i, a man claim;

1. the said Plaintiff’s/Wrongdoers trespass upon my property;
2. the causal agent of the trespass is theft, fraud, extortion;
3. the trespass did and does cause harm and injury to my property;
4. the commencement of the wrong and harm was on April 26th 2006 and it continues to this day;
5. approximately a year ago, i learned that there is no such thing as a bank loan in America, or anywhere

**“…the money creation process takes place principally through transaction accounts.”** Modern Money Mechanics, page 2, published by the Chicago Federal Reserve Bank, May 1961

**“Of course, they do not really pay out loans from the money they receive as deposits. If they did this, no additional money would be created. What they do when they make loans is to accept promissory notes in exchange for credits to the borrowers' transaction accounts.”** Modern Money Mechanics, page 6, published by the Chicago Federal Reserve Bank, May 1961

1. i witnessed that when somebody makes a deposit into a bank account, it becomes the property of the bank and they are in a contract to pay it back, on demand
2. i witnessed that it is illegal for a bank to loan their property

**“(a) GENERAL PROHIBITION - No national bank shall make any loan or discount on the security of the shares of its own capital stock.”** 12 U.S. Code § 83 - Loans by bank on its own stock

1. i witnessed that an unconditional promise to pay is itself money

**“The case of *Farmer v. Russell,* 1 Bos. & Pull. 295, so far as the point before us is concerned, asserts the principle that if A receives money from B to pay to C, it is money had and received for the use of the latter. In such a case it is immaterial whether the promise to pay over be express or implied, for by the very act of receipt, the party holds it not for A, but in trust for C. *See also Schermerhorn v. Vanderheyden,* 1 Johns. 139; *Onion v. Paul,* 1 Harris & Johns. 114; *Pigott v. Thompson,* 3 Bos. & Pull. 146, 149, note.”** Tiernan v Jackson 30 US 580 (1831)

**“What is said to be an unconditional promise to pay a sum certain in money is itself money. The words on the face of the paper money, “will pay to the bearer on demand”, cannot alter its character as money and turn it into a different document which calls for the payment of money.”** Bank of Canada v. Bank of Montreal, [1978] 1 S.C.R. 1148 at page 1155

and i created the money when i signed the promissory note, but the banksters unjustly enriched themselves by demanding payments, and interest, and now with their fraudulent foreclosure which is the theft of my property

1. i witnessed that at no time, and in no way did any of these Plaintiff’s/Wrongdoers named herein disclose that their US citizen is a cestui que trust

**“Chap. 854. – An Act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia.”**

which was Approved on March 3, 1901, by the Fifty-Sixth Congress, Session II, at 31 Stat. 1189, and in Sec. 117, at 31 Stat. 1208, where it says;

**“That in addition to the jurisdiction conferred in the preceding section, plenary jurisdiction is hereby given to the said court holding the said special term to hear and determine all questions relative to the execution of any and all wills…”**

and at Chapter Fifty-Six in Sec. 1617, at 31 Stat. 1432, where it says;

**“The Legal Estate to be in Cestui Que Use”**

**“A “*citizen of the United States*” is a civilly dead entity operating as a co-trustee and co-beneficiary of the *PCT (Public Charitable Trust)*, the constructive, *cestui que trust* of US Inc. under the 14th Amendment, which upholds the debt of the USA and US Inc.”** Congressional Record, June 13 1967, pp. 15641-15646

**". . . (E)very taxpayer is a cestui qui trust having sufficient interest in the preventing abuse of the trust to be recognized in the field of this court's prerogative jurisdiction . .”** In Re Bolens (1912), 135 N.W. 164

**"...it might be correctly said that there is no such thing as a citizen of the United States. ..... A citizen of any one of the States of the Union, is held to be, and called a citizen of the United States, although technically and abstractly there is no such thing."** Ex Parte Frank Knowles, 5 Cal. Rep. 300;

1. i witnessed that at no time, and in no way did any of these Plaintiff’s/Wrongdoers named herein disclose that their US citizen / cestui que trust was created by the Roman Cult

**“Yet still it was found difficult to set bounds to ecclesiastical ingenuity; for when they were driven out of all their former holds, they devised a new method of conveyance, by which the lands were granted, not to themselves directly, but to nominal feoffees *to the use* of the religious houses; thus distinguishing between the *possession* and the *use,* and receiving the actual profits, while the seisin of the lands remained in the nominal feoffee, who was held by the courts of equity (then under the direction of the clergy) to be bound in conscience to account to his *cestui que use* for the rents and emoluments of the estate: and it is to these inventions that our practitioners are indebted for the introduction of uses and trusts, the foundation of modern conveyancing.”** Tomlins Law Dictionary 1835 edition, Volume 2 under the definition of Mortmain [emphasis added]

1. i witnessed that the Plaintiff’s/Wrongdoers named herein at all material times had teams of attorneys who are officers of the court, and are therefore required to know the law

**“Officers of the court have no immunity, when violating a constitutional right, for**

**they are deemed to know the law.”** Owens v Independence 100 S.C.T. 1398

**“An officer who acts in violation of the Constitution ceases to represent the government”.** Brookfield Const. Co. v. Kozinski, 284 F. Supp. 94,

1. i witnessed that all through their application process and in the mortgage contract, it continually talks about and uses the word “loan” as if they are actually loaning money, which is a fraud.
2. i witnessed that their documents are full of fraud, that there never was a “loan”, and they fraudulently assaulted me with their Roman Cult cestui que trust, which is itself a fraud, therefore there was fraud from the inception and fraud vitiates the most solemn promise to pay

**“Once a fraud, always a fraud.”** 13 Vin. Abr. 539

**“Things invalid from the beginning cannot be made valid by subsequent act.”** Trayner, Max. 482. Maxims of Law, Black’s Law Dictionary 9th Edition, page 1862

**“A thing void in the beginning does not become valid by lapse of time.”** 1 S. & R. 58. Maxims of Law, Black’s Law Dictionary 9th Edition, page 1866

**Time cannot render valid an act void in its origin.** Dig. 50, 17, 29; Broom, Max. 178, Maxims of Law, Black’s Law Dictionary 9th Edition, page 1862,

**“Ex dolo malo non oritur action. Out of fraud no action arises. Cowper, 343; Broom’s Max. 349.”** Bouvier’s Maxims of Law, 1856,

and fraud is inexcusable and unpardonable;

**“Fraus et dolus nemini patrocianari debent. Fraud and deceit should excuse no man. 3 Co. 78.”** Bouvier’s Maxims of Law 1856

and any fraud amounts to injustice;

**“Fraus et jus nunquam cohabitant. Fraud and justice never dwell together.”** Maxims of Law, Black’s Law Dictionary, 9th Edition, page 1832

**“Quod alias bonum et justum est, si per vim vei fraudem petatur, malum et injustum efficitur. What is otherwise good and just, if sought by force or fraud, becomes bad and unjust. 3 Co. 78.”** Bouvier’s Maxims of Law, 1856

1. i witnessed that I served a Notice of Rescission on or about 28 July, 2015, a true copy of which is attached hereto, all of which is incorporated herein by reference in its entirety, and as follows;

Western Progressive - Nevada, Inc, Newly Appointed Substitute Trustee

ATTN: Chelsea Jackson, Trustee Sale Assistant, or all successors or assigns

1000 Abernathy Rd. NE, Bldg 400, Suite 200, Atlanta, GA 30328

Sent Via USPS Express Mail No: EK 911118186 US

Also Sent Via Facsmile No. (866) 960-8298

Ocwen Loan Servicing, LLC, Loan Servicer

1661 Worthington Road, Suite 100

West Palm Beach, FL 33409

Sent Via USPS Express Mail No: EK 911118190 US

Also Sent Via Facsmile No. (407) 737-5693

Also served by email at; Ombudsman@ocwen.com

1. i witnessed that i served a Notice of Default, a true copy of which is attached hereto, all of which is incorporated herein by reference in its entirety, and as follows;

Western Progressive - Nevada, Inc, Substitute Trustee

ATTN: Chelsea Jackson, in esse, d.b.a CHELSEA JACKSON

Trustee Sale Assistant, (and all successors)

1. Abernathy Rd. NE, Bldg 400, Suite 200, Atlanta, GA 30328

USPS Registered Mail No.RE 825 187 161 US

Ocwen Loan Servicing, LLC, Servicer, (and all successors and assigns)

ATTN: Agent for server of process

1661 Worthington Road, Suite 100

West Palm Beach. FL 33409

USPS Registered Mail No. RE 825 187 158 US

City First Mortgage Services, LLC, (and all successors and assigns)

750 S Main, Suite 104

Bountiful, UT 84010

USPS Registered Mail No. RE 825 187 144 US

1. i witnessed that i have demanded to see the original note from the beginning, of this process to determine if they were the Holder in Due Course, and they have refused to produce it.
2. i believe that these wrongdoers named herein and others known and unknown have securitized the original application that was submitted and sold it on Wall Street
3. i have demanded to see the original application and they have stonewalled.
4. i witnessed that I brought forward all of the rights and privileges of the original land patent on the property, a true copy of the Grant Deed and Bill of Exchange which is recorded with the Clark County Recorder at their number 3276779, all of which is incorporated herein by reference in its entirety.
5. i witnessed that Assistant County Recorder Eugene Mendiola perjured his oath by refusing to record my Grant Deed and Bill of Exchange, but it doesn’t affect the fact that it was recorded because once it has been received, it is filed regardless of whether they file stamp it or not

**"An instrument is deemed in law filed at the time it is delivered to the clerk, regardless of whether the instrument is file marked."** Biffle v Morton Rubber Industry Inc., 785 S.W.2d 143, 144 (Tex. 1990)

a true copy of the rejection letter of Eugene Mendiola is attached hereto, all of which is incorporated herein by reference in its entirety, and it exposes Mendiola’s true allegiance to the banksters.

1. i witnessed that the land patent is the highest and best title

**“[N]othing but a patent passes a perfect and consummate title;”** *Wilcox v. Jackson*, 38 U.S. 498 (1839)

**“A patent to land, issued by the United States under authority of law, is the highest evidence of title, something upon which its holder can rely for peace and security in his possession. *It is conclusive evidence of title against the United States and all the world...*”** 2 The American Law of Mining, § 1.29 at 357. *Nichols v. Rysavy*, (S.D. 1985) 610 F. Supp. 1245.

**“Issuance of a government patent granting title to land is 'the most accredited type of conveyance known to our law‘”.** United States v Creek Nation, 295 U.S. 103 (1935); see also United States v Cherokee Nation, 474 F.2d 628 (1973)

and no equitable interest can prevail against a land patent

**“A patent issued, by the government of the United States is legal and conclusive evidence of title to the land described therein. No equitable interest, however strong, to land described in such a patent, can prevail at law, against the patent.”** Land patents, opinions of the United States Attorney General's office. (Sept. 1869) [emphasis added]

1. i witnessed that it was the intent of Congress that patented land be unassailable

**"it was calculated to plant in the new country a population of independent unembarrassed freeholder ... that it would place, in every man, the Power to Purchase a freehold, the price of which could be cleared in 3 years... that it would cut up speculation and monopoly ... that it would prevent the accumulation of alarming debt, which experience proved never would and never could be paid"** (emphasis added) Senator King of New York, in March 1820 during the passage of the Act for the sale of public lands

1. i witnessed that these Plaintiff’s/Wrongdoers are now trying to complete their theft of my property with their unlawful detainder action that they brought in Las Vegas Township Justice Court case number 17C005972.

1. i witnessed each of the Plaintiff’s/Wrongdoers named herein know that Article 1 in Amendment to the Constitution for the United States of America requires that;

**“Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof,…”** Article 1 in Amendment, Constitution for the United States of America [emphasis added]

1. i witnessed each of the Plaintiff’s/Wrongdoers named herein know that their Article 2, of their International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights requires that there be no discrimination because of religious beliefs

**“1. Each State Party to the present Covenant undertakes to respect and to ensure to all individuals within its territory and subject to its jurisdiction the rights recognized in the present Covenant, without distinction of any kind, such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status.”** International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, Article 2, Clause 1 [emphasis added]

1. i witnessed each of the Plaintiff’s/Wrongdoers named herein know that their Article 18, of their International Covenant on Civil and Political rights requires that everyone have the right to freedom of religion, in particular NOT to participate in the Satanism of the Roman Cult, which is entirely the opposite of my Christian convictions

**“1. Everyone shall have the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion. This right shall include freedom to have or to adopt a religion or belief of his choice, and freedom, either individually or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in worship, observance, practice and teaching. 2. No one shall be subject to coercion which would impair his freedom to have or to adopt a religion or belief of his choice.”** International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, Article 18, Clause 1, & 2 [emphasis added]

1. i witnessed each of the Plaintiff’s/Wrongdoers named herein know the so-called Fourteenth Amendment was used as justification to issue Bills of Credit

**"The forced loans of 1862 and 1863, in the form of legal tender notes, were vital forces in the struggle for national supremacy. They formed a part of the public debt of the United States, the validity of which is solemnly established by the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution.“** Julliard v. Greenman, 110 US 432 [emphasis added]

and the so-called Fourteenth Amendment converted corporations into citizens

**"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 [emphasis added]

**“STATUS. L. Standing: state, condition, situation. Compare Estate. A corporation has no status as a citizen outside of the jurisdiction where it was created.”** Anderson’s Law Dictionary, 1889 Edition, page 968;

because previously corporations had no standing in any court of law

**“My opinion is and long has been that the mayor and aldermen of a city corporation, or the president and directors of a bank, or the president and directors of a railroad company and of other similar corporations, are the true parties that sue and are sued as trustees and representatives of the constantly changing stockholders…. A corporation, therefore, being not a natural person, but a mere creature of the mind, invisible and intangible, cannot be a citizen of a state, or of the United States, and cannot fall within the terms or the power of the above mentioned article, and can therefore neither plead nor be impleaded in the courts of the United States.”** Rundle v Delaware & Raritan Canal Company 55 U.S. 80 (1852) [emphasis added];

and the so-called Fourteenth Amendment converted US citizens into “other property of the United States” which is just another form of slavery

**“The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States”** US Constitution, Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2

**“...it is evident that they [US citizens] have not the political rights which are vested in citizens of the States. They are not constituents of any community in which is vested any sovereign power of government. Their position partakes more of the character of subjects than of citizens. They are subject to the laws of the United States, but have no voice in its management. If they are allowed to make laws, the validity of these laws is derived from the sanction of a Government in which they are not represented. Mere citizenship they may have, but the political rights of citizens they cannot enjoy…”** People v. De La Guerra,40 Cal. 311, 342 (A.D. 1870) [emphasis added]

**“[T]he term "citizen," in the United States, is analogous to the term "subject" in the common law.”** State vs Manual 20 NC 122, 14 C.J.S. 4, p 430

and the so-called Fourteenth Amendment criminally converts citizenship into the opposite of what the founders intended

**"And while the Fourteenth Amendment does not create a national citizenship, it has the effect of making that citizenship "paramount and dominant" instead of "derivative and dependent" upon state citizenship."** Colgate v Harvey 296 US 404 at p 427

**"The amendment (fourteeth) reversed and annulled the original policy of the constitution,"** United States v. Rhodes, 27 Federal Cases, 785, 794

a criminally converted US citizen has no rights

**"The only absolute and unqualified right of a United States citizen is to residence within the territorial boundaries of the United States,"** US vs. Valentine 288 F. Supp. 957 [emphasis added]

**"...the privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States do not necessarily include all the rights protected by the first eight amendments [common law rights] to the Federal constitution against the powers of the Federal government."** Maxwell v Dow, 20 S.C.R. 448, at pg 455

**"The right of trial by jury in civil cases, guaranteed by the 7th Amendment (Walker v. Sauvinet, 92 U. S. 90), and the right to bear arms, guaranteed by the 2nd Amendment (Presser v. Illinois, 116 U. S. 252), have been distinctly held not to be privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States guaranteed by the 14th Amendment against abridgement by the states, and in effect the same decision was made in respect of the guarantee against prosecution, except by indictment of a grand jury, contained in the 5th Amendment (Hurtado v. California, 110 U. S. 516), and in respect of the right to be confronted with witnesses, contained in the 6th Amendment."** West v. Louisiana, 194 U. S. 258.

the so-called Fourteenth Amendment converts civil rights into statutory privileges

**"After the adoption of the 14th Amendment, a bill which became the first Civil Rights Act was introduced in the 39th Congress, the major purpose of which was to secure to the recently freed Negroes all the civil rights secured to white men... (N)one other than citizens of the United States were within the provisions of the Act.”** Hague v. C. I. O., 307 U. S. 496, 509

**“By this means, white Citizens birthrights become of no affect and their rights are reduce to the inferior character of statutory *Civil Rights* (*mere legislative privileges*).”** The Non-Ratification of the Fourteenth Amendment, in the case (Dyett v. Turner, 439 P2d 266 @ 269, 20 U2d 403 [1968]), Judge AH Ellett of the Utah Supreme Court

and the so-called Fourteenth Amendment was actually a revision

**". . . the wide and diverse range of subject matters proposed to be voted upon, and the revisional effect which it would necessarily have on our basic plan of government. The proposal is offered as a single amendment but it obviously is multifarious. It does not give the people an opportunity to express approval or disapproval severally as to each major change suggested. . . ."** McFadden v Jordan, 196 P.2d 787

because it changes many things in the Constitution, including property rights, citizenship, taxes, apportionment, the debt, and more,

* 1. **“It violates the Preamble, which defines the whole intent of all powers granted to Congress, by introducing a foreign member into the sovereign body.**
	2. **It is an "ex post facto law" punishing Southerners in many ways for acts not necessarily illegal at the time of their commission.**
	3. **It is a "bill of attainder" (in its lesser form of a "bill of pains and penalties") depriving all southern slave holders of property without trial.**
	4. **It deprived Southerners of property by unreasonable seizure and without just compensation, bringing Congress beyond limitations set out by the Fourth and Fifth Articles in Amendment (Bill of Rights).**
	5. **It lays prohibitions upon the States beyond those known to the original Constitution of the United States and makes inroads upon the Constitutions of the several States, encroaching upon sovereignty belonging to the people of the several States which is prohibited by the Tenth Article in Amendment (Bill of Rights ).**
	6. **It created purely legislative "Tribunals" without respect to the separation of powers.** **It extended Congress' "martial law power" allowing the emission of "bills of credit" [legal tender] and etc..**
	7. **The list is too long to completely enumerate. (Refer back within this exposé to list more Constitutional violations)”** The Non-Ratification of the Fourteenth Amendment, in the case (Dyett v. Turner, 439 P2d 266 @ 269, 20 U2d 403 [1968]), Judge AH Ellett of the Utah Supreme Court

and an amendment should relate to one subject and not affect any other section or articles of the constitution, and be complete within itself

**"…includes only the power to amend any section in such a manner that such Amendment, if approved, would be complete within itself, relate to one subject and not substantially affect any other section of Articles of the Constitution or require further Amendments to the Constitution to accomplish its purpose."** Adams v Gunter, 238 So.2d 824 [emphasis added]

and Congress is NOT authorized to revise the Constitutionand the so-called Fourteenth Amendment was created by Congress

**"The term resident and citizen of the United States is distinguished from a Citizen of one of the several states, in that the former is a special class of citizen created by Congress."** U.S. v. Anthony 24 Fed. 829 (1873) [emphasis added]

**“Citizenship is a political status, and may be defined and privilege limited by Congress.”** Ex Parte (NG) Fung Sing, Federal Reporter, 2nd Series, Vol. 6, Page 670 (1925)

and the so-called Fourteenth Amendment was never properly ratified

**“The dissenting opinion asserts that "The Fourteenth Amendment is a part of the Constitution of the United States." While this same assertion has been made by The United States Supreme Court, that court has never held that the amendment was legally adopted. I cannot believe that any court, in full possession of its faculties could honestly hold that the amendment was properly approved and adopted."** State v Phillips 540 Pac. Rep.2d 936

therefore the so-called Fourteenth Amendment is unconstitutional, and a fraud and a nullity

**“No one is bound to obey an unconstitutional law and no courts are bound to enforce it."** 16th American Jurisprudence 2d, Section 177 late 2nd, Section 256

**“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.”** Norton vs Shelby County, 118 U.S. 425, p. 442

**"An unconstitutional law is void, and is as no law. An offence created by it is not a crime."** Ex parte Siebold, 100 U.S. 371, 376 (1880), quoted with approval in Fay v. Noia, 372 U.S. 391, 408 (1963)

**"it never became a law and was as much a nullity as if it had been the act or declaration of an unauthorized assemblage of individuals."** (Ryan v. Lynch, 68 Ill. 160)

1. i witnessed each of the Plaintiff’s/Wrongdoers named herein know their own *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights* Article 1, Clause 1 affirms the right of all people for self-determination to determine their political status

**“All peoples have the right of self-determination. By virtue of that right they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social and cultural development.”** Article 1, Clause 1 [emphasis added]

1. i witnessed each of the Plaintiff’s/Wrongdoers named herein know their own *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights* Article 1, Clause 1 affirms the duty of their corporation to “promote the realization of the right of self-determination” which includes my right to determine my political status

**“The States Parties to the present Covenant, including those having responsibility for the administration of Non-Self-Governing and Trust Territories, shall promote the realization of the right of self-determination, and shall respect that right, in conformity with the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations.”** Article 1, Clause 3 [emphasis added]

which also means that it is NOT up to these Plaintiff’s/Wrongdoers named herein or any of their accomplices to determine my political status, which is proof that their assaulting me with their US citizen / cestui que trust / slave status was deliberate, calculated, self-serving, and malicious

1. i witnessed each of the Plaintiff’s/Wrongdoers named herein breach their requirement to promote my right to self-determination by denying my right to determine my status as a Nevadian Citizen sovereign, rather than their fabricated preferred US citizen / cestui que trust / slave
2. i witnessed each of the Plaintiff’s/Wrongdoers named herein know their own *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights* Article 2, Clause 3 affirms their duty to provide a remedy when my rights have been violated

**“Each State Party to the present Covenant undertakes:**

**(a) To ensure that any person whose rights or freedoms as herein recognized are violated shall have an effective remedy, notwithstanding that the violation has been committed by persons acting in an official capacity;”** Article 2, Clause 3 [emphasis added]

1. i witnessed each of the Plaintiff’s/Wrongdoers named herein know their own *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights* Article 16 requires that;

**“Everyone shall have the right to recognition everywhere as a person before the law.”** Article 16

1. i witnessed each of the Plaintiff’s/Wrongdoers named herein know Congress is the Supreme Legislating body for the District of Columbia

**“Congress is the supreme legislative body of District of Columbia; District of Columbia is a municipal corporation, and not department of government, or sovereignty, and while, in sense, it may be called state, it is such in very qualified sense."** Metropolitan R. Co. v District of Columbia (1889) 132 US 1, 33 L Ed 231, 10 S Ct 19.

1. i witnessed each of the plaintiffs/wrongdoers named herein know United States is a municipal corporation domiciled in the District of Columbia

**"AN ACT To enact the Uniform Commercial Code for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes."** 77 Stat 630 Public Law 88-243

**“(h) The United States is located in the District of Columbia.”** Uniform Commercial Code Sec. 9.307. LOCATION OF DEBTOR.

1. i witnessed each of the Plaintiff’s/Wrongdoers named herein know Congress, as the supreme legislating body for the District of Columbia signed onto the UNIDROIT Treaty, and United Nations Charter, and the *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights*

**“Congress is the supreme legislative body of District of Columbia; District of Columbia is a municipal corporation, and not department of government, or sovereignty, and while, in sense, it may be called state, it is such in very qualified sense."** Metropolitan R. Co. v District of Columbia (1889) 132 US 1, 33 L Ed 231, 10 S Ct 19

which are applicable ONLY in the District of Columbia and the territories

1. i witnessed each of thePlaintiff’s/Wrongdoers named herein know the District of Columbia is NOT authorized to enter into Treaties

**“No State shall enter into any Treaty, Alliance, or Confederation…”** Article 1, Section 10, Clause 1, Constitution for the United States of America

1. i witnessed each of the Plaintiff’s/Wrongdoers named herein know all Treaties “made under the authority of the United States are the Supreme Law of the land…”

**“This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof; and all Treaties made, or which shall be made, under the Authority of the United States, shall be the supreme Law of the Land; and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby, any Thing in the Constitution or Laws of any State to the Contrary notwithstanding.”** Article VI, Clause 2, Constitution for the United States of America [emphasis added]

1. i witnessed each of the Plaintiff’s/Wrongdoers named herein know the *Constitution for the United States of America* is a trust indenture

**“There is no such thing as a power of inherent Sovereignty in the government(s) of the United States. In this country Sovereignty resides in the people, and congress can exercise no power which they have not, by their Constitution entrusted to it: All else is withheld”**. Julliard VS. Greenman, 110 U.S. 421

**"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 entrust to whom they please. ... The sovereignty in every state resides in the people of the state and they may alter and change their form of government at their own pleasure."** --Luther v. Borden, 48 US 1, 12 Led 581 [emphasis added]

**“The government of the United States . . . is one of limited powers. It can exercise authority over no subjects, except those which have been delegated to it. Congress cannot, by legislation, enlarge the federal jurisdiction, nor can it be enlarged under the treaty-making power”** Mayor of New Orleans v. United States, 10 Pet. 662, 736 [emphasis added]

1. i witnessed each of the Plaintiff’s/Wrongdoers named herein know when Congress says the legal estate in the District of Columbia is a cestui que trust

**“Chap. 854. – An Act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia.”**

which was Approved on March 3, 1901, by the Fifty-Sixth Congress, Session II, at 31 Stat. 1189, and at Chapter Fifty-Six in Sec. 1617, at 31 Stat. 1432, where it says;

**“The Legal Estate to be in Cestui Que Use”**

and at Chapter three – Absence for Seven Years, in Sec. 252, 253, at 31 Stat. 1230, where it says they can presume you are dead;

**“SEC. 252. PRESUMPTION OF DEATH. - If any person shall leave his domicile without any known intention of changing the same, and shall not return or be heard from for seven years from the time of his so leaving, he shall be presumed to be dead, in any case wherein his death shall come in question, unless proof be made that he was alive within that time.**

therefore the District of Columbia and the municipal corporations THE UNITED STATES and all of its subsidiaries THE STATE OF TEXAS, THE STATE OF ARIZONA, and all of the other so-called ‘STATE’s are owned and operated by their Roman Cult handlers

1. i witnessed each of the Plaintiff’s/Wrongdoers named herein know Congress has legislated that the Roman Cult owns and operates the District of Columbia, and the unconstitutional municipal corporation called THE UNITED STATES which is located in the District of Columbia, and all of its subsidiaries, including THE STATE OF NEVADA and THE STATE OF ARIZONA, and all other such unconstitutional municipal corporations

**“There has been created a fictional federal State (of) xxxxxx within a state. See Howard v. Sinking Fund of Louisville, 344 U.S. 624, 73 S.Ct. 465, 476, 97 L.Ed. 617 (1953)”;** Schwarts v. O'Hara TP School District, 100 A 2d. 621, 625, 375, Pa. 440

Dissenting opinion of Justice Marshall Harlan. **“Two national governments exist, one to be maintained under the Constitution, with all its restrictions, the other to be maintained by Congress outside and independently of that instrument”** Downes v. Bidwell, 182 U.S. 244 1901

**“Eliminating, then, from the opinions of this court all expressions unnecessary to the disposition of the particular case, and gleaning therefrom the exact point decided in each, the following propositions may be considered as established:**

**1. That the District of Columbia and the territories are not states within the judicial clause of the Constitution giving jurisdiction in cases between citizens of different states;**

**3. That the District of Columbia and the territories are states as that word is used in treaties with foreign powers, with respect to the ownership, disposition, and inheritance of property; [cestui que trust]**

**4. That the territories are not within the clause of the Constitution providing for the creation of a supreme court and such inferior courts as Congress may see fit to establish;”** Downes v Bidwell 182 US 244

and Congress even passed the Act to enact the Uniform Commercial Code in support of the Roman Cult’s UNIDROIT Treaty

**"AN ACT To enact the Uniform Commercial Code for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes."** 77 Stat 630 Public Law 88-243

**“(h) The United States is located in the District of Columbia.”** Uniform Commercial Code Sec. 9.307. LOCATION OF DEBTOR.

1. i witnessed each of the Plaintiff’s/Wrongdoers named herein know they cannot use the Treaty Power internally

**“The government of the United States . . . is one of limited powers. It can exercise authority over no subjects, except those which have been delegated to it. Congress cannot, by legislation, enlarge the federal jurisdiction, nor can it be enlarged under the treaty-making power”** Mayor of New Orleans v. United States, 10 Pet. 662, 736 [emphasis added]

**“but Madison insisted that just “because this power is given to Congress,” it did not follow that the Treaty Power was “absolute and unlimited.” The President and the Senate lacked the power “to dismember the empire,” for example, because “[t]he exercise of the power must be consistent with the object of the delegation.” “The object of treaties,” in Madison’s oft-repeated formulation, “is the regulation of intercourse with foreign nations, and is external.”** Bond v United States 572 US \_\_\_\_ (2014) case number 12-158 [emphasis added]

**“Today, it is enough to high­light some of the structural and historical evidence sug­gesting that the Treaty Power can be used to arrange intercourse with other nations, but not to regulate purely domestic affairs.”** Bond v United States 572 US \_\_\_\_ (2014) case number 12-158 [emphasis added]

1. i witnessed each of the Plaintiff’s/Wrongdoers named herein assault me with their unconstitutional application of International law internally
2. i witnessed each of the Plaintiff’s/Wrongdoers named herein know that their alleged foreclosure proceedings is under a statute, where the so-called Judge is actually a (bought and paid for), Clerk masquerading as a Judge

**“"When acting to enforce a statute and its subsequent amendments to the present date, the judge of the municipal court is acting as an administrative officer and not in a judicial capacity; courts administrating or enforcing statutes do not act judicially, but merely ministerially….but merely act as an extension as an agent for the involved agency -- but only in a “ministerial” and not a “discretionary capacity...”** Thompson v. Smith, 154 S.E. 579, 583; Keller v. P.E., 261 US 428; F.R.C. v. G.E., 281, U.S. 464 [emphasis added]

**"It is the accepted rule, not only in state courts, but, of the federal courts as well, that when a judge is enforcing administrative law they are described as mere 'extensions of the administrative agency for superior reviewing purposes' as a ministerial clerk for an agency..."** 30 Cal 596; 167 Cal 762

**"...judges who become involved in enforcement of mere statutes (civil or criminal in nature and otherwise), act as mere "clerks" of the involved agency..."** K.C. Davis, ADMIN. LAW, Ch. 1 (CTP. West's 1965 Ed.)

and the (bought and paid for) Clerk masquerading as a Judge holds an show-trial and legislative kangaroo court, because a (bought and paid for) Clerk masquerading as a Judge cannot do anything judicial, and if they attempt to do anything judicial it is a nullity

**"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

and the decisions of their legislative so-called court are advisory ONLY and mean absolutely nothing

**“It is noted as significant that the act constituting the court dispenses with trial by jury, a provision which was distinctly upheld in spite of the Seventh Amendment in *McElrath v.* *United States,* 102 U. S. 426. With respect to the status of the court, the opinion concludes (pp. 279 U. S. 454-455):**

**"While what has been said of the creation and special function of the court definitely reflects its status as a legislative court, there is propriety in mentioning the fact that Congress always has treated it as having that status. From the outset, Congress has required it to give merely advisory decisions…. Under the act creating it, all of its decisions were to be of that nature….This is true at the present time. A duty to give decisions which are advisory only, and so without force as judicial judgments, may be laid on a legislative court, but not on a constitutional court established under Art. III."”** Williams v United States 289 U.S. 553 (1933)

and the Plaintiff’s/Wrongdoers are operating in their private capacity

**“All oaths must be lawful, allowed by the common law, or some statute; if they are administered by persons in a private capacity, or not duly authorized, they are *coram non judice,* and void; …. 3 *Inst.* 165; 4 *Inst.* 278; 2 *Roll. Abr. 277.*”** Tomlin’s Law Dictionary 1835 Edition, Volume 2;

as revenue officers under the Federal Tax Lien act of 1966

**"(h) DEFINITION’s. ….** **"(3) MOTOR VEHICLE.-The term 'motor vehicle' means a self-propelled vehicle which is registered for highway use under the laws of any State or foreign country.** **"(4) SECURITY.-The term 'security' means any bond, debenture, note, or certificate or other evidence of indebtedness, issued by a corporation or a government or political subdivision thereof, with interest coupons or in registered form, share of stock, voting trust certificate, or any certificate of interest or participation in, certificate of deposit or receipt for, temporary or interim certificate for, or warrant or right to subscribe to or purchase any of the foregoing: negotiable instrument: or money.”** Tax Lien Act of 1966 at Public Law 89-719 at 80 Stat. 1130-1131

and the allegedPlaintiff’s/Wrongdoers are personally liable in their private capacity

**“...where any state proceeds against a private individual in a judicial forum it is well settled that the state, county, municipality, etc. waives any immunity to counters, cross claims and complaints, by direct or collateral means regarding the matters involved.”** Luckenback v. The Thekla, 295 F 1020, 226 Us 328; Lyders v. Lund, 32 F2d 308;

**“When enforcing mere statutes, judges of all courts do not act judicially” (and thus are not protected by “qualified” or “limited immunity,”** - SEE: Owen v. City, 445 U.S. 662; Bothke v. Terry, 713 F2d 1404) - -

but the clerks like to use it as an excuse to assault me with their foreclosure proceeding, which is a void judgments

**"Where there is no jurisdiction there is no judge; the proceeding is as nothing. Such has been the law from the days of the Marshalsea, 10 Coke 68; also Bradley v. Fisher, 13 Wall 335,351."** Manning v. Ketcham, 58 F.2d 948

**“A void judgment is one which, from its inception, was a complete nullity and without legal effect”** Lubben v. Selective Service System Local Bd. No. 27,  453 F.2d 645, 14 A.L.R. Fed. 298 (C.A. 1 Mass. 1972).  Hobbs v. U.S. Office of Personnel Management,  485 F.Supp. 456 (M.D. Fla. 1980) [emphasis added]

**“Void judgment is one which has no legal force or effect whatever, it is an absolute nullity, its invalidity may be asserted by any person whose rights are affected at any time and at any place and it need not be attacked directly but may be attacked collaterally whenever and wherever it is interposed.”**  City of Lufkin v. McVicker,  510 S.W. 2d 141 (Tex. Civ. App. – Beaumont 1973) [emphasis added]

**“A void judgment, insofar as it purports to be pronouncement of  court, is an absolute nullity”** Thompson v. Thompson,  238 S.W.2d 218 (Tex.Civ.App. – Waco 1951) [emphasis added]

**“Void order may be attacked, either directly or collaterally, at any time”**  In re Estate of Steinfield, 630 N.E.2d 801, certiorari denied, See also Steinfeld v. Hoddick, 513 U.S. 809, (Ill. 1994) [emphasis added]

**“A void judgment is one which, from its inception, is and forever continues to be absolutely null, without legal efficacy, ineffectual to bind the parties or to support a right, of no legal force and effect whatever, and incapable of enforcement in any manner or to any degree.”** Loyd v. Director, Dept. of Public Safety, 480 So. 2d 577 (Ala. Civ. App. 1985) [emphasis added]

all of which is brutum fulmen

*“***brutum fulmen***”:* **“An empty noise; an empty threat.  A judgment void upon its face which is in legal effect no judgment at all, and by which no rights are divested, and from which none can be obtained; and neither binds****nor bars anyone.  Dollert v. Pratt-Hewitt Oil Corporation, Tex.Civ.Appl,****179 S.W.2d 346, 348. *Also, see* Corpus Juris Secundum, “Judgments”** **§§ 499, 512 546, 549.**Black’s Law Dictionary, 4th Edition

1. i witnessed all of the Plaintiff’s/Wrongdoers named herein and others known and unknown, are the real terrorists

**“Terrorism - *noun* – 2 A system of government that seeks to rule by intimidation.”** Funk and Wagnal’s New Practical Standard Dictionary (1946)

1. i witnessed each of the Plaintiff’s/Wrongdoers named herein know all of their statutes, codes, rules are Bills of Pains and Penalties,

an act is a "bill of attainder" when the punishment is death and a "bill of pains and penalties" when the punishment is less severe [than death]; both kinds of punishment fall within the scope of the constitutional prohibition.  U.S.Const.  Art. I,  Sec. 9, Cl. 3 (as to Congress); Art. I, Sec. 10 (as to state legislatures)

**“bill of attainder. 2. A special legislative act prescribing punishment, without a trial, for a specific person or group. • Bills of attainder are prohibited by the U.S. Constitution (art. I, § 9, cl. 3; art. I, § 10, cl. 1). — Also termed act of attainder. See ATTAINDER; BILL OF PAINS AND PENALTIES . [Cases: Constitutional Law 82.5. C.J.S. Constitutional Law §§ 429–431.]”** Black’s Law Dictionary, 8th Edition, page 496

**“BILL OF PAINS AND PENALTIES** **bill of pains and penalties. A legislative act that, though similar to a bill of attainder, prescribes punishment less severe than capital punishment. • Bills of pains and penalties are included within the U.S. Constitution's ban on bills of attainder. U.S. Const. art I, § 9. [Cases: Constitutional Law 82.5. C.J.S. Constitutional Law §§ 429–431.]”** Black’s Law Dictionary, 8th Edition, page 499

because there was no judicial trial, since they want to be Clerks masquerading as Judges, in legislative kangaroo courts, as described herein.

1. i witnessed each of the Plaintiff’s/Wrongdoers named herein know that they have denied me due process by assaulting with their kangaroo court legislative tribunal

**“It is a fundamental right of a party to have a neutral and detached judge preside over the judicial proceedings.”** Ward v Village of Monroeville, 409 U.S. 57, 61-62, 93 S.Ct 80, 83, 34 L.Ed. 2d 267 (1972); Tumey v Ohio, 273 U.S. 510, 5209, 47 S. Ct. 437, 440, 71 L.Ed. 749 (1927)

where the clerks masquerading as Judges, and hold a show-trial in their kangaroo court, convict me of being their US citizen / cestui que trust / slave, with no witnesses, with no evidence, and with no testimony.

1. i witnessed each of the Plaintiff’s/Wrongdoers named herein know that Nevada is part of the territory that was granted by Spain with the Treaty of Hidalgo, and it under martial law

**“A place, district, or country occupied by an enemy stands, in consequence of the occupation, under the Martial Law of the invading or occupying army, whether any proclamation declaring Martial Law, or any public warning to the inhabitants, has been issued or not. Martial Law is the immediate and direct effect and consequence of occupation or conquest. The presence of a hostile army proclaims its Martial Law.”** Article 1, Lieber Code [emphasis added]

**“Territory is considered occupied when it is actually placed under the authority of the hostile army.**

**The occupation extends only to the territory where such authority has been established and can be exercised.”** Law and Customs of War on Land (Hague IV), Article 42

and the end of Martial Law, can ONLY happen in 1 of 2 ways, by Proclamation by the Commander and Chief, or by specific mention in a Treaty of Peace

**“Martial Law does not cease during the hostile occupation, except by special proclamation, ordered by the commander in chief; or by special mention in the treaty of peace concluding the war, when the occupation of a place or territory continues beyond the conclusion of peace as one of the conditions of the same.”** Article 2, Lieber Code [emphasis added]

**“NOTE: Under the Law-Martial, only the criminal jurisdiction of a *Military Court* is the recognized law. But as Article Three says, "*the civil courts can continue wholly or in part as long as the civil jurisdiction does not violate the Military orders laid down by the Commander in Chief or one of his Commanders*." By this means; a military venue, jurisdiction, and authority are imposed upon the occupied populace under disguise of the ordinary civil courts and officers of the occupied district or region, because the so-called civil authorities in an occupied district, or region, only act at the pleasure of a military authority.**

**It should also be noted here that the several State Legislatures, County Boards of Commissioners, and City Councils, are constantly legislating to please the edicts of the federal government (*the occupying force*) and that their legislation, in this sense, is not an exercise of State sovereignty, but instead, a compliance with edicts of the military force which occupies the several States and consequently are edicts of *Martial Law Rule*.”** Dyett v Turner 439 P2d 266 @ 269, 20 U2d 403 [1968] The Non-Ratification of the Fourteenth Amendment by Judge A.H. Ellett, Utah Supreme Court [emphasis added]

and the Treaty of Hidalgo says nothing about ending Martial Law, and there has been no proclamations ending Martial Law, therefore, the Hague Convention on the Treatment of Civilians in a Time of War of 1949, and Hague Convention IV both apply and Article

**“Territory is considered occupied when it is actually placed under the authority of the hostile army.**

**The occupation extends only to the territory where such authority has been established and can be exercised.”** Law and Customs of War on Land (Hague IV), Article 42

**“In addition to the provisions which shall be implemented in peacetime, the present Convention shall apply to all cases of declared war or of any other armed conflict which may arise between two or more of the High Contracting Parties, even if the state of war is not recognized by one of them.**

**The Convention shall also apply to all cases of partial or total occupation of the territory of a High Contracting Party, even if the said occupation meets with no armed resistance.**

**Although one of the Powers in conflict may not be a party to the present Convention, the Powers who are parties thereto shall remain bound by it in their mutual relations. They shall furthermore be bound by the Convention in relation to the said Power, if the latter accepts and applies the provisions thereof.”** Article 2, Geneva Convention Relative to the Protection of Civilians in Time of War of 1949 [emphasis added]

**“The present Convention shall apply from the outset of any conflict or occupation mentioned in Article 2.**

**In the territory of Parties to the conflict, the application of the present Convention shall cease on the general close of military operations.**

**In the case of occupied territory, the application of the present Convention shall cease one year after the general close of military operations; however, the Occupying Power shall be bound, for the duration of the occupation, to the extent that such Power exercises the functions of government in such territory, by the provisions of the following Articles of the present Convention: 1 to 12, 27, 29 to 34, 47, 49, 51, 52, 53, 59, 61 to 77, 143.”** Article 6, Geneva Convention Relative to the Protection of Civilians in Time of War of 1949 [emphasis added]

all of which means that the Plaintiff’s/Wrongdoers are violating my religious convictions in violation of Article 27

**“Protected persons are entitled, in all circumstances, to respect for their persons, … their religious convictions and practices, and their manners and customs.…**

**Without prejudice to the provisions relating to their state of health, age and sex, all protected persons shall be treated with the same consideration by the Party to the conflict in whose power they are, without any adverse distinction based, in particular, on race, religion or political opinion.….”** Article 27, Geneva Convention Relative to the Protection of Civilians in Time of War of 1949 [emphasis added]

and the Plaintiff’s/Wrongdoers are punishing me for something their fraudulently created cestui que trust is alleged to have done, and they are pillaging in violation of Article 33

**“No protected person may be punished for an offence he or she has not personally committed. Collective penalties and likewise all measures of intimidation or of terrorism are prohibited.**

**Pillage is prohibited.**

**Reprisals against protected persons and their property are prohibited.”** Article 33, Geneva Convention Relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War of 1949 [emphasis added]

1. i witnessed each of the Plaintiff’s/Wrongdoers named herein know that they need to fabricate evidence of their US citizen / cestui que trust by compelling payment in federal reserve notes or their equivalent = government employee = US citizen

**“Sec. 15. As used in this Act the term “United States” means the Government of the United States…the term “currency of the United States” means currency which is legal tender in the United States, and includes United States notes,…Federal Reserve Notes…”** Gold Reserve Act of 1934, 48 Stat. 337

**“At common law only gold and silver were a legal tender. (2 Inst. 577.)”** McClarin v. Nesbit, 2 Nott & McC. (11 S.C.L.) 519 (1820)

thereby presuming, under the District of Columbia code, that you are a criminally converted US citizen / cestui que trust

**“The power to create presumptions is not a means of escape from constitutional restrictions.”** Bailey v Alabama, 219 U.S. 219, 238, et seq., 31 S.Ct. 145; Manley v Georgia, 279 U.S. 1, 5-6, 49 S.Ct. 215

1. i witnessed each of the Plaintiff’s/Wrongdoers named herein know i can be a state citizen without being their criminally converted US citizen

**"there is in our Political System, a government of each of the several states and a government of the United States  Each is distinct from the other and has citizens of its own."** . US vs. Cruikshank, 92 US 542,

**"One may be a citizen of a State and yet not a citizen of the United States. Thomasson v State, 15 Ind. 449; Cory v Carter, 48 Ind. 327 (17 Am. R. 738); McCarthy v. Froelke, 63 Ind. 507; In Re Wehlitz, 16 Wis. 443."** Mc Donel v State, 90 Ind. Rep. 320 at pg 323

**"There is a clear distinction between national citizenship and state citizenship."** 256 P. 545, affirmed 278 US 123, Tashiro vs. Jordan

**“Instead this provision protects only those rights peculiar to being a citizen of the federal government; it does not protect those rights which relate to state citizenship."** Jones v. Temmer, 89 F. Supp 1226 (1993)

**"Such construction ignores the rights of a state in virtue of its sovereignty to confer citizenship within its own limits, where the rights incident to such a status are not of the citizenship mentioned in the federal Constitution. It does not follow that, because one has all the rights and privileges of a citizen of a state, he must be a citizen of the United States. Such a distinction has long been recognized in this County."** See Scott v. Sandford, 19 How. (U.S.) 393, 15 L.Ed. 691; Mitchell v. Wells, 37 Miss. 235

**"The rights of (original judicial) Citizens of the States, as such, are not under consideration in the fourteenth amendment. They stand as they did before the fourteenth amendment, and are fully guaranteed under other provisions."** United States v. Anthony, 24 Fed. Cas. 829, 930 (1873).

**"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

**“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

**"State Citizenship is a vested substantial property right, and the State has no power to divest or impair these rights."** Favot v. Kingsbury, (1929) 98 Cal. App. 284, 276 P. 1083

and their own statutes talk about state citizens in the Judicial Code of 1911 was created at 36 Stat. 1087, where it says;

**"CHAP. 231. - An Act To codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary.**

and at 36 Stat. 1091 under the heading; **"CHAPTER Two.** **DISTRICT COURTS - JURISDICTION."** it says;

**SEC. 24 . The district courts shall have original jurisdiction as follows:** **First. Of all suits of a civil nature, at common law or in equity, brought by the United States, or by any officer thereof authorized by United States law to sue, or between citizens of the same State claiming lands under grants from different States; or, where the matter in controversy exceeds, exclusive of interest and costs, the sum or value of three thousand dollars, and (a) arises under the Constitution or laws of the United States, or treaties made, or which shall be made, under their authority, or (b) is between Citizens of different States, or (c) is between citizens of a State and foreign States citizens, or subjects. No district court shall have cognizance of any suit (except upon bills of exchange) to recover upon any promissory note or other chose in action in favor of any assignee, or of any subsequent holder if such instrument be payable to bearer and be not made by any corporation, unless such suit might have been prosecuted in such court to recover upon said note or other chose in action if no assignment had been made: Provided, however, That the foregoing provision as to the sum or value of the matter in controversy shall not be construed to apply to any of the cases mentioned in the succeeding paragraphs of this section:**…**."** [emphasis added]

1. i witnessed each of the Plaintiff’s/Wrongdoers named herein know their own legitimate authority comes from me and the rest of the State Citizens

**"The sovereignty of a state does not reside in the persons who fill the different departments of its government, but in the People, from whom the government emanated; and they may change it at their discretion.  Sovereignty, then in this country, abides with the constituency, and not with the agent; and this remark is true, both in reference to the federal and state government.“** Spooner v. McConnell, 22 F 939 @ 943

**"Sovereignty itself is, of course, not subject to law, for it is the author and source of law; but in our system, while sovereign powers are delegated to the agencies of government, sovereignty itself remains with the people, by whom and for whom all government exists and acts."** Yick Wo v Hopkins, 118 US 356, at pg 370;

**"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).

**"...at the revolution the Sovereignty devolved on the people; and they are truly the sovereigns of the country, but they are sovereigns without subjects ......and have none to govern but themselves; the citizens of America are equal as fellow citizens, and as joint tenants in the sovereignty."** Chisholm v Georgia, 2 Dall. 440, at pg 471;

**“the government is but an agency to the state,”** -- the state being the sovereign people. *State v. Chase, 175 Minn, 259, 220 N.W. 951, 953*

**"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 entrust to whom they please. ... The sovereignty in every state resides in the people of the state and they may alter and change their form of government at their own pleasure."** --Luther v. Borden, 48 US 1, 12 L.Ed. 581, [emphasis added]

1. i witnessed each of the Plaintiff’s/Wrongdoers named herein know my rights are not defined by any of their Roman Cult statutes but are unlimited, and I have all the rights of the King

**"The very meaning of 'sovereignty' is that the decree of the sovereign makes law."** American Banana Co. v. United Fruit Co., 29 S.Ct. 511, 513, 213 U.S. 347, 53 L.Ed. 826, 19 Ann.Cas. 1047. [emphasis added]

**“The judicial power is the power to hear those matters which affect life, liberty or property of the Citizens of the State.”** Sapulpa v Land, 101 Okla. 22, 223 Pac. 640, 35 A.L.R. 872,

**“This law of nature, being coeval with mankind and dictated by God himself, is of course superior in obligation to any other. It is binding over all the globe in all countries, and at all times: no human laws are of any validity, if contrary to this; and such of them as are valid derive all their force, and all their authority, mediately or immediately, from this original.”** Blackstone’s Commentaries on the Laws of England (1765-1769) at number 41,

**"Every citizen & freeman is endowed with certain rights & privileges to enjoy which no written law or statute is required. These are the fundamental or natural rights, recognized among all free people."** U.S. v. Morris, 125 F 322, 325

**"As general rule men have natural right to do anything which their inclinations may suggest, if it be not evil in itself, and in no way impairs the rights of others."** In Re Newman (1858), 9 C. 502

**"The people or sovereign are not bound by general word 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."** People v Herkimer, 4 Cowen (NY) 345, 348 (1825)

1. compensation due from the Plaintiff/Wrongdoers, all of the money wrongfully collected by the Plaintiff’s/Wrongdoers.
2. i require an ORDER vacating the fraudulent fictitious foreclosure and all subsequent proceedings.
3. i require that the Plaintiff/Wrongdoer surrender the original note, for inspection, and because it is my property.
4. i require that the Plaintiffs/Wrondoers surrender the original application, for inspection, and because it is my property.
5. i, say here, and will verify in open court, that all herein be true.

 \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_L.S.

 , a man,

not a cestui que trust

not a government employee