

Subject: COURTS ARE FREE IF YOU DON'T READ AND LEARN THIS YOU WILL END UP PAYING BETWEEN 300 AND 600 DOLLARS TO FILE A COURT CASE!

COURTS ARE FREE IF YOU DON'T READ AND LEARN THIS YOU WILL END UP PAYING BETWEEN 300 AND 600 DOLLARS TO FILE A COURT CASE!

Plaintiffs, think the easiest way to show the facts, are we the sovereign people, first show what a person is not; in the law. So we have our basis of the claim considering 28 U.S.C. 1914 –(District court; filing and miscellaneous fees; rules of court) which requires a person, or persons, to pay a filing fee. Since a person, or persons, must pay the filing fee; one should denote what a person, is according to law in the second to properly show both sides of the coin. Starting with the Supreme Court decisions which denote the sovereign American people are not a person. Please see the following

" 'in common usage, the term 'person' does not include the sovereign people, and statutes employing the (word person) are normally construed to exclude the sovereign people.' Wilson v Omaha Tribe, 442 US653 667, 61 L Ed 2d 153, 99 S Ct 2529 (1979) (quoting United States v Cooper Corp. 312 US 600, 604, 85 L Ed 1071, 61 S Ct 742 (1941). See also United States v Mine Workers, 330 US 258, 275, 91 L Ed 884, 67 S Ct 677 (1947)" Will v Michigan State Police, 491 US 58, 105 L. Ed. 2d 45, 109 S.Ct. 2304 b)

The sovereign people are not a person in a legal sense" In re Fox, 52 N. Y. 535, 11 Am. Rep. 751; U.S.v. Fox, 94 U.S. 315, 24 L. Ed. 192.

A corporation is not a citizen within the meaning of that provision of the Constitution, which declares that the citizens of each State shall be entitled to all the privileges and immunities of citizens of the several States. Special privileges enjoyed by citizens in their own States are not secured in other States by this provision such as grants of corporate existence and powers. States may exclude a foreign corporation entirely or they may exact such security for the performance of its contracts with their citizens as, in their judgment, will best promote the public interest.

[Paul v. Virginia, 8 Wall (U.S.) 168; 19 L.Ed 357 (1868)]

We now know what a person is not, so let us see what a person is, the following definition of person was found in BLACKS LAW DICTIONARY 5TH EDITION PG 1028

Person. In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include a firm, labor organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers. National Labor Relations Act, § 2(1). Bankruptcy Act. "Person" includes individual, partnership, and corporation, but not governmental unit. Sec. 101(30). Corporation. A corporation is a "person" within meaning of equal protection and due process provisions of United States Constitution. Allen v. Pavach, Ind., 335 N.E.2d 219, 221; Borreca v. Fasi, D.C.Hawaii, 369 F.Supp. 906, 911. The term "persons" in statute relating to conspiracy to commit offense against United States, or to defraud United States, or any agency, includes corporation. Alamo Fence Co. of Houston v. U. S., C.A.Tex., 240 F.2d 179, 181. Foreign government. Foreign governments otherwise eligible to sue in U.S.

courts are "persons" entitled to bring treble-damage suit for alleged anti-trust violations under Clayton Act, Section 4. Pfizer, Inc. v. Government of India, C.A.Minn., 550 F.2d 396. Illegitimate child. Illegitimate children are "persons" within meaning of the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, Levy v. Louisiana, 391 U.S. 68, 88 S.Ct. 1509, 1511, 20 L.Ed.2d 436; and

scope of wrongful death statute, *Jordan v. Delta Drilling Co.*, Wyo., 541 P.2d 39, 48. Interested person. Includes heirs, devisees, offspring (**biological property, never use child**), spouses, creditors, beneficiaries and any others having a property right in or claim against a trust estate or the estate of a decedent, ward or protected person which may be affected by the proceeding. It also includes persons having priority for appointment as personal representative, and other fiduciaries representing interested persons. The meaning as it relates to particular persons may vary from time to time and must be determined according to the particular purposes of, and matter involved in, any proceeding. Uniform Probate Code, § 1-201(20). Municipalities. Municipalities and other government units are "persons" within meaning of 42 U.S.C.A. § 1983. Local government officials sued in their official capacities are "persons" for purposes of Section 1983 in those cases in which a local government would be sue able in its own name. *Monell v. N.Y. City Department of Social Services*, 436 U.S. 658, 98 S.Ct. 2018, 56 L.Ed.2d 611. See *Color of law*. Protected person. One for whom a conservator has been appointed or other protective order has been made Uniform, Probate Code § 5-101(3).

Now we must examine Supreme Court decisions, to get a definitive answer. Do the sovereign people have to pay filing fees; or are they entitled to free, access of the courts?

The courts must realize the sovereign people (**not sovereign citizens, never use that false term**), are not bound to pay filing fees as the sovereign people, are not a person, or persons. The use of the word person the reason the sovereign; people have been paying for filing fees. It is the use of the word person in law, and the confusion, the word person creates for the average sovereign people, when used in law. A person is a corporation that **is why the courts are not to be charging, the sovereign people to pay filing fees falsely**. They state the under Title 28 sec 1914 that persons or a person must pay, so when the sovereign people, point out that only apply s to person or persons which is a corporation, and the sovereign people need the law, that says the people or a natural person, is required to pay filing fees, or receive free access as ordered by the Supreme Court. **Take Mandatory Judicial Notice and Cognizance under (Federal Rules of Evidence 201 (d) that "plaintiff" ie Libellant has a lawful right to proceed without cost, based upon the following case law:**

The US Supreme Court has ruled that a natural individual entitled to relief is "**entitled to free access to the natural peoples judicial tribunals and public offices in every State of the Union**"(2 Black 620, see also

Crandell v Nevada, 6 Wall 35]. Plaintiff (libellant) should not be charged fees or costs for the lawful and Constitutional Protected Right to petition this court in this matter in which he/she is entitled to relief, as it appears that the filing fee rule was originally implemented for fictions and subjects of the State and should not be applied to the Plaintiff who is a natural individual and entitled to relief (*Hale v Hinkel*, 201 US 43, *NAACP v Button*, 371 US 415); *United Mineworkers v Gibbs*, 383 US 715; and *Johnson v Avery*, 89 S.Ct. 747 (1969).

Petitioner (libellant) cannot be charged a fee as no charge can be placed upon a citizen as a condition precedent to exercise his/her Constitutional Protected Rights, his/her rights secured by the Constitution. A fee is a charge "fixed by law for services fixed by public officers or for use of a privilege under control of government." *Fort Smith Gas Co. v Wisemen*" 189 Ark.675 74 SW.2d 789,790, from Black's Law Dictionary 5th Ed.

The US Supreme Court has ruled that a natural person entitled to relief is "entitled to free access to its judicial tribunals and public offices in every State of the Union(2 Black 620, see also Crandell v Nevada, 6 Wall 35].

Plaintiff (libellant) should not be charged fees or costs for the lawful and Constitutional Right to petition this court in this matter in which he/she is entitled to relief, as it appears that the filing fee rule was originally implemented for fictions and subjects of the State and should not be applied to the Plaintiff who is a natural individual and entitled to relief (Hale v Hinkel, 201 US 43,

NOTICE AND CONCLUSION IN LAW (How you want to set it up)

So in closing it is clear petitioners /plaintiffs must have their funds, refunded if PLAINTIFFS have paid under Title 28 U.S.C. 1914 – (District court; filing and miscellaneous fees; rules of court) or not be charged at all, as the sovereign people are entitled to free access of the courts. Plaintiffs believe this is proper, in any form, as the people's tax dollars fund these courts. If the people are not, to have free access then the tax dollars should stop flowing, for this purpose. Because it would mean the courts, are receiving enumeration twice. Once by taxes then paid, again by the people paying for a use of the courts, when, their tax dollars had already paid. Petitioners also respectfully demands the Magistrate takes judicial notice of all herein under RULE 201 (d) which is adjudicated facts.

Petitioners also gives notice to the Magistrate, that the Magistrate is bound by US Supreme Court rulings please see the following. Howlett V. Rose, 496 U.S. 356 (1990) Federal Law and Supreme Court cases apply to State court cases. (Cooper v. Aaron, 358 U.S. 1) (1958)--States are bound by United States Supreme Court Case decisions.

I/We declare swear and affirm under penalty of perjury that, to the best of my knowledge and belief, the information herein is true, correct, and complete & pursuant to 28 U.S. Code § 1746 - Unsworn declarations under penalty of perjury

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 Protected Right." Sherer v. Cullen 481 F. 945:

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.

"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.].

"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.

"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

Please Make Amends Honor thy Oath Elected and public servants, title 5USC2906-3331 Oath of office, title 18 241-242-

WHAT YOU DON'T KNOW-THE B.A.R. ASSOCIATION IS UNDER THE VATICAN OWNED CITY OF LONDON WATER AND SEWER UTILITY AND THEY'RE COMMITTING TREASON AND WAR CRIMES AGAINST AMERICA BY VIOLATING ARTICLES 16 AND 70 OF THE LIEBER CODE. NOW THERE IS A REMEDY FOR CORRUPT JUDGES AND ATTORNEYS. BTW, THEY ARE NOT JUDGES. THEY'RE BROKERS AS B.A.R. ATTORNEYS.

It is No injury or Property damage to any offspring (biological property), woman or man, thus the State CORPS can not be an injured party that would be A lawful American's by Honoring thy Oath office of servitude to God; false allegiance to the Treaty of 1213 of religious, cult, organizations are The Foreign Agents Registration Act (FARA) Title 5 2906 3331-3333. Whereas Their is title 18 241 242. Merely **being native born within the territorial boundaries of the United States of America does not make such an inhabitant a Citizen of the United States subject to the jurisdiction of the Fourteenth Amendment**" ... Elk v. Wilkins, Neb (1884), 5s.ct.41,112 U.S. 99, 28 L. Ed. 643.

"The fact is, property is a tree; income is the fruit; labour is a tree; income the fruit; capital, the tree; income the 'fruit.' The fruit, if not consumed (severed) as fast as it ripens, will germinate from the seed... and will produce other trees and grow into more property; but so long as it is fruit merely, and plucked (severed) to eat... it is no tree, and will produce itself no fruit." Waring v. City of Savannah. 60 Ga. 93, 100 (1878.)

Lawful Bloodline native 1868

Except for all city county and state immigrants servants State, county and municipal (city) employees work, respectively, for those distinct divisions of government. All are public servants.

In 1868, there was a corporation founded and in that particular company, the founders of that company called it the "United States Corporation" and they stipulated that anybody who would be a member of that corporation or worked for that corporation, would be called, not an employee but a "citizen". So today, if you are asked, 'are you a citizen of the United States', what you think you're being asked is, 'are you lawfully in this country to do business?' but that's not lawfully, what's being asked. They didn't ask you if you are an American, lawfully, they asked you a specific question... are you, of your own volition, out of your own mouth testifying that you are a citizen of the United States because in that way, citizen of the United States means you are an employee of a foreign corporation, operating under international maritime law. So today, the President of United States is the President of a privately owned company. The company is called "United States" and the word "President", is always the word used in corporate law - banks have Presidents, all companies have Presidents. President Trump is not the President of America. President Bush is the president of a privately owned company, privately owned out of England. **We need to understand words and terms and they have been used to trick and enslave you...by signature of you rights over to the newly form CORPS**

US GOV Elected and public servants aka employees laughing about stealing land also raping and robbing, kidnapping holding woman man and offspring (biological property) for ransom as filed

destroying family's for personal gain for the British foreign 1871 government contracted elected and public servants service of employment Federal law,

When any officer , Judge , Attorney , Elected and Public Servants of the court has committed "fraud upon the court", the orders and judgment of that court are void, of no legal force or effect.

In 1994, the United States Supreme Court held that "Disqualification is required if an objective observer would entertain reasonable questions about the judge's impartiality. **If a Judge's attitude or state of mind leads a detached observer to conclude that a fair and impartial hearing is unlikely, the judge must be disqualified.**" [Emphasis added]. *Liteky v. U.S.*, 114 S.Ct. 1147, 1162 (1994). That Court also stated that Section 455(a) "requires a judge to recuse himself in any proceeding in which her impartiality might reasonably be questioned." *Taylor v. O'Grady*, 888 F.2d 1189 (7th Cir. 1989). In *Pfizer Inc. v. Lord*, 456 F.2d 532 (8th Cir. 1972), the Court stated that "It is important that the litigant not only actually receive Justice