**To: *County District Attorney***

***Attorney General of Texas***

***State of*** Texas v John Doe

***Case/Citation Number: 123456***

***Demand for Bill of Particulars***

***Nature and Cause of Accusation***

***U.S. Constitution 6th Amendment***

***NOT A DISCOVERY MOTION ! ! !***

Comes now the Accused, ***John Doe***, a lawful de jure, jus sanguinis State Citizen in his own proper person sui juris pursuant to the  ***unpurviewed 6th Article of the Bill of Rights, the 9th Article of Amendment to, the Constitution for the united States{1787-1791}*** and other applicable provisions of law, to demand of ***Tarrant County District Attorney and/or Texas Attorney General*** a***Bill of Particulars***regarding the ***nature and cause***of the accusations in the hereinabove mentioned citation in order that the Accused might be able enter a***voluntary, knowing and intelligent plea***to the charges, ostensibly some or another alleged ***Vehicle*** code ‘crimes‘, in order that s/he thus be able to put on a***meaningful and substantive defense***to the charges therein in order that s/he not be deprived of life, liberty, or property ***without judicial process*** and be thereby subjected to a***Bill of Attainder or a Bill of Pains & Penalties, (Article I, Section 9 or10, as the case may be, of the Constitution for the united States {1787-1791} , and/or be caused to lose his/her own court (Magna Charta, Article 34)****.*

In the alternative, the Accused will expect a ***written*** notice of dismissal of all charges and a ***written*** order to the ***DMV*** to cease and desist all activities pursuant to Case No. ***123456*** and/or Citation Number ***123456***.

To this end, the following questions are ***specifically***posed, to wit (***not*** an exhaustive list)*:*

***1***. What is the jurisdiction and venue of the alleged causes of action in the instant citation ?? Keep firmly in mind those mentioned in ***Article III of the Constitution for the united States {1787-1791}*** *-- (*see e.g*.* ***US v Hudson 7 Cranch 32****).*

***2****.* What provision(s) of the ***Constitution***(Federal and/or ‘state’) confers authority to proceed in this jurisdiction ??

***3****.* In what way does the person (“person” ?) of the Accused attach to the statute(s) sought to be enforced against him/her ?

***4***. does the word “person” mean the same thing in the statute(s) allegedly violated as it does in Section 1 of the 14th “amendment”, e.g. a “corporation”;

***5***. if so, where are the Articles of Incorporation for Petitioner, and has Petitioner’s Designated Agent for Service of Process been served ??

***6****.* Is there a right to (***effective*** ?) ***assistance of counsel***in the instant case ? If so what provision of the Constitution (Federal and/or ‘state’) secures such a right ?

***7****.* Is there a right to a ***trial by jury according to the course of the common law****,* or otherwise*,* in the instant case and, if so, secured by what provision(s) of the ***Constitution for the united States {1787-1791}*** ??

***8****.* From what pool(s) are members of Grand or petit juries summoned and do these juries function at common law ? If not, pursuant to ***what*** law do they function ?

***9****.* given that the current jurisprudence of the supreme Court which seem to say that there are ***NO*** limits on the commerce clause powers of Congress (***Wickard v Filburn 317 US 111*** – notwithstanding the later decision in ***US v Lopez 514 US 549***), that the Court has ruled that these commerce clause powers are ‘closely associated with the ***admiralty*** jurisdiction’ (***NJ Steam v Merchants Bank 6 How. 344***), that admiralty was decried by the Colonists as a “jurisdiction ***foreign*** to our Constitution and unacknowledged by our laws” (***Declaration of Independence***) and that State judicial Courts of common law general jurisdiction are ***constitutionally forbidden*** to exercise admiralty, what is the factual foundation and legal basis for the trial “court” in the instant case to exercise admiralty jurisdiction ??

***10****.* Who is the alleged ***injured party***or what constitutes the***corpus delicti/scienter***of the alleged “crime” and***what loss of life, liberty, or property***is purportedly alleged in the charges/citation as having been caused by the Accused ?

***11***. Observing that the current ***Texas*** Constitution does ***NOT*** defined them, who is “The State of ***Texas***” who are named as the Plaintiffs whose interests are purportedly represented by the DA ??

**“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]

***12***. With ***NO*** provision of the bastardized version of the ***Texas*** Constitution allegedly currently in effect providing for process being in the name of the “State of ***Texas***”, on ***what*** authority are you proceeding to act to represent the “People” ??

***13****.* What constitutes the ***consent*** ***of the governed*** {See e.g. ***Declaration of Independence 1776****}* of any member of the de jure Body Politic to be regulated other than by the ***common law of England***  *?*

***14***. What are each and every one of the elements of the “crime” which the prosecution has to prove, and what are the definitions of any words and phrases in any alleged statutory acts, most particularly if different from the meanings of such words in ***everyday usage*** ??

**15**. what is the definition of “scienter”, most particularly in any allegedly applicable statute in which “willfulness” is an element, concentrating here on the “violation of a ***known legal duty***” ??

***16***. what is the nature of the instant action ?

[ ] criminal

[ ] civil

[ ] quasi-criminal

[ ] “other”

What is the factual foundation and legal basis for the ‘choice’ ?

***17***. what is the level of burden of proof necessary to get a “conviction” ?

[ ] Beyond a reasonable doubt

[ ] Clear and convincing

[ ] Preponderance of evidence

What is the factual foundation and legal basis to support this ‘choice’ ?

***18***. (check all boxes that apply)

[ ] the nominal Plaintiff is “The People of the State of ***Texas***”, yet the ***Texas*** Constitution makes ***NO*** mention of who the “People of the State of ***Texas***” are ***AND*** no mention of any authority for process to issue in the name of “The People of the State of ***Texas***”. Accordingly, a factual foundation and legal basis is ***essential*** to establish both the Plaintiff and the alleged injury and this information is demanded;

[ ] the nominal Plaintiff is the “State of ***Texas***”, yet ***Article III, Section 2*** of the Constitution for the united States provides, in relevant part here “… and in ***ALL*** cases in which a State shall be a party, the supreme Court shall have original jurisdiction”; how can the trial “court” possibly have any jurisdiction in the instant case at all here ??

[ ] the ‘law(s) attempted to be enforces here, either overtly in a criminal setting or in quasi-civil cases, are purportedly promulgated in the name of “The People of the State of Texas” who are not only ***NOT*** defined anywhere in the Texas Constitution, but such ‘laws’ are, for all apparent intents and purposes, Bills of Attainder which are flatly prohibited by ***at least Article I, Section 9 or 10*** , as the case may be, of the ***Constitution for the united States {1787-1791}***; how can any such purportedly applicable laws be applied in the instant case ??

***19***. What form of payment is accepted to “pay” the fine or, more accurately, to ***discharge the obligation*** for any fine and in what jurisdiction does such medium circulate ?

***20*.** If an offer of discharge of the obligation for the fine is made, will the person accepting such offer be prepared to sign a receipt/declaration under ***penalty of perjury*** that binds the State or United States and estops it from bringing further suit against the Accused for “***willfully***” not ***paying*** the fine ??

***21*.** What is a ***CUSIP*** number and how is it related to the case ?

***22*.** What is the ***CUSIP*** number assigned to this case number and/or Citation number of this case, and what legal significance does this number have ?

***23***. Has this case been “monetized” and, if so, by what agency(ies) and based on what lawful authority(ies) ??

***24***. Are other documents, such as marriage licenses, birth certificates, applications for credit, applications for Social (in)Security, and the like created by individuals also monetized ?? Are any or all of these associated with the jurisdiction of the court ?

***25***. And if “money”, in the form of ***debt*** has thus been created, and created based on the signature of an individual, why is that individual not credited with the creation of such “money” or, if so credited, into what account is such “money“ placed ?

***26*.** Is there in existence an artificial, corporate entity known as “The Superior Court for the County of Commercial County”, or the functional equivalent thereof ??

***27***. If so, has this entity been recognized by, among other commercial banking entities, Dun & Bradstreet, pursuant to some or another registration process ??

***28***. If so, is this entity a “for profit corporation” ??

***29***. If so, where can documents recording the ‘official’ existence of this entity be obtained and/or subpoenaed ??

This list of questions shall ***not*** be construed to be all inclusive and any and all other questions pertaining to this Bill of Particulars are likewise demanded to be answered as well.

Consistent with and pursuant to the obligations of the government relative to the administration of ‘criminal ‘law the answers to the above questions, in ***clear and unambiguous terms***, will be expected in a timely manner ***prior*** to any attempt at arraignment, consistent with the obligations imposed by the Constitution.

It would be well to keep in mind the words of the ***supreme Court of the united States*** regarding the duties of a public prosecutor:

“The United States Attorney is the representative not of an ordinary party to a controversy, but of a sovereignty whose obligation to ***govern impartially*** is as compelling as its obligation to govern all; and whose interests, therefore, in a criminal prosecution is not that it shall win a case, ***but that justice shall be done***. As such, he is in a peculiar and very definite sense a ***servant of the law***, the twofold aim of which is that guilt shall not escape nor ***innocence suffer***. He may prosecute with earnestness and vigor -- indeed -- he should do so. But while he may strike hard blows ***he is not at liberty to strike foul ones***. It is as much his duty to ***refrain from improper methods*** calculated to produce a ***wrongful conviction*** as it is to use every legitimate means to bring about a just one.”

***united States v Berger 295 US 78***

“Decency, security, and liberty alike demand that government officials ***shall be subjected to the same rules of conduct that are commands to the citizen***. In a government of laws, existence of the government will be imperiled ***if it fails to observe the law scrupulously***. Our government is the potent, omnipresent teacher. For good or ill, it teaches the whole people by its example. Crime is contagious. ***If the government becomes a lawbreaker, it breeds contempt for law, it invites every man to become a law unto himself; it invites anarchy***. To declare that in the administration of the criminal law the end justifies the means -- to declare that the government may ***commit crimes*** in order to secure the conviction of a private criminal -- would bring terrible retribution. Against that ***pernicious doctrine*** ***this Court should resolutely set its face***.

***Olmstead v united States 277 US 438***

Attention is also drawn to the case of ***US v Smith 776 Fed 2nd 1104*** in which the court opined, about the importance of the Bill of Particulars, that:

“Historically and functionally, the Bill of Particulars is closely related to the indictment. Bills of Particulars, relative to indictments, have a brief history. Nevertheless, that history closely ties the Bill of Particulars to the indictment. Originally, indictments set forth the accusation in great detail and there was no need for supplementation. The modern trend, however, has been towards ***more skeletal accusations*** (to conceal ***martial law*** jurisdiction ?? -- ed) combined with procedures providing access to omitted details if the defense has a legitimate need for them. FRCrP(7)(f) provides the opportunity for such access. That rule authorizes the court to “direct the filing of a Bill of Particulars”. This is in ***marked contrast*** to the provisions of Rule 16, which authorizes the court to direct that the government “furnish to the defendant certain items of ***discovery***.”

In addition, with multiple jurisdictions existing pursuant to at least federal law, the matter of jurisdiction and venue is the ***prime*** issue, if ***timely*** challenged, as stated in ***U.S. v Tully 140 Fed. Rptr. 899***:

“It is unfortunate that a ***murderer should go unwhipped of justice*** but it would be yet ***more unfortunate if any court should assume to try one charged with a crime without jurisdiction over the offense***.”

Please address all correspondence to me at my address ***exactly*** as it appears below. All rights are reserved to return ***unopened*** any and all correspondence ***with*** a Zip Code absent clear and compelling authority for its use, as being improperly addressed to an artificial entity in a ***federal regional martial law and/or commercial jurisdiction and venue (see e.g. 26 USC 7408(d))***, as opposed to a lawful de jure, ***jus sanguinis*** State Citizen /aka/ member of the sovereign body politic of the Nation & Republic /aka/ ***Beneficiary*** of the Trust known as “The United States”, ***domiciled*** in a State ***judicial*** district in a State admitted into “***this Union***”.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

John Doe/Petitioner -- In Propria Persona Sui Juris

666 Styx Way

Cucamonga, Texas, united States of America