



The Utah Assembly  
member, The  
Federation of States  
d.b.a. The United States of America, unincorporated (1776)



## Notice of Land Law

Notice to Principals is Notice to Agents; Notice to Agents is Notice to Principals;

Applicable to all Assigns and Successors;

Non-negotiable;

Spencer Cox, Governor of Utah 350 N State Street, Suite 200 Post Office Box 142220 Salt Lake City, Utah 84114 801.538.1000 courtesy copy, Priority mail:	Deidre Henderson, Lt. Governor of Utah 350 N State Street, Suite 220 Post Office Box 142325 Salt Lake City, Utah 84114 801.538.1041 Priority mail:
Attorney General Derek Brown Office of the Attorney General  350 North State Street Suite 230 PO Box 142320 SLC UT 84114-2320Post Office Box 801-366-0260 courtesy copy, Priority mail:	Head Justice Utah Supreme Court Honorable Matthew B. Durrant P.O. Box 140210 450 South State Street, Salt Lake City, Utah 84114 courtesy copy, Priority mail:
Mike Schultz, Speaker of the House Utah House 350 N State Street, Suite 350 Salt Lake City, Utah 84114 801.538.1029  Priority mail:	Utah State Senate President Stuart Adams 350 N State Street, Suite 320 Post Office Box 145115 Salt Lake City, Utah 84114 801.538.1035 courtesy copy, Priority mail:



The Utah Assembly  
member, The  
Federation of States

d.b.a. The United States of America, unincorporated (1776)



Utah Sheriffs Association  P. O. Box 489  Santa Clara, Utah 84765  courtesy copy, Priority mail:	Jess L. Anderson, Commissioner  Department of Public Safety 4501 S 2700 W Salt Lake City, Utah 84114 Phone: 801-965-4461 courtesy copy, Priority mail:
--	---

Greetings to all County Sheriffs on Utah:

The Utah Assembly is in session. We operate in our unincorporated capacity as the Lawful Government on Utah. Our presence requires that the Utah State Trust is dissolved and Utah's assets, affairs and resources, including the employees of our Federal contractors, are returned to the oversight of the people/People on Utah.

The Utah Assembly is providing Notice to all Sheriffs of their Public Duty to Keep the Peace, uphold the Public Law and the rights of ALL men and women living on the Land and soil on Utah. The Lawfully elected Sheriff, in his/her Peacekeeping capacity is the highest law within the borders of the County where they serve. Upon the implementation of Land Law, Sheriffs are Lawfully converted from serving as a corporate Law Enforcement Officer under commercial law and corporate policy, to serving in the intended Peacekeeping capacity of the Office. Please read the following notice and contact us directly if you have questions. We thank you for your service and we welcome the opportunity to work together in service to the people on Utah.

## Notice:

### Land Law is in Force on The United States

As of October 5<sup>th</sup> of 2024, The Federation of States, d.b.a. The United States of America, unincorporated has declared Land Law on all Fifty (50) Union States known as The United States (1776). Each State is geographically defined by the Land and soil with



The Utah Assembly  
member, The  
Federation of States



d.b.a. The United States of America, unincorporated (1776)

factual borders and includes all natural and physical assets. Land Law respects the Law of Free Will and forbids usury and insurance. And it is entirely local and subjective in nature.

This is further Notice of the restoration of the Lawful Governance on Utah and includes stand down orders to all service contractors, corporate entities and employees of those entities to cease operating in Maritime/Admiralty and begin operating under Land Law.

Any incorporated entity, man, woman or otherwise, who is engaged in unlawful conduct (violation of the Constitutional Contract and Land Law in general) and trespass or harm upon our people, soil, land, air or water, must be acted upon posthaste and with the full force of American Common Law.

The only purpose for government is to protect the people and their assets. Sheriffs are now required to enter their Peacekeeping Offices to operate under Land Law even if elected under a State of State, corporate election process. In the eyes of the uninformed men and women who voted for you, you are a Lawful County Sheriff. Any man or woman failing to uphold Land Law has the option of resigning or being otherwise removed from Office with the potential for deportation. The Utah Assembly would prefer that you begin to serve and protect the Living people of your county in full empowerment of your Office under Land Law.

## Please take Notice of these Additional Facts:

On October 1st of 2024 — The involuntary Chapter 7 Bankruptcy for the Municipal Corporation United States, Inc/UNITED STATES, INC, was finalized and the foreign, for-profit Papist Municipal corporation was liquidated as of 1:00 pm Eastern Standard Time. This includes any State of Utah, STATE OF UTAH and all subsidiaries, franchises and branches. They are unauthorized to operate within Utah's borders

The American government has been at peace since 1812 and remains so today. However, the U.S. and U.S.A. Corporate entities (British Territorial, Papist Municipal), the successors to the original foreign service contracts for America, have been engaged in waging commercial war since 1860. The people have had enough!

Land Law requires a Peacekeeping capacity from all those who are domiciled or residing on the Land and soil of our State, particularly those who hold any office of service. It applies to all Federal/State employees of the State of Utah, Utah State, Utah State Trust and County elected officials and hired officers. If you are found to be acting against the people, you will be relieved of your duties. Sheriffs are required to enter their Peacekeeping Offices, and Judges are required to Operate under Land Law and acknowledge the difference between a legal "person" and the living people.



The Utah Assembly  
member, The  
Federation of States



d.b.a. The United States of America, unincorporated (1776)

The Federal/State Subcontractors have been functioning under corporate, international and administrative law exclusively. They cannot administer Land Law but they are obligated to obey it when they enter our Dominion and must operate under the Provenance of the Living people. This Land Law is spelled out for them via their respective Constitutions and their Agencies and Subcontractors are also obligated to obey the limitations of the Constitutions while in the employ of Federal/State Subcontractors and Principals to contract. The Principals of all foreign "governments" are entirely responsible for the conduct of their Employees, Agents and Assigns. In addition, our Public Law and Custom provides that any man, woman, human, foreign government or subsidiary, business or other incorporated entity found to be in harm or trespass against the people or environment, are considered to be Enemies of the State and will be addressed with the full force of Land Law and American Common Law. It is the Sheriff's duty to assist the people in cleaning up the corruption in their County. And a reminder, Federal Eminent Domain does not exist and thus, the Sheriff will ensure that corporate land grabs and unlawful home foreclosures etc. do not occur on Utah.

Also note that as of October 5<sup>th</sup> of 2024, all branches of the Military on American Land and soil have been Lawfully converted back to an honorable soldiery which allows the opportunity for good people to stand up within a defunct and criminal system and take right action. This is an end to the role our men and women have played as a mercenary force that has wreaked devastation around the Earth in our name and under our purloined Title IV flag.

Our Federation of States has ingress and egress treaties in place among the several sovereign States of the Union which specifically allows American Military Forces to engage enemies both foreign and domestic within the physical borders of the States, specifically in this case, Utah.

The Utah Assembly is here to educate and inform as we move forward through the current shift of Governance back to Land Law and the enforcement of the Law of the Land as documented in the three (3) original Federal Constitutions. Please contact The Utah Assembly with any questions or for additional information and support. We look forward to observing how you will begin operating in your Lawful capacity for Utahns, and please revisit Utah's Notice of Harm 2023-2024 — Cease and Desist, and We See! We Do Not Consent! Found on our website, here: <https://utahassembly.info/notices-and-claims>. Our older Sheriff notice (which is still applicable and provides a lot of background history) can be found here: <https://utahassembly.info/sheriff>.

Please forward all communications and questions to The Utah Assembly, 4710 South 150 West, Murray, Utah [84107] and/or [utahcoordinator@utahassembly.org](mailto:utahcoordinator@utahassembly.org)



The Utah Assembly  
member, The  
Federation of States

d.b.a. The United States of America, unincorporated (1776)



For more information:

The Utah Assembly website: <https://utahassembly.info>

The American States Assembly website: <https://tasa.americanstatenationals.org/>

Notice to Principals is Notice to Agents; Notice to Agents is Notice to Principals;

Applicable to all Assigns and Successors;

Non-negotiable;

The Utah Assembly

May Peace and Freedom Be!

All Rights Reserved, Without Recourse, Without Prejudice.

All Rights Reserved, Without Recourse, Without Prejudice.

Enclosures:

1. October 8<sup>th</sup> of 2024 Notice to County Sheriffs — Notice of Land Law
2. Sheriffs, Deputies, It's Up to You
3. International Public Notice: Land and Soil Jurisdiction Sheriffs
3. Constitutional Case Law document



## **Notice to County Sheriffs**

**October 8, 2024**

Land Law has been declared throughout The United States as of October 5<sup>th</sup> 2024. This means that you must now enter upon the Peacekeeping Office of County Sheriff and it signals significant changes to your own authority and the Law you operate under:

- (1) As a County Sheriff operating on the land and soil jurisdiction of this country, you are the highest Peacekeeping and Law Enforcement Officer within the County borders;
- (2) You are indemnified and hold state immunity;
- (3) You directly outrank all Federal Personnel and Agency Employees;
- (4) You directly outrank all State of State and State Trust Employees;
- (5) You are empowered and required to protect the people of your county and their assets;
- (6) You may deputize as many Americans as you deem necessary;
- (7) You are advised that there are no Federal Eminent Domain rights;
- (8) If a properly constituted State Legislature acting prior to 1860 has not specifically granted land to a Federal entity for public purposes, Federal Personnel making claims to own or control land within your County are guilty of international trespass, false claims, and conspiracy to defraud under color of law;
- (9) Any Federal Personnel offering to encumber, delay or restrict civilian rescue and recovery efforts must be arrested; any Federal Personnel confiscating disaster relief supplies must be arrested; any Federal Personnel failing to render immediate aid and assistance must be arrested, shot, or hung on the spot as the situation demands. Escalation of force protocols are authorized; use of deadly force is authorized.

Issued by: Anna Maria Riezinger, Fiduciary

The United States of America

In care of: Box 520994

Big Lake, Alaska 99652

# International Public Notice: Land and Soil Jurisdiction Sheriffs

By Anna Von Reitz



On our land and soil, County Sheriffs are the ultimate peacekeeping and law enforcement officers. Within the borders of their counties they are literally the Law when Land Law is declared, as it now is.

This supreme authority exists only within the physical borders of their specific County.

For criminal investigations and pursuits across County and State borders, they rely on our Continental Marshals.

Both the County Sheriffs and the Continental Marshals are fully indemnified and enjoy state immunity.

A written Public Notice has been issued [this morning](#) advising the County Sheriffs of the change of law and their duties under it. A copy of this Public Notice is attached so that all individuals and foreign governments are fully informed.

Notice to Agents is Notice to Principals; Notice to Principals is Notice to Agents.

This Public Notice is being distributed to all County Sheriffs throughout the country.

<https://annavonreitz.com/sheriffsnotice.pdf>

Issued by:  
Anna Maria Riezinger, Fiduciary  
The United States of America  
In care of: Box 520994  
Big Lake, Alaska 99652

October 8th 2024

-----  
See this article and over 5000 others on Anna's website here: [www.annavonreitz.com](http://www.annavonreitz.com)

To support this work look for the Donate button on this website.



# Sheriffs, Deputies, It's Up to You

By Anna Von Reitz



I have said this before and I am going to say it again:

There are three kinds of "Sheriff" operating in this country.

The more common kind of Sheriff is a hired Law Enforcement Officer acting as a private security agent, similar to the famous Pinkerton Agents of a century ago.

These "Sheriffs" are elected by District Assemblies, not State Assemblies.

Both these Sheriffs and their Deputies work for incorporated (also called "federated") Counties, which are commercial corporation franchises of one of two large Federal Parent Corporations.

The State of State organizations that these Counties are part of, are also franchise commercial corporations in the business of providing governmental services.

Typically, things stack out like this:

"the" United States of America, Inc. (USA, Inc) has operated "the" State of Ohio (for example) and "the" State of Ohio has operated "the" Clayton County franchise. These are all British Territorial United States business organizations-- foreign commercial corporations, and these Sheriffs are elected by members of the populace who adopt British Territorial (Commonwealth) U.S. Citizenship and who are members of the so-called District Assembly.

At the same time:

"the" UNITED STATES, INC. (US CORP) has operated "the" STATE OF OHIO (for example) and "the" STATE OF OHIO has operated its own Municipal franchise doing business as "CLAYTON COUNTY". These are all Papist business organizations, more foreign commercial corporations, and these "SHERIFFS" are elected by members of the populace who adopt Municipal citizenship of the United States and who are members of the so-called Municipal Assembly.

Since 1937, these two large Federal Parent Corporations started colluding together under The Declaration of Interdependence of the Governments in The United States. They have arbitrarily pretended that Americans are all Federal Dual Citizens, both Territorial U.S. Citizens and Municipal citizens of the United States, and all owing "allegiance" to their corporations.

We have proven this using DUNS, CAGE, EIN, and CRIS account numbers.

There is no doubt that these "State of State" and "STATE OF STATE" organizations are operating as foreign commercial corporations, and that their employees are acting in a foreign and private capacity as private security personnel hired by these corporations.

One of the consequences of all this is that the majority of "Sheriffs" and "SHERIFFS" actually hold no Public Offices, even though they are being paid out of public trust funds.

Thus, they have no true bond, no public indemnity, no true public Oath of Office and technically, no authority as what we think of as "County Sheriffs". They are operating in the wrong jurisdiction and have been elected by the wrong sector of the populace for that.

Our Sheriffs and Deputies were never told about this change.

Many of our Sheriffs and Deputies who kept Good Faith with the people of this country have suffered disciplinary action when they have enforced constitutional guarantees and Public Law, because these foreign corporations benefit themselves by enforcing their private "corporate law" instead.

This situation led to a watershed United States Supreme Court case, Mack and Prinz v. USA, Inc., and the standing decision that it is up to the "discretion" of Law Enforcement Officers whether they enforce the Public Laws, including the Constitutions, or not.

If they do, they may lose favor with the greedy corporations they work for, and if they don't they may lose favor with the people they are supposed to serve. This puts LEO Sheriffs and Deputies squarely in the cross-hairs of this international fraud scheme. Damned if they do and damned if they don't.

But what happened to our Sheriffs?

Our Sheriffs are Public Officials elected by Americans who are members of the State and County Assemblies.

They operate in physically defined Counties with supreme authority within the borders of that County to enforce the Public Law --- including the Constitutions.

There are now fifty actual State Assemblies in Session in every State, and as these State Assemblies are populated, so are our land-and-soil based County Governments.

It has been many years since our States were called into Session and our Counties, too.

Actual American Sheriffs are elected by the people of this country, and they don't work for foreign commercial corporations---- in token of this separate status as Public Officials, they are called "Peacekeeping Officials" if they are elected by American State Nationals and State Citizens.

The elected County Assembly Sheriffs are the highest ranking Peacekeeping Officials and their Deputies are the highest ranking Peacekeeping Officers. It is their Public Duty to enforce the Public Law, including the Federal Constitutions.

And it is the duty of all LEO Sheriffs and Deputies to obey them.

While it may be left to the "discretion" of individual LEO's as to whether or not they step up and enforce the Public Law, they are nonetheless under obligation to obey it.

LEOs have the power to use their discretion wisely and anyone misdirecting them is directly liable for the harm they have caused the people of this country. That includes politicians, judges, prosecuting attorneys, bill collectors, and others who have preyed upon the American population using fraud and deceit and especially semantic deceit to accomplish their aims.

Please also see TheThickRedLine.org which explains the harm to our country that is being done every day as a result of enforcing private statutory laws and codes on the General Public, including so-called "victimless crimes" and even "thought crimes".

-----

See this article and over 3000 others on Anna's website here: [www.annavonreitz.com](http://www.annavonreitz.com)

To support this work look for the PayPal buttons on this website.

# CONSTITUTIONAL CASE LAW

**Bennett v. Boggs, 1 Baldw 60**, “Statutes that violate the plain and obvious principles of common right and common reason are null and void”. Would we not say that these judicial decisions are straight to the point --that there is no lawful method for government to put restrictions or limitations on rights belonging to the people? Other cases are even more straight forward: “The assertion of federal rights, when plainly and reasonably made, is not to be defeated under the name of practice.”

**Davis v. Wechsler , 263 US 22, 24.** “Where rights secured by the Constitution are involved, there can be no rule making or legislation which would abrogate them.”

**Miranda v. Arizona, 384 US 436, 491.** “The claim and exercise of a constitutional right cannot be converted into a crime.”

**Miller v. US, 230 F 486, 489.** “There can be no sanction or penalty imposed upon one because of this exercise of constitutional rights.”

**Sherer v. Cullen , 481 F 946.** We could go on, quoting court decision after court decision, however, the Constitution itself answers our question ♦ Can a government legally put restrictions on the rights of the American people at anytime, for any reason? The answer is found in Article Six of the U.S. Constitution: **Miranda v. Arizona, 384 U.S. 426, 491; 86 S. Ct. 1603** "Where rights secured by the Constitution are involved, there can be no 'rule making' or legislation which would abrogate them."

**Norton v. Shelby County , 118 U.S. 425 p. 442**

"An unconstitutional act is not law; it confers no rights; it imposes no duties; affords no protection; it creates no office; it is in legal contemplation, as inoperative as though it had never been passed."

**Sherar v. Cullen , 481 F. 2d 946 (1973)**

"There can be no sanction or penalty imposed upon one because of his exercise of constitutional rights."

**Simmons v. United States , 390 U.S. 377 (1968)**

"The claim and exercise of a Constitution right cannot be converted into a crime"... "a denial of them would be a denial of due process of law".

**Cooper v. Aaron, 358 U.S. 1, 78 S. Ct. 1401 (1958)**

Note: Any judge who does not comply with his oath to the Constitution of the United States wars against that Constitution and engages in acts in violation of the supreme law of the land. The judge is engaged in acts of treason. The U.S. Supreme Court has stated that "no state legislator or executive or judicial officer can war against the Constitution without violating his undertaking to support it". See also **In Re Sawyer, 124 U.S. 200 (188); U.S. v. Will, 449 U.S. 200, 216, 101 S. Ct. 471, 66 L. Ed. 2d 392, 406 (1980); Cohens v. Virginia,**

**19 U.S. (6 Wheat) 264, 404, 5 L. Ed 257 (1821).**

**Hoffsomer v. Hayes, 92 Okla 32, 227 F. 417** "The courts are not bound by an officer's interpretation of the law under which he presumes to act."

**Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S. (2 Cranch) 137, 180 (1803)**

"... the particular phraseology of the constitution of the United States confirms and strengthens the principle, supposed to be essential to all written constitutions, that a law repugnant to the constitution is void, and that courts, as well as other departments, are bound by that instrument." "In declaring what shall be the supreme law of the land, the Constitution itself is first mentioned; and not the laws of the United States generally, but those only which shall be made in pursuance of the Constitution, have that rank". "All law (rules and practices) which are repugnant to the Constitution are VOID". Since the 14th Amendment to the Constitution states "NO State (Jurisdiction) shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the rights, privileges, or immunities of citizens of the United States nor deprive any citizens of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law, ... or equal protection under the law", this renders judicial immunity unconstitutional.

**Scheuer v. Rhodes, 416 U.S. 232, 94 S. Ct. 1683, 1687 (1974)**

Note: By law, a judge is a state officer. The judge then acts not as a judge, but as a private individual (in his person). **When a judge acts as a trespasser of the law**, when a judge does not follow the law, the Judge loses subject-matter jurisdiction and the judges' orders are not voidable, but VOID, and of no legal force or effect. The U.S. Supreme Court stated that "when a state officer acts under a state law in a manner violative of the Federal Constitution, he comes into conflict with the superior authority of that Constitution, and he is in that case stripped of his official or representative character and is subjected in his person to the consequences of his individual conduct. The State has no power to impart to him any immunity from responsibility to the supreme authority of the United States."

**Miller v. U.S., 230 F. 2d. 486, 490; 42**

"There can be no sanction or penalty imposed upon one, because of his exercise of constitutional rights."

**Murdock v. Pennsylvania, 319 U.S. 105**

"No state shall convert a liberty into a license, and charge a fee therefore."

**Shuttlesworth v. City of Birmingham, Alabama, 373 U.S. 262**

"If the State converts a right (liberty) into a privilege, the citizen can ignore the license and fee and engage in the right (liberty) with impunity."

**Brinegar v. U.S., 388 US 160 (1949)**

Probable Cause to Arrest - Provides details on how to determine if a crime has been or is being committed.

**Carroll v. U.S., 267 US 132 (1925)**

Probable Cause to Search - Provides details on the belief that seizable property exists in a particular place or on a particular person.

**Draper v. U.S. (1959)**

Probable cause is where known facts and circumstances, of a reasonably trustworthy nature, are sufficient to justify a man of reasonable caution in the belief that a crime has been or is being committed. *Reasonable man definition*; common textbook definition; comes from this case.

**Davis v. Wechler, 263 U.S. 22, 24; Stromberg v. California, 283 U.S. 359; NAACP v.**

**Alabama, 375 U.S. 449** "The assertion of federal rights, when plainly and reasonably made, are not to be defeated under the name of local practice."

**Elmore v. McCammon (1986) 640 F. Supp. 905**

"... the right to file a lawsuit pro se is one of the most important rights under the constitution and laws."

**Haines v. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519 (1972)**

"Allegations such as those asserted by petitioner, however in artfully pleaded, are sufficient"...  
"which we hold to less stringent standards than formal pleadings drafted by lawyers."

**Jenkins v. McKeithen, 395 U.S. 411, 421 (1959); Picking v. Pennsylvania R. Co.,**

**151 Fed 2nd 240 ; Puckett v. Cox, 456 2nd 233** Pro se pleadings are to be considered without regard to technicality; pro se litigants' pleadings are not to be held to the same high standards of perfection as lawyers.

**Picking v. Pennsylvania Railway, 151 F.2d. 240, Third Circuit Court of Appeals**

The plaintiff's civil rights pleading was 150 pages and described by a federal judge as "inept". Nevertheless, it was held "Where a plaintiff pleads pro se in a suit for protection of civil rights, the Court should endeavor to construe Plaintiff's Pleadings without regard to technicalities."

**Puckett v. Cox, 456 F. 2d 233 (1972) (6th Cir. USCA)**

It was held that a pro se complaint requires a less stringent reading than one drafted by a lawyer per Justice Black in Conley v. Gibson (see case listed above, Pro Se Rights Section).

**Sims v. Aherns, 271 SW 720 (1925)** "The practice of law is an occupation of common right."

"Because of what appears to be a lawful command on the surface, many Citizens, because of their respect for what appears to be law, are cunningly coerced into waiving their rights due to ignorance."

**US v Minker, 350 US 179 at 187(1956)**

◆ Supreme Court of the United States 1795 "Inasmuch as every government is an artificial person, an abstraction, and a creature of the mind only, a government can interface only with other artificial persons. The imaginary, having neither actuality nor substance, is foreclosed from creating and attaining parity with the tangible. The legal manifestation of this is that no

government, as well as any law, agency, aspect, court, etc. can concern itself with anything other than corporate, artificial persons and the contracts between them."

**S.C.R. 1795, Penhallow v. Doane's Administrators (3 U.S. 54; 1 L.Ed. 57; 3 Dall.**

**54)**, "The prosecutor is not a witness; and he should not be permitted to add to the record either by subtle or gross improprieties. Those who have experienced the full thrust of the power of government when leveled against them know that the only protection the citizen has is in the requirement for a fair trial."

**Donnelly v. Dechristoforo, 1974.SCT.41709 ¶ 56; 416 U.S. 637 (1974) McNally v. U.S., 483 U.S. 350, 371-372, Quoting U.S. v Holzer, 816 F.2d. 304, 307** Fraud in its elementary common law sense of deceit... includes the deliberate concealment of material information in a setting of fiduciary obligation.

A public official is a fiduciary toward the public,... and if he deliberately conceals material information from them he is guilty of fraud.

**"The law requires proof of jurisdiction to appear on the record of the administrative agency and all administrative proceedings."**

**Hagans v Lavine 415 U. S. 533.** "A judgment rendered by a court without personal jurisdiction over the defendant is void. It is a nullity."

**Sramek v. Sramek, 17 Kan. App 2d 573, 576-7, 840 P. 2d 553 (1992) rev. denied 252 Kan. 1093(1993)** "The law provides that once State and Federal jurisdiction has been challenged, it must be proven."

**Main v Thiboutot, 100 S Ct. 2502(1980)** "Jurisdiction can be challenged at any time," and "Jurisdiction, once challenged, cannot be assumed and must be decided."

**Basso v. Utah Power & Light Co. 395 F 2d 906, 910**

"Once challenged, jurisdiction cannot be assumed, it must be proved to exist."

**Stock v. Medical Examiners 94 Ca 2d 751. 211 P2d 289 In Interest of M.V., 288 Ill.App.3d 300, 681 N.E.2d 532 (1st Dist. 1997)** "Where a court's power to act is controlled by statute, the court is governed by the rules of limited jurisdiction, and courts exercising jurisdiction over such matters must proceed within the structures of the statute." "The state citizen is immune from any and all government attacks and procedure, absent contract." see, **Dred Scott vs. Sanford, 60 U.S. (19 How.) 393** or as the Supreme Court has stated clearly, "...every man is independent of all laws, except those prescribed by nature. He is not bound by any institutions formed by his fellowmen without his consent."

**CRUDEN vs. NEALE, 2 N.C. 338 2 S.E. 70** "Corpus delicti consists of a showing of "1) the occurrence of the specific kind of injury and 2) someone's criminal act as the cause of the injury."

**Johnson v. State, 653 N.E.2d 478, 479 (Ind. 1995).** "State must produce corroborating evidence of "corpus delicti," showing that injury or harm constituting

crime occurred and that injury or harm was caused by someone's criminal activity."

**Jorgensen v. State, 567 N.E.2d 113, 121.** "To establish the corpus delicti, independent evidence must be presented showing the occurrence of a specific kind of injury and that a criminal act was the cause of the injury."

**Porter v. State , 391 N.E.2d 801, 808-809.** "When governments enter the world of commerce, they are subject to the same burdens as any private firm or corporation" -- **U.S. v. Burr, 309 U.S. 242 See: 22 U.S.C.A.286e, Bank of U.S. vs. Planters Bank of Georgia, 6L, Ed. (9 Wheat) 244; 22 U.S.C.A. 286 et seq., C.R.S. 11-60-103**

### **TREZEVANT CASE DAMAGE AWARD STANDARD**

"Evidence that motorist cited for traffic violation was incarcerated for 23 minutes during booking process, even though he had never been arrested and at all times had sufficient cash on hand to post bond pending court disposition of citation, was sufficient to support finding that municipality employing officer who cited motorist and county board of criminal justice, which operated facility in which motorist was incarcerated, had unconstitutionally deprived motorist of his right to liberty. **42 U.S.C.A. Sec. 1983." Trezevant v. City of Tampa (1984) 741 F.2d 336, hn. 1**

"Jury verdict of \$25,000 in favor of motorist who was unconstitutionally deprived of his liberty when incarcerated during booking process following citation for traffic violation was not excessive in view of evidence of motorist's back pain during period of incarceration and jailor's refusal to provide medical treatment, as well as fact that motorist was clearly entitled to compensation for incarceration itself and for mental anguish that he had suffered from entire episode. **42 U.S.C.A. Sec. 1983." Trezevant v. City of Tampa (1984) 741 F.2d 336, hn. 5**

**Mattox v. U.S., 156 US 237,243. (1895)** "We are bound to interpret the Constitution in the light of the law as it existed at the time it was adopted."

**SHAPIRO vs. THOMSON, 394 U. S. 618 April 21, 1969.** Further, the Right to TRAVEL by private conveyance for private purposes upon the Common way can NOT BE INFRINGED. **No license or permission is required for TRAVEL** when such TRAVEL IS NOT for the purpose of [COMMERCIAL] PROFIT OR GAIN on the open highways operating under license IN COMMERCE. "The rights of the individuals are restricted only to the extent that they have been voluntarily surrendered by the citizenship to the agencies of government."

**City of Dallas v Mitchell, 245 S.W. 944** "To take away all remedy for the enforcement of a right is to take away the right itself. But that is not within the power of the State."

**Poindexter v. Greenhow, 114 U.S. 270, 303 (1885). Brady v. U.S., 397 U.S. 742, 748, (1970)** "Waivers of Constitutional Rights, not only must they be voluntary, they must be knowingly intelligent acts done with sufficient awareness."

**Carnley v. Cochran, 369 U.S. 506, 516 (1962),** "Presuming waiver from a silent record is impermissible. The record must show, or there must be an allegation and evidence which show,

that an accused was offered counsel but intelligently and understandingly rejected the offer. Anything less is not waiver."

**Cooper v. Aaron, 358 U.S. 1, 78 S.Ct. 1401 (1958).** "No state legislator or executive or judicial officer can war against the Constitution without violating his undertaking to support it." The constitutional theory is that we the people are the sovereigns, the state and federal officials only our agents." "The individual, unlike the corporation, cannot be taxed for the mere privilege of existing. The corporation is an artificial entity which owes its existence and charter powers to the state; but, the individual's rights to live and own property are natural rights for the enjoyment of which an excise cannot be imposed."

**Redfield v Fisher, 292 P 813, at 819 [1930]** "...an officer may be held liable in damages to any person injured in consequence of a breach of any of the duties connected with his office...The liability for nonfeasance, misfeasance, and for malfeasance in office is in his 'individual' , not his official capacity..."

#### **70 Am. Jur. 2nd Sec. 50, VII Civil Liability**

"Fraud destroys the validity of everything into which it enters,"

**Nudd v. Burrows, 91 U.S 426.** "Fraud vitiates everything"

**Boyce v. Grundy, 3 Pet. 210** "Fraud vitiates the most solemn contracts, documents and even judgments."

**U.S. v. Throckmorton, 98 US 61** WHEREAS, officials and even judges have no immunity (See, **Owen vs. City of Independence, 100 S Ct. 1398; Maine vs. Thiboutot, 100 S. Ct. 2502; and Hafer vs. Melo, 502 U.S. 21**; officials and judges are deemed to know the law and sworn to uphold the law; officials and judges cannot claim to act in good faith in willful deprivation of law, they certainly cannot plead ignorance of the law, even the Citizen cannot plead ignorance of the law, the courts have ruled there is no such thing as ignorance of the law, it is ludicrous for learned officials and judges to plead ignorance of the law therefore there is no immunity, judicial or otherwise, in matters of rights secured by the Constitution for the United States of America. See: **Title 42 U.S.C. Sec. 1983**. "When lawsuits are brought against federal officials, they must be brought against them in their "individual" capacity not their official capacity. When federal officials perpetrate constitutional torts, they do so *ultra vires* (beyond the powers) and lose the shield of immunity."

**Williamson v. U.S. Department of Agriculture, 815 F.2d. 369, ACLU Foundation v. Barr, 952 F.2d. 457, 293 U.S. App. DC 101, (CA DC 1991).**

"It is the duty of all officials whether legislative, judicial, executive, administrative, or ministerial to so perform every official act as not to violate constitutional provisions."

#### **Montgomery v state 55 Fla. 97-45S0.879**

a. "Inasmuch as every government is an artificial person, an abstraction, and a creature of the mind only, a government can interface only with other artificial persons. The imaginary, having neither actuality nor substance, is foreclosed from creating and attaining parity with the tangible.



The legal manifestation of this is that no government, as well as any law, agency, aspect, court, etc. can concern itself with anything other than corporate, artificial persons and the contracts between them."

**S.C.R. 1795, Penhallow v. Doane's Administrators 3 U.S. 54; 1 L.Ed. 57; 3**

**Dall. 54; and,**

b. "the contracts between them" involve U.S. citizens, which are deemed as Corporate Entities:

c. "Therefore, the U.S. citizens residing in one of the states of the union, are classified as property and franchises of the federal government as an "individual entity"', **Wheeling Steel Corp. v. Fox, 298 U.S. 193, 80 L.Ed. 1143, 56 S.Ct. 773**

**Alexander v. Bothsworth, 1915.** "Party cannot be bound by contract that he has not made or authorized. Free consent is an indispensable element in making valid contracts."

**HALE v. HENKEL 201 U.S. 43 at 89 (1906)** Hale v. Henkel was decided by the united States Supreme Court in 1906. The opinion of the court states: "The "individual" may stand upon "his Constitutional Rights" as a 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, 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)** Hale v. Henkel is binding on all the courts of the United States of America until another Supreme Court case says it isn't. No other Supreme Court case has ever overturned Hale v. Henkel None of the various issues of Hale v. Henkel has ever been overruled since 1906, Hale v. Henkel has been cited by the Federal and State Appellate Court systems over 1,600 times! In nearly every instance when a case is cited, it has an impact on precedent authority of the cited case. Compared with other previously decided Supreme Court cases, no other case has surpassed Hale v. Henkel in the number of times it has been cited by the courts. "The rights of the individuals are restricted only to the extent that they have been voluntarily surrendered by the citizenship to the agencies of government."

**City of Dallas v Mitchell, 245 S.W. 944**

"An illegal arrest is an assault and battery. The person so attempted to be restrained of his liberty has the same right to use force in defending himself as he would in repelling any other assault and battery." (**State v. Robinson, 145 ME. 77, 72 ATL. 260**).

TITLE 18

>

PART I

>

CHAPTER 2

> §

### 31Definitions (6)

**Motor vehicle.** The term “motor vehicle” means every description of carriage or other **contrivance** propelled or drawn by mechanical power and used for commercial purposes on the highways in the transportation of passengers, passengers and property, or property or cargo.

"Highways are for the use of the traveling public, and all have the right to use them in a reasonable and proper manner; the use thereof is an inalienable right of every citizen." **Escobedo v. State 35 C2d 870 in 8 Cal Jur 3d p.27**

The use of the automobile as a necessary adjunct to the earning of a livelihood in modern life requires us in the interest of realism to conclude that the RIGHT to use an automobile on the public highways partakes of the of a liberty within the meaning of the Constitutional guarantees. ..."

**Berberian v. Lussier (1958) 139 A2d 869, 872** "The RIGHT of the citizen to DRIVE on the public street with freedom from police interference, unless he is engaged in suspicious conduct associated in some manner with criminality is a FUNDAMENTAL CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT which must be protected by the courts."

**People v. Horton 14 Cal. App. 3rd 667 (1971)** “A “US Citizen” upon leaving the District of Columbia becomes involved in “interstate commerce”, as a “resident” does not have the common-law right to travel, of a Citizen of one of the several states.”

**Hendrick v. Maryland S.C. Reporter’s Rd. 610-625. (1914)** "One who DRIVES an automobile is an operator within meaning of the Motor Vehicle Act."

**Pontius v. McClean 113 CA 452** "The word 'operator' shall not include any person who solely transports his own property and who transports no persons or property for hire or compensation." Statutes at Large California Chapter 412 p.833 "The right of a citizen to travel upon the public highways and to transport his property thereon, by horse-drawn carriage, wagon, or automobile is not a mere privilege which may be permitted or prohibited at will, but a common right which he has under his right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

**Slusher v. Safety Coach Transit Co., 229 Ky 731, 17 SW2d 1012, and affirmed by the Supreme Court in Thompson v. Smith 154 S.E. 579.**

### Also See:

- **EDWARDS VS. CALIFORNIA, 314 U.S. 160**
- **TWINING VS NEW JERSEY, 211 U.S. 78**
- **WILLIAMS VS. FEARS, 179 U.S. 270, AT 274**
- **CRANDALL VS. NEVADA, 6 WALL. 35, AT 43-44**
- **THE PASSENGER CASES, 7 HOWARD 287, AT 492**
- **U.S. VS. GUEST, 383 U.S. 745, AT 757-758 (1966)**
- **GRIFFIN VS. BRECKENRIDGE, 403 U.S. 88, AT 105-106 (1971)**
- **CALIFANO VS. TORRES, 435 U.S. 1, AT 4, note 6**
- **SHAPIRO VS. THOMPSON, 394 U.S. 618 (1969)**
- **CALIFANO VS. AZNAVORIAN, 439 U.S. 170, AT 176 (1978)**

Protection; **California Constitution Article 1, section 9 Due Process; Equal Privileges and Immunities:**

(a) A person may not be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law or denied equal protection of the laws. Due process means that anybody wishing to restrain property or file a protest against property of another, be it land, livestock, etc. must first put up a Bond to indemnify the lawful owner(s) for the takings, THEN go through the process of having the matter decided by a jury.