

Azle Texas District of Columbia Municipal Corporation Police Court

THE STATE OF TEXAS

PLAINTIFF

VS

Citation NO. 000000-00000

Richard Travis; Martin
Special appearance

ALLEGED DEFENDANT

**Jurisdictional Challenge
to the prosecution/plaintiff and to the court
by special appearance.**

An appearance de bene esse is designed to permit a party to a proceeding to refuse to submit his person to the jurisdiction of the court unless it is finally determined that he has forever waived that right. Such an appearance is therefore a special appearance designed to allow the accused to meet and any supposed requirement of making an appearance, and at the same time, to refuse to submit to the jurisdiction of any alleged plaintiff (and therefore of the applicable court), unless and until some judicial department prosecutor makes all disclosures, specifically by producing a complaint of damage or injury, signed and verified by the injured party.

FOR THE RECORD

I, the alleged Defendant **Richard Travis; Martin**, Sui Juris, Reserving all rights at all times and places, one of the people, a natural, private common **man**, within the **Texas** a republic, **by special appearance**, do challenge, and demand proof of jurisdiction, appearing on the record, of the prosecution/plaintiff to file charges/suit and prosecute. And further the jurisdiction of the court, appearing on the record, in all actions against the alleged defendant.

VERIFIED NOTICE AND DEMAND TO PRESENT MAJOR OBJECTIONS TO THE CONTINUING, NON-CONSTITUTIONAL ACTIONS ABSENT PROOF OF JURISDICTION APPEARING ON THE RECORD WITH RELIEF BEING TO DISMISS THIS BOGUS ACTION WITH PREJUDICE.

THIS IS NOT A MOTION

"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

"Defense of lack of jurisdiction over the subject matter may be raised at any time, even on appeal." Hill Top Developers v. Holiday Pines Service Corp. 478 So. 2D, 368 Fla a DCA 1985)

"Once challenged, jurisdiction cannot be assumed, it must be proved to exist." Stuck v. Medica1 Examiners 94 Ca 2d 751. 211 P2d 289

"There is no discretion to ignore that lack of jurisdiction." Joyce v. US. 474 F2d 215

"Where jurisdiction is contested, the burden of establishing it **rests upon the plaintiff.**" Loos v American Energy Savers, Inc., 168 I11.App.3d 558, 522 N.E.2d 841(1988)

"the burden of proving jurisdiction **rests upon the party asserting it.**" Binde11 v City Of Harvey. 212 I11.App.3d 1042, 571 N.E.2d 1017(1st Dist. 1991)

"Court must prove on the record, all jurisdiction facts related to the jurisdiction asserted." Lantana v. Hopper,102 F. 2d 188; Chicago v. New York 37 FSupp. 150

*"...[H]owever late this objection [to jurisdiction] has been made, or may be made in any cause, in an inferior or appellate court of the United States, it must be considered and decided, **BEFORE any court can move ONE FURTHER STEP IN THE CAUSE;** as any movement is necessarily the exercise of jurisdiction."* RHODE ISLAND MASSACHUSETTS. 37 U.S. 657, 718, 9 L.Ed. 1233 (1838).

"Where a court failed to observe safeguards, it amounts to denial of due process of law, court is deprived of juris." Merritt v. Hunter. C.A. Kansas 170 F2d 739

*"a universal principle as old as the law is that a proceedings of a court without jurisdiction **are a nullity and its judgment therein without effect either on person or property,**"* Norwood v. Renfield. 34 C 329; Ex parte Giambonini. 49 P. 732

"A court has no jurisdiction to determine its own jurisdiction, for a basic issue in any case before a tribunal is its power to act, and a court must have the authority to decide that question the first instance." Rescue Army v. Municipal Court of Los Angeles. 171 P2d 8: 331 US 549, 91 K. ed. 1666m 67 S. Ct. 1409

"A departure by a court from those recognized and established requirements of law however close apparent adherence to mere form in methods of procedure which has the effect of

depriving one of a constitutional right, is an excess of jurisdiction.” Wuest v. Wuest, 127 P2d 934, 937.

"A court cannot confer jurisdiction where none existed and cannot make a void proceeding valid. It is clear and well established law that a void order can be challenged in any court", OLD WAYNE MUT. L. ASSOC. v. McDONOUGH, 204 U. S. 8, 27 S. Ct. 236 (1907)

"The burden shifts to the court to prove jurisdiction." Rosemond v. Lambert, 469 F 2d 416

*"Thus, where a judicial tribunal has no jurisdiction of the subject matter on which it assumes to act, **its proceedings are absolutely void** in the fullest sense of the term." Dillon v. Dillon, 187 P 27.*

*"the fact that the petitioner was released on a promise to appear before a magistrate for an arraignment, that fact is circumstance to be considered in determining whether **in first instance there was a probable cause for the arrest.**" Monroe v.Papa, DC, Ill. 1963, 221 F Supp 685.*

"When a judge acts where he or she does not have jurisdiction to act, the judge is engaged in an act or acts of treason." US v Will, 449 US 200,216, 101 S Ct, 471, 66 LEd2nd 392, 406 (1980) Cohens V Virginia, 19 US (6 Wheat) 264, 404, 5LEd 257 (1821)

Points:

2. Proof of jurisdiction, appearing on the record, to state jurisdiction on the record the "facts necessary to give jurisdiction". See...

"if the record does not show upon its face the facts necessary to give jurisdiction, they will be presumed not to have existed. "Norman v. Zieber, 3 Or at 202-03.

Also see... *"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. 538 (1974)*

3. Proof of jurisdiction appearing on the record, that plaintiff/prosecutor has standing. (Corpus Delicti) See...

*"For a crime to exist, **there must be an injured party** (Corpus Delicti) There can be no sanction or penalty imposed on one because of this Constitutional right." Sherer v. Cullen 481 F. 945:*

Also see...

*"**With no injured party, a complaint is invalid on its face**". Gibson v. Boyle, 139 Ariz. 512*

Also see...

Supreme courts ruled **“Without Corpus delicti there can be no crime”** “In every prosecution for crime it is necessary to establish the “corpus delecti”, i.e., the body or elements of the crime.” People v. Lopez, 62 Ca.Rptr. 47, 254 C.A.2d 185. Also see... “In every criminal trial, **the prosecution must prove the corpus delecti**, or the body of the crime itself-i.e., the fact of injury, loss or harm, and the existence of a criminal agency as its cause.” People v. Sapp, 73 P.3d 433, 467 (Cal. 2003) [quoting People v. Alvarez, (2002) 27 Cal.4th 1161, 1168-1169, 119 Cal.Rptr.2d 903, 46 P.3d 372.] Also see...

“As a general principal, standing to invoke the judicial process requires an actual **justiciable** controversy as to which the complainant has a **real interest** in the ultimate adjudication because **he or she** has either suffered or is about to suffer an **injury**.” People v. Superior Court, 126 Cal.Rptr.2d 793.

Also see... “Without standing, there is no actual or justiciable controversy, and courts will not entertain such cases. (3 Witlen, Cal. Procedure (3rd ed. 1985) Actions § 44, pp 70-72.)

“Typically, ... the standing inquiry requires careful judicial examination of a complaint’s allegations to ascertain whether the particular plaintiff is entitled to an adjudication of the particular claims asserted.” (Allen v. Wright, (1984) 468 U.S. 737, 752... Whether one has standing in a particular case generally revolved around the question whether that person has rights that may suffer some injury, actual or threatened.” Clifford S. v. Superior Court, 45 Cal.Rptr.2d 333, 335.

4. Proof of jurisdiction, appearing on the record that the alleged defendant is subject to commercial law and or the Uniform Commercial Code in light of the following:

Let it be known to all that I, Richard Travis; Martin explicitly reserve all of my rights. See your...

UCC 1-308 which was formally UCC 1-207. “§ 1-308. *Performance or Acceptance Under Reservation of Rights.* (a) A party that with explicit reservation of rights performs or promises performance or assents to performance in a manner demanded or offered by the other party does not thereby prejudice the rights reserved. Such words as “without prejudice,” “under protest,” **or the like are sufficient.**”

I retain all of my rights and liberties at all times and in all places, **nunc pro tunc** (now for then) from the time of my birth and forevermore. Further, I retain my rights not to be compelled to perform under any contract that I did not enter knowingly, voluntarily and intentionally. And

furthermore, I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed contract. I am not ever subject to silent contracts and have never knowingly or willingly contracted away my sovereignty.

5. Proof of jurisdiction, appearing on the record, that the defendant is subject to rules, codes and regulations. See...

"All codes, rules and regulations are applicable to the government authorities only, not Human/Creators in accordance with God's laws. All codes, rules and regulations are unconstitutional and lacking in due process..." RODRIQUES v RAY DONAVAN (U.S. Department of Labor), 769 F. 2d 1344, 1348 (1985).

6. Proof of jurisdiction appearing on the record, to force the alleged defendant into involuntary servitude. See...

UNITED STATES V. KOZMINSKI, 487 U. S. 931 (1988) *"For purposes of criminal prosecution under § 241 or § 1584, the term "involuntary servitude" necessarily means a condition of servitude in which the victim is forced to work for the defendant by the use or threat of physical restraint or physical injury or by the use or threat of coercion through law or the legal process. This definition encompasses cases in which the defendant holds the victim in servitude **by placing him or her in fear of such physical restraint or injury or legal coercion.**"*

Also see... The constitution for the united States 1789, 13th amendment, Section 1. *Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the united States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction. Also see...*

The constitution for the united States, 1789, Preamble *We the people of the united States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, **and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity**, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the united States of America.*

7. Proof of jurisdiction appearing on the record, that the alleged defendant is a person or other legal or commercial entity. See your satanic...

UCC 1-201 General Definitions (27) *"Person" means an individual, corporation, business trust, estate, trust, partnership, limited liability company, association, joint venture, government,*

governmental subdivision, agency, or instrumentality, public corporation, **or any other legal or commercial entity**. Also see...

American Law and Procedure, Vol. 13, page 137, 1910: "This word 'person' and its scope and bearing in the law, involving, as it does, legal fictions and also apparently natural beings, it is difficult to understand; but it is absolutely necessary to grasp, at whatever cost, a true and proper understanding to the word in all the phases of its proper use ... A person is here not a physical or individual person, but the status or condition with which he is invested ... **not an individual or physical person, but the status, condition or character borne by physical persons...The law of persons is the law of status or condition.**" Also see... Uniform Commercial code creates a corporate State of the United States, the federal corporation. As opposed to one of the de jure several States.

Also See...

UCC 1-201. General Definitions. (38)"State" means a State of the [corporate] United States, ... As opposed to...

USC TITLE 28 > PART VI > CHAPTER 176 > SUBCHAPTER A >§ 3002Definitions (14)"State" means any of the [de jure union states] several States,...

8. Proof of jurisdiction, appearing on the record, that the alleged defendant is not sovereign. See...

"In the United States the People are sovereign and the government cannot sever its relationship to the People by taking away their citizenship." Afroyim v. Rusk, 387 U.S. 253(1967).

Also see... **"The People of a State are entitled to all rights which formerly belonged to the King by his prerogative."** Lansing v. Smith, 4 Wendel 19, 20(1829) Also see...

In Europe, the executive is synonymous with the sovereign power of a state...where it is too commonly acquired by force or fraud or both...In America, however the case is widely different. Our government is founded upon Compact. **Sovereignty was, and is, in the People.** Glass v. The Sloop Betsy, 3 Dall 6. (1794)

9. Proof of jurisdiction appearing on the record, to force the alleged defendant or other sovereigns to be subject to statutes.

See... US Supreme Court in Wilson v. Omaha Indian Tribe, 442 US 653, 667 (1979): "In common usage, **the term 'person' does not include the sovereign, and statutes employing**

the word are ordinarily construed to exclude it." Also see...

US Supreme Court in U.S. v. Cooper, 312 US 600,604, 61 S.Ct 742 (1941): "**Since in common usage the term 'person' does not include the sovereign, statutes employing that term are ordinarily construed to exclude it.**"

Also see... US Supreme Court in U.S. v. United Mine Workers of America, 330 U.S. 258 67 S.Ct677 (1947): "**In common usage, the term 'person' does not include the sovereign and statutes employing it will ordinarily not be construed to do so.**"

Also see... US Supreme Court in US v. Fox, 94 US 315: "**Since in common usage, the term 'person' does not include the sovereign, statutes employing the phrase are ordinarily construed to exclude it.**" Also see...

U.S. v. General Motors Corporation, D.C. Ill, 2 F.R.D. 528, 530: "**In common usage the word 'person' does not include the sovereign, and statutes employing the word are generally construed to exclude the sovereign.**" Also see...

Church of Scientology v. US Department of Justice, 612 F.2d 417, 425 (1979): "**the word 'person' in legal terminology is perceived as a general word which normally includes in its scope a variety of entities other than human beings. See e.g., 1 U.S.C. Sec. 1.**"

10. Proof of jurisdiction, appearing on the record, that the alleged defendant is a citizen of the United States and not a State Citizen in light of the following:

I, **Richard Travis; Martin**, am not a United States corporation citizen or a 14th amendment citizen. I am a State Citizen of one of the **several** states of the republic, and **not** as a state of the United States®.

And I reject any attempted expatriation.

See... attached Affidavit of Corporate Denial

Also see... Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act (FSIA) of 1976

Also see... USC TITLE 28 > PART IV > CHAPTER 97 -JURISDICTIONAL IMMUNITIES OF FOREIGN STATES § 1604. Immunity of a foreign state from jurisdiction Subject to existing international agreements to which the United States is a party at the time of enactment of this Act a foreign state shall be immune from the jurisdiction of the courts of the United States and of the States except as provided in sections 1605 to 1607 of this chapter. Also see...

In Volume 20: Corpus Juris Sec. § 1785 we find "**The United States government is a foreign corporation with respect to a State**"(see: NY re: Merriam 36 N.E. 505 1441 S. 0.1973, 14 L. Ed. 287).

Also see... DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (the United States ®) created by the Congressional act of 1871, which states "... *the District of Columbia, by which name it is hereby constituted a **body corporate for municipal purposes, and may contract and be contracted with, sue and be sued, plead and be impleaded...***"

Also see... "*The idea prevails with some, indeed it has expression in arguments at the bar, that we have in this country substantially **two national governments; one to be maintained under the Constitution, with all its restrictions; the other to be maintained by Congress outside and independently of that instrument, by exercising such powers as other nations of the earth are accustomed to...**I take leave to say that, if the principles thus announced should ever receive the sanction of a majority of this court, a radical and mischievous change in our system will result. We will, in that event, pass from the era of constitutional liberty guarded and protected by a written constitution into an era of legislative absolutism ... It will be an evil day for American Liberty if the theory of a government outside the Supreme Law of the Land finds lodgment in our Constitutional Jurisprudence. **No higher duty rests upon this court than to exert its full authority to prevent all violation of the principles of the Constitution.**"*

--Honorable Supreme Court Justice John Harlan in the 1886 case of *Downes v. Bidwell*.

Also see... UCC 1-201. General Definitions(38) "*State*" means a *State of the United States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the United States Virgin Islands, or any territory or insular possession subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.* Also see...

TITLE 18 > PART I > CHAPTER 43 > § 911: Citizen of the United States "*Whoever falsely and willfully represents himself to be a citizen of the United States shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than three years, or both.*" Also see...

Declaration of Independence. (Adopted by Congress on July 4, 1776): *The Unanimous Declaration of the Thirteen United States of America* "*We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.*"

11. Proof of jurisdiction, appearing on the record, that the alleged defendant cannot have status of State Citizen. See...

15 United States statute at large, July 27th, 1868 also known as the expatriation statute.

Also see... U.S. v. Anthony 24 Fed. 829 (1873) "*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.**"

Also see...

"We have in our political system a government of the United States and a government of each of the several States. **Each one of these governments is distinct from the others, and each has citizens of it's own ...**" United States v. Cruikshank, 92 U.S. 542 (1875)

Also see... "...he was not a citizen of the United States, he was a citizen and voter of the State,..."**"One may be a citizen of a State an yet not a citizen of the United States"**.

McDonel v. The State, 90 Ind. 320 (1883)

Also see... **"That there is a citizenship of the United States and citizenship of a state, ..."**
Tashiro v. Jordan, 201 Cal. 236(1927)

Also see... "A citizen of the United States is a citizen of the federal government ..."
Kitchens v. Steele, 112 F.Supp 383

Also see... State v. Manuel, 20 NC 122: "the term 'citizen' in the United States, is analogous to the term 'subject' in common law; the change of phrase has resulted from the change in government."

Also see... Jones v. Temmer, 89 F. Supp 1226: "The privileges and immunities clause of the 14th Amendment protects very few rights because it neither incorporates the Bill of Rights, nor protects all rights of individual citizens. Instead this provision protects only those rights peculiar to being a citizen of the federal government; it does not protect those rights which relate to state citizenship."

Also see... Supreme Court: US vs. Valentine 288 F. Supp. 957: "The only absolute and unqualified right of a United States citizen is to residence within the territorial boundaries of the United States."

12. Proof of jurisdiction, appearing on the record, that the alleged defendants' rights are alienable. See...

"Men are endowed by their Creator with certain **unalienable rights**,-'life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness;' and to 'secure,' **not grant or create, these rights, governments are instituted. That property [or income] which a man has honestly acquired he retains full control of.**"
[Budd v. People of State of New York, 143 U.S. 517 (1892)]

13. Proof of jurisdiction, appearing on the record. To deny the alleged defendant the right to

travel. See...

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."

Also see...

"The claim and exercise of a constitutional right cannot be converted into a crime." Miller v. US, 230 F 486, at 489.

Also see...

"There can be no sanction or penalty imposed upon one because of this exercise of constitutional rights." Sherer v. Cullen, 481 F 946.

14. Proof of jurisdiction, appearing on the record, to convert a liberty into a privilege. See... Murdock v. Penn., 319 US 105, (1943) "No state shall convert a liberty into a privilege, license it, and attach a fee to it." Also see... Shuttlesworth v. Birmingham, 373 US 262, (1969) "If the state converts a liberty into a privilege, the citizen can engage in the right with impunity."

Also see... Miranda v. Arizona, 384 U.S. 436, (1966) "Where rights secured by the Constitution are involved, there can be no rule making or legislation, which would abrogate them."

15. Proof of jurisdiction, appearing on the record, to conspire against or deprive the rights of the defendant under color of law. See...

Black's Law Dictionary, Fifth Edition, p. 241, color of law: The appearance or semblance, without the substance, of legal right. Misuse of power, possessed by virtue of state law and made possible only because wrongdoer is clothed with authority of state, is action taken under "color of state law." Atkins v. Lanning, D.C.Okl., 415 F.Supp. 186, 188.

Also see...

USC TITLE 18 > PART I> CHAPTER 13 > § 241 Conspiracy against rights: "If two or more persons conspire to injure, oppress, threaten, or intimidate any person in any State, Territory, Commonwealth, Possession, or District in the free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege secured to him by the Constitution or laws of the United States, or because of his having so exercised the same; or If two or more persons go in disguise on the highway, or on the

premises of another, with intent to prevent or hinder his free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege so secured- They shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both; and if death results from the acts committed in violation of this section or if such acts include kidnapping or an attempt to kidnap, aggravated sexual abuse or an attempt to commit aggravated sexual abuse, or an attempt to kill, they shall be fined under this title or imprisoned for any term of years or for life, or both, or may be sentenced to death."

Also see...

The court held in UNITED STATES v. KOZMINSKI, 487 U.S. 931 (1988) by looking to the meaning of the Thirteenth Amendment in interpreting two enforcement statutes, one prohibiting conspiracy to interfere with exercise or enjoyment of constitutional rights, the other prohibiting the holding of a person in a condition of involuntary servitude. For purposes of prosecution under these authorities, the Court held, *"the term 'involuntary servitude' necessarily means a condition of servitude in which the victim is forced to work for the defendant by the use or threat of physical restraint or physical injury, or by the use or threat of coercion through law or the legal process."* Also see...

"Where rights secured by the Constitution are involved, there can be no rule making or legislation which would abrogate them." MIRANDA V. ARIZONA, 384 U.S. 436, 491.

Also see... *"The State cannot diminish rights of the people."* HERTADO V. CALIFORNIA, 110 U.S. 516

16. Proof of jurisdiction, appearing on the record, of having taken an oath of office.

17. Proof of jurisdiction, appearing on the record, that the court or the prosecution has the right to violate their oath of office. See...

"faithfully perform the duties of his office" which is to secure defendants unalienable Right to the liberty of ownership of property as per the **Declaration of Independence** secured in the contract known as the Constitution for the united States of 1789.

I, Richard Travis;Martin, accept your oath of office and bind you to it.

18. Proof of jurisdiction, appearing on the record, to impair or force nonexistent obligations to a contract.

19. Proof of jurisdiction, appearing on the record, of any maritime or admiralty contract that the alleged defendant is a part of. See...

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

20. Proof of jurisdiction, appearing on the record, to deprive the defendant of common law rights/due process as protected by both the Constitution for the united States and the de jure state constitution.

21. Proof of jurisdiction, appearing on the record, the alleged defendant has given consent to anything or anyone to govern him or his private property.

22. Proof of jurisdiction, appearing on the record, that police officers are above the law.

See...

Butz v. Economou, 98 S. Ct. 2894 1978); United States v. Lee, 106 U.S. at 220, 1 S. Ct. at 261 (1882) *"No man [or woman] in this country is so high that he is above the law. No officer of the law may set that law at defiance with impunity. All the officers of the government from the highest to the lowest, are creatures of the law, and are bound to obey it."*

Also see...

a Citizen challenges the acts of a federal or state official as being illegal, that official cannot just simply avoid liability based upon the fact that he is a public official. In United States v. Lee 106 U.S. 196, 220, 221, 1 S.Ct. 240, 261, the United States claimed title to Arlington, Lee's estate, via a tax sale some years earlier, held to be void by the Court. In so voiding the title of the United States the Court declared: *"No man in this country is so high that he is above the law. No officer of the law may set that law at defiance with impunity. All the officers of the government, from the highest to the lowest, are creatures of the law and are bound to obey it. It is the only supreme power in our system of government, and every man who by accepting office participates in its functions is only the more strongly bound to submit to that supremacy, and to observe the limitations which it imposes upon the exercise of the authority which it gives."*

Also see... Pierce v. United States ("The Floyd Acceptances"), 7 Wall. (74 U.S.) 666, 677 (*"We have no officers in this government from the President down to the most subordinate agent, who does not hold office under the law, with prescribed duties and limited authority"*); Cunningham v. Macon, 109 U.S. 446, 452, 456, 3 S.Ct. 292, 297 (*"In these cases he is not sued as, or because he is, the officer of the government, but as an individual, and the court is not ousted of jurisdiction because he asserts authority as such officer. To make out his defense he must show*

that his authority was sufficient in law to protect him...**It is no answer for the defendant to say I am an officer of the government and acted under its authority unless he shows the sufficiency of that authority**"); and Poindexter v. Greenhaw, 114 U.S. 270, 287, 5 S.Ct. 903, 912

Also see... *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.

Also see... *"Personal involvement in deprivation of constitutional rights is prerequisite to award of damages, but defendant may be personally involved in constitutional deprivation by direct participation, failure to remedy wrongs after learning about it, creation of a policy or custom under which unconstitutional practices occur or gross negligence in managing subordinates who cause violation."* (Gallegos v. Haggerty, N.D. of New York, 689 F. Supp. 93 (1988)).

23. Proof of jurisdiction, appearing on the record that a commercial entity can detain, imprison, enslave and force into indentured servitude a human being. See...
13th amendment, united States constitution

Also see... USC TITLE 18 > PART I > CHAPTER 55 > § 1201 Kidnapping

24. Proof of jurisdiction, appearing on the record that a commercial entity can sell penal bonds on human beings and/or sovereign Citizens. See...
13th amendment, united States constitution

Also see... USC TITLE 15 > CHAPTER 1 > § 17 "The labor of a human being is not a commodity or article of commerce. "

Also see... Palermo protocols United Nations 2000

Also see... TITLE 18 > PART I > CHAPTER 77 > § 1590. Trafficking with respect to peonage,

slavery, involuntary servitude, or forced labor

25. Proof of jurisdiction, appearing on the record that corporate entities can interface with other than corporate entities. See...

"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,

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

26. Proof of jurisdiction, appearing on the record that I am the property of the federal government. See...

"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

27. Proof of jurisdiction, appearing on the record, and that statements of the liar (prosecutor) are not evidence or admissible

"Statements of counsel in brief or in argument are not facts before the court and are therefore insufficient for a motion to dismiss or for summary judgment." *Trinsey v Pagliaro, D.C. Pa. 1964, 229 F. Supp. 647.*

"Manifestly, [such statements] cannot be properly considered by us in the disposition of [a] case." *United States v. Lovasco (06/09/77) 431 U.S. 783, 97 S. Ct. 2044, 52 L. Ed. 2d 752,*

"Under no possible view, however, of the findings we are considering can they be held to constitute a compliance with the statute, since they merely embody conflicting statements of counsel concerning the facts as they suppose them to be and their appreciation of the law which they deem applicable, there being, therefore, no attempt whatever to state the ultimate facts by a consideration of which we would be able to

conclude whether or not the judgment was warranted." Gonzales v. Buist. (04/01/12) 224 U.S. 126, 56 L. Ed. 693, 32 S. Ct. 463.

"No instruction was asked, but, as we have said, the judge told the jury that they were to regard only the evidence admitted by him, not statements of counsel", Holt v. United States, (10/31/10) 218 U.S. 245, 54 L. Ed. 1021, 31 S. Ct. 2,

"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) Mr. Justice Douglas, dissenting.

"Care has been taken, however, in summoning witnesses to testify, to call no man whose character or whose word could be successfully impeached by any methods known to the law. And it is remarkable, we submit, that in a case of this magnitude, with every means and resource at their command, the complainants, after years of effort and search in near and in the most remote paths, and in every collateral by-way, now rest the charges of conspiracy and of gullibility against these witnesses, only upon the bare statements of counsel. The lives of all the witnesses are clean, their characters for truth and veracity un-assailed, and the evidence of any attempt to influence the memory or the impressions of any man called, cannot be successfully pointed out in this record." Telephone Cases. Dolbear v. American Bell Telephone Company, Molecular Telephone Company v. American Bell Telephone Company. American Bell Telephone Company v.. Molecular Telephone Company, Clay Commercial Telephone Company v. American Bell Telephone Company, People's Telephone Company v. American Bell Telephone Company, Overland Telephone Company v. American Bell Telephone Company,. (PART TWO OF THREE) (03/19/88) 126 U.S. 1, 31 L. Ed. 863, 8 S. Ct. 778.

"Statements of counsel in brief or in argument are not sufficient for motion to dismiss or for summary judgment," Trinsey v. Pagliaro, D. C. Pa. 1964, 229 F. Supp. 647.

"Factual statements or documents appearing only in briefs shall not be deemed to be a part of the record in the case, unless specifically permitted by the Court" – Oklahoma Court Rules and Procedure, Federal local rule 7.1(h).

Trinsey v Pagliaro, D.C.Pa. 1964, 229 F.Supp. 647. **"Statements of counsel in brief or in argument are not facts before the court and are therefore insufficient for a motion to dismiss or for summary judgment."**

"Where there are no depositions, admissions, or affidavits the court has no facts to rely on for a summary determination." Trinsey v. Pagliaro, D.C. Pa. 1964, 229 F. Supp. 647.

Frunzar v. Allied Property and Casualty Ins. Co., (Iowa 1996)† 548 N.W.2d 880 Professional statements of litigants attorney are treated as affidavits, and attorney making statements may be cross-examined regarding substance of statement. [And, how many of those Ass-Holes have "first hand knowledge"? NONE!!!]

Porter v. Porter, (N.D. 1979) 274 N.W.2d 235 ñ The practice of an attorney filing an affidavit on behalf of his client asserting the status of that client is not approved, inasmuch as not only does the affidavit become hearsay, but it places the attorney in a position of witness thus compromising his role as advocate.

and it goes on to say that Article Eleven in Amendment says that these United States so-called courts have no standing to do anything involving a state citizen, but they go ahead and assault you anyway.

It's a VIOLATION of the 11th Amendment for a FOREIGN CITIZEN to INVOKE the JUDICIAL POWER of the State.

Article XI.

The Judicial power of the United States shall not be construed to extend to any suit in law or equity, commenced or prosecuted against one of the United States by Citizens of another State, or by Citizens or Subjects of any Foreign State.

US citizens (FEDERAL CITIZENS) are FOREIGN to the several States and SUBJECTS of the FEDERAL UNITED STATES/STATE of NEW COLUMBIA/DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Attorneys are considered FOREIGN AGENTS under the FOREIGN AGENTS REGISTRATION ACT (FARA) and are SUBJECTS of the BAR ASSOCIATION.

Government Is Foreclosed from Parity with Real People

– 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),

28. Proof of jurisdiction, appearing on the record, that the alleged defendant cannot stand upon his/her constitutional rights. See...

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.

29. Your code enforcers LEOs (Law Enforcement Officers) are operating in their private capacity

"An officer who acts in violation of the Constitution ceases to represent the government". Brookfield Const. Co. v. Stewart, 284 F. Supp. 94

as revenue officers under the Federal Tax Lien Act of 1966

"(h) DEFINITION's. (1) SECURITY INTEREST.-The term 'security interest' means any interest in property acquired by contract for the purpose of securing payment or performance of an obligation or indemnifying against loss or liability. A security interest exists at any time (A) if, at such time, the property is in existence and the interest has become protected under local law against a subsequent judgment lien arising out of an unsecured obligation, and (B) to the extent that, at such time, the holder has parted "with money or money's worth. "(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." Federal Tax Lien Act of 1966 at Public Law 89-719 at 80 Stat. 1130-1131

30. Your code enforcers LEOs (Law Enforcement Officers) assaulted Me because of your District of Columbia Code 27 CFR 7211

"Commercial crimes. Any of the following types of crimes (Federal or State): Offenses against the revenue laws; burglary; counterfeiting; forgery; kidnapping; larceny; robbery; illegal sale or possession of deadly weapons; prostitution (including soliciting, procuring, pandering, white slaving, keeping house of ill fame, and like offenses); extortion; swindling and confidence games; and attempting to commit, conspiring to commit, or compounding any of the foregoing crimes. Addiction to narcotic drugs and use of marihuana will be treated as if such were commercial crime."

which means that the so-called Judge is actually a Clerk working for the prosecutor

“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 administering 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.

“...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.)

“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,

and when a Judge becomes a Clerk working for the prosecutor, he is NOT acting in his official capacity, but is acting in his private capacity,

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

and he cannot do anything judicial

“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 further,

therefore any so-called order the Clerk (masquerading as a Judge) issues, is a fraud and a nullity, like a warrant for arrest, is a fraud and a nullity, and a fine is a fraud and a nullity, and he is fully liable in his personal capacity, and has no judicial immunity

“...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 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.

Immunity for judges does not extend to acts which are clearly outside of their jurisdiction. Bauers v. Heisel, C.A. N.J. 1966, 361 F.2d 581, Cert. Den. 87 S.Ct. 1367, 386

U.S. 1021, 18 L.Ed. 2d 457 (see also Muller v. Wachtel, D.C.N.Y. 1972, 345 F.Supp. 160; Rhodes v. Houston, D.C. Nebr. 1962, 202 F.Supp. 624 affirmed 309 F.2d 959, Cert. den 83 St. 724, 372 U.S. 909, 9 L.Ed. 719, Cert. Den 83 S.Ct. 1282, 383 U.S. 971, 16 L.Ed. 2nd 311, Motion denied 285 F.Supp. 546).

“In arriving at our decision in this matter we do not depart in any way from our holding in Huendling v. Jensen [*300] that the doctrine of judicial immunity extends to courts of limited jurisdiction. But, when a minor magistrate acts wholly without jurisdiction, civil liability attaches for his malicious and corrupt abuse of process and his willful and malicious oppression of any person under the pretense of acting in his official capacity. See [Huendling v. Jensen, 168 N.W.2d at 749](#) and authorities cited.”188 N.W.2d 294; 1971 Iowa Sup. LEXIS 863; 64 A.L.R.3d 1242

and your so-called court is actually a kangaroo court

“Kangaroo court. Term descriptive of a sham legal proceeding in which a person's rights are totally disregarded and in which the result is a foregone conclusion because of the bias of the court or other tribunal.” Black’s Law Dictionary, 6th Edition, page 868,

31. Everything your so-called court does is a fraud and a nullity under color of law

“Colour of Law – Mere semblance of a legal right. An action done under colour of law is one done with the apparent authority of law but actually in contravention of law.” Barron’s Canadian Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, page 51 [emphasis added]

“Color” means “An appearance, semblance, or simulacrum, as distinguished from that which is real. A prima facie or apparent right. Hence, a deceptive appearance, a plausible, assumed exterior, concealing a lack of reality; a disguise or pretext. See also colorable.” Black’s Law Dictionary, 5th Edition, on page 240. [emphasis added]

“Colour, color. Signifies a probable plea, but which is in fact false...” Tomlin’s Law Dictionary 1835, Volume 1

by assaulting me based on your fictitious US citizen which is a fraud

“By metaphysical refinement in examining the form of our government 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, [emphasis added]

by criminally converting my proper appellation into a fictitious fraud “GLENN-WINNINGHAM, FEARN” in my case,

by criminally converting my postal address from the land of Texas into your District of Columbia territory with the use of a ZIP CODE

“As we have said, the Federal Personal Income Tax is Collected under a Military Venue within a Martial-Law jurisdiction. Federal Reserve Notes are Military Scrip circulated within a Military Venue. The problem is the people don't understand how the entire United States is covered by a Military Venue.... Under the Social Security Act, there was brought into existence Ten Federal Regional Areas. These ten federal regional areas are the same as a military base. It is not unconstitutional to circulate "military scrip" on a military base as the base is considered to be a military venue. "Military scrip" cannot circulate in the civil jurisdiction of the several States. To get around this Constitutional bar, the Congress (via the Social Security Act), created Ten Military Venues, called Federal Regional Areas. The problem the Congress realized was, while Congress could restructure the Government agencies into these Federal Regional Areas, the people could not be identified to be within this Military Venue but by their own consent. The solution was to create another Military Venue which would trick the people to voluntarily accept recognition that they are within a Military Venue. Congress solved this problem by creating the ZIP CODE. The "zip code" divides the United States into Ten Military Venues called "National Areas." When a Citizen receives mail from an agency of the federal government (such as the I.R.S.), in the return address of the federal agency is the district within the regional area the letter is sent from, and on the address of the "Citizen" it was sent to is the national area [ZIP] in which he received the correspondence from the I.R.S.. In other words, the correspondence was sent from one of the federal regional areas [military venue] to one of the National Areas [another military venue]. "Taxing Districts" are established within one of the Federal Regional Areas, which places the collection of taxes under a martial law jurisdiction." Dyett v Turner 439 P2d 266 @ 269, 20 U2d 403 [1968] The Non-Ratification of the Fourteenth Amendment by Assistant Director A.H. Ellett, Utah Supreme Court [Emphasis added],

by assaulting Me with your fraudulent fictitious unconstitutional District of Columbia municipal corporation called City of Azle

“Fifth. The Constitution has undoubtedly conferred on Congress the right to create such municipal organizations as it may deem best for all the territories of the United States, whether they have been incorporated or not, to give to the inhabitants as respects the local governments such degree of representation as may be conducive to the public wellbeing, to deprive such territory of representative government if it is considered just to do so, and to change such local governments at discretion.” Downes v Bidwell 182 US 244

by assaulting Me with your fraudulent fictitious unconstitutional District of Columbia municipal corporation called State of Texas when you know that no corporation has standing to do anything in any court

“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]

everything you do is a fraud

“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, and further,

“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 any act by any government official to conceal the fraud becomes an act of fraud;

“fraus est celare fraudem. It is a fraud to conceal a fraud. 1 Vern. 270.”
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

and you are all satanic children of the devil

“Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar, and the father of it.” John 8:44

“But the fearful, and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers [pharmaceutical drug pushers], and idolaters, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone: which is the second death.” Revelations 21:8

and your judgment day is coming

“I know thy works , and tribulation, and poverty, (but thou art rich) and I know the blasphemy of them which say they are Jews, [or Christians] and are not, but are the synagogue of Satan.” Revelations 2:9

32. The Constitution for the United States of America requires that lawful Article III Judges be provided

“ART. III. § 1. The judicial power of the United States shall be vested in one Supreme Court, and in such inferior courts as the Congress may, from time to time, ordain and establish. The judges, both of the Supreme and inferior courts, shall hold their offices during good behaviour; and shall, at stated times, receive for their services, a compensation, which shall not be diminished during their continuance in office.

§ 2. The judicial power shall extend to all cases, in law and equity, arising under this Constitution, the laws of the United States, and treaties made, or which shall be made, under their authority; to all cases affecting ambassadors, other public ministers, and consuls; to all cases of admiralty and maritime jurisdiction; to controversies to which the United States shall be a party;- to controversies between two or more States, between a State and citizens of another State, between citizens of different States, between citizens of the same State claiming lands under grants of different States, and between a State, or the citizens thereof and foreign States, citizens or subjects.” 1 Stat. 17-18, and further,

33. All District of Columbia territorial courts are using their Uniform Commercial Code which is controlled and regulated by their UNIDROIT Treaty (International Institute for the Unification of Private Law), which the UNITED STATES, INC., has been a signatory to for over 30 years, which is unconstitutional, because the Treaty power can ONLY be used externally,

“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]

and you have no authority to use your UNIDROIT Treaty in America, and your use of the Uniform Commercial Code is unconstitutional

“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]

34. Ignorance of the law is no excuse and all officers of the court are presumed to know the law

"Ignorance of the law does not excuse misconduct in anyone, least of all in a sworn officer of the law." In re McCowan (1917), 177 C. 93, 170 P. 1100.

"It is one of the fundamental maxims of the common law that ignorance of the law excuses no one." Daniels v. Dean (1905), 2 C.A. 421, 84 P. 332.

"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, and further,

35. United Nations Clerks masquerading as Judges in Texas are impersonating a public official, which is a felony

"(a) A person commits an offense if he:

(1) impersonates a public servant with intent to induce another to submit to his pretended official authority or to rely on his pretended official acts; or

(2) knowingly purports to exercise any function of a public servant or of a public office, including that of a judge and court, and the position or office through which he purports to exercise a function of a public servant or public office has no lawful existence under the constitution or laws of this state or of the United States.

(b) *An offense under this section is a felony of the third degree.*" Texas Penal Code, Section 37.11. IMPERSONATING PUBLIC SERVANT, [emphasis added], and further,

NOTICE OF VOID JUDGMENT

WHEREFORE, the real question for the Court in this matter is whether they intend to be an accomplice to the assault that has already taken place, because a lawsuit is coming, and since I am being assaulted based on unconstitutional District of Columbia territorial statutes in Texas, it will be in the federal court. If this so-called Court decides to be an accomplice to the assault, without jurisdiction, then it will be a void judgment

"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)

“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).

“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)

“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 Steinfield v. Hoddick, 513 U.S. 809, (Ill. 1994)

“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).

“Not every action by any judge is in exercise of his judicial function. It is not a judicial function for a Judge to commit an intentional tort even though the tort occurs in the Courthouse, 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 Judge's orders are void, of no legal force or effect”! Yates Vs. Village of Hoffman Estates, Illinois, 209 F.Supp. 757 (N.D. Ill. 1962)

and it will be 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

and the Clerk masquerading as a Judge will be an accomplice, with these City of Azle LEOs code enforcers who are all Satanists (see Mark Passio’s Youtube channel – former Satanist priest)

“Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar, and the father of it.” John 8:44

“But the fearful, and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers [pharmaceutical drug pushers], and idolaters, and all liars,

shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone: which is the second death.” Revelations 21:8

“... I know the blasphemy of them which say they are Jews, [or Christians] and are not, but are the synagogue of Satan.” Revelations 2:9

All charges, and demands, brought against Richard Travis; Martin, sui juris are void, false, fraudulent and treasonous. Failure and/or refusal to bring forth such ‘proof of claim’ will place you in dishonor under your satanic commercial codes, and thus constitute an admission of false claims, damages and injury to Richard Travis; Martin, sui juris. **I demand that you dismiss all of these trumped up fictitious satanic charges with prejudice.** Failure and/or refusal to bring forth such “proof of jurisdiction” is acquiescence, agreement that the court and the prosecution, et al has no jurisdiction and all charges are fraudulent and treasonous without objection. Silence is Fraud.

"Fraud and deceit may arise from silence where there is a duty to speak the truth, as well as from speaking an untruth." Morrison v Acton, 198 P.2d 590, 68 Ariz. 27 (1948)

"Fraud" may be committed by a failure to speak when the duty of speaking is imposed as much as by speaking falsely." Batty v Arizona State Dental Board, 112 P.2d 870, 57 Ariz. 239. (1941).

SUBMITTED BY DECLARATION

I have sealed this Declaration pursuant to locus sigilli

“locus sigilli - The place of the seal. Today this phrase is almost always abbreviated "L.S." ” Black’s Law Dictionary 9th Edition, page 1026.

Signed and sealed in red ink on the land of Texas, under penalties with perjury, [28 USC § 1746 (1)], under the laws of the United States of America, and without the United States.

I, **Richard Travis; Martin**, Sui Juris, a natural man of the republic, living in the republic, a common man, does declare that I have scribed and read the foregoing facts, and in accordance with the best of My firsthand knowledge, such are true, correct complete and not misleading, the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, pursuant to your Rule 201 of your rules of evidence.

This Declaration is dated **July _____, 2020.**

_____L.S.
Glenn Winningham; house of Fearn, sui juris
sovereign living soul, holder of the office of "the People"
Inhabitant of the land known as Texas
With full responsibility for my actions
under the Laws of YHWH as found in the Holy Bible
with a Postal address of;
Non-Domestic Mail
C/O 6340 Lake Worth Blvd., #437
Fort Worth, Texas
ZIP CODE EXEMPT
America without the US corp.®