much as it does their sound." "Great latitude is allowed in the pronunciation and spelling of appropriate names, since accepted names are often spelled differently, although pronounced the identical " (Terry-Terri) . "If they sound alike, or even if common usage (widely known) has made their pronunciation identical, they are regarded as the interchangeable and a variance in their spelling is immaterial, unless it is such as misleads a natural person to his prejudice,, or the misspelling transforms the name into a wholly distinct appellation/corporate soul.. "

An all-capital letters written version of one's name is not one's name, but strictly an artificial construct, existing by color of law only. That construct is an office, or status of citizenship created and defined by law among numerous that may be applied. And further results in a diminishing or complete loss of legal or citizenship status, wherein one actually becomes a slave or an item of inventory, often being the method, by which the State causes a natural person to "volunteer" himself into public service as a civil servant under contract, forming legal joinder, implied or stated, with a duty or obligation to perform.  
Of course if a man/woman has not had full disclosure of the aforesaid transformation; it is (Agreed that without full disclosure unknowingly, from first date of waiver, a waiver of rights has no power)./10 Brady. supra 748. Johnson v. Zebet, 304-US 458. 464. Aetna Inc Co. v. Kennedy 301 US 389-393

Service of process that presents one's name in all capital letters, does transform the name into a wholly distinct separate entity, yet challenges to this process, which may be claimed accidental, will fail if the litigant seeking to preserve his rights and capacity cannot defend an accurate interpretation of his Legal status and capacity in law to sue and be sued, and the misspelling or capitalization of his name will be regarded as harmless error, because the litigant couldn’t see his argument through to its completion.

Please, Allow me to assist you in doing that by eliminating some common misconceptions.

II Distinct Classes of Persons

"The people shall be secure in their persons...." Ammendment IV, U.S. Constitution

Are you insecure in your person(s)?

You may have many : Father, Son, brother, uncle, nephew.

"A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights [duties, obligations, responsibilities and liabilities] to which the place he holds [or has excepted] entitles him, and the duties which it imposes." 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137. 1856 Edition

There are many types of person as defined in law.

PERSON : (1) a human being who is alive, including an unborn child at every state of gestation from fertilization until birth.   
(2) a living being as defined in (1), acting in some contextually defined individual legal capacity, on behalf of one of the following types of legal entities...  
(4) an individual, firm, partnership, association, or corporation."  
(Texas Penal Code Sec. 1.07(a)(26)). See also TITLE 7. CHAPTER 541. DEFINITIONS SUBCHAPTER A. PERSONS AND GOVERNMENTAL AUTHORITIES Sec. 541.001.

Natural persons are divided into males, or men; and females or women. Men are capable of all kinds of engagements and functions, unless by reasons applying to particular individuals. (Civ. Code of Louis. art. 25).  
They are also sometimes divided into free persons and slaves. Freemen are those who have preserved their natural liberty, that is to say, who have the right of doing what is not forbidden by the law. A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. Slaves are sometimes ranked not with persons but things. But sometimes they are considered as persons for example, a negro is in contemplation of law a person, so as to be capable of committing a riot in conjunction with white men. (1 Bay, 358. Vide Man).  
Persons are also divided into citizens, (q. v.) and aliens, (q. v.) when viewed with regard to their political rights. When they are considered in relation to their civil rights, they are living or civilly dead; vide Civil Death; outlaws; and infamous persons.

Persons are divided into legitimates and bastards, when examined as to their rights by birth.  
When viewed in their domestic relations, they are divided into parents and children; husbands and wives; guardians and wards; and masters and servants son, as it is understood in law, see 1 Toull. n. 168; 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 1890, note.

“Interested People Includes heirs, devisees, children, spouses, creditors, beneficiaries and any others having a property right in or claim against a trust estate or the estate of a decedent, ward or protected person which may be affected by the proceeding. It also includes persons having priority for appointment as personal representative, and other fiduciaries representing interested persons. The meaning as it relates to particular persons may vary from time to time and must be determined according to the particular purposes of, and matter involved in, any proceeding.”(Uniform Probate Code, § 1-201(20)). Protected person : “One for whom a conservator has been appointed or another protective order has been made.” (Uniform Probate Code, § 5-101(3)). “Illegitimate children are "persons" within meaning of the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, (Levy v. Louisiana, 391 U.S. 68, 88 S.Ct. 1509, 1511, 20 L.Ed.2d 436); and within the scope of wrongful death statute.” (Jordan v. Delta Drilling Co., Wyo., 541 P.2d 39, 48).

"Person : In general usage, a human being [i.e. natural person], though by statute this term [i.e. corperate person] may include a firm, labor organizations, partnerships, associations, cor-porations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers. Black’s law dictionary 5th edition, p. 1028. See National Labor Relations Act, § 2(1). Person is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial [corperate] person. 1 Bl. Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164. (National Labor Relations Act, § 2(1). Bankruptcy Act).

Individual Persons are not necessarily fictional or artificial. However, Persons can also be fictional and artificial individuals.

"Natural Person means human being, and not an artificial or juristic person." (Shawmut Bank, N.A. v. Valley Farms, 610 A. 2d. 652, 654; 222 Conn. 36)"The natural body or such as is formed by the laws of God, [is] as distinguished from an artificial body or ('creature of statute' or public office) such as is devised by human laws. "(1 Bl. Com. 467).

A corporation is a [type of] "person" within meaning of equal protection and due process provisions of United States Constitution. (Allen v. Pavach, Ind., 335 N.E.2d 219, 221; Borreca v. Fasi, D.C.Ha¬waii, 369 F.Supp. 906, 911).

“Person" was ALREADY being used to ALSO identify a corporate entity in 1856. The corporate definition of "person" in American law predates the 14th Amendment, which was enacted in 1868, by twelve years. Yet the 'natural person' is defined separate and distinct from the the 'corporate person.' It is sheer idiocy and illogical "patri-nut" mythology to keep insistently arguing that a "person" is always unnatural, artificial, or 'fictional,' a "straw man" or “corporation” created entirely by the 14th Amendment to the US Constitution.  
While a man is NOT actually a "person," he HAS a "person," 'personality,' or 'persona,' of some type with which he is associated, whether that "person" be natural (private), or corporate (public). This goes directly to varying degrees of 'legal capacity,' "AND THE DUTIES WHICH IT IMPOSES." A "person," as a legal capacity, may, and usually does, hold some duty to which the human acting in that capacity can and is bound to answer when failing to perform as that office, or rank, requires. These offices, and ranks, vary with the type of person under consideration.

"Thus, in law, a body is considered a natural person formed by the laws of God... as distinguished from an 'artificial body,' or 'corporate person,' specifying that an artificial body is devised, and regulated by human laws. And, as such, An artificial body (or public office) can do only what is authorized by its charter or by law... a natural person or body, whatever is not forbidden by law." (Paul v. Virginia, 8 Wall. 177 (1868.)) "This fundamental principle flows from the very nature of our free Republican governments, that no man should be compelled to do what the laws do not require [of his rank and type of person]; nor to refrain from acts which the laws permit [if he is not bound by rules and regulations that govern other persons] ..."( Calder v. Bull, 3 Dallas 386 (1798))

"This word ‘person’ and its scope and bearing in the law, involving, as it does, legal fictions [titles of public office] and also apparently natural beings [without title of public office], it is difficult to understand; but it is absolutely necessary to grasp, at whatever cost, a true and proper understanding to the word in all the phases of its proper use . . . A person is here not a physical or individual person, but the status or condition with which he is invested . . . not an individual or physical person, but the status, condition or character borne by physical persons . . . The law of persons is the law of status or condition." -- American Law and Procedure, Vol. 13, page 137, 1910.;

"The Doctrine of Sovereign Immunity is one of the Common-Law immunities and defenses that are available to the Sovereign..." (Citizen of Minnesota. Will v. Michigan Dept. of State Police 491 U.S. 58, 105 L.Ed. 2d. 45, 109 S.Ct. 2304 (1988)); "No action can be taken against a sovereign in the non-constitutional courts of either the United states or the state courts and any such action is considered the crime of Barratry. Barratry is an offense at common law." (State v. Batson, 17 S.E. 2D 511, 512, 513 ( )).

"The sovereign people are not a person in a legal [legislative] sense” (In re Fox, 52 N. Y. 535, 11 Am. Rep. 751; U.S. v. Fox, 94 U.S. 315, 24 L. Ed. 192). " Any human being... is a legal entity as distinguished from an artificial person, like a corporation, which derives its status as a legal entity from being recognized so in law. “ (Natural Person Amon v. Moreschi, 296 N.Y. 395, 73 N.E.2d 716)." Max Radin, Radin’s Law Dictionary (1955), p. 216.

"There can be no [legislative or statutory] limitation on the power of the people of the United States. By their authority the State Constitutions were made, and by their authority the Constitution of the United States was established" (Hauenstein vs Lynham 100 US 483 (1879));"The people in their capacity of Sovereigns made and adopted the Constitution; and it binds the state governments without the state's permission." (4 Wheat, 402);

COMPARE :

I "A Sovereign is exempt from suit, not because of any formal conception or obsolete theory, but on the logical and practical ground that there can be no legal Right as against the authority that makes the law on which the Right depends." (Kawananakoa v Polyblank, 205 U.S. 349, 353, 27 S. Ct. 526, 527, 51 L.Ed. 834 (1907))"

"... The governments are but trustees acting under derived authority and have no power to delegate what is not delegated to them. But the people, as the original fountain might take away what they have delegated and intrust to whom they please. They have the whole title and as absolute proprietors have the right of using or abusing." (Luther v. Borden 48 US 1)

II "[E]very man is independent of all laws, except those prescribed by nature. He is not bound by any institutions [ unions or licensing boards ] formed by his fellowman without his consent." (Cruden v. Neale, 2 N.C. 338, 2 S.E. (1796)

III “The state citizen is immune from any and all government attacks and procedure, absent contract." (Dred Scott vs. Sanford, 60 U.S. 19 How. 393 (1856));

A man, a natural person, and the sovereign, can, however, under American Law, become associated with the obligations and duties of a public or corporate personage, title, or office, through contract, consent, enlistment, conscription, election, employment, or appointment, or treaty.

"The people, or sovereign are not bound by general words in statutes, restrictive of prerogative right, title or interest, unless expressly named. Acts of limitation do not bind the King or the people. The people have been ceded all the rights of the King, the former sovereign ... It is a maxim of the common law, that when an act is made for the common good and to prevent injury, the King shall be bound, though not named, but when a statute is general and prerogative right would be divested or taken from the King [or the people] he shall not be bound." (The People v. Herkimer, 4 Cowen (NY) 345, 348 (1825)

TITLE(S) OF PUBLIC OFFICE

"The term 'person' [as used legislatively] includes an officer or employee of a corporation, or a member or employee of a partnership, who as such officer, employee or member is under a duty to perform the act in respect of which the violation occurs [and as used legislatively, excludes natural persons]. A corporation is a 'person' within the meaning of equal protection and due process provisions of the United States Constitution." - Title 26, Subtitle F, Chapter 75, Subchapter D, Sub. Sec. §7343:

"(S)tatutes apply only to state created creatures known as corporations [corporate persons (i.e. public offices), and not natural persons (i.e. private citizens)] no matter whether state, local, or federal." (Colonial Pipeline Co. v. Traigle, 421 US 100. (1975). "All codes, rules, and regulations are for government authorities only, not human/Creators in accordance with God's laws. All codes, rules, and regulations are unconstitutional and lacking due process…" (Rodriques v. Ray Donavan, U.S. Department of Labor, 769 F. 2d 1344, 1348 (1985)); “The common law is the real law, the Supreme Law of the land, the code, rules, regulations, policy and statutes are “not the law.” (Self v. Rhay, 61 Wn 2d 261);

"Government admits that often the word 'person' is used in such a sense as not to include the sovereign but urges that... the term should be held to embrace government [and creatures of statute, representatives, employees, agents, officers, and offices, created and regulated by government legislation, and not by God]." (United States v. Cooper Corp. 318 US 600 (1941); United States v. Fox 94 US 315; United States v. Mine Workers 330 US 258 (1947); The "word ‘person’ as used and employed in most statutory language [and civil law] is ordinarily construed to exclude the sovereign, and that for one as such to be bound by statute, they must be 'specifically' named." ( Wilson v. Omaha Indian Tribe 442 US 653 (1979); Will v. Michigan state Police 491 U.S. 58, 105 L.Ed.2nd 45 (1989); U.S. v. General Motors Corporation, D.C. Ill, 2 F.R.D. 528, 530) ; "unless the context indicates otherwise" - 1 U.S.C. Sec. 1, 2; Particularly is true where the statute imposes a burden or limitation, as distinguished from conferring a benefit or advantage." (United States v. Knight 14 pet. 301, 315 (1840); Chisolm v Georgia 2 Dall 419; Penhallen v Doane v Administration 3 Dall 54; McCullogh v Maryland 4 Wheat 316; Hauenstein v Lynharm 100 US 483 (1879); Yick Wo v Hopkins and Woo Loo v Hopkins 188 US 356 (1886)).

The Supreme Court, in numerous instances, has reluctantly overturned the rulings of inferior State supreme courts, maintaining that : "the word 'person' in legal terminology is perceived as a general word which normally includes in its scope a variety of entities other than human beings." ( Church of Scientology v. U.S. Dept. of Justice 612 F. 2D 417, 425 (1979)).

'(i)n common (legislative) usage, the term 'person' does not include the sovereign people, and statutes employing the term (person) are normally construed [to apply to corporate person, and not the natural person, private person, or citizen] to exclude the sovereign people [who are natural persons that may be regarded as possessing the rights of private, original citizenship of state].' (Wilson v Omaha Tribe, 442 US653 667, 61 L Ed 2d 153, 99 S Ct 2529 (1979) (quoting United States v Cooper Corp. 312 US 600, 604, 85 L Ed 1071, 61 S Ct 742 (1941). United States v Mine Workers, 330 US 258, 275, 91 L Ed 884, 67 S Ct 677 (1947); Will v Michigan State Police, 491 US 58, 105 L. Ed. 2d 45, 109 S.Ct. 2304 b)

"The "individual" may stand upon "his Constitutional[ly protected] Rights" as a [private] Citizen. He is entitled to carry on his "private" business in his own way... His power to contract is unlimited... He owes no duty to the State or to his neighbors to divulge his business, or to open his doors to an investigation, so far as it may tend to incriminate him. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from [unless he is employed by the state, acting in a representative capacity as a corporate person], beyond the protection of his life and property. "His rights" are such as "existed" by the Law of the Land (Common Law) "long antecedent" to the organization of the State", and can only be taken from him by "due process of law," and "in accordance with the Constitution... He owes nothing" to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights." (Hale v. Henkel 201 U.S. 43 at 89 (1906)) - published by the Federal and State Appellate Court systems in over 1,600 cases.

The Natural person, the private citizen of state, owes no duty to the state , without contract for performance, Subject to government only to the extent that he has surrendered his rights to an agency of government by accepting a change in citizenship status that accompanies appointment or commission subject to legislated rules and regulations. All legislation applies only to such persons.

"All legislation [statutory commercial obligations and Code of conduct] is prima fascia, territorial, and words [such as 'person'] having universal scope will be taken, as a matter of course, to mean only everyone subject to such [territorial] legislation, not that all the legislator [prosecutor, or courts] subsequently may be able to catch. (American Banana Co. v United Fruit Co. 213 US 347, 29 S Ct 511, 53 L Ed 826 (1909))

XXX - cite : 'State citizen is subject to the jurisdiction of government only to the extent that he has sacrificed his rights to an agency of government by [variation in status of] citizenship – XXX XXX

The word 'person,' in legislation, which refers only to 'corporate person(s), has been employed as a catchall in the courts, when in fact such over broad application by the courts, with respect to various distinct classes of persons among the public, exceeds legislative authority.

Us cit stauts created by government and distinct from state citizenship

"Criminal statutes are not by implication given extra-territorial effect, (or personam jurisdiction) " (United States v Flores, 289 US 137, 53 S Ct 580, 77 L Ed 1086). “A statute will not be presumed to have extra-territorial effect... outside the (territorial) jurisdiction of the legislature, over the people residing outside the (territorial) jurisdiction, of the legislature [who are not compelled under contract for the performance of duties]" (Bond v Jay, 7 Cranch 350, 3 L Ed 367).

This is because Government can only tax or regulate something it has created, or licensed, such as an official title of any public office, uniform, or rank, created by government, regarded as representing a 'corporate persons,' or capacity of 'Agency'.

Diversity of citizenship

PERSONS : "There is clear distinction between national and State Citizenship, U.S. Citizenship does not entitle citizen to the privileges and immunities of the Citizen of the State"- ( K Tashiro v. Jordan 256 P 545, Reaffirmed 278 US 123);

“The state citizen is immune from any and all government attacks and procedure, absent contract." (Dred Scott vs. Sanford, 60 U.S. 19 How. 393 (1856));

U.S. Constitution Article 4, Section 2 guarantees "privileges and immunities" to Citizens of each state. In contrast, “The privileges and immunities clause of the 14th Amendment protects very few rights because it neither incorporates the Bill of Rights nor protects all rights of individual citizens. Instead this provision protects only those rights peculiar to being a citizen of the federal government. It does not protect those rights which belong to state Citizenship." (Jones v. Temmer, 829 F. Supp. 1226 (1993). See also, Hammerstein v. Lyne, W.D.Mo. 1912, 200 F.165);

US CITIZN IS AN OFFICER COMPELLED UNDER CONTRACT FOR THE PERFORMANCE OF DUTIES

“Local government officials sued in their official capacities are [corperate] "persons" for purposes of Section 1983 in those cases in which a local government would be suable in its own name.” (Monell v. N.Y. City Department of Social Services, 436 U.S. 658, 98 S.Ct. 2018, 56 L.Ed.2d 611). Municipalities and other government units are "persons" within meaning of 42 U.S.C.A. § 1983.” “Foreign governments otherwise eligible to sue in U.S. courts are "persons" entitled to bring treble-damage suit for alleged anti trust violations under Clayton Act, Section 4.” (Pfizer, Inc. v. Government of India, C.A.Minn., 550 F.2d 396).

XXX add from Platform

INTRODUCTION TO CLOSING ON PERSONS  
“When the words of a statute are unambiguous, the first canon of statutory construction – that courts must presume that a legislature says in a statute what it means and means in a statute what it says there – is also the last, and judicial inquiry is complete.” (Connecticut National Bank v. Germain, 503 US 249, L. .Ed 2nd 391 (1992))

"(T)he fact that Congress might have acted with greater clarity or foresight does not give courts a carte Blanche to redraft statutes in an effort to achieve that which Congress is perceived to have failed to do." (United States v. Locke, 471 U.S. 84, 95 (1985)).

The United States Supreme Court, [much less any inferior court of limited jurisdiction] cannot supply what Congress (or the legislatures of the several states) has studiously omitted in a statute.“ (Federal Trade Com. v. Simplicity Pattern Co. 360 U.S. 55, p. 55 475042/56451 (1959)).

"[N]o clause, sentence, or word shall be superfluous, void, or insignificant" (United States v. Harriss, 347 U.S. 612, 617 (1954))

DONT SEPERATE / ENDING / STAGING CHANGE INTO DIVERSITY OF CITIZENSHIP  
"Where plaintiff, suing in the circuit court of the United States for the district of Maryland, alleges that he is a citizen of Maryland, an affidavit signed by him in a suit brought in a state court, reciting that he was not a citizen of the United States, thereby procuring a removal of the case to the federal court, is admissible on defendant's behalf." - ( Urtetiqui v. D'Arcy 34 US 692); "The saving clause lets plaintiffs bring some maritime actions in state courts--but the diversity jurisdiction then lets defendants of diverse citizenship (americans who are not U.S. Citizen or Corperate State officers) from the plaintiff remove the actions to federal courts (see Poirrier v Nickols Drilling Co. 648 F 2d 1063, 1982 AMC 1514 (1981)), where they are heard on the diversity "side" (including jury trial), and not on the non-jury admiralty side.” All cases involving prize capture, salvage, or revenue, are the exclusive Jurisdiction of federal admiralty court, “savings to suitor all other protections and defenses to which they are otherwise entitled.” ( See also Commonwealth of Puerto Rico v. D.Puerto Rico 1970)); "[O]fficers of the state... clothed with some duty in regard to the enforcement of the laws of the state... who threaten and are about to commence proceedings, either of a civil or criminal nature, to enforce against parties affected an unconstitutional act, violating the Federal Constitution, may be enjoined by a Federal court of equity from such action." (HASTINGS v. SELBY OIL & GAS CO., 319 U.S. 348 (1943))

“A corporation is not a citizen within the meaning of that provision of the Constitution, which declares that the citizens of each State shall be entitled to all the privileges and immunities/(IE 11th Amendment immunity) of citizens of the several States. Special privileges enjoyed by citizens in their own States are not secured in other States by this provision such as grants of corporate existence and powers. States may exclude a foreign corporation entirely or they may exact such security for the performance of its contracts with their citizens as, in their judgment, will best promote the public interest).” (Paul v. Virginia, 8 Wall (U.S.) 168; 19 L.Ed 357 (1868)

BOTTOM LINE

STUPID QUESTIONS FOR JACKASS JUDGES

Judge : Do You Understand the charge and how do you plead?

Response : No I do not understand the charge where the prosecution has failed to provide the terms and conditions of any contract for performance for me to review as evidence of any duty to perform with respect to commercial statutory obligations, legislated rules and regulations, that apply only to persons under contractual obligation to perform with respect to acts of limitation or that compel performance in this specified manner.

I can say this a thousand different ways... and I will, until all of you – get it.

“If you don't understand that, I can't explain it to you any other way. They will get away with what ever you let them get away with. And until your willing to draw a line, and say you can not come across this line, or I'll kill you, they will keep taking and taking and taking until there is no more to take, and it's all gone, an your a slave.” - Bill Cooper

a gimp in cage dressed up for some s&m bondage shit you didn't sign up for

Judge : Do you understand the charge / how do you plead?

Response : "[Hell] no, I dont understand any charge without adequate written notice of nature and cause from the prosecution, and of the proper standing of the parties to invoke the jurisdiction of this court... and while the prosecutor is busy trying to provide some evidence I'm not Exempt and Immune in response to my peremptory challenge to insufficient service of process in these administrative proceedings, your required to stay out of it, refrain from prosecuting and keep your [fucking] mouth shut, EVEN if you do, have a vested pecuniary financial interest in the outcome of these proceedings that disqualifies you from administrating or presiding fairly and impartially, your benefits, pension and retirement being based on the fines and fees you access and the number of innocent people you confine to private prison industry slave labor work camps... an obvious conflict of interest.

If I and the people are presumed innocent, then you and the prosecution are presumed corrupt or in error?

This was a turning point for me. I was just beginning to understand jurisdiction. And I was getting all nervous for days thinking how I was going to argue the court had no jurisdiction. And then right before I walked in, in the parking lot with my girlfriend, a sudden calm came over me, and I decided I would not make allegations and statements, but instead present my argument in the form of a question. So when they called the case, I Identified myself, and sfter the charge was read and the judge asked if I UNDERSTOOD, I immediately asked the one, simple, question. "How does this Texas court assume jurisdiction over a Michigan born State citizen driving on a Kentucky state license, whether it's expired or not? "  
  
The judge looked nervously around the court room and then turned to sharply eye ball the prosecutor, who dropped his head, in shame, to look at the floor, as he mumbled the following words:  
"the state withdraws. "  
  
After this, I always kept an out of state license.   
Till I out grew that as well.

Your transportation codes do not apply to private citizens not engaged in commerce, like a taxi, limo, or coal truck driver would be, and unless the prosecution, in response to my preemptory challenge can prove that they do, I cant reasonably understand the charge or make an informed, intelligent and voluntary plea, until I have reviewed the alleged supporting facts that establish jurisdiction and standing.

.. DRIVING in commerce is : "transporting persons or property for profit."  
  
If your not in commerce, transporting persons or property for profit, your not DRIVING, for hire, like a cab or delivery truck, you are instead TRAVELING, and if your traveling in a motor vehicle, registered to the state for such commercial purposes exclusively, and your using a company vehicle for personal use... then they are not charging you correctly... and the charge, what ever it is involving DRIVING... states an untried conclusion of law in the charge or claim, making the indictment, presentment, or information FATALLY DEFECTIVE.  
  
Took me another five years to develop the foregoing, which BUTTRESSED another argument I used in KY when I was facing 12 no insurance tickets, expired tags, registration, and... obstructed license plate. I had been in some mud.  
  
Those were all dismissed to, but only after a lot of back and forth, and two separate judges voluntarily disqualifying themselves with out me even attempting to disqualify them, something I had only attempted, and failed to accomplish years before during my divorce.  
  
It then surprised me, when my arguments caused them to voluntarily disqualify themselves and transfer the case to another judge, without an answer or explanation.

After several years at this, Ive determined there are certain things, like Jurisdiction, you discuss with the Judge, cause cops generally will not understand. And there are things that must be addressed when interacting with the police, like probable cause and reasonable suspicion.

If there is no probable cause or reasonable suspicion to believe that you have been involved in a crime involving a victim or damage to property, they are violating your right to privacy and to be left alone when they stop you to check your papers. Papers you are not required to have in a free society.

'You may not be arrested solely to ascertain your identity.' (Arrington v. McDonald, 808 F2d 466 (1988))

The police may not arrest you solely to determine your identity, but when they stop you, you are under arrest, firstly to determine your identity, and then to look for Probable cause and Reasonable suspicion to justify the Illegal stop that has already been made. This is where the real crime is committed. Its called harassment, torturous interference, and a few other things, and its criminal when a public servant does it... Putting the cart before the horse, policing for profit and unjust enrichment without a valid cause to arrest, probe, investigate, and harass.

There is no other definition but Abuse of powers not granted or delegated by operation of law, and in abrogation and abridgment of the rights of others.

"You may refuse to provide the police I.D. or information." (U.S. V. Brown, 731 F2d 1491 (1984))

'You may verbally challenge the officer's actions and ask for his ID.' (Gainor v. Roberts, 973 F2d 1379 (1992))

“An information charging the driving of a motor vehicle upon a public highway without a driver's license charges no offense, as there is no such license as a driver's license known to the law." (Keith Brooks v. State, 158 Tex. Crim. 546; 258 S.W. 2D 317).

“An information alleging that the defendant operated a motor vehicle upon a highway without a “drivers license” was held insufficient to charge an offense since driver’s license is not known to law.” (W. Lee Hassell v. The State, 149 Tex. Crim. 333; 194 S.W. 2D 400).

" [A] political subdivision of this state may not require an owner of a motor vehicle to register the vehicle..." (Registration By Political Subdivision Prohibited -Texas Trans Code § 502.003);   
"[A] vehicle for which a certificate of title has been issued but that is not required to be registered, is not subject to inspection." (Vehicles Not Subject To Inspection -Texas Trans Code § 548.052).