INJURY DEFENSE FRANCHISE AND AGREEMENT
FORM INSTRUCTIONS

1. PURPOSE:

This form is a defensive tool for use by those interfacing with either a government officer or government agency. Its purpose is to:

1. Establish and protect your sovereignty.
2. Preserve your equitable position and prevent you from becoming unequal or inferior in relation to any government or government actor. The only way you can become unequal is by consenting to it in some form.
3. Ensure that you cannot lawfully participate in any franchise court or be subject to the whims of any government agency or the administrative law that implements it, such as:
   3.1. Traffic Court.
   3.2. Family Court.
   3.3. Tax Court.
4. Invoke ONLY the protections of the common law and not statutory civil law. All statutory civil law is law for government and not private human beings.
5. Ensure that everyone you deal with in the government is constrained to provide the ONLY thing that government was established for, which is to protect private property and private rights.
6. Impose an anti-franchise franchise that prevents the enforcement of any government franchise against you.
7. Maintain the status of your PRIVATE property as private and prevent it from being donated to a public use, public purpose, or public office without your express written consent.
8. Establish, preserve, and protect your proper status within existing state and federal law.
9. Prevent private people from being victimized by the presumptions of others by defining the meaning of all words and burden of proof against the government in redefining them.
10. Keep you disconnected from all government statutory civil law, which can lawfully regulate only government actors and instead impose only the common law for the protection of your rights.
11. Invoke all the same presumptions against the government that they invoke against you and therefore turn the tables.
12. Prevent any commercial use of materials or services or interactions by Government Actor as against Protected Party.

The authority for creating and enforcing this franchise and agreement is the requirement for equal protection and equal treatment that is the foundation of the United States Constitution. Since governments have implemented franchises on a grand scale, we claim the EQUAL right to establish and enforce similar franchises to prevent us from being compelled to be part of theirs.

Attach this form to correspondence sent to the government to give reasonable notice of what the recipient mandatorily agrees to as a condition of either demanding or receiving any of your property or services.

2. OTHER FORMS THIS FORM IS REFERENCED IN

This form is incorporated by reference into the following other forms. Therefore, there is no need to add it to these forums:

2.1. SEDM Member Agreement, Form #01.001, Section 5
   http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm
2.2. SEDM Disclaimer, Section 5
   http://www.sedm.org/disclaimer.htm
2.3. Deposition Handout: Member Deposition, Form #03.005, Exhibit 1
   http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm
2.4. Federal Pleading/Motion/Petition Attachment, Litigation Tool #01.002, Section 8
   http://sedm.org/Litigation/LitIndex.htm
2.5. Affidavit of Citizenship, Domicile, and Tax Status, Form #02.001, Section 4
   http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm
2.6. Tax Form Attachment, Form #04.201, Section 6
3. FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTION(S)

3.1. QUESTION 1: Why would anyone in their right mind want to sign or consent to this agreement?"

Hi, I just finished reading the Injury Defense Franchise and Agreement, Form 06.027. At the end of this document, there is a page for the signature of the Protected Party AND signature of the "Government Actor."

My question is .... no "government actor" in his/her right mind is actually going to sign this document, so I would like to know what it is that "binds" the government actor to the stipulations within the Anti Franchise Franchise.

I realize that WE DID NOT agree to the stipulations of their franchises either, at least not knowingly, and that this is kind of the whole point in making the Anti Franchise Franchise, but how can this be used against them if they refuse to sign it, which they obviously will do?

3.2. ANSWER 1:

What binds them is the SAME thing that binds us to THEIR franchise: Acceptance of the "benefits" of the relationship. Those "benefits" are enumerated in this document itself. Here are some legal authorities documenting that the acceptance of the benefits described constitutes constructive consent to all the obligations arising from the delivery of the benefit:

CALIFORNIA CIVIL CODE
DIVISION 3. OBLIGATIONS
PART 2. CONTRACTS
CHAPTER 3. CONSENT
Section 1589

1589. A voluntary acceptance of the benefit of a transaction is equivalent to a consent to all the obligations arising from it, so far as the facts are known, or ought to be known, to the person accepting.

 он

He who receives the benefit should also bear the disadvantage."
"Quando dicit commodum, sentire debet et onus.

He who derives a benefit from a thing, ought to feel the disadvantages attending it. 2 Bouv.
Inst. n. 1433."
[Bouvier’s Maxims of Law, 1856;
SOURCE:
http://famguardian.org/Publications/BouvierMaximsOfLaw/BouviersMaxims.htm]

Under our system of law ALL "persons" are equal. If the government can rope US into THEIR franchises by the above mechanisms, which is EXACTLY what they do, then we can do the SAME thing to them under the concept of EQUAL PROTECTION and EQUAL TREATMENT. Any assertion to the contrary is a violation of due process of law and a denial of equal protection and equal treatment.

Any government actor who argues against the above approach is essentially:

1. Discrediting the ONLY useful tool they have to prosecute tax crimes.
2. Contradicting their own statements and behavior.
3. Declaring any and all previous criminal tax prosecutions as VOID and FRAUDULENT.
Whenever they prosecute people for tax crimes, they ALWAYS do the same thing as the anti-franchise franchise does:

1. They claim that the defendant is accepting the "benefits" of living here without "paying their fair share".
2. Getting the jury angry at the defendant because it increases THEIR tax bill, which incidentally is a CRIME called jury tampering and criminal financial conflict of interest under 18 U.S.C. 208.

The above techniques are documented in:

*The Government Benefits Scam*, Form #05.040
FORMS PAGE: [http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm](http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm)

If THEY can do it, then YOU can do it! In a nation that at least gives LIP service to EQUALITY OF ALL and where Obama stated in his very own inauguration speech that "we are all equal", anyone who claims otherwise is a HYPOCRITE AND is calling our very own president a LIAR!

Every technique that is or can be successful against the corrupted government will ALWAYS emulate their very own behavior and let them discredit themselves in the process of defending against it. And what jurist DOESN"T hate that kind of hypocrisy? We don't know any. That's Sun Tzu's approach:

"*Use the enemy's main strength against himself.*"

The U.S. Supreme Court has held that EQUALITY OF RIGHTS and TREATMENT are the FOUNDATIONS of ALL of your freedom:

"No duty rests more imperatively upon the courts than the enforcement of those constitutional provisions intended to secure that equality of rights which is the foundation of free government."

[Gulf, C. & S. F. R. Co. v. Ellis, 165 U.S. 150 (1897)]

The ONLY way you can lawfully be treated UNEQUALLY is with your express consent. Any government which asserts a right that they refuse to allow you to have has the burden of proving with evidence introduced into the record that you EXPRESSLY CONSENTED to be treated unequally in relation to them in a form and in a manner that ONLY you can specify. That manner should ALWAYS be in writing with your signature on it and with the signature of someone from the government who has delegated authority to make such a commitment.

If you would like to know more about the legal requirement for EQUAL PROTECTION AND EQUAL TREATMENT that is the FOUNDATION of the United States Constitution, see:

*Requirement for Equal Protection and Equal Treatment*, Form #05.033
DIRECT LINK: [http://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/EqualProtection.pdf](http://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/EqualProtection.pdf)
FORMS PAGE: [http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm](http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm)

You can't "govern" people who are equal. They have to consent to be UNEQUAL before they can be CIVILLY governed and be called a "subject". AND you can't be a "sovereign" and a "subject" at the same time. A statutory "citizen" is a subject, and therefore is UNEQUAL and INFERIOR to the government they are member of. That is the conclusion of the following wonderful memorandum of law, which you should ALSO read:

*Why Statutory Civil Law is Law for Government and not Private Persons*, Form #05.037
FORMS PAGE: [http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm](http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm)

### 4. RESOURCES FOR FURTHER STUDY

4.1. *Sovereignty and Freedom Page-Family Guardian Website*  
[http://fgamguardian.org/Subjects/Freedom/Freedom.htm](http://fgamguardian.org/Subjects/Freedom/Freedom.htm)

4.2. *Government Instituted Slavery Using Franchises*, Form #05.030-how the government accomplishes the OPPOSITE of the purpose of its creation, and thereby illegally converts all private property to public property.
4.3. The “Trade or Business” Scam, Form #05.001-heart of the IRS fraud
http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm

4.4. Sovereignty Forms and Instructions, Form #10.005-how to restore one’s sovereignty
http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm

4.5. Sovereignty Forms and Instructions Online, Form #10.004-online version of the above
http://famguardian.org/TaxFreedom/FormsInstr.htm
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Why Statutory Civil Law is Law for Government and Not Private Persons, Form #05.037
Why You are a “national”, “state national”, and Constitutional but not Statutory Citizen, Form #05.006
Why You Aren’t Eligible for Social Security, Form #06.001
Why Your Government is Either a Thief or You are a “Public Officer” For Income Tax Purposes, Form #05.008
Word Crimes, Al Yankovic
Words are Our Enemies’ Weapons, Part 1, Sheldon Emry
Words are Our Enemies’ Weapons, Part 2, Sheldon Emry
Your Exclusive Right to Declare or Establish Your Civil Status, Form #13.008
1 Purpose

This form is a defensive tool for use by private parties interfacing with either a government officer or government agency. Its purpose is to do all the following in respect to the Protected Party:

1. Establish and protect their sovereignty.
2. Preserve their equitable position and prevent them from becoming unequal or inferior in relation to any government or government actor.
3. Ensure that Protected party cannot lawfully participate in any franchise court or be subject to the whims of any government agency or the administrative law that implements it, such as:
4. Traffic Court.
5. Family Court.
6. State or federal tax Court.
7. Invoke ONLY the protections of the common law and not statutory civil law. All statutory civil law is law for government and not private human beings.
8. Ensure that Government Actors are constrained to provide the ONLY thing that government was established for, which is to protect private property and private rights.
9. Impose an anti-franchise franchise against Government Actors that prevents the enforcement of any government franchise against the Protected Party.
10. Maintain the status of their PRIVATE property as private and prevent it from being donated to a public use, public purpose, or public office without your consent.
11. Establish, preserve, and protect the proper status within existing state and federal law.
12. Prevent the Protected Party from being victimized by the presumptions of others by defining the meaning of all words and burden of proof against the government in redefining them.
13. Keep the Protected Party disconnected from all government statutory civil law, which can lawfully regulate only government actors and instead impose only the common law for the protection of your rights.
14. Invoke all the same presumptions against them that they invoke against the Protected Party and therefore turn the tables.
15. Prevent any commercial use of materials or services or interactions by Government Actor as against Protected Party.

The authority for creating and enforcing this franchise and agreement is the requirement for equal protection and equal treatment that is the foundation of the United States Constitution. It uses the government’s tactics in implementing and enforcing franchises against Government Actors as a way to prevent Protected Party from being victimized by their franchises. Equal protection mandates that the government must protect the SAME method of acquiring rights for all parties.

If this agreement was initiated in connection with a government form or application submitted to the Government Actor, then:

1. All rights are reserved by the Protected Party pursuant to U.C.C. §1-308 in relation to the original government offer that is the subject of the form.
2. The original application shall be superseded from an OFFER in commerce, and replaced with this COUNTEROFFER in commerce pursuant to U.C.C. §2-209.
3. No matter what the response to this counter-offer is by the Government Actor, the response by the Government Actor to the original application or offer by the Protected Party shall be the following:

“You are not eligible for the original offer or application and we can’t force you to consent to it. Your LACK OF CONSENT is the reason you are ineligible. Therefore, any third party trying to force you to apply is doing so illegally and is instigating a THEFT of your property to try to force you to participate or consent. It is an abuse of government property or franchises to offer them outside of federal territory or to people who were not ALREADY public officers in the government BEFORE making application to participate.”

2 Definitions, Rules of Construction and Interpretation

This section is a defense against the following fraudulent tactics by those in government:
1. **Foundations of Freedom Course, Video 4: Willful Government Deception and Propaganda, Form #12.021**
   https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hPWMfa_oD-w
2. **Legal Deception, Propaganda, and Fraud, Form #05.014**
   https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/LegalDecPropFraud.pdf
3. **Presumption: Chief Weapon for Unlawfully Enlarging Federal Jurisdiction, Form #05.017**
   https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/Presumption.pdf
4. **The Beginning of Wisdom is to Call Things By Their Proper Names**, Stefan Molyneux
   https://youtu.be/FXZSEHVtWOE
5. **Mirror Image Rule**
   http://www.youtube.com/embed/j8pgbZV757w
6. **Oreilly Factor, April 8, 2015**, John Piper of the Oklahoma Wesleyan University
   http://famguardian1.org/Mirror/Famguardian/20150408_1958-The_O'Reilly_Factor-
   Dealing%20with%20slanderous%20liberals%20biblically-Everett%20Piper.mp4
   https://sedm.org/Media/Ligoniere-OvercomingTheWorld2014-Against%20the%20World-15-24-Language.mp4
   https://sheldonemrylibrary.famguardian.org/BibleStudyCourses/KBS-1.pdf
   https://sheldonemrylibrary.famguardian.org/BibleStudyCourses/KBS-2.pdf
10. **Words are Our Enemies’ Weapons, Part 1**, Sheldon Emry
11. **Words are Our Enemies’ Weapons, Part 2**, Sheldon Emry
12. **Roman Catholicism and the Battle Over Words**, Ligonier Ministries
    https://youtu.be/uxmEK1RGJQc
13. **The Keys to Freedom**, Bob Hamp
    https://youtu.be/rY1DRxDU5nw

The biblical reason for this section is explained in the following videos:

The legal purpose of these definitions is to prevent GOVERNMENT crime using words:

**Word Crimes**, Al Yankovic
https://youtu.be/8Gv0H-vPoDc

The definitions in this section are MANDATORY in any interaction between either the government or any of its agents or officers and any agent or member of this ministry. The reasons why this MUST be the case are described in:

**Path to Freedom, Form #09.015, Sections 5.3 through 5.8**
https://sedm.org/Forms/09-0Proc/PathToFreedom.pdf

The following definitions shall apply throughout this document and in the context of all interactions between Protected Party, Government Actor, and the employer of Government Actor (government):

**anarchy**: The term "anarchy" implies any one or more of the following, and especially as regards so-called "governments". An important goal of this site is to ELIMINATE all such "anarchy":

1. Are superior in any way to the people they govern UNDER THE LAW.
2. Are not directly accountable to the people or the law. They prohibit the PEOPLE from criminally prosecuting their own crimes, reserving the right to prosecute to their own fellow criminals. Who polices the police? THE CRIMINALS.
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3. Enact laws that exempt themselves. This is a violation of the Constitutional requirement for equal protection and
equal treatment and constitutes an unconstitutional Title of Nobility in violation of Article 1, Section 9, Clause 8
of the United States Constitution.
4. Only enforce the law against others and NOT themselves, as a way to protect their own criminal activities by
persecuting dissidents. This is called “selective enforcement”. In the legal field it is also called “professional
courtesy”. Never kill the goose that lays the STOLEN golden eggs.
5. Break the laws with impunity. This happens most frequently when corrupt people in government engage in
“selective enforcement”, whereby they refuse to prosecute or interfere with the prosecution of anyone in
government. The Department of Justice (D.O.J.) or the District Attorney are the most frequent perpetrators of
this type of crime.
6. Are able to choose which laws they want to be subject to, and thus refuse to enforce laws against themselves.
The most frequent method for this type of abuse is to assert sovereign, official, or judicial immunity as a defense
in order to protect the wrongdoers in government when they are acting outside their delegated authority, or
outside what the definitions in the statutes EXPRESSLY allow.
7. Impute to themselves more rights or methods of acquiring rights than the people themselves have. In other
words, who are the object of PAGAN IDOL WORSHIP because they possess “supernatural” powers. By
“supernatural”, we mean that which is superior to the “natural”, which is ordinary human beings.
8. Claim and protect their own sovereign immunity, but refuse to recognize the same EQUAL immunity of the
people from whom that power was delegated to begin with. Hypocrites.
9. Abuse sovereign immunity to exclude either the government or anyone working in the government from being
subject to the laws they pass to regulate everyone ELSE’S behavior. In other words, they can choose WHEN
they want to be a statutory “person” who is subject, and when they aren’t. Anyone who has this kind of choice
will ALWAYS corruptly exclude themselves and include everyone else, and thereby enforce and implement an
unconstitutional “Title of Nobility” towards themself. On this subject, the U.S. Supreme Court has held the
following:

“No man in this country [including legislators of the government as a legal person] 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,” 106 U.S., at 220. “Shall it be said... that the courts cannot give remedy when the Citizen has been deprived of his property by force, his estate seized and converted to the use of the government without any lawful authority, without any process of law, and without any compensation, because the president has ordered it and his officers are in possession? If such be the law of this country, it sanctions a tyranny which has no existence in the monarchies of Europe, nor in any other government which has a just claim to well-regulated liberty and the protection of personal rights.” 106 U.S., at 220, 221. [United States v. Lee, 106 U.S. 196, 1 S. Ct. 240 (1882)]

10. Have a monopoly on anything, INCLUDING “protection”, and who turn that monopoly into a mechanism to
force EVERYONE illegally to be treated as uncompensated public officers in exchange for the “privilege” of
being able to even exist or earn a living to support oneself.
11. Can tax and spend any amount or percentage of the people’s earnings over the OBJECTIONS of the people.
12. Can print, meaning illegally counterfeit, as much money as they want to fund their criminal enterprise, and thus
to be completely free from accountability to the people.
13. Deceive and/or lie to the public with impunity by telling you that you can’t trust anything they say, but force
YOU to sign everything under penalty of perjury when you want to talk to them. 26 U.S.C. §6065.

In support of the above definition of “anarchy”, here is how the U.S. Supreme Court defined it:

“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, the omnipresent teacher. For good
or for 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—this is 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 U.S. 438 (1928)]

The above requirements are a consequence of the fact that the foundation of the United States Constitution is **EQUAL protection and EQUAL treatment**. Any attempt to undermine equal rights and equal protection described above constitutes:

1. The establishment of a state sponsored religion in violation of the First Amendment and the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, 42 U.S.C. Chapter 21B. That religion is described in: **Socialism: The New American Civil Religion, Form #05.016**. The object of worship of such a religion is imputing "supernatural powers" to civil rulers and forcing everyone to worship and serve said rulers as "superior beings".
2. The establishment of an unconstitutional Title of Nobility in violation of **Article 1, Section 9, Clause 8 of the United States Constitution**.

---

**“beneficial owner”**: Defined as a human being who is:

1. NOT the entity described in 26 C.F.R. §1.1441-1(c)(6) or any other statute or regulation published by the United States federal government.
2. A “nonresident alien” not engaged in a “trade or business”.
3. A “nontaxpayer” not subject to any provision of Internal Revenue Code Subtitles A, B, or C.

---

**“benefit”**: Defined as follows:

"Benefit: Advantage; profit; fruit; gain; interest associated with a specific transaction which conveys a right or property interest which:"

1. Is not dispensed by an administrative agency of any state or federal government, but by a private party.
2. Does not require the recipient to be an officer, agent, employee, or “personnel” within any government.
3. Is not called a “tax” or collected by the Internal Revenue Service, but is clearly identified as “private business activity beyond the core purposes of government”.
4. Does not confer upon the grantor any form of sovereign, official, or judicial immunity.
5. Is legally enforceable in OTHER than a franchise court or administrative agency. That is, may be heard in equity within a true, Article III constitutional court and NOT a legislative franchise court.
6. True constitutional courts are provided in which to litigate disputes arising under the benefit and those with said disputes are not required to exhaust administrative remedies with an executive branch agency BEFORE they may litigate. These constitutional courts are required to produce evidence that they are constitutional courts with OTHER than strictly legislative franchise powers when challenged by the recipients of said benefits.
7. The specific value of the consideration can be quantified at any time.
8. Monies paid in by the recipient to subsidize the program are entirely refundable if the benefits they pay for have not been received or employed either partially or in full.
9. Has all contributions paid in refunded if they die and never collect any benefits.
10. Participation in the program is not also attached to any other government program. For instance, being a recipient of “social insurance” does not also make the recipient liable for unrelated or other federal taxes.
11. The term “benefit” must be defined in the franchise agreement that dispenses it, and its definition may not be left to the subjective whims of any judge or jury.
12. If the “benefit” is financial, then it is paid in lawful money rather than Federal Reserve Notes, which are non interest bearing promissory notes that are not lawful money and are backed by nothing.
13. The franchise must expressly state that participation is voluntary and that no one can be prosecuted or punished for failure to participate.

14. The identifying numbers, if any, that administer the program may not be used for identification and may not be shared with or used by any nongovernmental entity other than the recipient him or her self.


16. During any litigation involving the “benefit”, both the grantor and the grantee share equal obligation to prove that equally valuable consideration was provided to the other party. Note that Federal Reserve Notes do not constitute lawful money or therefore consideration.

Anything offered by the government that does not meet ALL of the above criteria is herein defined as an INJURY and a TORT. Compelled participation is stipulated by both parties as being slavery in criminal violation of 18 U.S.C. §1583, 42 U.S.C. §1994, and the Thirteenth Amendment.

Receipt of the attached government application constitutes consent by the recipient of the application to use the above definition of “benefit” in any disputes that might arise over this transaction. Government recipient and its agents, employees, and assignees forfeit their right as private individuals acting in any government office to define the term “benefit” and agree to use ONLY the above definition.


The term "civil status" describes the process by which human beings become “persons” under civil statutory law. It is what the courts call a “res” which gives them civil control over you under one of three different systems of civil law. Civil status is VERY important, because it is the source of civil statutory jurisdiction of courts over you and their right to “personal jurisdiction” over you. It also describes how your actions affect “choice of law” and your “status” in any court cases you bring. Human beings who are “sovereign” in fact:

1. Have no “civil status” under statutory law.
2. Only have a “civil status” under the constitution and the common law.
3. Are governed mainly by the “civil laws” found in the Holy Bible. This is a protected First Amendment right to practice their religion.

Laws of the Bible, Litigation Tool #09.001: [https://sedm.org/Litigation/09-Reference/LawsOfTheBible.pdf](https://sedm.org/Litigation/09-Reference/LawsOfTheBible.pdf)

You cannot have a “civil status” under the laws of a place WITHOUT at least one of the following conditions:

1. A physical presence in that place. The status would be under the COMMON law.
2. CONSENSUALLY doing business in that place. The status would be under the common law.
3. A domicile in that place. This would be a status under the civil statutes of that place.
4. CONSENSUALLY representing an artificial entity (a legal fiction) that has a domicile in that place. This would be a status under the civil statutes of that place.

If any of the above rules are violated, you are a victim of criminal identity theft:

"civil status" is further discussed in:

1. Civil Status (important!)-Article under "Litigation->Civil Status (important!) on the SEDM menus [https://sedm.org/civil-status/](https://sedm.org/civil-status/)
2. Your Exclusive Right to Declare or Establish Your Civil Status, Form #13.008 [https://sedm.org/civil-status/index.htm](https://sedm.org/civil-status/index.htm)
3. Proof that There is a "Straw Man", Form #05.042-SEDM [https://sedm.org/civil-status/index.htm](https://sedm.org/civil-status/index.htm)
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“civil service” or “civil service fee”: relates to any and all activities of “government” OTHER than:

1. Police.
5. Common law court.

"civil service" and "civil service fee" includes any attempt or act to:

1. Establish or enforce a domicile (Form #05.002).
2. Procure consent (Form #05.003) of any kind to alienate rights that are supposed to be INALIENABLE per the Declaration of Independence.
3. PRESUME consent (Form #05.003) to surrender INALIENABLE PRIVATE RIGHTS by virtue of submitting, accepting, or receiving any application for a government benefit, license, or franchise. See Form #12.023.
4. Convert PRIVATE property or PRIVATE rights to PUBLIC property, PUBLIC offices, or excise taxable franchises. See Form #12.025. Government’s FIRST and most important duty is to at all times maintain TOTAL separation between PRIVATE and PUBLIC and NEVER to allow them to convert one to another. Every attempt to convert one to the other represents a criminal financial conflict of interest that turns the PUBLIC trust into a SHAM trust.
5. Offer or enforce the civil statutory code.
6. Offer or enforce civil franchises (see Form #05.030).

“commercial use”: any use or employment of information, services, or interactions associated with Sovereignty Education and Defense Ministry (SEDM) or its members, which causes or could cause any of the following by either Government Actor or his/her/its employer or sponsor:

1. An increase in tax revenues caused by increased compliance with the Internal Revenue Code.
2. A damage award against any SEDM ministry member or officer and in favor of Government Actor or his/her/its employer or sponsor.
3. A raise, promotion, financial incentive, or favorable mention of or to Government Actor by his/her/its employer or sponsor.

“constitutional”: The term “constitutional” when used as a prefix to any other term, means that the term it precedes pertains only to land, property, rights, or privileges under the exclusive jurisdiction of a state of the Union and not within the civil or criminal jurisdiction of the national government.

“dollar”: 1/20th of an ounce of gold. There is no statutory definition of “dollar” that equates a Federal Reserve Note with a dollar and the legal definition of “money” found in Black’s Law Dictionary specifically excludes “notes” from the definition of “money”. See:

SEDM Exhibit #06.001: http://sedm.org/Exhibits/ExhibitIndex.htm

De facto government: A for profit corporation pretending to be a government characterized by any one or more of the following activities:

1. Imputes or enforces in courts of law any power for itself that the people it serves AS INDIVIDUALS do not ALSO possess. This is a violation of the requirement for equal protection and equal treatment that is the foundation of the United States Constitution.
2. “citizens” or “residents” are franchisees and/or public officers domiciled on federal territory.
3. Does not recognize or protect private rights.
4. Personal or real property is subject to any form of taxation and therefore is NOT private property but PUBLIC property. REAL ownership implies the right to exclude EVERYONE, including government, from the use, enjoyment, or benefit of the property.
5. Does not provide a remedy for the protection of private rights because all courts are franchise courts that can only rule on public rights.
6. “Codes” replace real de jure “Law”, and all codes are voluntary civil franchises.
7. Criminal law is replaced by penalties under a franchise.
8. Attorneys are gagged from telling the truth by a license.
9. Establishes or enforces government franchises either outside of federal territory OR against parties not domiciled on federal territory and thereby “invades” states of the union as a domestic enemy in violation of Article 4, Section 4 of the United States Constitution.
10. Tax revenues are paid to private parties.

"The king establishes the land by justice, But he who receives bribes [socialist handouts, government "benefits", or PLUNDER stolen from nontaxpayers] overthrows it."

[Prov. 29:4, Bible, NKJV]

11. Judges and/or jurists are “taxpayers” or participate in any government franchise/benefit and who therefore are not only incapable of being impartial, but have a criminal conflict of interest.
12. Those receiving government bribes/”benefits” are allowed to vote or serve as jurists. This creates a criminal conflict of interest and perverts justice.
13. Money is based on debt rather than substance.
14. Allows parties domiciled within and present with states of the Union, through presumption, fraudulent information returns, federal franchises, or any other methods, to obtain or pretend to have the status of “citizen”, “resident”, or “person” under any federal law.

“employee”: Defined as a human being and not a statutory “person” who:

1. Works for a “private employer” and not a “public employer” or any state or federal government, who is NOT engaged in a “trade or business” as defined in 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(26), and who has no liability to deduct, withhold, or pay any tax described in 26 U.S.C. Subtitles A, B, or C.
2. Is NOT the legal entity described in 26 U.S.C. §3401(c) or 26 C.F.R. §31.3401(c)-1 or any other statute or regulation published by the United States federal government.

“employer”: Someone who has “employees” as defined in the previous item.

“exempt”: Definition:

1. Not subject to any provision within the Internal Revenue Code Subtitles A or C.
2. Not an “individual” (26 C.F.R. §1.1441-1(c)(3)) or “person” (26 U.S.C. §7701(c)) or “taxpayer” (26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(14)) within the Internal Revenue Code.
3. Entire estate is a “foreign estate” pursuant to 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(31).
4. Not the entity described in 26 U.S.C. §7701(b)(5) as an “exempt individual”, because not the “individual” defined in 26 C.F.R. §1.1441-1(c)(3) or any other state or federal statute, code applicable within the exclusive jurisdiction of the national or state governments.

“fact”: Means that which is admissible as evidence in a court of law BECAUSE ENACTED LAW makes it admissible AND because the speaker (other than us) INTENDED for it to be factual. It does NOT imply that we allege that it is factual, actionable, or even truthful. Any attempt by any government to make anything published on our ministry website or anything said by members or officers of the ministry FACTUAL or ACTIONABLE in conflict with this disclaimer is hereby declared and stipulated by all members to be FRAUDULENT, PERJURIOUS, and a willful act of international terrorism and organized extortion.
“federal income tax”: Means the revenue scheme described inSubtitle A of the Internal Revenue Code as applied specifically and only to human beings who are not statutory "persons" or "individuals" under federal law and shall NOT refer to businesses. This website does NOT concern itself with businesses or corporations or artificial entities of any description.

“franchise”: The word "franchise" means a loan rather than a gift of specific property with legal strings or "obligations" attached.

**FRANCHISE. A special privilege conferred by government on individual or corporation, and which does not belong to citizens of country generally of common right.** Elliott v. City of Eugene, 135 Or. 108, 294 P. 358, 360. In England it is defined to be a royal privilege in the hands of a subject.

A "franchise," as used by Blackstone in defining quo warranto, (3 Com. 262 [4th Am. Ed.] 322), had reference to a royal privilege or branch of the king's prerogative subsisting in the hands of the subject, and must arise from the king's grant, or be held by prescription, but today we understand a franchise to be some special privilege conferred by government on an individual, natural or artificial, which is not enjoyed by its citizens in general. State v. Fernandez, 106 Fla. 779, 143 So. 638, 639, 86 A.L.R. 240.

In this country a franchise is a privilege or immunity of a public nature, which cannot be legally exercised without legislative grant. To be a corporation is a franchise. The various powers conferred on corporations are franchises. The execution of a policy of insurance by an insurance company [e.g. Social Insurance/Socialist Security], and the issuing a bank note by an incorporated bank [such as a Federal Reserve NOTE], are franchises. People v. Utica Ins. Co. 15 Johns., N.Y., 387, 8 Am. Dec. 243. But it does not embrace the property acquired by the exercise of the franchise. Bridgeport v. New York & N. H. R. Co., 36 Conn. 255, 4 Arm. Rep. 63. Nor involve interest in land acquired by grantee. Whitbeck v. Funk, 140 Or. 70, 12 P.2d 1019, 1020. In a popular sense, the political rights of subjects and citizens are franchises, such as the right of suffrage, etc. Pierce v. Emery, 32 N.H. 484; State v. Black Diamond Co., 97 Ohio St. 24, 119 N.E. 195, 199, L.R.A.1918E, 352.

Elective Franchise. The right of suffrage: the right or privilege of voting in public elections.

Exclusive Franchise. See Exclusive Privilege or Franchise.

General and Special. The charter of a corporation is its "general" franchise, while a "special" franchise consists in any rights granted by the public to use property for a public use but-with private profit. Lord v. Equitable Life Assur. Soc., 194 N.Y. 212, 81 N. E. 443, 22 L.R.A., N.S., 420.

Personal Franchise. A franchise of corporate existence, or one which authorizes the formation and existence of a corporation, is sometimes called a "personal" franchise, as distinguished from a "property" franchise, which authorizes a corporation so formed to apply its property to some particular enterprise or exercise some special privilege in its employment, as, for example, to construct and operate a railroad. See Sandham v. Nye, 9 Misc. Rep. 541, 30 N.Y.S. 552.

Secondary Franchises. The franchise of corporate existence being sometimes called the "primary" franchise of a corporation, its "secondary" franchises are the special and peculiar rights, privileges, or grants which it may, receive under its charter or from a municipal corporation, such as the right to use the public streets, exact tolls, collect fares, etc. State v. Topeka Water Co., 61 Kan. 547, 60 P. 337; Virginia Canon Toll Road Co. v. People, 22 Colo. 429, 45 P. 398 37 L.R.A. 711. The franchises of a corporation are divisible into (1) corporate or general franchises; and (2) "special or secondary franchises. The
The definition of "privilege" in the definition above means PROPERTY, whether physical or intangible. This loan is often called a "grant" in statutes, as in the case of Social Security in 42 U.S. Code Subchapter I-Grants to the States for Old Age Assistance. That grant is to federal territories and NOT constitutional states, as demonstrated by the definition of "State" found in 42 U.S.C. §1301(a)(1). Hence, Social Security cannot be offered in constitutional states, but only federal territories, as proven in Form #06.001.

"For here, the state must deposit the proceeds of its taxation in the federal treasury, upon terms which make the deposit suspiciously like a forced loan to be repaid only in accordance with restrictions imposed by federal law. Title IX, §§ 903 (a) (3), 904 (a), (b), (e). All moneys withdrawn from this fund must be used exclusively for the payment of compensation. § 903 (a) (4). And this compensation is to be paid through public employment offices in the state or such other agencies as a federal board may approve. § 903 (a) (1)."

[Steward Machine Co. v. Davis, 301 U.S. 548 (1937)]

In the case of government franchises, property loaned can include one or more of the following:

1. A public right or public privilege granted by a statute that is not found in the Constitution but rather created by the Legislature. This includes remedies provided in franchise courts in the Executive Branch under Article I or Article IV to vindicate such rights. It does not include remedies provided in true Article III courts.

   "The distinction between public rights and private rights has not been definitively explained in our precedents. Nor is it necessary to do so in the present cases, for it suffices to observe that a matter of public rights must at a minimum arise “between the government and others.” Ex parte Bakelite Corp., supra, at 451, 49 S.Ct., at 413. In contrast, “the liability of one individual to another under the law as defined,” Crowell v. Benson, supra, at 51, 52 S.Ct., at 292, is a matter of private rights. Our precedents clearly establish that only controversies in the former category may be removed from Art. III courts and delegated to legislative courts or administrative agencies for their determination. See Atlas Roofing Co. v. Occupational Safety and Health Review Comm’n, 430 U.S. 442, 450, n. 7, 97 S.Ct. 1261, 1266, n. 7, 51 L.Ed.2d 464 (1977); Crowell v. Benson, supra, 285 U.S., at 50-51, 52 S.Ct., at 292. See also Katz, Federal Legislative Courts, 43 Harv. L.Rev. 894, 917-918 (1930).FN24 Private-rights disputes, on the other hand, lie at the core of the historically recognized judicial power."

[...]

Although Crowell and Raddatz do not explicitly distinguish between rights created by Congress [PUBLIC RIGHTS] and other [PRIVATE] rights, such a distinction underlies in part Crowell’s and Raddatz’ recognition of a critical difference between rights created by federal statute and rights recognized by the Constitution. Moreover, such a distinction seems to us to be necessary in light of the delicate accommodations required by the principle of separation of powers reflected in Art. III. The constitutional system of checks and balances is designed to guard against “encroachment or aggrandizement” by Congress at the expense of the other branches of government. Buckley v. Valeo, 424 U.S., at 122, 96 S.Ct., at 683. But when Congress creates a statutory right [a “privilege” or “public right” in this case, such as a “trade or business”], it clearly has the discretion, in defining that right, to create presumptions, or assign burdens of proof, or prescribe remedies; it may also provide that persons seeking to vindicate that right must do so before particularized tribunals created to perform the specialized adjudicative tasks related to...
that right. FN35 Such provisions do, in a sense, affect the exercise of judicial power, but
they are also incidental to Congress’ power to define the right that it has created. No
comparable justification exists, however, when the right being adjudicated is not of
congressional creation. In such a situation, substantial inroads into functions that have
traditionally been performed by the Judiciary cannot be characterized merely as incidental
extensions of Congress’ power to define rights that it has created. Rather, such inroads
suggest unwarranted encroachments upon the judicial power of the United States, which
our Constitution reserves for Art. III courts.
(1983)]

2. Any type of privilege, immunity, or exemption granted by a statute to a specific class of people and not to all people
generally that is not found in the Constitution. All such statues are referred to as "special law" or "private law", where
the government itself is acting in a private rather than a public capacity on an equal footing with every other private
human in equity. The U.S. Supreme court also called such legislation "class legislation" in Pollock v. Farmers Loan
and Trust, 157 U.S. 429 (1895) and the ONLY "class" they can be talking about are public officers in the U.S.
government and not to all people generally. See the following for proof:

Why Your Government is Either a Thief or You are a "Public Officer" For Income Tax Purposes, Form #05.008
https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/WhyThiefOrPubOfficer.pdf

"special law. One relating to particular persons or things; one made for individual cases
or for particular places or districts; one operating upon a selected class, rather than upon
the public generally. A private law. A law is "special" when it is different from others of
the same general kind or designed for a particular purpose, or limited in range or confined
to a prescribed field of action or operation. A "special law" relates to either particular
persons, places, or things to persons, places, or things which, though not particularized,
are separated by any method of selection from the whole class to which the law might, but
not such legislation, be applied. Utah Farm Bureau Ins. Co. v. Utah Ins. Guaranty Ass’n,
Utah, 564 P.2d. 751, 754. A special law applies only to an individual or a number of
individuals out of a single class similarly situated and affected, or to a special locality.
Board of County Com’rs of Lemhi County v. Swensen, Idaho, 80 Idaho 198, 327 P.2d. 361,
362. See also Private bill; Private law. Compare General law; Public law."

3. A statutory "civil status" created and therefore owned by the legislature. This includes statutory "taxpayers", "drivers",
“persons”, "individuals", etc. All such entities are creations of Congress and public rights which carry obligations when
consensually and lawfully exercised. See:

Your Exclusive Right to Declare or Establish Your Civil Status, Form #13.008
https://sedm.org/Forms/13-SelfFamilyChurchGovnce/RightToDeclStatus.pdf

4. A STATUTORY Social Security Card. The regulations at 20 C.F.R. §422.103(d) indicates the card is property of the
government and must be returned upon request.
5. A U.S. passport. The passport indicates that it is property of the government that must be returned upon request.
6. A "license", which is legally defined as permission by the state to do something that would otherwise be illegal or even
criminal.

In legal parlance, such a loan makes the recipient a temporary trustee, and if they violate their trust, the property can be taken
back through administrative action or physical seizure and without legal process so long as the conditions of the loan allowed
for these methods of enforcement:

“How, then, are purely equitable obligations created? For the most part, either by the acts
of third persons or by equity alone. But how can one person impose an obligation upon
another? By giving property to the latter on the terms of his assuming an obligation in
respect to it. At law there are only two means by which the object of the donor could be
at all accomplished, consistently with the entire ownership of the property passing to the
donee, namely: first, by imposing a real obligation upon the property; secondly, by
subjecting the title of the donee to a condition subsequent. The first of these the law does
not permit; the second is entirely inadequate. Equity, however, can secure most of the
objects of the donee, and yet avoid the mischiefs of real obligations by imposing upon the donee (and upon all persons to whom the property shall afterwards come without value or with notice) a personal obligation with respect to the property; and accordingly this is what equity does. It is in this way that all trusts are created, and all equitable charges made (i.e., equitable hypothecations or liens created) by testators in their wills. In this way, also, most trusts are created by acts inter vivos, except in those cases in which the trustee incurs a legal as well as an equitable obligation. In short, as property is the subject of every equitable obligation, so the owner of property is the only person whose act or acts can be the means of creating an obligation in respect to that property. Moreover, the owner of property can create an obligation in respect to it in only two ways: first, by incurring the obligation himself, in which case he commonly also incurs a legal obligation; secondly, by imposing the obligation upon some third person; and this he does in the way just explained.”


“When Sir Matthew Hale, and the sages of the law in his day, spoke of property as affected by a public interest, and ceasing from that cause to be juris privati solely, that is, ceasing to be held merely in private right, they referred to

[1] property dedicated [DONATED] by the owner to public uses, or

[2] to property the use of which was granted by the government [e.g. Social Security Card], or

[3] in connection with which special privileges were conferred [licenses].

Unless the property was thus dedicated [by one of the above three mechanisms], or some right bestowed by the government was held with the property, either by specific grant or by prescription of so long a time as to imply a grant originally, the property was not affected by any public interest so as to be taken out of the category of property held in private right.”

[Munn v. Illinois, 94 U.S. 113, 139-140 (1876)]

The above authorities imply that a mere act of accepting or using the property in question in effect represents "implied consent" to abide by the conditions associated with the loan, as described in the California Civil Code below:

CALIFORNIA CIVIL CODE
DIVISION 3. OBLIGATIONS
PART 2. CONTRACTS
CHAPTER 3. CONSENT
Section 1589

1589. A voluntary acceptance of the benefit of a transaction is equivalent to a consent to all the obligations arising from it, so far as the facts are known, or ought to be known, to the person accepting.

The U.S. Supreme Court further acknowledged the above mechanisms of using loans of government property to create equitable obligations against the recipient of the property as follows. Note that they ALSO imply that YOU can use exactly the same mechanism against the government to impose obligations upon them, if they are trying to acquire your physical property, your services, your labor, your time, or impose any kind of obligation (Form #12.040) against you without your express written consent, because all such activities involve efforts to acquire what is usually PRIVATE, absolutely owned property that you can use to control the GOVERNMENT as the lawful owner:

“The State in such cases exercises no greater right than an individual may exercise over the use of his own property when leased or loaned to others. The conditions upon which the privilege shall be enjoyed being stated or implied in the legislation authorizing its
grant, no right is, of course, impaired by their enforcement. The recipient of the privilege, in effect, stipulates to comply with the conditions. It matters not how limited the privilege conferred, its acceptance implies an assent to the regulation of its use and the compensation for it.”

[Munn v. Illinois, 94 U.S. 113 (1876)]

The injustice (Form #05.050), sophistry, and deception (Form #05.014) underlying their welfare state system is that:

1. Governments don’t produce anything, but merely transfer wealth between otherwise private people (see Separation Between Public and Private Course, Form #12.025).

2. The money they are paying you can never be more than what you paid them, and if it is, then they are abusing their taxing powers!

To lay, with one hand, the power of the government on the property of the citizen, and with the other to bestow it upon favored individuals to aid private enterprises and build up private fortunes, is none the less a robbery because it is done under the forms of law and is called taxation. This is not legislation. It is a decree under legislative forms.

Nor is it taxation. ‘A tax,’ says Webster’s Dictionary, ‘is a rate or sum of money assessed on the person or property of a citizen by government for the use of the nation or State.’ ‘Taxes are burdens or charges imposed by the Legislature upon persons or property to raise money for public purposes.’ Cooley, Const. Lim., 479.

Coulter, J., in Northern Liberties v. St. John’s Church, 13 Pa.St. 104 says, very forcibly, ‘I think the common mind has everywhere taken in the understanding that taxes are a public imposition, levied by authority of the government for the purposes of carrying on the government in all its machinery and operations—that they are imposed for a public purpose.’ See, also Pray v. Northern Liberties, 31 Pa.St. 69; Matter of Mayor of N.Y., 11 Johns., 77; Camden v. Allen, 2 Dutch., 398; Sharpless v. Mayor, supra; Hanson v. Vernon, 27 La., 47; Whiting v. Fond du Lac, supra.” [Loan Association v. Topeka, 20 Wall. 655 (1874)]

3. If they try to pay you more than you paid them, they must make you into a public officer to do so to avoid the prohibition of the case above. In doing so, they in most cases must illegally establish a public office and in effect use “benefits” to criminally bribe you to illegally impersonate such an office. See The “Trade or Business” Scam, Form #05.001 for details.

4. Paying you back what was originally your own money and NOTHING more is not a “benefit” or even a loan by them to you. If anything, it is a temporary loan by you to them! And its an unjust loan because they don’t have to pay interest!

5. Since you are the real lender, then you are the only real party who can make rules against them and not vice versa. See Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution for where the ability to make those rules comes from.

6. All franchises are contracts that require mutual consideration and mutual obligation to be enforceable. Since government isn’t contractually obligated to provide the main consideration, which is “benefits” and isn’t obligated to provide ANYTHING that is truly economically valuable beyond that, then the “contract” or “compact” is unenforceable against you and can impose no obligations on you based on mere equitable principals of contract law.

“We must conclude that a person covered by the Act has not such a right in benefit payments... This is not to say, however, that Congress may exercise its power to modify the statutory scheme free of all constitutional restraint.” [Flemming v. Nestor, 363 U.S. 603 (1960)]

“... railroad benefits, like social security benefits, are not contractual and may be altered or even eliminated at any time.” [United States Railroad Retirement Board v. Fritz, 449 U.S. 166 (1980)]

“Social Security is not insurance at all but merely welfare” [Helvering v. Davis, 301 U.S. 619, 81 L.Ed. 1307, 57 S.Ct. 904]
For further details on government franchises, see:

1.  Sovereignty Forms and Instructions Online, Form #10.014, Cites by Topic: "franchise"
2.  Government Franchises Course, Form #12.012 Slide
3.  Video
4.  Government Instituted Slavery Using Franchises, Form #05.030

For information on how to avoid franchises, quit them, or use your own PERSONAL franchises to DEFEND yourself against illegal government franchise administration or enforcement, usually against ineligible parties, see:

1.  Avoiding Traps on Government Forms Course, Form #12.023
2.  Path to Freedom, Form #09.015, Section 5
3.  Injury Defense Franchise and Agreement, Form #06.027
4.  SEDM Forms/Pubs page, Section 1.6: Avoiding Government Franchises
5.  The Government "Benefits" Scam, Form #05.040 (Member Subscription form)
6.  Why the Government is the Only Real Beneficiary of All Government Franchises, Form #05.051 (Member Subscription form)

"frivolous": Truthful, accurate, and consistent with prevailing law and legal precedent. Any attempts to call anything relating to the submitter incorrect or untruthful must be accompanied by authoritative, court-admissible evidence to support such a conclusion or shall be presumed by the reader to be untrustworthy and untruthful. All such evidence MUST derive EXCLUSIVELY from the consensual civil domicile of the defendant pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 17(b). Parties subject to this agreement stipulate that any violation of this rule is a malicious prosecution and obstruction of justice in violation of 18 U.S.C. §1589(a)(3). See the following for details on domicile:

Why Domicile and Becoming a “Taxpayer” Require Your Consent, Form #05.002
http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm

Remember, the key word in “IRS” is “Service”. I’m the “customer” you serve and the customer is ALWAYS right! If you want to say something is wrong, you need to tell me it is incorrect and then explain all the legal authorities that justify why, consistent with the following basis for reasonable belief:

Reasonable Belief About Income Tax Liability, Form #05.007
http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm

NOTE: Consistent with Internal Revenue Manual (I.R.M.), Section 4.10.7.2.9.8, I am NOT interested in any court ruling below the supreme Court, because if the “Service” is not bound by anything below the U.S. Supreme Court, then neither am I or should I.

"Government": that group of people dedicated to the protection of purely and exclusively PRIVATE RIGHTS and PRIVATE PROPERTY that are absolutely and exclusively owned by a truly free and sovereign human being who is EQUAL to the government in the eyes of the law per the Declaration of Independence. It excludes the protection of PUBLIC rights or PUBLIC privileges (franchises, Form #05.030) and collective rights (Form #12.024) because of the tendency to subordinate PRIVATE rights to PUBLIC rights due to the CRIMINAL conflict of financial interest on the part of those in the alleged "government" (18 U.S.C. §208, 28 U.S.C. §§144, and 455). See Separation Between Public and Private Course, Form #12.025 for the distinctions between PUBLIC and PRIVATE.

"As expressed otherwise, the powers delegated to a public officer are held in trust for the people and are to be exercised in behalf of the government or of all citizens who may need the intervention of the officer, [1] Furthermore, the view has been expressed that all public officers, within whatever branch and whatever level of government, and whatever be their private vocations, are trustees of the people, and accordingly
labor under every disability and prohibition imposed by law upon trustees
relative to the making of personal financial gain from a discharge of their trusts.
[2] That is, a public officer occupies a fiduciary relationship to the political entity
on whose behalf he or she serves. [3] and owes a fiduciary duty to the public. [4]
It has been said that the fiduciary responsibilities of a public officer cannot be less
than those of a private individual. Furthermore, it has been stated that any
enterprise undertaken by the public official which tends to weaken public
confidence and undermine the sense of security for individual [PRIVATE] rights
is against public policy. [5]”
[63C American Jurisprudence 2d, Public Officers and Employees, §247 (1999) ]

FOOTNOTES:


official is held in public trust. Madlener v. Finley (1st Dist), 161 Ill.App.3d. 796, 113
grounds 128 Ill.2d. 147, 131 Ill.Dec. 145, 538 N.E.2d. 520.

appeal after remand (1st Dist) 107 Ill.App.3d. 222, 63 Ill.Dec. 134, 437 N.E.2d. 783.

[4] United States v. Holzer (CA7 Ill), 816 F.2d. 304 and vacated, remanded on other
grounds 484 U.S. 807, 98 L.Ed.2d. 18, 108 S.Ct. 53, on remand (CA7 Ill) 840 F.2d. 1343,
cert den 486 U.S. 1035, 100 L.Ed.2d. 608, 108 S.Ct. 2022 and (criticized on other grounds
by United States v. Otser (CA3 Pa) 864 F.2d. 1056) and (superseded by statute on other
grounds as stated in United States v. Little (CA5 Miss) 889 F.2d. 1367) and (among
conflicting authorities on other grounds noted in United States v. Boylan (CA1 Mass), 898

proceeding (1st Dist) 105 Ill.App.3d. 298, 61 Ill.Dec. 172, 434 N.E.2d. 325.

[6] Indiana State Ethics Comm’n v. Nelson (Ind App), 656 N.E.2d. 1172, reh gr (Ind App)
659 N.E.2d. 260, reh den (Jan 24, 1996) and transfer den (May 28, 1996).

Anything done CIVILLY for the benefit of those working IN the government at the involuntary, enforced, coerced, or
compelled (Form #05.003) expense of PRIVATE free humans is classified as DE FACTO (Form #05.043), non-
governmental, PRIVATE business activity beyond the core purpose of government that cannot and should not be protected
by official, judicial, or sovereign immunity. Click here (Form #11.401) for a detailed exposition of ALL of the illegal
methods of enforcement (Form #05.032) and duress (Form #02.005). "Duress" as used here INCLUDES:

1. Any type of LEGAL DECEPTION, Form #05.014.
2. Every attempt to insulate government workers from responsibility or accountability for their false or misleading
   statements (Form #05.014 and Form 12.021 Video 4), forms, or publications (Form #05.007 and Form 12.023).
3. Every attempt to offer or enforce civil franchise statutes against anyone OTHER than public officers ALREADY
   in the government. Civil franchises cannot and should not be used to CREATE new public offices, but to add
duties to EXISTING public officers who are ALREADY lawfully elected or appointed. See Form #05.030.
4. Every attempt to commit identity theft by legally kidnapping CONSTITUTIONAL state domiciled parties onto
   federal territory or into the "United States" federal corporation as public officers. Form #05.046.
5. Every attempt to offer or enforce any kind of franchise within a CONSTITUTIONAL state. See Form #05.030.
6. Every attempt to entice people to give up an inalienable CONSTITUTIONAL right in exchange for a franchise
   privilege. See Form #05.030.
7. Every attempt to use the police to enforce civil franchises or civil penalties. Police power can be lawfully used ONLY to enforce the criminal law. Any other use, and especially for revenue collection, is akin to sticking people up at gunpoint. See Form #12.022.

8. Every attempt at CIVIL asset forfeiture to police in the conduct of CRIMINAL enforcement. This merely creates a criminal conflict of interest in police and makes them into CIVIL revenue collectors who seek primarily their own enrichment. See Form #12.022.

9. Every attempt to compel or penalize anyone to declare a specific civil status on a government form that is signed under penalty of perjury. That is criminal witness tampering and the IRS does it all the time.

10. Every attempt to call something voluntary and yet to refuse to offer forms and procedures to unvolunteer. This is criminal FRAUD. Congressmen call income taxes voluntary all the time but the IRS refuses to even recognize or help anyone who is a "nontaxpayer". See Exhibit #05.051.

All of the above instances of duress place personal interest in direct conflict with obedience to REAL law, Form #05.048. They are the main source of government corruption (Form #11.401) in the present de facto system (Form #05.043). The only type of enforcement by a DE JURE government that can or should be compelled and lawful is CRIMINAL or COMMON LAW enforcement where a SPECIFIC private human has been injured, not CIVIL statutory enforcement (a franchise, Form #05.030). Under the State Action Doctrine of the U.S. Supreme Court, everyone who is the target of CIVIL enforcement is, by definition a public officer or agent in the government and Christians are forbidden by the Bible from becoming such public officers, Form #13.007.

Every type of DE JURE CIVIL governmental service or regulation MUST be voluntary and ALL must be offered the right to NOT participate on every governmental form that administers such a CIVIL program. It shall mandatorily, publicly, and NOTORIOUSLY be enforced and prosecuted as a crime NOT to offer the right to NOT PARTICIPATE in any CIVIL STATUTORY activity of government or to call a service "VOLUNTARY" but actively interfere with and/or persecute those who REFUSE to volunteer or INSIST on unvolunteering. All statements by any government actor or government form or publication relating to the right to volunteer shall be treated as statements under penalty of perjury for which the head of the governmental department shall be help PERSONALLY liable if false. EVERY CIVIL "benefit" or activity offered by any government MUST identify at the beginning of ever law creating the program that the program is VOLUNTARY and HOW specifically to UNVOLUNTEER or quit the program. Any violation of these rules makes the activity NON-GOVERNMENTAL in nature AND makes those offering the program into a DE FACTO government (Form #05.043).

The Declaration of Independence says that all "just powers" of government derive from the CONSENT of those governed. Any attempt to CIVILLY enforce MUST be preceded by an explicit written attempt to procure consent, to not punish those who DO NOT consent, and to not PRESUME consent by virtue of even submitting a government form that does not IDENTIFY that submission of the form is an IMPLIED act of consent (Form #05.003). This ensures "justice" in a constitutional sense, which is legally defined as "the right to be left alone". For the purposes of this website, those who do not consent to ANYTHING civil are referred to "non-resident non-persons" (Form #05.020). An example of such a human would be a devout Christian who is acting in complete obedience to the word of God in all their interactions with anyone and everyone in government. Any attempt by a PRIVATE human to consent to any CIVIL STATUTORY offering by any government (a franchise, Form #05.030) is a violation of their delegation of authority order from God (Form #13.007) that places them OUTSIDE the protection of God under the Bible.

Under this legal definition of "government" the IDEAL and DE JURE government is one that:

1. The States cannot offer THEIR taxable franchises within federal territory and the FEDERAL government may not establish taxable franchises within the territorial borders of the states. This limitation was acknowledged by the U.S. Supreme Court in the License Tax Cases, 72 U.S. 462 (1866) and continues to this day but is UNCONSTITUTIONALLY ignored more by fiat and practice than by law.
2. Has the administrative burden of proof IN WRITING to prove to a common law jury of your peers that you CONSENTED in writing to the CIVIL service or offering before they may COMMENCE administrative enforcement of any kind against you. Such administrative enforcement includes, but is not limited to administrative liens, administrative levies, administrative summons, or contacting third parties about you. This ensures that you CANNOT become the unlawful victim of a USUALLY FALSE PRESUMPTION (Form #05.017) about your CIVIL STATUS (Form #13.008) that ultimately leads to CRIMINAL IDENTITY THEFT (Form #05.046). The decision maker on whether you have CONSENTED should NOT be anyone in the AGENCY that administers the service or benefit and should NEVER be ADMINISTRATIVE. It should be JUDICIAL.
3. Judges making decisions about the payment of any CIVIL SERVICE fee may NOT participate in ANY of the programs they are deciding on and may NOT be "taxpayers" under the I.R.C. Subtitle A Income tax. This creates a criminal financial conflict of interest that denies due process to all those who are targeted for enforcement. This sort of corruption was abused to unlawfully expand the income tax and the Social Security program OUTSIDE of their lawful territorial extent (Form #05.018). See Lucas v. Earl, 281 U.S. 111 (1930), O'Malley v. Woodrough, 307 U.S. 277 (1939) and later in Hatter v. U.S, 532 U.S. 557 (2001).

4. EVERY CIVIL service offered by any government MUST be subject to choice and competition, in order to ensure accountability and efficiency in delivering the service. This INCLUDES the minting of substance based currency. The government should NOT have a monopoly on ANY service, including money or even the postal service. All such monopolies are inevitably abused to institute duress and destroy the autonomy and sovereignty and EQUALITY of everyone else.

5. CANNOT "bundle" any service with any other in order to FORCE you to buy MORE services than you want. Bundling removes choice and autonomy and constitutes biblical "usury". For instance, it CANNOT:

   5.1. Use "driver licensing" to FORCE people to sign up for Social Security by forcing them to provide a "franchise license number" called an SSN or TIN in order to procure the PRIVILEGE of "driving", meaning using the commercial roadways FOR HIRE and at a profit.

   5.2. Revoke driver licenses as a method of enforcing ANY OTHER franchise or commercial obligation, including but not limited to child support, taxes, etc.

   5.3. Use funds from ONE program to "prop up" or support another. For instance, they cannot use Social Security as a way to recruit "taxpayers" of other services or the income tax. This ensures that EVERY PROGRAM stands on its own two feet and ensures that those paying for one program do not have to subsidize failing OTHER programs that are not self-supporting. It also ensures that the government MUST follow the SAME free market rules that every other business must follow for any of the CIVIL services it competes with other businesses to deliver.

   5.4. Piggyback STATE income taxes onto FEDERAL income taxes, make the FEDERAL government the tax collector for STATE TAXES, or the STATES into tax collectors for the FEDERAL government.

6. Can lawfully enforce the CRIMINAL laws without your express consent.

7. Can lawfully COMPEL you to pay for BASIC SERVICES of the courts, jails, military, and ROADS and NO OTHERS. EVERYONE pays the EQUAL amount for these services.

8. Sends you an ITEMIZED annual bill for CIVIL services that you have contracted in writing to procure. That bill should include a signed copy of your consent for EACH individual CIVIL service or "social insurance". Such "social services" include anything that costs the government money to provide BEYOND the BASIC SERVICES, such as health insurance, health care, Social Security, Medicare, etc.

9. If you do not pay the ITEMIZED annual bill for the services you EXPRESSLY consented to, the government should have the right to collect ITS obligations the SAME way as any OTHER PRIVATE human. That means they can administratively lien your real or personal property, but ONLY if YOU can do the same thing to THEM for services or property THEY have procured from you either voluntarily or involuntarily. Otherwise, they must go to court IN EQUITY to collect, and MUST produce evidence of consent to EACH service they seek payment or collection for. In other words, they have to follow the SAME rules as every private human for the collection of CIVIL obligations that are in default. Otherwise, they have superior or supernatural powers and become a pagan deity and you become the compelled WORSHIPPER of that pagan deity. See Socialism: The New American Civil Religion, Form #05.016 for details on all the BAD things that happen by turning government into such a CIVIL RELIGION.

Jesus described the above de jure government as follows. He is implying that Christians cannot consent to any government that rules from above or has superior or supernatural powers in relation to biological humans. In other words, the government Christians adopt or participate in or subsidize CANNOT function as a religion as described in Socialism: The New American Civil Religion, Form #05.016:

“You know that the rulers of the Gentiles [unbelievers] lord it over them [govern from ABOVE as pagan idols] , and those who are great exercise authority over them [supernatural powers that are the object of idol worship]. Yet it shall not be so among you; but whoever desires to become great among you, let him be your servant [serve the sovereign people from BELOW rather than rule from above]. And whoever desires to be first among you, let him be your slave—just as the Son of Man did not come to be served,
but to serve, and to give His life a ransom for many.”

[Matt. 20:25-28, Bible, NKJV]

For documentation on HOW to implement the above IDEAL or DE JURE government by making MINOR changes to existing foundational documents of the present government such as the Constitution, see:

Self Government Federation: Articles of Confederation. Form #13.002
http://sedm.org/Forms/13-SelfFamilyChurchGovnce/SGFArtOfConfed.pdf

“Government franchise”: Includes but not limited to:

1. Income tax under Internal Revenue Code, Subtitles A through C or state revenue code.
3. Drivers licenses under the vehicle code of either the United States or any state of the Union.
4. Licensed marriage under the family code of the United States or any state of the Union.
5. Professional licensing.
6. Attorney licensing.

“gross income”: Profit originating from within the United States government corporation and earned by a federal instrumentality. Pursuant to 26 U.S.C. §871, said profit must either originate from the District of Columbia or abroad pursuant to 26 U.S.C. §911 but may not originate within any state of the Union.

“human”: The word "human" means a man or woman above the age of majority, which we regard as 18 years of age. Anyone below the age of 18 is considered a "child" rather than a "human".

“justice”: The essence of the meaning of “justice” in fact, is the right to be “left alone”:

PAULSEN, ETHICS (Thilly's translation), chap. 9.

“Justice, as a moral habit, is that tendency of the will and mode of conduct which refrains from disturbing the lives and interests of others, and, as far as possible, hinders such interference on the part of others. This virtue springs from the individual's respect for his fellows as ends in themselves and as his co equals. The different spheres of interests may be roughly classified as follows: body and life; the family, or the extended individual life; property, or the totality of the instruments of action; honor, or the ideal existence; and finally freedom, or the possibility of fashioning one's life as an end in itself. The law defends these different spheres, thus giving rise to a corresponding number of spheres of rights, each being protected by a prohibition. . . . To violate the rights, to interfere with the interests of others, is injustice. All injustice is ultimately directed against the life of the neighbor; it is an open avowal that the latter is not an end in itself, having the same value as the individual's own life. The general formula of the duty of justice may therefore be stated as follows: Do no wrong yourself, and permit no wrong to be done, so far as lies in your power; or, expressed positively: Respect and protect the right.”


The U.S. Supreme Court stated the above slightly differently:

“The makers of our Constitution undertook to secure conditions favorable to the pursuit of happiness. They recognized the significance of man's spiritual nature, of his feelings and of his intellect. They knew that only a part of the pain, pleasure and satisfactions of life are to be found in material things. They sought to protect Americans in their beliefs, their thoughts, their emotions and their sensations. They conferred, as against the Government.
the right to be let alone - the most comprehensive of rights and the right most valued by civilized men.”

So in the context of “government” as legally defined, the FIRST duty of government is to LEAVE YOU ALONE, and to ONLY enforce that which you have specifically asked for and consented to in a civil context. If they won’t do that, then you shouldn’t be hiring them to protect your right to be left alone by anyone ELSE through paying them “taxes”.

“Justice is the end of government. It is the end of civil society. It ever has been, and ever will be pursued, until it be obtained, or until liberty be lost in the pursuit.”
[James Madison, The Federalist No. 51 (1788)]

The Bible also states the foundation of justice by saying:

“Do not strive with [or try to regulate or control or enslave] a man without cause, if he has done you no harm.”
[Prov. 3:30, Bible, NKJV]

And finally, Thomas Jefferson agreed with the above by defining “justice” as follows in his First Inaugural Address:

“With all [our] blessings, what more is necessary to make us a happy and a prosperous people? Still one thing more, fellow citizens—a wise and frugal Government, which shall restrain men from injuring one another, shall leave them otherwise free to regulate their own pursuits of industry and improvement, and shall not take from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned. This is the sum of good government, and this is necessary to close the circle of our felicities.”
[Thomas Jefferson: 1st Inaugural, 1801. ME 3:320]

Therefore, the word “injustice” means interference with the equal rights of others absent their consent and which constitutes an injury NOT as any law defines it, but as the PERSON who is injured defines it. Under this conception of “justice”, anything done with your consent cannot be classified as “injustice” or an injury.

The most obvious form of injustice is a criminal mafia that will continue to disturb and threaten you until you pay them “protection money” in order to essentially procure the PRIVILEGE to be left alone. This is the model upon which the IRS operates: They continue to harass, lien, and levy you administratively, even if you are NOT a statutory “taxpayer” and instead are a non-resident non-person, unless and until you essentially pay them “protection money”. Materials on our site prove extensively that a criminal mafia is EXACTLY what the IRS is, including the following memorandum of law:

 Origins and Authority of the Internal Revenue Service, Form #05.005
http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm

The concept of justice explains why a policeman must have “probable cause” in order to detain, arrest, or interrogate you. The presumption is that you have a right to be left alone and the policemen must not disturb your peace unless they have a reasonable cause to do so that is or can be demonstrated with court admissible evidence.

The concept of justice originates from the legal definition of property. The essence and foundation of the “property right”, as held by the U.S. Supreme Court, is the right to EXCLUDE ANYONE AND EVERYONE else, from using, controlling, or benefitting from the use of YOUR property:

“We have repeatedly held that, as to property reserved by its owner for private use, “the right to exclude [others] is one of the most essential sticks in the bundle of rights that are commonly characterized as property.”” Loretto v. Teleprompter Manhattan CATV Corp., 458 U.S. 419, 433 (1982), quoting Kaiser Aetna v. United States, 444 U.S. 164, 176 (1979), “
[Nollan v. California Coastal Comm’n, 483 U.S. 825 (1987)]
"In this case, we hold that the "right to exclude," so universally held to be a fundamental element of the property right, falls within this category of interests that the Government cannot take without compensation.”


The right to exclude that is the essence of the right to PRIVATE property extends not only to other people or businesses, but to ANY and EVERY government, because under the concept of equal protection and equal treatment, all “persons”, including artificial “persons” such as government corporations, are EQUAL. The result of exercising your right to exclude the government is that they HAVE to LEAVE THE PROPERTY ALONE, and NOT try to steal it or deceive you into donating it to them. The only lawful basis for interfering with the use or ownership of any kind of property is when the property is abused to INJURE the equal rights of your sovereign neighbor, and that interference can come only AFTER the injury is inflicted, and not before.

“The sole end, for which mankind are warranted, individually or collectively... in interfering with the liberty of action of any of their number, is self-protection.”

[John Stewart Mill, On Liberty, p. 223]

“Do not strive with [or try to regulate or control or enslave] a man without cause, if he has done you no harm.”

[Prov. 3:30, Bible, NKJV]

Every remedy provided by a lawful de jure government for the protection of private rights therefore BEGINS with demonstrating a quantifiable PAST and not FUTURE injury to a specific, enumerated natural or constitutional right. That remedy can only be imposed absent our consent when the following two conditions are met:

1. Someone’s else’s equal rights have been injured.. AND
2. A specific injury has resulted from that violation under the common law.
   2.1. If the remedy is a civil statutory remedy, we must have a domicile within the jurisdiction of the court administering the remedy before it can be invoked.
   2.2. If the remedy is a civil common law remedy, no domicile is necessary to invoke it in court.
   2.3. If the remedy is a criminal remedy, the violation occurred on territory protected by the sovereign. Otherwise the act of criminal enforcement against nonresident parties amounts essentially to international terrorism.

Fulfillment of the above requirements in a court of law is why those serving as “judges” are referred to as “justices”.

“Leaving people alone” and “not injuring them” are therefore equivalent. The biblical definition of “love” also fills this requirement not to harm others and thereby to ensure that you “leave them alone”.

For the commandments, “You shall not commit adultery,” “You shall not murder,” “You shall not steal,” “You shall not bear false witness,” “You shall not covet,” and if there is any other commandment, are all summed up in this saying, namely, “You shall love your neighbor as yourself.”

Love does no harm to a neighbor; therefore love is the fulfillment of the law.

[Romans 13:9-10, Bible, NKJV]

In order to sue someone in court for an injury to your private rights under the common law, you must be able to demonstrate an injury. This is called “standing”. You don’t have the right or the jurisdiction to interfere with others and drag them into court until THEY have injured you and thereby disturbed your right to be left alone. That’s what the Readings on the History and System of Common Law book above implies.
For further details on the meaning of legal "justice", see and rebut:

What is “Justice”? Form #05.050

“law”: The term "law" as used on this site is constrained by the following requirements:

1. It must apply equally to ALL. It cannot compel INEQUALITY of treatment between any man or class of men. See Form #05.033.
2. It cannot deal cohesively what people individually cannot NATURALLY do. In other words, in the words of Frederic Bastiat, it aggregates the individual right of self-defense into a collective body so that it can be delegated. A single human CANNOT delegate a right he does not individually ALSO possess, which indirectly implies that no GROUP of men called “government" can have any more COLLECTIVE rights under the collective entity rule than a single human being. See the following for a video on the subject. Philosophy of Liberty, SEDM
3. It cannot punish a citizen for an innocent action that was not a crime or not demonstrated to produce measurable harm. The ability to PROVE such harm with evidence in court is called “standing”.
4. It cannot compel the redistribution of wealth between two private parties. This is ESPECIALLY true if it is called a “tax”.
5. It cannot interfere with or impair the right of contracts between PRIVATE parties. That means it cannot compel income tax withholding unless one or more of the parties to the withholding are ALREADY public officers in the government.
6. It cannot interfere with the use or enjoyment or CONTROL over private property, so long as the use injures no one. Implicit in this requirement is that it cannot FAIL to recognize the right of private property or force the owner to donate it to a PUBLIC USE or PUBLIC PURPOSE. In the common law, such an interference is called a “trespass”.
7. The rights it conveys must attach to LAND rather than the CIVIL STATUS (e.g. “taxpayer”, “citizen”, “resident”, etc.) of the people ON that land. One can be ON land within a PHYSICAL state WITHOUT being legally “WITHIN” that state (a corporation) as an officer of the government or corporation (Form #05.042) called a “citizen” or “resident”. See:
   7.1 Your Exclusive Right to Declare or Establish Your Civil Status, Form #13.008.
   https://sedm.org/Forms/13-SelfFamilyChurchGovnce/RightToDeclStatus.pdf
   7.2 Foundations of Freedom, Form #12.021. Video 4 covers how LAND and STATUS are deliberately confused through equivocation in order to KIDNAP people’s identity (Form #05.046) and transport it illegally to federal territory. (“It is locality that is determinative of the application of the Constitution, in such matters as judicial procedure, and not the status of the people who live in it.” [Balzac v. Porto Rico, 258 U.S. 298 (1922)])
   https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hPWFmfa_oD-w
8. It must provide a remedy AFTER an injury occurs. It may not PREVENT injuries before they occur. Anything that operates in a PREVENTIVE rather than CORRECTIVE mode is a franchise. There is no standing in a REAL court to sue WITHOUT first demonstrating such an injury to the PRIVATE or NATURAL rights of the Plaintiff or VICTIM.
9. It cannot acquire the “force of law” from the consent of those it is enforced against. In other words, it cannot be an agreement or contract. All franchises and licensing, by the way, are types of contracts.
10. It does not include compacts or contracts between private people and governments. Rights that are INALIENABLE cannot be contracted away, even WITH consent. See Form #05.003.
11. It cannot, at any time, be called “voluntary”. Congress and even the U.S. Supreme Court call the IRC Subtitle a “income tax” voluntary. See Exhibits #05.025 and #05.051.
12. It does not include franchises, licenses, or civil statutory codes, all of which derive ALL of their force of law from your consent in choosing a civil domicile (Form #05.002).

The above criteria derives from What Is "law"?, Form #05.048, Section 16. Any violation of the above rules is what the Bible calls “devises evil by law” in Psalm 94:20-23 as indicated above.

Roman statesman Cicero defined law as follows:
“True Law is right reason in agreement with Nature, it is of universal application, unchanging and everlasting; it summons to duty by its commands and averts from wrongdoing by its prohibitions. And it does not lay its commands or prohibitions upon good men in vain, although neither have any effect upon the wicked. It is a sin to try to alter this law, nor is it allowable to try to repeal a part of it, and it is impossible to abolish it entirely. We cannot be freed from its obligations by Senate or People, and we need not look outside for an expounder or interpreter of it. And there will not be different laws at Rome or at Athens, or different laws now and in the future, but one eternal and unchangeable law will be valid for all times and all nations, and there will be one master and one rule, that is God, for He is the author of this law, its promulger, and its enforcing judge.”

[Marcus Tullius Cicero, 106-43 B.C.]

“Power and law are not synonymous. In truth, they are frequently in opposition and irreconcilable. There is God’s Law from which all equitable laws of man emerge and by which men must live if they are not to die in oppression, chaos and despair. Divorced from God’s eternal and immutable Law, established before the founding of the suns, man’s power is evil no matter the noble words with which it is employed or the motives urged when enforcing it. Men of good will, mindful therefore of the Law laid down by God, will oppose governments whose rule is by men, and if they wish to survive as a nation they will destroy the [de facto] government which attempts to adjudicate by the whim of venal judges.”

[Marcus Tullius Cicero, 106-43 B.C.]

“Law” is defined to EXCLUDE any and all civil statutory codes, franchises, or privileges in relation to any and all governments and to include ONLY the COMMON law, the CONSTITUTION (if trespassing government actors ONLY are involved), and the CRIMINAL law.

The Court developed, for its own governance in the cases confessedly within its jurisdiction, a series of rules under which it has avoided passing upon a large part of all the constitutional questions pressed upon it for decision. They are:

[...]


FOOTNOTES:

[Ashwander v. Tennessee Valley Authority, 297 U.S. 288, 56 S.Ct. 466 (1936)]

Municipal law, thus understood, is properly defined to be "a rule of civil conduct prescribed by the supreme power in a state, commanding what is right and prohibiting what is wrong."

[...]

It is also called a rule to distinguish it from a compact or agreement; for a compact is a promise proceeding from us, law is a command directed to us. The language of a
compact is, "I will, or will not, do this"; that of a law is, "thou shalt, or shalt not, do it." It is true there is an obligation which a compact carries with it, equal in point of conscience to that of a law; but then the original of the obligation is different. In compacts we ourselves determine and promise what shall be done, before we are obliged to do it; in laws, we are obliged to act without ourselves determining or promising anything at all. Upon these accounts law is defined to be "a rule."

"The words "privileges" and "immunities," like the greater part of the legal phraseology of this country, have been carried over from the law of Great Britain, and recur constantly either as such or in equivalent expressions from the time of Magna Charta. For all practical purposes they are synonymous in meaning, and originally signified a peculiar right or private law conceded to particular persons or places whereby a certain individual or class of individuals was exempted from the rigor of the common law. Privilege or immunity is conferred upon any person when he is invested with a legal claim to the exercise of special or peculiar rights, authorizing him to enjoy some particular advantage or exemption.[1]."
[The Privileges and Immunities of State Citizenship, Roger Howell, PhD, 1918, pp. 9-10; SOURCE: http://famguardian.org/Publications/ThePrivAndImmOfStateCit/The_privileges_and_immunities_of_state_c.pdf]

FOOTNOTES:


"What, then, is [civil] legislation? It is an assumption [presumption] by one man, or body of men, of absolute, irresponsible dominion [because of abuse of sovereign immunity and the act of "CONSENT" by calling yourself a "citizen"] over all other men whom they call subject to their power. It is the assumption by one man, or body of men, of a right to subject all other men to their will and their service. It is the assumption by one man, or body of men, of a right to abolish outright all the natural rights, all the natural liberty of all other men; to make all other men their slaves; to arbitrarily dictate to all other men what they may, and may not, do; what they may, and may not, have; what they may, and may not, be. It is, in short, the assumption of a right to banish the principle of human rights, the principle of justice itself, from off the earth, and set up their own personal will [society of men and not law], pleasure, and interest in its place. All this, and nothing less, is involved in the very idea that there can be any such thing as human [CIVIL] legislation that is obligatory upon those upon whom it is imposed [and ESPECIALLY those who never expressly consented in writing]."
[Natural Law, Chapter 1, Section IV, Lysander Spooner; SOURCE: http://famguardian.org/PublishedAuthors/Indiv/SpoonerLysander/NaturalLaw.htm]

The above methods of REMOVING the protections of the common law and the constitution from the INALIENABLE rights [rights that CANNOT lawfully be given away, even WITH consent] that are protected by them has been described by the U.S. Congress as the ESSENCE of communism itself! This is especially true when you add games with legal words of art to remove even the STATUTORY limitations upon the conduct of the government. See Legal Deception, Propaganda, and Fraud, Form #05.014.
The Congress finds and declares that the Communist Party of the United States [consisting of the IRS, DOJ, and a corrupted federal judiciary], although purportedly a political party, is in fact an instrumentality of a conspiracy to overthrow the [de jure] Government of the United States [and replace it with a de facto government ruled by the judiciary]. It constitutes an authoritarian dictatorship [IRS, DOJ, and corrupted federal judiciary in collusion] within a [constitutional] republic, demanding for itself the rights and /FRANCHISE/ privileges [including immunity from prosecution for their wrongdoing in violation of Article I, Section 9, Clause 8 of the Constitution] accorded to political parties, but denying to all others the liberties [Bill of Rights] guaranteed by the Constitution [Form #10.002]. Unlike political parties, which evolve their policies and programs through public means, by the reconciliation of a wide variety of individual views, and submit those policies and programs to the electorate at large for approval or disapproval, the policies and programs of the Communist Party are secretly /by corrupt judges and the IRS in complete disregard of, Form #05.014, the tax franchise "codes", Form #05.001/ prescribed for it by the foreign leaders of the world Communist movement [the IRS and Federal Reserve]. Its members [the Congress, which was terrorized to do IRS bidding by the framing of Congressman Traficant] have no part in determining its goals, and are not permitted to voice dissent to party objectives. Unlike members of political parties, members of the Communist Party are recruited for indoctrination [in the public FOOL system] by homosexuals, liberals, and socialists with respect to its objectives and methods, and are organized, instructed, and disciplined [by the IRS and a corrupted judiciary] to carry into action slavishly the assignments given them by their hierarchical chiefains.

Unlike political parties, the Communist Party [thanks to a corrupted federal judiciary] acknowledges no constitutional or statutory limitations upon its conduct or upon that of its members [ANARCHISTS!, Form #08.020]. The Communist Party is relatively small numerically, and gives scant indication of capacity ever to attain its ends by lawful political means. The peril inherent in its operation arises not from its numbers, but from its failure to acknowledge any limitation as to the nature of its activities, and its dedication to the proposition that the present constitutional Government of the United States ultimately must be brought to ruin by any available means, including resort to force and violence [or using income taxes]. Holding that doctrine, its role as the agency of a hostile foreign power [the Federal Reserve and the American Bar Association (ABA)] renders its existence a clear present and continuing danger to the security of the United States. It is the means whereby individuals are seduced [illegally KIDNAPPED via identity theft!, Form #05.046] into the service of the world Communist movement [using FALSE information returns and other PERJURIOUS government forms, Form #04.001], trained to do its bidding [by FALSE government publications and statements that the government is not accountable for the accuracy of, Form #05.007], and directed and controlled [using FRANCHISES illegally enforced upon NONRESIDENTS, Form #05.030] in the conspiratorial performance of their revolutionary services. Therefore, the Communist Party should be outlawed.

The above corruption of our Constitutional Republic by the unconstitutional abuse of franchises, the violation of the rules of statutory construction, and interference with common law remedies was described by the U.S. Supreme Court as follows:

"These are words of weighty import. They involve consequences of the most momentous character. 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 of government will be the 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.

Although from the foundation of the Government this court has held steadily to the view that the Government of the United States was one of enumerated powers, and that no one
of its branches, nor all of its branches combined, could constitutionally exercise powers
not granted, or which were not necessarily implied from those expressly granted. Martin
v. Hunter, 1 Wheat. 304, 326, 331; we are now informed that Congress possesses powers
outside of the Constitution, and may deal with new territory, 380*380 acquired by
treaty or conquest, in the same manner as other nations have been accustomed to act
with respect to territories acquired by them. In my opinion, Congress has no existence
and can exercise no authority outside of the Constitution. Still less is it true that
Congress can deal with new territories just as other nations have done or may do with
their new territories. This nation is under the control of a written constitution, the
supreme law of the land and the only source of the powers which our Government, or
any branch or officer of it, may exert at any time or at any place. Monarchical and
despotic governments, unrestrained by written constitutions, may do with newly
acquired territories what this Government may not do consistently with our
fundamental law. To say otherwise is to concede that Congress may, by action taken
outside of the Constitution, engraft upon our republican institutions a colonial system
such as exists under monarchical governments. Surely such a result was never
contemplated by the fathers of the Constitution. If that instrument had contained a
word suggesting the possibility of a result of that character it would never have been
adopted by the People of the United States. The idea that this country may acquire
territories anywhere upon the earth, by conquest or treaty, and hold them as mere
colonies or provinces — the people inhabiting them to enjoy only such rights as
Congress chooses to accord to them — is wholly inconsistent with the spirit and genius
as well as with the words of the Constitution.”
[Downes v. Bidwell. 182 U.S. 244 (1901), Justice Harlan, Dissenting]

Civil statutory codes, franchises, or privileges are referred to on this website as “private law”, but not “law”. The word
“public” precedes all uses of “law” when dealing with acts of government and hence, refers only to COMMON law and
CRIMINAL law that applies equally to everyone, regardless of their consent. Involvement in any and all “private law”
franchises or privileges offered by any government ALWAYS undermines and threatens sovereignty, autonomy, and equality,
turns government into an unconstitutional civil religion, and corrupts even the finest of people. This is explained in:

Government Instituted Slavery Using Franchises, Form #05.030
https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm

Any use of the word "law" by any government actor directed at us or any member, if not clarified with the words "private"
or "public" in front of the word "law" shall constitute:

1. A criminal attempt and conspiracy to recruit us to be a public officer called a "person", "taxpayer", "citizen",
   "resident", etc.
2. A solicitation of illegal bribes called "taxes" to treat us "AS IF" we are a public officer.
3. A criminal conspiracy to convert PRIVATE rights into PUBLIC rights and to violate the Bill of Rights.

The protection of PRIVATE rights mandated by the Bill of Rights BEGINS with and requires:

1. ALWAYS keeping PRIVATE and PUBLIC rights separated and never mixing them together.
2. Using unambiguous language about the TYPE of "right" that is being protected: PUBLIC or PRIVATE in every use of
   the word "right". The way to avoid confusing PUBLIC and PRIVATE RIGHTS is to simply refer to PRIVATE rights
   as "privileges" and NEVER refer to them as "rights".
3. Only converting PRIVATE rights to PUBLIC rights with the express written consent of the HUMAN owner.
4. Limiting the conversion to geographical places where rights are NOT unalienable. This means the conversion must
   occur either abroad or on government territory not within the exclusive jurisdiction of a Constitutional state. Otherwise,
   the Declaration of Independence, which is organic law, would be violated.
5. Keeping the rules for converting PRIVATE to PUBLIC so simple, unambiguous, and clear that a child could
   understand them and always referring to these rules in every interaction between the government and those they are
   charged with protecting.
6. Ensuring that in every interaction (and ESPECIALLY ENFORCEMENT ACTION) between the government both
   administratively and in court, that any right the government claims to civilly enforce against, regulate, tax, or burden
   otherwise PRIVATE property is proven ON THE RECORD IN WRITING to originate from the rules documented in
the previous step. This BURDEN OF PROOF must be met both ADMINISTRATIVELY and IN COURT BEFORE any enforcement action may be lawfully attempted by any government. It must be met by an IMPARTIAL decision maker with NO FINANCIAL interest in the outcome and not employed by the government or else a criminal financial conflict of interest will result. In other words, the government has to prove that it is NOT stealing before it can take property, that it is the lawful owner, and expressly HOW it became the lawful owner.

7. Enforcing the following CONCLUSIVE PRESUMPTION against government jurisdiction to enforce unless and until the above requirements are met:

"All rights and property are PRESUMED to be EXCLUSIVELY PRIVATE and beyond the control of government or the CIVIL statutory franchise codes unless and until the government meets the burden of proving, WITH EVIDENCE, on the record of the proceeding that:

1. A SPECIFIC formerly PRIVATE owner consented IN WRITING to convert said property to PUBLIC property.
2. The owner was either abroad, domiciled on, or at least PRESENT on federal territory NOT protected by the Constitution and therefore had the legal capacity to ALIENATE a Constitutional right or relieve a public servant of the fiduciary obligation to respect and protect the right. Those physically present but not necessarily domiciled in a constitutional but not statutory state protected by the constitution cannot lawfully alienate rights to a real, de jure government, even WITH their consent.
3. If the government refuses to meet the above burden of proof, it shall be CONCLUSIVELY PRESUMED to be operating in a PRIVATE, corporate capacity on an EQUAL footing with every other private corporation and which is therefore NOT protected by official, judicial, or sovereign immunity."

For a detailed exposition on the mandatory separation between PUBLIC and PRIVATE as indicated above, please see the following course on our site:

Separation Between Public and Private Course, Form #12.025
https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm

For a detailed exposition of the legal meaning of the word "law" and why the above restrictions on its definition are important, see:

What is "law"?, Form #05.048
https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm

“law practice” or “practice of law”: 

1. Exclude any and all statutory references to said term in any state or federal statute.
2. Exclude any use of these terms found in any rule of court.
3. Exclude any litigation in which the party “practicing” is representing either a government instrumentality or acting as an officer for said instrumentality such as a statutory “taxpayer” (under the Internal Revenue Code), “driver” (under the vehicle code), “spouse” (under the family code), or “benefit recipient” (under any entitlement program, including Social Security).
4. Include litigation involving ONLY the protection of EXCLUSIVELY PRIVATE property and rights beyond the civil legislative jurisdiction of any de jure government to take away, control, or impair.
5. Include common law or constitutional litigation that does not acquire the "force of law" from the consent of the parties protected by it.

“meritless”: See “frivolous” above.

“non-person”, “non-resident non-person”: The term "non-person" or "non-resident non-person" (Form #05.020) as used on this site we define to be a human not domiciled on federal territory, not engaged in a public office, and not "purposefully and consensually availing themselves of commerce within the jurisdiction of the United States government. Synonymous with "transient foreigner", "in transit", and "stateless" (in relation to the national government). We invented this term. The term
does not appear in federal statutes because statutes cannot even define things or people who are not subject to them and therefore foreign and sovereign. The term "non-individual" used on this site is equivalent to and a synonym for "non-person" on this site, even though STATUTORY "individuals" are a SUBSET of "persons" within the Internal Revenue Code. Likewise, the term "private human" is also synonymous with "non-person". Hence, a "non-person":

1. Retains their sovereign immunity. They do not waive it under the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act, 28 U.S.C. Chapter 97 or the longarm statutes of the state they occupy.
2. Is protected by the United States Constitution and not federal statutory civil law.
3. May not have federal statutory civil law cited against them. If they were, a violation of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 17 and a constitutional tort would result if they were physically present on land protected by the United States Constitution within the exterior limits of states of the Union.
4. Is on an equal footing with the United States government in court. "Persons" would be on an UNEQUAL, INFERIOR, and subservient level if they were subject to federal territorial law.

Don't expect vain public servants to willingly admit that there is such a thing as a human "non-person" who satisfies the above criteria because it would undermine their systematic and treasonous plunder and enslavement of people they are supposed to be protecting. However, the U.S. Supreme Court has held that the "right to be left alone" is the purpose of the constitution. Olmstead v. United States, 277 U.S. 438. A so-called "government" that refuses to leave you alone or respect or protect your sovereignty and equality in relation to them is no government at all and has violated the purpose of its creation described in the Declaration of Independence. Furthermore, anyone from the national or state government who refuses to enforce this status, or who imputes or enforces any status OTHER than this status under any law system other than the common law is:

1. "purposefully availing themselves" of commerce within OUR jurisdiction.
2. STEALING, where the thing being STOLEN are the public rights associated with the statutory civil "status" they are presuming we have but never expressly consented to have.
3. Engaging in criminal identity theft, because the civil status is associated with a domicile in a place we are not physically in and do not consent to a civil domicile in.
4. Consenting to our Member Agreement.
5. Waiving official, judicial, and sovereign immunity.
6. Acting in a private and personal capacity beyond the statutory jurisdiction of their government employer.
7. Compelling us to contract with the state under the civil statutory "social compact".
8. Interfering with our First Amendment right to freely and civilly DISASSOCIATE with the state.

If freedom and self-ownership or "ownership" in general means anything at all, it means the right to deny any and all others, including governments, the ability to use or benefit in any way from our body, our exclusively owned private property, and our labor.

"We have repeatedly held that, as to property reserved by its owner for private use, "the right to exclude [others is] 'one of the most essential sticks in the bundle of rights that are commonly characterized as property.' " Loretto v. Teleprompter Manhattan CATV Corp., 458 U.S. 419, 433 (1982), quoting Kaiser Aetna v. United States, 444 U.S. 164, 176 (1979).

[Nollan v. California Coastal Comm'n, 483 U.S. 825 (1987)]

"In this case, we hold that the "right to exclude," so universally held to be a fundamental element of the property right,[11] falls within this category of interests that the Government cannot take without compensation." [Kaiser Aetna v. United States, 444 U.S. 164 (1979)]

FOOTNOTES:

“nontaxpayer”: Same definition as “taxpayer” above.

“permanent address”: Defined as one’s legal domicile. See:

Why Domicile and Becoming a “Taxpayer” Require Your Consent, Form #05.002
http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm

“personal services”: Defined as services which:

1. Are NOT connected with a “trade or business” or a “public office” within any government or any other government “franchise”.
2. Are NOT the term defined in 26 C.F.R. §1.469-9(b)(4).
3. Are NOT defined or referenced anywhere within any statute or regulation published by the United States federal government and therefore entirely beyond the jurisdiction of the government to regulate.
4. Are connected with labor of a human being that is not subject to withholding, attachment, or taxation of any kind:

   "Every man has a natural right to the fruits of his own labor, is generally admitted; and no other person can rightfully deprive him of those fruits, and appropriate them against his will..."

   [The Antelope, 23 U.S. 66, 10 Wheat. 66, 6 L.Ed. 268 (1825)]

“private”: When it appears in front of other entity names such as "person", "individual", "business", "employee", "employer", etc. shall imply that the entity is:

1. In possession of absolute, exclusive ownership and control over their own labor, body, and all their property. In Roman Law this was called "dominium".
2. On an EQUAL rather than inferior relationship to government in court. This means that they have no obligations to any government OTHER than possibly the duty to serve on jury and vote upon voluntary acceptance of the obligations of the civil status of “citizen” (and the DOMICILE that creates it). Otherwise, they are entirely free and unregulated unless and until they INJURE the equal rights of another under the common law.
3. A "nonresident" in relation to the state and federal government.
4. Not a PUBLIC entity defined within any state or federal statutory law. This includes but is not limited to statutory "person", "individual", "taxpayer", "driver", "spouse" under any under any civil statute or franchise.
5. Not engaged in a public office, "trade or business" (per 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(26)). Such offices include but are not limited to statutory "person", "individual", "taxpayer", "driver", "spouse" under any civil statute or franchise.

   "PRIVATE PERSON. An individual who is not the incumbent of an office."

6. Not consenting to contract with or acquire any public status, public privilege, or public right under any state or federal franchise. For instance, the phrase "private employee" means a common law worker that is NOT the statutory "employe" defined within 26 U.S.C. §3401(c) or 26 C.F.R. §301.3401(c)-1 or any other federal or state law or statute.
7. Not sharing ownership or control of their body or property with anyone, and especially a government. In other words:
   7.1. Ownership is not "qualified" but "absolute".
7.2. There are not moities between them and the government.
7.3. The government has no usufructs over any of their property.
8. Not subject to civil enforcement or regulation of any kind, except AFTER an injury to the equal rights of others has occurred. Preventive rather than corrective regulation is an unlawful taking of property according to the Fifth Amendment takings clause.
9. Not "privileged" or party to a franchise of any kind:

"PRIVILEGE. “A right, power, franchise, or immunity held by a person or class, against or beyond the course of the law. [ . . .] That which releases one from the performance of a duty or obligation, or exempts one from a liability which he would otherwise be required to perform, or sustain in common [common law] with all other persons. State v. Grosnickle, 189 Wis. 17, 206 N.W. 895, 896. A peculiar advantage, exemption, or immunity. Sacramento Orphanage & Children's Home v. Chambers, 25 Cal.App. 536, 144 P. 317, 319. [Black's Law Dictionary, Fourth Edition, pp. 1359-1360]

"Is it a franchise? A franchise is said to be a right reserved to the people by the constitution, as the elective franchise. Again, it is said to be a privilege conferred by grant from government, and vested in one or more individuals, as a public office. Corporations, or bodies politic are the most usual franchises known to our laws. In England they are very numerous, and are defined to be royal privileges in the hands of a subject. An information will lie in many cases growing out of these grants, especially where corporations are concerned, as by the statute of 9 Anne, ch. 20, and in which the public have an interest. In 1 Strange R. ( The King v. Sir William Louther,) it was held that an information of this kind did not lie in the case of private rights, where no franchise of the crown has been invaded.

If this is so--if in England a privilege existing in a subject, which the king alone could grant, constitutes it a franchise--in this country, under our institutions, a privilege or immunity of a public nature, which could not be exercised without a legislative grant, would also be a franchise."
[People v. Ridgley, 21 Ill. 65, 1859 WL 6687, 11 Peck 65 (Ill., 1859)]

10. The equivalent to a common law or Constitutional "person" who retains all of their common law and Constitutional protections and waives none.

"The words "privileges" and "immunities," like the greater part of the legal phraseology of this country, have been carried over from the law of Great Britain, and recur constantly either as such or in equivalent expressions from the time of Magna Charta. For all practical purposes they are synonymous in meaning, and originally signified a peculiar right or private law conceded to particular persons or places whereby a certain individual or class of individuals was exempted from the rigor of the common law. Privilege or immunity is conferred upon any person when he is invested with a legal claim to the exercise of special or peculiar rights, authorizing him to enjoy some particular advantage or exemption."

[The Privileges and Immunities of State Citizenship, Roger Howell, PhD, 1918, pp. 9-10; SOURCE: http://famguardian.org/Publications/ThePrivAndImmOfStateCit/The_privileges_and_immunities_of_state_c.pdf]

Every attempt by anyone in government to alienate rights that the Declaration of Independence says are UNALIENABLE shall also be treated as "PRIVATE BUSINESS ACTIVITY" that cannot be protected by sovereign, official, or judicial immunity. So called "government" cannot make a profitable business or franchise out of alienating inalienable rights without ceasing to be a classical/de jure government and instead becoming in effect an economic terrorist and de facto government in violation of Article 4, Section 4.

"No servant [or government or biological person] can serve two masters; for either he will hate the one and love the other, or else he will be loyal to the one and despise the other. You cannot serve God and mammon [government]."

[Luke 16:13, Bible, NKJV]

“protection”: The word "protection" includes only CRIMINAL, constitutional, and common law protection. It excludes every type of government activity, franchise, or program that requires a predicate civil status (Form #13.008) to enforce, such as "citizen", "resident", "taxpayer", "spouse", Social Security beneficiary, etc. Every attempt to impose, acquire, or enforce a civil status or to enforce duties upon a civil status NOT related to voting or jury service constitutes the following:

1. An INJURY and an INJUSTICE (Form #05.050).
2. Identity Theft (Form #05.046).

“resident”: Means an alien with a legal domicile or “residence” in the “United States”, which includes the territories and possessions of the “United States” and excludes states of the Union.

“sovereign”: When referring to humans or governments means all the following:

1. A human being and NOT a "government". Only human beings are "sovereign". All powers of government are delegated from the PEOPLE and are NOT "divine rights". Those powers in turn are only operative when government PREVENTS the conversion of PRIVATE rights into PUBLIC rights. When that goal is avoided or undermined or when law is used to accomplish involuntary conversion, we cease to have a government and instead end up with a private, de facto for profit corporation that has no sovereign immunity and cannot abuse sovereign immunity to protect its criminal thefts from the people.
2. EQUAL in every respect to any and every government or actor in government. All governments are legal "persons" and under our Constitutional system, ALL "persons" are equal and can only become UNEQUAL in relation to each other WITH their EXPRESS and NOT IMPLIED consent. Since our Constitutional rights are unalienable per the Declaration of Independence, then we can't become unequal in relation to any government, INCLUDING through our consent.
3. Not superior in any way to any human being within the jurisdiction of the courts of any country.
4. Possessing the EQUAL right to acquire rights over others by the same mechanisms as the government uses. For instance, if the government encourages the filing of FALSE information returns that essentially "elect" people into public office without their consent, then we have an EQUAL right to elect any and every government or officer within government into our PERSONAL service as our PERSONAL officer without THEIR consent. See: Correcting Erroneous Information Returns, Form #04.001 http://sedm.org/Forms/Tax/CorrErrInfoRtns/CorrErrInfoRtns.pdf
5. Subject to the criminal laws of the jurisdiction they are physically situated in, just like everyone else. This provision excludes "quasi criminal provisions" within civil franchises, such as tax crimes.
6. The origin of all authority delegated to the government per the Declaration of Independence.
7. Reserving all rights and delegating NONE to any and every government or government actor. U.C.C. §1-308 and its predecessor, U.C.C. §1-207.
8. Not consenting to any and every civil franchise offered by any government.
9. Possessing the same sovereign immunity as any government. Hence, like the government, any government actor asserting a liability or obligation has the burden of proving on the record of any court proceeding EXPRESS WRITTEN consent to be sued before the obligation becomes enforceable.
10. Claiming no civil or franchise status under any statutory franchise, including but not limited to "citizen", "resident", "driver" (under the vehicle code), "spouse" (under the family code), "taxpayer" (under the tax code), "person" (under...
the civil law). Any attempt to associate a statutory status and the public rights it represents against a non-consenting party is THEFT and SLAVERY and INJUSTICE.

11. Acting as a fiduciary, agent, and trustee on behalf of God 24 hours a day, seven days a week as an ambassador of a legislatively foreign jurisdiction and as a public officer of "Heaven, Inc.", a private foreign corporation. God is the ONLY "sovereign" and the source of all sovereignty. We must be acting as His agent and fiduciary before we can exercise any sovereignty at all. Any attempt by so-called "government" to interfere with our ability to act as His fiduciaries is a direct interference with our right to contract and the free exercise of religion. See:

Delegation of Authority Order from God to Christians, Form #13.007
http://sedm.org/Forms/SelfFamilyChurchGvnce/DelOfAuthority.pdf

12. Capable of being civilly sued ONLY under the common law and equity and not under any statutory civil law. All statutory civil laws are law for government and public officers, and NOT for private human beings. They are civil franchises that only acquire the "force of law" with the consent of the subject. See:

Why Statutory Civil Law is Law for Government and Not Private Persons, Form #05.037

13. Protected from the civil statutory law by the First Amendment requirement for separation of church and state because we Christians are the church and our physical body is the "temple" of the church. See: 1 Cor. 6:19.

14. Responsible for all the injuries they cause to every other person under equity and common law ONLY, and not under civil statutory law.

15. "State": Means the "State" defined in 4 U.S.C. §110(d) as a federal territory or possession and not any state of the Union.

1. "individual": Defined as a human being and NOT a statutory "person" that:

2. Excludes the "individual" defined in 26 C.F.R. §1.1441-1(c)(3).


4. Excludes the definition found in 5 U.S.C. §552(a)(2), who are all "domiciliaries" of the "United States".


6. Includes those who are nonresident aliens not engaged in a "trade or business" who have no earnings from the United States as defined in 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(9) and (a)(10) and whose estate is a "foreign estate" pursuant to 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(31).

"state national": The term "state national" means those who are born in a Constitutional but not Statutory "State" as described in the Fourteenth Amendment. Equivalent to a "non-citizen national of the United States OF AMERICA". EXCLUDES any of the following:

1. STATUTORY "person" under 26 U.S.C. §6671(b) and §7343.

2. Statutory "national and citizen of the United States** at birth" as defined in 8 U.S.C. §1401. This is a territorial citizen rather than a state citizen.


4. "National but not citizen of the United States** at birth" under 8 U.S.C. §1408. This is a person born in a federal possession RATHER than a state of the Union.

5. "U.S.[**] non-citizen national" under 8 U.S.C. §1452. This is a person born in a federal possession RATHER than a state of the Union.

6. STATUTORY "U.S. person" as defined in 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(30), which is a human being born and domiciled on federal territory not within the exclusive jurisdiction of any Constitutional state.

The term "tax" includes any method to collect revenues to support ONLY the operation of the government. It does NOT include the abuse of taxing power to transfer wealth between ordinary citizens or residents and when it is used for this purpose it is THEFT, not "taxation".

"The power to tax is, therefore, the strongest, the most pervading of all powers of government, reaching directly or indirectly to all classes of the people. It was said by Chief Justice Marshall, in the case of McCulloch v. Md., 4 Wheat. 431, that the power to tax is the power to destroy. A striking instance of the truth of the proposition is seen
in the fact that the existing tax of ten per cent, imposed by the United States on the
circulation of all other banks than the National Banks, drove out of existence every *state
bank of circulation within a year or two after its passage. This power can be readily
employed against one class of individuals and in favor of another, so as to ruin the one
class and give unlimited wealth and prosperity to the other, if there is no implied limitation
of the uses for which the power may be exercised.

To lay, with one hand, the power of the government on the property of the citizen,
and with the other to bestow it upon favored individuals to aid private enterprises
and build up private fortunes, is none the less a robbery because it is done under the
forms of law and is called taxation. This is not legislation. It is a decree under
legislative forms.

Nor is it taxation. ‘A tax,’ says Webster’s Dictionary, ‘is a rate or sum of money
assessed on the person or property of a citizen by government for the use of the nation
or State.’ ‘Taxes are burdens or charges imposed by the Legislature upon persons or
property to raise money for public purposes.’ Cooley, Const. Lim., 479.

think the common mind has everywhere taken in the understanding that taxes are a public
imposition, levied by authority of the government for the purposes of carrying on the
government in all its machinery and operations—that they are imposed for a public
purpose,’ See, also Pray v. Northern Liberties, 31 Pa.St. 69; Matter of Mayor of N.Y., 11
Johns., 77; Camden v. Allen, 2 Dutch., 398; Sharpless v. Mayor, supra; Hanson v. Vernon,
27 Ia., 47; Whiting v. Fond du Lac, supra.”

[Loan Association v. Topeka, 20 Wall. 655 (1874)]

"A tax, in the general understanding of the term and as used in the constitution, signifies
an exaction for the support of the government. The word has never thought to connote the
expropriation of money from one group for the benefit of another.”

[U.S. v. Butler, 297 U.S. 1 (1936)]

"Tax" includes ONLY impositions upon PUBLIC property or franchises (Form #05.030) and not upon absolutely owned
PRIVATE property.

1. PRIVATE property must be consensually converted to PUBLIC property before it can be taxed, and the burden of
proof rests on the government to prove that it was lawfully converted before it can be subject to tax. See:

Separation Between Public and Private Course, Form #12.025
https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm

2. The "persons" spoken above are civil statutory PUBLIC "persons" and not PRIVATE humans. See:

Why Statutory Civil Law is Law for Government and Not Private Persons, Form #05.037
https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm

“taxpayer”: Defined as human being and NOT a statutory “person” who is:

1. NOT the entity described in 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(14) or 26 U.S.C. §1313 or any other statute or regulation published by
the United States federal government.
2. NOT subject to any provision of the Internal Revenue Code or any other statute or regulation published by the United
States federal government, which is foreign law.
3. Whose entire estate is a “foreign estate” pursuant to 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(31)

“Terrorism”: Any action taken by either a government or a government actor which is done without the express written
consent of the Protected Party and which causes a loss or injury to the property, time, or resources of the Protected Party.
“trade or business”: Defined in 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(26) as “the functions of a public office”. Excludes anything or class of thing not expressly described somewhere in the Internal Revenue Code. See:

The “Trade or Business” Scam, Form #05.001
http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm

“transferor”: Defined as all the following:

1. The entity or human being selling real property that is NOT located in the “United States” as defined in 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(9) and (a)(10), not connected with a “trade or business” as defined in 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(26).
2. The owner of real property that is not subject to the Federal Investment in Real Property Transfer Act (FIRPTA), 26 U.S.C. §897, the proceeds of which is not “gross income” as described in 26 U.S.C. §61 and which does not originate from “sources within the United States” described in 26 U.S.C. §871.
3. NOT the entity defined in 26 U.S.C. §1445(f)(1)

“United States”: means the United States government corporation defined in 28 U.S.C. §3002(15)(A) and excludes states of the Union as used in the Constitution of the United States of America.

“U.S. person”: Defined as:

1. NOT the entity described 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(30) or any other statute or regulation published by the United States federal government.
2. Those domiciled in either a state of the Union or a foreign country on land not under the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States Federal Government as documented in 40 U.S.C. §3112.

“wage” or “wages”: The term defined in 26 U.S.C. §3401(a). Excludes earnings of human beings who are not engaged in a “public office” or a “trade or business” or who have not made an “election” to associate their earnings with a “public office” by voluntarily submitting an “agreement” pursuant to 26 C.F.R. §31.3401(a)-3(a), and 26 C.F.R. §31.3402(p)-1. Consequently, anyone who does not submit an IRS form W-4 and who is not otherwise engaged in a “public office” earns no reportable “wages” or “gross income” in connection with their labor pursuant to 26 C.F.R. §31.3401(a)-3(a), and 26 C.F.R. §31.3402(p)-1.

The legal or statutory definitions for words used in all interactions between the parties in turn:

1. Shall be based FIRST upon statutory definitions provided.
2. Shall conclusively be presumed to EXCLUDE the ordinary or EXCLUSIVELY PRIVATE civil context for the meaning of words. This is because the ability to regulate EXCLUSIVELY PRIVATE conduct is REPUGNANT TO THE CONSTITUTION as held by the U.S. Supreme Court.
3. Shall rely FIRST on the Sovereignty Forms and Instructions Online, Form #10.004, Cites By Topic for the statutory definitions.
4. May not ADD anything not EXPRESSLY appearing in any statute in which they are defined, if a statutory definition is provided. Any attempt to do so shall be interpreted as TREASON by the judge or government prosecutor who attempts it.

*When a statute includes an explicit definition, we must follow that definition, even if it varies from that term's ordinary meaning.* Meese v. Keene, 481 U.S. 465, 484-485 (1987) (“It is axiomatic that the statutory definition of the term excludes unstated meanings of that term”); Colautti v. Franklin, 439 U.S. at 392-393, n. 10 (“As a rule, a definition which declares what a term “means” . . . excludes any meaning that is not stated”); Western Union Telegraph Co. v. Lenroot, 323 U.S. 490, 502 (1945) ; Fox v. Standard Oil Co. of N.J., 294 U.S. 87, 95-96 (1935) (Cardozo, J.); see also 2A N. Singer, Sutherland on Statutes and Statutory Construction § 47.07, p. 152, and n. 10 (5th ed. 1992) (collecting...
cases). That is to say, the statute, read "as a whole," post at 998 [530 U.S. 943] (THOMAS, J., dissenting), leads the reader to a definition. That definition does not include the Attorney General's restriction -- "the child up to the head." Its words, "substantial portion," indicate the contrary."

/Stenberg v. Carhart, 530 U.S. 914 (2000)/

The purpose of this requirement is to eliminate ALL presumptions from any legal proceeding about what we might write or say so that such false and unauthorized presumptions cannot be used to discredit or slander us or prejudice our rights or sovereignty. For instance, here are two examples:

**Other than the words defined above, all words used in this agreement shall have only the common meaning ascribed to them and shall NOT be construed in any way to have the legal meaning found in any federal or state law.** The only exception to this rule is that when a word is surrounded in quotation marks and preceded or succeeded by an indication of the legal definition upon which it is based, then and only then will it assume the legal definition. The legal definitions for words used on this website, in turn, shall be based entirely upon the Sovereignty Forms and Instructions Online, Form #10.004, Cites By Topic. The purpose of this requirement is to eliminate ALL presumptions from any legal proceeding about what we might write or say so that such false and unauthorized presumptions cannot be used to discredit or slander us or prejudice our rights or sovereignty. For instance, here are two examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement from this website</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wages are not taxable</td>
<td>Earnings from labor of a human being that do not fit the description of &quot;wages&quot; defined in 26 U.S.C. §3401(a) and 26 C.F.R. §31.3401(a)-3 are not taxable without the consent of the subject.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Wages&quot; are taxable</td>
<td>Wages as defined in 26 U.S.C. §3401(a) and 26 C.F.R. §31.3401(a)-3 ARE taxable because they fit the legal description of &quot;wages&quot;.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key to Capitalization Conventions within Laws.** Whenever you are reading a particular law, including the U.S. Constitution, or a statute, the Sovereign referenced in that law, who is usually the author of the law, is referenced in the law with the first letter of its name capitalized. For instance, in the U.S. Constitution the phrase "We the People", "State", and "Citizen" are all capitalized, because these were the sovereign entities who were writing the document residing in the States. This document formed the federal government and gave it its authority. Subsequently, the federal government wrote statutes to implement the intent of the Constitution, and it became the Sovereign, but only in the context of those territories and lands ceded to it by the union states. When that federal government then refers in statutes to federal "States", for instance in 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(10) or 4 U.S.C. §110(d), then these federal "States" are Sovereigns because they are part of the territory controlled by the Sovereign who wrote the statute, so they are capitalized. Foreign states referenced in the federal statutes then must be in lower case. The sovereign 50 union states, for example, must be in lower case in federal statutes because of this convention because they are foreign states. Capitalization is therefore always relative to who is writing the document, which is usually the Sovereign and is therefore capitalized. The exact same convention is used in the Bible, where all appellations of God are capitalized because they are sovereigns: "Jesus", "God", "Him", "His", "Father". These words aren’t capitalized because they are proper names, but because the entity described is a sovereign or an agent or part of the sovereign. The only exception to this capitalization rule is in state revenue laws, where the state legislators use the same capitalization as the Internal Revenue Code for "State" in referring to federal enclaves within their territory because they want to scam money out of you. In state revenue laws, for instance in the California Revenue and Taxation Code, §§17018 and 6017, "State" means a federal State within the boundaries of California and described as part of the Buck Act of 1940 found in 4 U.S.C. §§105-113. See the following URL to see what we mean:

**Terms in Quotation Marks:** Whenever a term appears in quotation marks, we are using the statutory or regulatory definition of the term instead of the layman’s or dictionary definition. We do this to clarify which definition we mean and to avoid creating the kind of confusion with definitions that our government and the unethical lawyers who work in it are famous for.

For instance, when we use say "employee", we mean the statutory definition of that term found in 26 U.S.C. §3401(c) and 26 C.F.R. §31.3401(c)-1 rather than the common definition everyone uses, which means anyone who receives compensation for their labor. "Employees" are much more narrowly defined in the Internal Revenue Code to mean elected or appointed officers of the U.S. government only. We also put terms in quotation marks if they are new or we just introduced the term, to emphasize that we are trying to explain what the word means.

**Geographical terms:** The following geographical definitions apply within the context of discussions about law.
Table 1: Meaning of geographical “words of art”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Law</th>
<th>Federal constitution</th>
<th>Federal statutes</th>
<th>Federal regulations</th>
<th>State constitutions</th>
<th>State statutes</th>
<th>State regulations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Union States/&quot;We The People&quot;</td>
<td>Federal Government</td>
<td>&quot;We The People&quot;</td>
<td>State Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;state&quot;</td>
<td>Foreign country</td>
<td>Union state</td>
<td>Union state</td>
<td>Other Union state or federal government</td>
<td>Other Union state or federal government</td>
<td>Other Union state or federal government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;State&quot;</td>
<td>Union state</td>
<td>Federal state</td>
<td>Federal state</td>
<td>Union state</td>
<td>Union state</td>
<td>Union state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;in this State&quot; or “in the State”</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Federal enclave within state</td>
<td>Federal enclave within state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(State Revenue and taxation code only)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Federal enclave within state</td>
<td>Federal enclave within state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;several States&quot;</td>
<td>Union states collectively</td>
<td>Federal “States” collectively</td>
<td>Federal “States” collectively</td>
<td>Federal “States” collectively</td>
<td>Federal “States” collectively</td>
<td>Federal “States” collectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;United States&quot;</td>
<td>states of the Union collectively</td>
<td>Federal United States*</td>
<td>Federal United States**</td>
<td>United States* the country</td>
<td>Federal United States**</td>
<td>Federal United States**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES:

1. The term “Federal state” or “Federal ‘States’” as used above means a federal territory as defined in 4 U.S.C. §110(d) and EXCLUDES states of the Union.
2. The term “Union state” means a “State” mentioned in the United States Constitution, and this term EXCLUDES and is mutually exclusive to a federal “State”.
3. If you would like to investigate the various “words of art” that lawyers in the federal government use to deceive you, we recommend the following:
   3.2. Great IRS Hoax. Form #11.302, Sections 3.9.1 through 3.9.1.28. http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm

What the above table clearly shows is that the word “State” in the context of federal statutes and regulations means (not includes!) federal States only under Title 48 of the U.S. Code[4], and these areas do not include any of the 50 Union States. This is true in most cases and especially in the Internal Revenue Code. The lower case word “state” in the context of federal statutes and regulations means one of the 50 union states, which are “foreign states”, and “foreign countries” with respect to the federal government as clearly explained in section 5.2.11 of the Great IRS Hoax, Form #11.302 book. In the context of the above, a “Union State” means one of the 50 Union states of the United States* (the country, not the federal United States**) mentioned in the Constitution for the United States of America.

Parties stipulate that:

1. The purpose of providing statutory definition is to supersede rather than enlarge the ordinary meaning of a word.
2. They will not add anything or class of things that does not expressly appear within the statutory definition of any term within any law.

---

1 See California Revenue and Taxation Code, §6017.
2 See California Revenue and Taxation Code, §17018.
3 See, for instance, U.S. Constitution Article IV, Section 2.
3. They will not use the expansive or additive sense of the words “include” or “includes” to infer authority to add any
ting of things to the statutory definition of a term that does not expressly appear in the definition or
SOMEWHERE in the statutes. See:
Legal Deception, Propaganda, and Fraud, Form #05.014
http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm
4. Definitions in this section apply to and supersede definitions of any and all terms on any tax form received by the
Government Actor and pertaining to the Protected Party or his agents or assigns. Statutory definitions used on
government forms do not apply unless the specific statute that provides the definition is referenced within the government
publication, ruling, or form that invokes it the term.
5. Government Actor agrees to comply with the rules of statutory construction for all terms he/she/it uses in strict
compliance with the following:
5.1. Legal Deception, Propaganda, and Fraud, Form #05.014
http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm
5.2. Rules of Presumption and Statutory Interpretation, Litigation Tool #10.003
http://sedm.org/Litigation/LitIndex.htm
6. Any violation of the provisions in this section shall constitute the establishment of a state sponsored religion where
6.1. Presumption serves as an equivalent of “faith”.
6.2. The judge becomes the priest.
6.3. The attorneys become the deacons.
6.4. The court becomes the church.
6.5. The statute becomes a voluntary franchise.
6.6. Fees charged under the franchise become tithes to the state sponsored church.
6.7. Pleadings become “prayers” to the priest.
6.8. The “superior being” being worshipped is the socialist collective or a civil ruler, rather than the true and living
God.

3 Significance of Identifying Numbers Used in Correspondence between by
Protected Party and either Government or Government Actor

Parties to this agreement stipulate the following facts in connection with all of their interactions:

1. Pursuant to 26 C.F.R. §1.1441-1(c)(3), all “individuals” are “taxpayers” and statutory “aliens”. Consequently, SSNs
may only lawfully be used as a substitute for TINs in the case of a statutory but not constitutional alien. Since Protected
Person is NOT a statutory alien or statutory “individual” in relation to the national government as a person born within
and/or domiciled within the constitutional but not statutory “United States”, then Protected Person would be committing
fraud to either obtain or to use a Taxpayer Identification Number from the IRS or to use an SSN in place of a TIN.
2. Statutory “Nonresident aliens” not engaged in the “trade or business”/public office franchise such as myself are not
required to have or to use Taxpayer Identification Numbers or Social Security Numbers in connection with any financial
arrangement or transaction pursuant to the following:

31 C.F.R. §306.10

2 Taxpayer identifying numbers are not required for foreign governments, nonresident
aliens not engaged in trade or business within the United States, international
organizations and foreign corporations not engaged in trade or business and not having
an office or place of business or a financial or paying agent within the United States, and
other persons or organizations as may be exempted from furnishing such numbers under
regulations of the Internal Revenue Service.

Number”, or “TIN” as used on any government forms and all correspondence means “Nontaxpayer Identification
Number (NIN)”, signifying that the Protected party is a “nontaxpayer” who does not meet the definition of “taxpayer”
found in 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(14), who is not subject to any provision within the Internal Revenue Code, who is a
“nonresident alien” not engaged in a “trade or business”, and who has no earnings from within the “United States” as
4. The term “Social Security Number” or “SSN” as used on the attached government forms is NOT the number issued under the authority of 20 C.F.R. §422.104, which can only lawfully be issued to federal employees, agents, and benefit recipients, none of which describe the Protected Party. See and rebut the following if you disagree:

   Resignation of Compelled Social Security Trustee, Form #06.002
   http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm

5. The term “Employer Identification Number” or “EIN” as used on all government forms is NOT the number issued under the authority of 26 U.S.C. §6109 or any other Act of Congress. Instead, it means a “Nontaxpayer Identification Number” or “NIN” as defined above.

6. The term “Taxpayer Identification Number” or “TIN” as used on the All government forms and correspondence is NOT the number issued under the authority of either 26 U.S.C. §6109 or any other Act of Congress. Instead it means a “Nontaxpayer Identification Number” or “NIN” as defined above.

7. All “Nontaxpayer Identification Numbers” or “NINs”, or any other synonym described in this section and included in any form or attachment included herein or submitted on any previous government form are the exclusive, licensed, copyrighted intellectual property of the Protected Party. They are protected by the Copyright Act codified in Title 17 of the U.S. Code and this license agreement. Any use by the government of this property for any commercial or government purpose, including tax collection, is STRICTLY PROHIBITED. Each unauthorized use is punishable by a penalty of $100,000 per incident plus any tax or penalty assessment associated with the unauthorized use.

8. Providing any kind of identifying number on any government form shall NOT be evidence of consent to engage in a privileged “trade or business” franchise as described in 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(26). Instead, it shall be evidence of NON-consent to engage in said franchise and a formal request to criminally prosecute the company, financial institution, and/or government entity associated with the submission for criminal racketeering in violation of 18 U.S.C. §1956 and “extortion under the color of law” for compelling the use of said identifying number in violation of 42 U.S.C. §408.

WARNING: You may not lawfully use any government issued identifying number in connection with the Protected Party, such as a Social Security Number (SSN) as defined in 20 C.F.R. §422.103(d), Taxpayer Identification Number (TIN) as defined in 26 U.S.C. §6109, or Employer Identification Number (EIN) as defined in 26 U.S.C. §6109. Protected Party:

1. Does not participate and is not lawfully eligible to participate in Social Security or the “trade or business” excise taxable franchise described in 26 U.S.C. Subtitle A.

2. Is not a statutory “U.S. person” (26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(30)) for which a “Taxpayer Identification Number” may lawfully be used pursuant to 26 U.S.C. §6109 and 26 C.F.R. §301.6109-1.

3. May not lawfully use or possess any government identifying number because it is “public property” which belongs to the government pursuant to 20 C.F.R. §422.103(d). Only “public officers” on official business may lawfully use public property, and only in strict accordance with law for the benefit of the government and not them as private individuals.

4. Is appearing here as a PRIVATE HUMAN BEING and not a PUBLIC OFFICER. If you compel me to use a government identifying number, you are an accessory to criminal conversion of private property to a public use and a public purpose if you connect me or my assets with a public number in violation of 18 U.S.C. §654. You could end up in jail for up to ten years if you put an identifying number on any records pertaining to me or my property, assets, or my earnings from PRIVATE employment.


6. Will file a criminal complaint in connection with the use of any government issued identifying number connected with his exclusively PRIVATE life, property, and liberty and vociferously prosecute all those who unlawfully compel him to use a knowingly false number or any number at all in order to obtain any service or product in violation of 42 U.S.C. §408.

If the number “000-00-0000” appears in the TIN or SSN block on the attached government form, then it means that Protected Person doesn’t have a validly issued STATUTORY SSN or TIN. Consequently, Protected Person is not “federal personnel” as indicated in 5 U.S.C. §552a(a)(13).

If a number other than “000-00-0000” for the SSN/TIN was provided on the attached government form:

1. It was provided under unlawful duress because the agent accepting the form threatened to withhold issuance of the passport if Protected Person would not provide a number. It is a CRIME to compel the use of such numbers per 42 U.S.C. §408(a)(8).
2. The number shall be treated AS IF it were “000-00-0000”, regardless of what it says.

3. The acceptance agent, by instituting duress in compelling the use of government numbers, is attempting to convert constitutional rights into statutory privileges and franchises, which is a CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY against my rights punishable under 18 U.S.C. §241. Anyone who does any of the following is party to said conspiracy:

3.1. Anyone he or she talked to about how to circumvent my attempts to avoid enumeration is party to said conspiracy.

3.2. Anyone who fails or omits deliberately to prosecute the crimes indicated herein.

4. The number provided is NOT the number described in 26 U.S.C. §6109, 20 C.F.R. §422.103(d), or any other federal law, statute, or regulation. Hence, it is not subject to being either true, false, factual, or consistent with any record in possession of any government. The clerk said it was their “POLICY” (not LAW, but POLICY) to require a number and could show me no law. Well, if he or she can invent such policy, then Protected Person can INVENT a Nonstatutory number that conforms with the POLICY but also is equally not subject to or susceptible to the requirements of the law. The constitution protects the equality of ALL PERSONS, and hence, Protected Person has the EQUAL right to make “POLICY” to counteract the DOS’s policy to prevent injury to his/her own private rights.

5. The applicant, being under unlawful, criminal duress, does not vouch for the accuracy of said number. Instead, it is:

5.1. NONFACTUAL political beliefs and opinions that are not admissible as evidence in any legal proceeding and not legally actionable in any manner.

5.2. NOT the “Social Security Number” defined in 20 C.F.R. §422.103.

5.3. NOT the “Taxpayer Identification Number” (TIN) described in 26 U.S.C. §6109.

6. The applicant does not “have” a number described in 26 U.S.C. §6109, 20 C.F.R. §422.103(d) and cannot legally “have” such a number. One can only “have” something that they own and control. Protected Person doesn’t control the number because if he/she did, he/she could tell the government they CANNOT use it, so it must not be mine. The notion of “property” implies the right to FORBID other people from using or benefitting from something so I must not “OWN” a government number. Both the Social Security Card and 20 C.F.R. §422.103(d) say the card and the number belong to the GOVERNMENT and not the applicant, and therefore it is a legal and rational impossibility for me to “have” government property unless Protected Person is a public officer managing government property and serving in an official capacity. In fact, Protected Person DOES NOT consent to represent a public office in the government and it is a crime to unilaterally elect or appoint myself into such an office. Furthermore, filling out an SS-5 form or W-9 form and asking for such a number cannot and does not CREATE any public office in the government and any attempt to use it for that purpose is a violation of 18 U.S.C. §912. It is acknowledged as a CRIME to use government property such as a statutory SSN or TIN for a private purpose or personal benefit. Hence, the number provided MUST be described herein as NOT corresponding with anything described in any federal law and NOT to be used for any enforcement or government purpose because not connected with any existing application the government has ever received.

7. The power to create is the power to define, and since Protected Person created the form being processed, then Protected Person is the only one who can define both the meaning or the intended meaning of every word or phrase on the form. I must do so in order to avoid being victimized by the self-serving and usually FALSE presumptions of others or conferring undue discretion to a government bureaucrat or judge to INVENT a meaning I didn’t intend.

If a Social Security Number (SSN) or Taxpayer Identification Number (TIN) other than “000-00-0000” was provided on the application, recipient of this form is requested to prosecute the acceptance agent for:


2. Identity theft under the following for the commercial abuse of my identity for personal gain without my consent:

   2.1. 42 U.S.C. §405(c)(2)(C)(i)
   2.2. 42 U.S.C. §408(a)(7)
   2.3. 18 U.S.C. §1028(a)(7)
   2.4. 18 U.S.C. §1028A.
   2.5. Equivalent state statutes indicated in:

       https://sedm.org/litigation-main/sedm-jurisdiction-online/

4 Parties

The two parties to this agreement include:

1. The private party, hereinafter called the Protected Party, who sent the Government Actor this franchise and agreement or referenced it in their correspondence with government actors. This person is the ONLY Merchant under U.C.C. §2-104(1) in the context of any and every interaction with any or every government.

2. The government officer or agency, hereinafter called the Government Actor. This legal person is the Buyer under U.C.C. §2-103(1)(a) in relation to the Protected Party. This party fits one or more of the following criteria:
2.1. Initiated communication with the Protected Party requiring a response or ..
2.2. Made any demands upon the time or property of the Protected Party, or..
2.3. Made the Protected Party the target of enforcement for any government franchise, including but not limited to Income taxes under Internal Revenue Code, Subtitles A through C, Social Security, Vehicle Code, Family Code, or any other government franchise or debt. . . . or
2.4. Is acting as a withholding agent pursuant to 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(16) or filing any kind of information return against the Protected Party. Information returns include those submitted under the authority of 26 U.S.C. §6041.

5 Consideration

1. Consideration provided by Protected Party to Government Actor:
1.1. Responses to unwelcome correspondence sent by Government Actor.
1.2. The use of any information from, to, or about the Protected Party, and especially involving anything having a commercial consequence.
1.3. Services of Protected party to effect actions required to enforce this agreement.
1.4. Receiving temporary use, custody, and control of any and all monies withheld by anyone from my earnings and paid ultimately to the government. I am a man or woman or entity that is: 1. A nonresident not engaged in the “trade or business” franchise; 2. With no statutory “income” from the statutory “United States”; 3. Who never consented to withholding; 4. And against whom all information return reporting is FALSE. As such, any withholdings or reportings are under protest, under duress, are the product of constructive FRAUD and CRIMINAL misconduct on the part of the government, and are unlawfully withheld and paid. FRAUD has occurred because this franchise makes all statements of the recipient and/or government factual and material relating to tax reporting and withholding, and omissions and misfeasance by the government cause conduct that is inconsistent with and a violation of the written law. These monies may therefore not lawfully be retained either by you or the government without you being guilty of criminal money laundering and being an accessory after the fact to the crimes documented herein. I don’t have to become a privileged franchisee called a “taxpayer” or pursue a statutory “refund” in order to get these monies back, because they are laundered monies resulting from CRIMINAL RACKETEERING, EXTORTION, and FRAUD that are due back WITHOUT even requesting them back.

“A claim against the United States is a right to demand money from the United States. Such claims are sometimes spoken of as gratuitous in that they cannot be enforced by suit without statutory consent. The general rule of non-liability of the United States does not mean that a citizen cannot be protected against the wrongful governmental acts that affect the citizen or his or her property. If, for example, money or property of an innocent person goes into the federal treasury by fraud to which a government agent was a party, the United States cannot [lawfully] hold the money or property against the claim of the injured party.”

[American Jurisprudence 2d, United States, §45 (1999)]

“When the Government has illegally received money which is the property of an innocent citizen and when this money has gone into the Treasury of the United States, there arises an implied contract on the part of the Government to make restitution to the rightful owner under the Tucker Act and this court has jurisdiction to entertain the suit.

90 Ct.Cl. at 613, 31 F.Supp. at 769.”


---


5 Blagge v. Balch, 162 U.S. 439, 40 L.Ed. 1032, 16 S.Ct. 853.


California Civil Code
Section 2224

“One who gains a thing by fraud, accident, mistake, undue influence, the violation of a trust, or other wrongful act, is, unless he or she has some other and better right thereto, an involuntary trustee of the thing gained, for the benefit of the person who would otherwise have had it.”

“The United States, we have held, cannot, as against the claim of an innocent party, hold his money which has gone into its treasury by means of the fraud of its agent. While here the money was taken through mistake without element of fraud, the unjust retention is immoral and amounts in law to a fraud of the taxpayer’s rights. What was said in the State Bank Case applies with equal force to this situation. ‘An action will lie whenever the defendant has received money which is the property of the plaintiff, and which the defendant is obligated by natural justice and equity to refund. The form of the indebtedness or the mode in which it was incurred is immaterial.’”

6 Authority for Establishment

The authority for establishment of this franchise is the right to control the use of my private property, which includes my labor and all property held in my name. The purpose of establishing government is to protect PRIVATE property and to keep said property from being converted to the use of anyone else or from being converted to public property under a government franchise.

“How, then, are purely equitable obligations created? For the most part, either by the acts of third persons or by equity alone. But how can one person impose an obligation upon another? By giving property to the latter on the terms of his assuming an obligation in respect to it. At law there are only two means by which the object of the donor could be at all accomplished, consistently with the entire ownership of the property passing to the donee, namely: first, by imposing a real obligation upon the property; secondly, by subjecting the title of the donee to a condition subsequent. The first of these the law does not permit; the second is entirely inadequate. Equity, however, can secure most of the objects of the donor, and yet avoid the mischiefs of real obligations by imposing upon the donee (and upon all persons to whom the property shall afterwards come without value or with notice) a personal obligation with respect to the property; and accordingly this is what equity does. It is in this way that all trusts are created, and all equitable charges made (i.e., equitable hypothecations or liens created) by testators in their wills. In this way, also, most trusts are created by acts inter vivos, except in those cases in which the trustee incurs a legal as well as an equitable obligation. In short, as property is the subject of every equitable obligation, so the owner of property is the only person whose act or acts can be the means of creating an obligation in respect to that property. Moreover, the owner of property can create an obligation in respect to it in only two ways: first, by incurring the obligation himself, in which case he commonly also incurs a legal obligation; secondly, by imposing the obligation upon some third person; and this he does in the way just explained.”
The only requirement that Protected Party has to meet in order to lawfully impose a duty upon you is that he/she/it:

1. Conveys rights or property to a Government Actor.
2. Gives Government Actor formal, timely, and reasonable notice of the terms and conditions under which Government Actor receives the property or rights constituting the consideration specified in this agreement.

This agreement shall therefore serve as “reasonable notice” of the terms of receipt of said PRIVATE property in the temporary custody of Government Actor and/or his agents or assigns. Notice to the agent shall also serve as notice to the principal. This means that:

1. If you are working for a government in corresponding or interacting with me, you also implicitly agree to notify all others who might interact with me in that same government that they are similarly bound by the terms of this franchise and agreement.
2. In the event that you do not, you also agree to act as personal surety and an officer for any and all other human beings who also communicate or interact with me beyond the point that you have initiated this contact or interaction.

The above tactic is the same tactic the government uses against private people, whereby they use the tax system franchise to make innocent and unaware person into surety for endless and irresponsible deficit spending and public debt by career politicians. Hence, I am entitled to equal protection and equal treatment.

This franchise agreement operates **the same** as the federal government’s franchises: and Protected Party is entitled to equal protection and equal treatment:

1. **Income tax “trade or business” franchise:**
   1.1 The agreement operates as a “quasi-contract”, like the income tax itself. See Milwaukee v. White, 296 U.S. 268 (1935).
   1.2 Consent to the franchise agreement codified in Internal Revenue Code, Subtitle A is based upon unsigned, hearsay third party evidence called an “information return” (W-2, 1042-S, 1098, and 1099) that is usually false because the subject is not engaged in the “public office” franchise and receives no “benefits” thereby. In the case of my/this franchise, such third party hearsay reports consist of any and all administrative correspondence sent by you to me as well as legal pleadings filed in this case containing licensed information about me or relating to commercial/tax transactions, such as my name, address, facts about my conduct, or information illegally seized from a place outside of federal territory.
   1.3 Using government property called a “Social Security Number” or “Taxpayer Identification Number” in association with someone, which 20 C.F.R. §422.103(d) identifies as property of the Social Security Administration and NOT the user, constitutes constructive consent by the person so associated to the terms of the franchise agreement. In that sense, associating the subject with specific information owned by another in the form of an identifying number acts as a prima facie license number to engage in the franchise. In the case of MY franchise, information about me is MY PROPERTY and use of this licensed information makes those using or abusing it into my private officers and agents. In law, all rights are “property”, and the Fourth Amendment protects my right to privacy and thereby makes all information about me into “property” which I have a right to exclusive use and control over as “property”.
   1.4 The government’s “trade or business” franchise confers a “benefit”, which is a reduced or graduated rate of tax under I.R.C. §1, earned income credit under I.R.C. §32, and “trade or business” deductions under I.R.C. §162. Likewise, my/this franchise confers a similar “benefit”, which is the right to invade my privacy, engage in commercial relationships with me, and impose involuntary uncompensated duties upon me by abusing a legal system against me that otherwise has no jurisdiction over me as a human being and not a legal “person” not domiciled or resident on federal territory.
   1.5 The franchise is based on an “activity”, which is that of a “public office” in the U.S. government (I.R.C. §7701(a)(26)). The result is agency on behalf of the government by the de facto licensee. Likewise, my franchise agreement also creates agency and fiduciary duty on your part towards me as a private party, which I describe as a “private office” representing my wishes as documented herein.

2. **Social Security Franchise:**
   2.1 The SSA Form SS-5 is an application for a “card” and associated number, not for “benefits”.
   2.2 The SS card is identified in 20 C.F.R. §422.103(d) as property of the government and not the holder, even AFTER it is received. The back of the card also affirms this relationship and says it must be returned upon request.
   2.3 The back of the card and the regulations governing its use say that use of the card constitutes effective consent to the statutes regulating use of the property, including penalties.
If in defense Government Actor claims any of the following:

1. That Protected Party may not acquire rights by the same method as the government, as in Social Security or the “trade or business” franchise…OR
2. That Government Actor has no delegated authority to waive sovereign immunity or to consent by anything other than by an act of legislation.

. . . then Protected Party invokes and claims the SAME EQUAL right and therefore cannot be and is not subject to any government franchise, nor can he or she become the lawful subject of any enforcement action under said franchise. Furthermore, any and all funds contributed to any such franchise also shall constitute a LOAN and not a GIFT of any kind. All such loans of property also constitute consideration under the terms of this anti-franchise franchise.

7 Evidence of Consent to Offer/Agreement

The following subsections deal with conditions in which the Protected Party is a target of criminal activity by specific public servants and the result of the activity is the ILLEGAL CONVERSION of PRIVATE property to public use or control by civil statutes or a government officer against the consent of the owner. For the purposes of this discussion the term “private” is that defined earlier in section 2 and the term “private property” is that protected by the following mandatory presumption:

“All rights and property are PRESUMED to be EXCLUSIVELY PRIVATE and beyond the control of government or the CIVIL statutory franchise codes unless and until the government meets the burden of proving, WITH EVIDENCE, on the record of the proceeding that:

1. A SPECIFIC formerly PRIVATE owner consented IN WRITING to convert said property to PUBLIC property.

2. The owner was either abroad, domiciled on, or at least PRESENT on federal territory NOT protected by the Constitution and therefore had the legal capacity to ALIENATE a Constitutional right or relieve a public servant of the fiduciary obligation to respect and protect the right. Those physically present but not necessarily domiciled in a constitutional but not statutory state protected by the constitution cannot lawfully alienate rights to a real, de jure government, even WITH their consent.

3. If the government refuses to meet the above burden of proof, it shall be CONCLUSIVELY PRESUMED to be operating in a PRIVATE, corporate capacity on an EQUAL footing with every other private corporation and which is therefore NOT protected by official, judicial, or sovereign immunity."

As a consequence of the illegal use or control over PRIVATE property, government actors or the government itself is subject to control or regulation of the rightful owner under the terms of this agreement, which is a LOAN agreement.

“How, then, are purely equitable obligations created? For the most part, either by the acts of third persons or by equity alone. But how can one person impose an obligation upon another? By giving property to the latter on the terms of his assuming an obligation in respect to it. At law there are only two means by which the object of the donor could be at all accomplished, consistently with the entire ownership of the property passing to the donee, namely: first, by imposing a real obligation upon the property; secondly, by subjecting the title of the donee to a condition subsequent. The first of these the law does not permit; the second is entirely inadequate. Equity, however, can secure most of the objects of the donor, and yet avoid the mischiefs of real obligations by imposing upon the donee (and upon all persons to whom the property shall afterwards come without value or with notice) a personal obligation with respect to the property; and accordingly this is what equity does. It is in this way that all trusts are created, and all equitable charges made (i.e., equitable hypothecations or liens created) by testators in their wills. In this way, also, most trusts are created by acts inter vivos, except in those cases in which the trustee
incurs a legal as well as an equitable obligation. **In short, as property is the subject of every equitable obligation, so the owner of property is the only person whose act or acts can be the means of creating an obligation in respect to that property. Moreover, the owner of property can create an obligation in respect to it in only two ways: first, by incurring the obligation himself, in which case he commonly also incurs a legal obligation; secondly, by imposing the obligation upon some third person; and this he does in the way just explained.**”


“*Cujus est commodum ejus debet esse incommmodum.*

He who receives the benefit should also bear the disadvantage.”

“*Que sentit commodum, sentire debet et onus.*

He who derives a benefit from a thing, ought to feel the disadvantages attending it. 2 Bouv. Inst. n. 1433.”

[Bouvier’s Maxims of Law, 1856; SOURCE: http://famguardian.org/Publications/BouvierMaximsOfLaw/BouviersMaxims.htm]

“*The rich rules over the poor,*

And the borrower is servant to the lender.”

[Prov. 22:7, Bible, NKJV]

“*When the Government has illegally received money which is the property of an innocent citizen and when this money has gone into the Treasury of the United States, there arises an implied contract on the part of the Government to make restitution to the rightful owner under the Tucker Act and this court has jurisdiction to entertain the suit.*

90 Ct.Cl. at 613, 31 F.Supp. at 769.”


“*The United States, we have held, cannot, as against the claim of an innocent party, hold his money which has gone into its treasury by means of the fraud of its agent. While here the money was taken through mistake without element of fraud, the unjust retention is immoral and amounts in law to a fraud of the taxpayer’s rights. What was said in the State Bank Case applies with equal force to this situation. ‘An action will lie whenever the defendant has received money which is the property of the plaintiff, and which the defendant is obligated by natural justice and equity to refund. The form of the indebtedness or the mode in which it was incurred is immaterial.’*”


All government franchises are based upon loans of government property with conditions as described in:

**Government Instituted Slavery Using Franchises, Form #05.030**

http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm

Since the United States government is one of delegated powers ALONE, according to the U.S. Supreme Court, then the PRIVATE humans delegating this NATURAL power such as the Protected Party must also have the SAME power to create franchises and use them against the government as a defense against illegal enforcement of government franchises against them. Such franchises include the Internal Revenue Code Subtitle A “public officer”/”trade or business” franchise, Social Security, and every other government benefit.

Every attempt by anyone in government to alienate rights that the Declaration of Independence says are UNALIENABLE is hereby stipulated under this agreement as "PRIVATE BUSINESS ACTIVITY" that cannot be protected by sovereign, official, or judicial immunity. So called "government" cannot make a **profitable business or franchise** out of alienating inalienable rights without ceasing to be a classical/de jure government and instead becoming in effect an **economic terrorist** and de facto government in violation of Article 4, Section 4.

---

**Injury Defense Franchise and Agreement**

Rev. 6-5-2018

EXHIBIT: _______
"No servant [or government or biological person] can serve two masters; for either he will hate the one and love the other, or else he will be loyal to the one and despise the other. You cannot serve God and mammon [government]."

[Luke 16:13, Bible, NKJV]

For a detailed exposition of the rules of lawfully converting property from PRIVATE to PUBLIC, see and rebut:

Separation Between Public and Private Course, Form #12.025
https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm

7.1 Generally

Pursuant to U.C.C. §1-303, Course of Usage and Trade, evidence of unconditional consent to this agreement shall include any one or more of the following actions in a general sense:

1. Signing this agreement.
2. Making any demands upon the valuable time, resources, or property of the Protected Party.
3. Claiming a right or interest to any of the property of the Protected Party.
4. Adversely affecting constitutionally protected rights of the Protected Party.
5. Treating Protected Party as a “citizen”, “resident”, or domiciliary under any federal law or moving his identity to the District of Columbia under any franchise agreement, such as that codified at 26 U.S.C. §7408(d) and 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(39).
6. Engaging in or attempting to engage in any kind of commercial relationship with Protected Party or using his/her/its name in connection with a commercial obligation, which thereby causes an implied surrender of sovereign, official, and judicial immunity of the Government Actor in relation to the Protected Party pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1605. This includes instituting penalties, sending bills, or making any kind of financial demands upon the Protected Party.

   CALIFORNIA CIVIL CODE
   DIVISION 3. OBLIGATIONS
   PART 2. CONTRACTS
   CHAPTER 3. CONSENT
   Section 1589

   1589. A voluntary acceptance of the benefit of a transaction is equivalent to a consent to all the obligations arising from it, so far as the facts are known, or ought to be known, to the person accepting.

6.1. “driver” under the vehicle code of any state of the Union.
6.2. “spouse” under the family code of any state of the Union.
6.3. “taxpayer”, “person”, or “individual” under the revenue code of any state of the Union.
6.4. “taxpayer”, “person”, “individual”, “citizen”, or “resident” under the Internal Revenue Code, Title 26 of the United States Code.
6.7. “person” or “individual” under any government healthcare or tax law.

7.2 Attorneys

The following activities by attorneys litigating against the Protected Party constitute consent to this franchise and agreement:

1. Acting as a fact witness in any dispute in court. Attorneys are NOT authorized to act as fact witnesses.
2. Expunging or removing or striking pleadings filed by the Protected Party from the record of any legal proceeding, and especially at the request or under the direction of any government officer such as the judge or opposing counsel. This is criminal obstruction of justice.
3. Citing irrelevant caselaw against the Protected Party as a point and authority. By “irrelevant” we mean case law involving a party who was not “similarly situated” in terms of legal status to that of the Protected Party. For instance, citing rulings involving “taxpayers” against the Protected Party, who is a NONTAXPAYER not subject to the Internal Revenue Code. The result is CRIMINAL identity theft as described in:
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EXHIBIT:________
7.3 Judges

Any of the following activities by judges are beyond their delegated authority and shall therefore constitute consent to this agreement:

1. Ignoring or refusing to address any issue raised by the Protected Party that would result in a judgment against the government in litigation involving the government. This is criminal obstruction of justice by omission. Any and all factual statements made by the Protected Party verified under penalty of perjury and not expressly denied by either the judge or the opposing party WITH admissible evidence are stipulated by all parties concerned to be:
   a. Truthful under Federal Rule of Civi Procedure 8(b)(6).
   b. Admitting into evidence for examination by the jury in any litigation involving the Protected Party.

   “An agreement [consensual contract] obtained by duress, coercion, or intimidation is invalid, since the party coerced is not exercising his free will, and the test is not so much the means by which the party is compelled to execute the agreement as the state of mind induced. 8 Duress, like fraud, rarely becomes material, except where a contract or conveyance has been made which the maker wishes to avoid. As a general rule, duress renders the contract or conveyance voidable, not void, at the option of the person coerced, 9 and it is susceptible of ratification. Like other voidable contracts, it is valid until it is avoided by the person entitled to avoid it. 10 However, duress in the form of physical compulsion, in which a party is caused to appear to assent when he has no intention of doing so, is generally deemed to render the resulting purported contract void. 11”

   [American Jurisprudence 2d, Duress, §21 (1999)]

2. Refusing to judge the law AND the facts and to ensure that they are not told that they will have to pay the taxes that the defendant or plaintiff refuses to pay:

   “It is left... to the juries, if they think the permanent judges are under any bias whatever in any cause, to take on themselves to judge the law as well as the fact. They never exercise this power but when they suspect partiality in the judges; and by the exercise of this power they have been the firmest bulwarks of English liberty.”

   [Thomas Jefferson to Abbe Arnoux, 1789. ME 7:423, Papers 15:283 ]

3. Identifying a return of PRIVATE property rightfully owned by the Protected Party as a “benefit”. Justice cannot be a franchise or it is an INJUSTICE as legal “justice” is defined in section 2 of this document.

4. Attempting to judge the law in cases where the judge has a financial conflict of interest as described in 28 U.S.C. §§144 or 455 or 18 U.S.C. §208 and refuses to recuse him or herself. This includes judges ruling on tax matters as statutory “taxpayers”, whereby they can have their salary effectively reduced by those before them who refuse to pay their “fair share”, even though being a NONTAXPAYER is perfectly lawful. In such a case, the Founding Fathers held that the only proper approach is to allow an IMPARTIAL jury NOT receiving government “benefits” to rule on both the law AND the facts and to ensure that they are not told that they will have to pay the taxes that the defendant or plaintiff refuses to pay:

   “It is left... to the juries, if they think the permanent judges are under any bias whatever in any cause, to take on themselves to judge the law as well as the fact. They never exercise this power but when they suspect partiality in the judges; and by the exercise of this power they have been the firmest bulwarks of English liberty.”

   [Thomas Jefferson to Abbe Arnoux, 1789. ME 7:423, Papers 15:283 ]

5. Refusing to identify whether the SPECIFIC capacity in which the Protected Party is acting is a public office or government agency when he or she is the target of civil statutory enforcement by the government. Only those who are
agents and officers of the government may lawfully become the target of such enforcement. The government has the burden of proving with evidence that the Protected Party was lawfully elected or appointed to government office and is acting as an agent of government before it may lawfully enforce civil statutes against him/her. Failure to do so constitutes aiding or abetting criminal identity theft. For proof, see:

5.1. Why Statutory Civil Law is Law for Government and Not Private Persons, Form #05.037
https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm

5.2. Proof That There is a "Straw Man", Form #05.042
https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm

5.3. Why Your Government is Either a Thief or You are a "Public Officer" for Income Tax Purposes, Form #05.008
https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm

5.4. Government Identity Theft, Form #05.046
https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm

6. Interfering with, sanctioning, convicting, or penalizing Protected Party for any activity that the government can and does lawfully do to him or her or it. This includes but is not limited to administrative liens and levies under his/her own franchise agreement such as this one, just like the IRS does under the "trade or business"/public officer franchise. All such activities are a violation of the constitutional requirement for equal protection and equal treatment as describe in;

Requirement for Equal Protection and Equal Treatment, Form #05.033
https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm

7. Proceeding with a summary judgment where the party litigating against the government has ANY dispute with the government counsel over the facts.

8. In cases against the government, telling the party opposing the government or the jury that they may NOT talk about or quote the law to the jury.

9. Sealing the court record or making it unpublished in cases against the government, and especially where the party opposing the government won the case. This prejudices further litigation against the government on the same subject matter.

10. Refusing to recognize or discuss violation of private property rights by the government in cases against the government involving illegal enforcement or taking of property of any kind. See:

Separation Between Public and Private Course, Form #12.025
https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm

11. Excluding evidence of parties litigating against the government who are the target of government enforcement. All such parties are public officers according to the State Action Doctrine and therefore, their evidence CANNOT lawfully be excluded under Federal Rule of Evidence 803(8).

12. Acting as a fact witness by, for instance, representing anything BUT written positive law as "law" to a jury.

13. Legal deception, including:
13.2. Refusing to allow jurors to hear the definition of terms.
13.3. Interfering with the admission of evidence of the definition of a statutory term by parties litigating against the government.
13.4. Expanding the statutory definition of terms beyond what is clearly stated.
13.5. Making presumptions about the definitions of terms.
13.6. Using the ORDINARY definition of the term instead of the STATUTORY definition of terms in cases against the government.
13.7. Violating the rules of statutory construction.

For details on the above, see:

Legal Deception, Propaganda, and Fraud, Form #05.014
https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm

14. Interfering with jurors reading or hearing the statutory law being enforced EXACTLY AS WRITTEN by, for instance:
14.1. Preventing them from visiting the courthouse law library or any law library.
14.2. Refusing requests by the jury panel to receive the written statutes being enforced.

15. Representing any government publication that is NOT published in the government statutes as "law" to the jury. This unconstitutionally delegates legislative power to the judge. See:

Reasonable Belief About Income Tax Liability, Form #05.007
https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm

16. Entering a plea on behalf of a criminal defendant who is challenging jurisdiction BEFORE he or she makes a plea. This constitutes unlawfully "practicing law" while on the bench.

17. Tampering with the court record by ordering the court clerk to modify written testimony.
18. Compelling or enticing the surrender of rights in exchange for privileges or perks. This is a violation of the
Unconstitutional Conditions Doctrine as described in:

Government Instituted Slavery Using Franchises, Form #05.030, Section 28.2
https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/Franchises.pdf

19. Expunging or removing or striking pleadings filed by the the Protected Party from the record of any legal proceeding,
and especially at the request or under the direction of any government officer such as the judge or opposing counsel.
This is criminal obstruction of justice.

20. Citing irrelevant caselaw against the Protected Party as a point and authority. By “irrelevant” we mean case law
involving a party who was not “similarly situated” in terms of legal status to that of the Protected Party. For instance,
citing rulings involving “taxpayers” against the Protected Party, who is a NONTAXPAYER not subject to the Internal
Revenue Code. The result is CRIMINAL identity theft as described in:

Government Identity Theft, Form #05.046

7.4 Government employees

“As expressed otherwise, the powers delegated to a public officer are held in trust for the
people and are to be exercised in behalf of the government or of all citizens who may need
the intervention of the officer. 12 Furthermore, the view has been expressed that all public
officers, within whatever branch and whatever level of government, and whatever be
their private vocations, are trustees of the people, and accordingly labor under every
disability and prohibition imposed by law upon trustees relative to the making of personal
financial gain from a discharge of their trusts. 13 That is, a public officer occupies a
fiduciary relationship to the political entity on whose behalf he or she serves, 14 and
owes a fiduciary duty to the public. 15 It has been said that the fiduciary responsibilities
of a public officer cannot be less than those of a private individual. 16 Furthermore, it
has been stated that any enterprise undertaken by the public official which tends to
weaken public confidence and undermine the sense of security for individual
[PRIVATE] rights is against public policy.17"

[63C American Jurisprudence 2d, Public Officers and Employees, §247 (1999)]

Government employees consent to this agreement by any of the following activities that are beyond their delegated
authority:

1. Performing acts outside their written delegation order.
2. Refusing to recognize or discuss the legal or constitutional limits upon their authority, which the Congress defines as
the essence of COMMUNISM itself:

TITLE 50 > CHAPTER 23 > SUBCHAPTER IV > Sec. 841,
Sec. 841. - Findings and declarations of fact

13 Georgia Dep’t of Human Resources v. Sistrunk, 249 Ga. 543, 291 S.E.2d. 524. A public official is held in public trust. Madlener v. Finley (1st Dist), 161
Ill.App.3d. 796, 113 Ill.Dec. 712, 515 N.E.2d. 697, app gr 117 Ill.Dec. 226, 520 N.E.2d. 387 and revd on other grounds 128 Ill.2d. 147, 131 Ill.Dec. 145,
538 N.E.2d. 520.
437 N.E.2d. 783.
15 United States v. Holzer (CA7 Ill), 816 F.2d. 304 and vacated, remanded on other grounds 484 U.S. 807, 98 L.Ed.2d. 18, 108 S.Ct. 53, on remand (CA7
Ill) 840 F.2d. 1343, cert den 486 U.S. 1035, 100 L.Ed.2d. 608, 108 S.Ct. 2022 and (criticized on other grounds by United States v. Osser (CA3 Pa) 864
F.2d. 1056) and (superseded by statute on other grounds as stated in United States v. Little (CA5 Miss) 889 F.2d. 1367) and (among conflicting authorities
16 Chicago ex rel. Cohen v. Keane, 64 Ill.2d. 559, 2 Ill.Dec. 285, 357 N.E.2d. 452, later proceeding (1st Dist) 105 Ill.App.3d. 298, 61 Ill.Dec. 172, 434
N.E.2d. 325.
17 Indiana State Ethics Comm’n v. Nelson (Ind App), 656 N.E.2d. 1172, reh gr (Ind App) 659 N.E.2d. 260, reh den (Jan 24, 1996) and transfer den (May 28,
1996).
The Congress finds and declares that the Communist Party of the United States [consisting of the IRS, DOJ, and a corrupted federal judiciary], although purportedly a political party, is in fact an instrumentality of a conspiracy to overthrow the [de jure] Government of the United States [and replace it with a de facto government ruled by the judiciary]. It constitutes an authoritarian dictatorship [IRS, DOJ, and corrupted federal judiciary in collusion] within a [constitutional] republic, demanding for itself the rights and privileges [including immunity from prosecution for their wrongdoing in violation of Article 1, Section 9, Clause 8 of the Constitution] accorded to political parties, but denying to all others the liberties [Bill of Rights] guaranteed by the Constitution [Form #10.002].

Unlike political parties, which evolve their policies and programs through public means, by the reconciliation of a wide variety of individual views, and submit those policies and programs to the electorate at large for approval or disapproval, the policies and programs of the Communist Party are secretly [by corrupt judges and the IRS in complete disregard of, Form #05.014, the tax franchise "codes", Form #05.001] prescribed for it by the foreign leaders of the world Communist movement [the IRS and Federal Reserve]. Its members [the Congress, which was terrorized to do IRS bidding by the framing of Congressman Traficant] have no part in determining its goals, and are not permitted to voice dissent to party objectives. Unlike members of political parties, members of the Communist Party are recruited for indoctrination [in the public FOOL system by homosexuals, liberals, and socialists] with respect to its objectives and methods, and are organized, instructed, and disciplined [by the IRS and a corrupted judiciary] to carry into action slavishly the assignments given them by their hierarchical chieftains. Unlike political parties, the Communist Party [thanks to a corrupted federal judiciary] acknowledges no constitutional or statutory limitations upon its conduct or upon that of its members [ANARCHISTS!, Form #08.020]. The Communist Party is relatively small numerically, and gives scant indication of capacity ever to attain its ends by lawful political means. The peril inherent in its operation arises not from its numbers, but from its failure to acknowledge any limitation as to the nature of its activities, and its dedication to the proposition that the present constitutional Government of the United States ultimately must be brought to ruin by any available means, including resort to force and violence [or using income taxes]. Holding that doctrine, its role as the agency of a hostile foreign power [the Federal Reserve and the American Bar Association (ABA)] renders its existence a clear present and continuing danger to the security of the United States. It is the means whereby individuals are seduced [illegally KIDNAPPED via identity theft!, Form #05.046] into the service of the world Communist movement [using FALSE information returns and other PERJURIOUS government forms, Form #04.001], trained to do its bidding [by FALSE government publications and statements that the government is not accountable for the accuracy of, Form #05.007], and directed and controlled [using FRANCHISES illegally enforced upon NONRESIDENTS, Form #05.030] in the conspiratorial performance of their revolutionary services. Therefore, the Communist Party should be outlawed.

3. Penalizing or attempting illegally to penalize Protected Party illegally when he or she does NOT satisfy the statutory definition of “person”, such as in 26 U.S.C. §6671(b). For details, see: Why Penalties are Illegal for Anything But Government Franchisees, Employees, Contractors, or Agents, Form #05.010
https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm

4. Enforcing or attempting to enforce the penal or criminal statutes illegally against Protected Party when he or she does NOT satisfy the statutory definition of “person”, such as in 26 U.S.C. §7343.

5. Refusing to provide their delegation order.

6. Refusing to sign all correspondence under penalty of perjury, as required by 26 U.S.C. §6065. Government cannot exempt itself from this rule without attributing to itself in effect an unconstitutional “Title of Nobility” not available to ordinary Americans and erecting an illegal civil religion where they are the object of worship.

7. Interfering with administrative or legal discovery useful in cases against the government.

8. Refusing to authenticate documents obtained through FOIA or Privacy Act discovery as a way to make the data inadmissible in pending or actual litigation.

9. Using any written publication OTHER than positive law and the regulations implementing it in taking an action that adversely affects the private property of the Submitter. See:
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Reasonable Belief About Income Tax Liability, Form #05.007
https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/ReasonableBelief.pdf


11. Ignoring or suppressing from evidence any correspondence dealing with violations of law by government workers that jeopardizes the private property interests of someone litigating against the government.

8 Rights acquired by Protected Party Against Government Actor

Parties acquire the following private rights and private property against the other party under the terms of this franchise and agreement.

8.1 Return of Any and all Property of Protected Party Acquired by Government Actor or his Employer

Government Actor agrees to be responsible to return any and all property of Protected Party acquired through enforcement or collection activity of any government franchise by either the Government Actor or his/her employer. Property must be returned within 30 days upon receipt and upon written notice to the Government Actor. Failure to return property of Protected Party collected by Government Actor or his/her Employer shall incur a financial liability of TEN TIMES the value of said property.

Parties agree that any and all property of Protected Party collected by the Government Actor or his/her employer:

1. Shall be characterized as a temporary loan AT INTEREST by Protected Party to Government Actor.
2. Shall make the property custodian into a bailee and transferee over property of Protected Party. This is similar to how the Internal Revenue Code works, in which all “taxpayers” are, in fact, public officers and transferees over public property per 26 U.S.C. §6901.
3. Shall subject any and all government custodians of the loaned property into agents and officers and consenting parties under this agreement. Government Actor agrees to give timely notice of the existence of this agreement to any and all OTHER government actors who may be in temporary possession of property of the Protected Party.

Protected Party shall have the authority to exercise any and all means necessary to secure the return of his/her/its property under this section as indicated later in section 8.8. This includes, but is not limited to, filing non-judicial liens against Government Actor to include both administrative notices and U.C.C. 1 Financing Statements, with both the county recorder and the secretary of state.

Authority for this provision of law is the SAME authority as that used in the issuance of Social Security Cards. The Card itself and the regulations thereunder at 20 C.F.R. §422.103(d) both confirm that even after the card is sent to someone, it continues to be government property, and that possession and use of said card is the authority for instituting penalties and subjecting the applicant to the regulations governing Social Security. The following additional authority confirms this:

"How, then, are purely equitable obligations created? For the most part, either by the acts of third persons or by equity alone. But how can one person impose an obligation upon another? By giving property to the latter on the terms of his assuming an obligation in respect to it. At law there are only two means by which the object of the donor could be at all accomplished, consistently with the entire ownership of the property passing to the donee, namely: first, by imposing a real obligation upon the property; secondly, by subjecting the title of the donee to a condition subsequent. The first of these the law does not permit; the second is entirely inadequate. Equity, however, can secure most of the objects of the donor, and yet avoid the mischiefs of real obligations by imposing upon the donee (and upon all persons to whom the property shall afterwards come without value or with notice) a personal obligation with respect to the property; and accordingly this is what equity does. It is in this way that all trusts are created, and all equitable charges made (i.e., equitable hypothecations or liens created) by testators in their wills. In this way, also, most trusts are created by acts inter vivos, except in those cases in which the trustee incurs a legal as well as an equitable obligation. In short, as property is the subject of every equitable obligation, so the owner of property is the only person whose act or acts..."
can be the means of creating an obligation in respect to that property. Moreover, the
owner of property can create an obligation in respect to it in only two ways: first, by
incurring the obligation himself, in which case he commonly also incurs a legal
obligation; secondly, by imposing the obligation upon some third person; and this he
does in the way just explained.”
[Readings on the History and System of the Common Law, Second Edition, Roscoe Pound,
1925, p. 543]

Parties to this agreement also stipulate that any use of government identifying numbers in connection with their relationship
shall NOT mean any number issued under the authority of any federal statute, but instead shall be the license issued from the
Protected Party to the Government Actor under the authority of this agreement. This includes “Taxpayer Identification
Numbers”, “Social Security Numbers”, etc.

8.2 Agency Established

This agreement establishes agency on the part of both parties in relation to the other party in delivering the consideration
promised by the agreement. This agency supersedes any and all other agency exercised by either party. In the case of the
Government Agent, that agency shall be referred to as a “anti-public office” under the terms of this anti-franchise franchise.

8.3 Waiver of Full Payment Rule, Anti-Injunction Act, Exceptions to Declaratory Judgment
Act, Need to Exhaust Administrative Remedies, and ability to remove to Federal Court

For the purposes of this interaction, the parties stipulate that all of the following ordinary requirements are waived for the
purposes of their interactions in administering this agreement:

1. The Anti-Injunction Act, 26 U.S.C. §7421, does not apply to the recovery of any damages or property by the Protected
Party against Government Actor. Parties stipulate that monies collected are not “taxes” as legally defined. See Section
2 earlier for the definition of “taxes”.
2. The exceptions to the Declaratory Judgments Act, 28 U.S.C. §2201 relating to taxation do not apply to the settlement
of any disputes between the parties. Parties stipulate that monies collected are not “taxes” as legally defined. See
Section 2 earlier for the definition of “taxes”.
3. The Full Payment Rule established in Flora v. United States, 357 U.S. 63, 78 S.Ct. 1079, 2 L.Ed.2d 1165 (1958) and
collected are not “taxes” as legally defined. See Section 2 earlier for the definition of “taxes”.
4. The requirement to exhaust administrative remedies do not apply to the Protected Party in suits against the Government
Actor. This only administrative remedy available to a non-resident non-person not subject to the exclusive jurisdiction
of Congress is to notify them to return absolutely owned private property or its equivlent value STOLEN by
Government Actor. This document accomplishes that. Beyond that constitutionally required reasonable notice, suit
can immediately commence against government actor.
5. Government Actor also agrees per this agreement NOT to remove any suit brought against him or her or it to a federal
court if it was first filed in a state court by the Protect Party. If Government Actor files a Notice of Removal, that
notice shall be interpreted as a stipulation to agree to everything in the complaint filed against him or her or it in the
state court and a demand for summary judgment.

Any similar statutes or court doctrines which operate similar to the above at the state level are also to be treated the SAME
for the purposes of this agreement.

8.4 Information about Protected Party is PRIVATE Property Subject to Non-Disclosure

Any and all information about Protected Party shall be considered private property which shall:

1. Not be subject to retention by not subject to disclosure to any government.
2. Not be shared outside the agency which received it.
3. Shall be purged in its entirety from all government records upon written notice and demand sent by Protected Party to
   either Government Actor or his/her employer.
4. May not be employed for any purpose which could directly or indirectly benefit Government Actor financially, or
   his/her employer.
8.5 Waiver of Government Agency, Official, and Judicial Immunity on the Part of Government Actor

Parties stipulate that their duty and allegiance to abide by this agreement is superior to their employment duties and any other agency they may claim to be exercising on behalf of any other entity or government. All parties to this agreement hereby perpetually waive judicial, sovereign, or official immunity associated with any government position or agency they may otherwise occupy in the context of enforcing any provision of this franchise and/or agreement.

Protected Party shall have witness immunity pursuant to 18 U.S.C. §6002 for all interactions with any government.

Parties hereby stipulate to grant the SAME sovereign immunity to the Protected Party as the government asserts in any litigation between either the recipient or the government and the Protected Party pursuant to the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act, 28 U.S.C. §1603 et seq.

8.6 Waiver of Sovereign Immunity

Parties stipulate the following facts and agreements affecting sovereign immunity under the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act, 28 U.S.C. Chapter 97:

1. The parties stipulate that everything in the following documents relating to civil franchises is true:

   1.1. Government Franchises Course, Form #12.012
       https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm
       1.2. Government Instituted Slavery Using Franchises, Form #05.030
       https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm

2. The United States government is not exempted from the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act, 28 U.S.C. Chapter 97, for the purposes of their interactions with states of the Union.

3. Any attempt to offer or enforce any kind of civil franchise within a constitutional state is an attempt to alienate PRIVATE rights that the Declaration of Independence says are UNALIENABLE, meaning that those who possess them are legally incapable of consenting to surrender them to a real de jure government. See Form #05.043.

4. Any attempt to offer or enforce any kind of civil franchise within a constitutional state is stipulated to be strictly commercial activity that results in a waiver of sovereign immunity.

5. The ONLY place where civil franchises can lawfully be offered WITHOUT alienating rights that are unalienable is:

   5.1. Among those domiciled and physically present abroad.
   5.2. Among those domiciled on federal territory where the protections of the Constitution do not apply.

For details on the above, see:

   Unalienable Rights Course, Form #12.038
   https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm

6. The following subject matters are commercial franchises subject to waiver of sovereign immunity by the national government in relation to the states of the Union:

   6.1. Social Security. See
       Why You Aren’t Eligible for Social Security, Form #06.001
       https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm

   6.2. Income tax. See:
       The “Trade or Business” Scam, Form #05.001
       https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm

6.3. Driver licensing compacts between the states. See Form #06.010.

6.4. Disability insurance.

6.5. Medicare.

7. Government identifying numbers including but not limited to Social Security Numbers and Taxpayer Identification Numbers:

   7.1. Are what the Federal Trade Commission (F.T.C.) calls a “franchise mark”:

   “...a commercial business arrangement is a “franchise” if it satisfies three definitional elements. Specifically, the franchisor must:

   (1) promise to provide a trademark or other commercial symbol;
(2) promise to exercise significant control or provide significant assistance in the operation of the business; and
(3) require a minimum payment of at least $500 during the first six months of operations.”


7.2. Are property of the government issuer.
7.3. Because they are property, the issuer is liable in state court for their use in alienating, converting to public, or damaging any constitutional or PRIVATE right right. This is a consequence of the same criteria applied by the government against private companies called “product liability”.
7.4. Anyone using or benefitting in any way from the use of said numbers is a government actor and a public officer. The definition of “public office” confirms that a public officer is someone in charge of the property of the public, including government identifying numbers.

“Public office. The right, authority, and duty created and conferred by law, by which for a given period, either fixed by law or enduring at the pleasure of the creating power, an individual is invested with some portion of the sovereign functions of government for the benefit of the public. Walker v. Rich, 79 Cal.App. 139, 249 P. 56, 58. An agency for the state, the duties of which involve in their performance the exercise of some portion of the sovereign power, either great or small. Yaselli v. Goff, C.C.A., 12 F.2d. 396, 403, 56 A.L.R. 1239; Lacey v. State, 13 Ala.App. 212, 68 So. 706, 710; Curtin v. State, 61 Cal.App. 377, 214 P. 1030, 1035; Shelmadine v. City of Elkhart, 75 Ind.App. 493, 129 N.E. 878. State ex rel. Colorado River Commission v. Frohmler, 46 Ariz. 413, 52 P.2d. 483, 486. Where, by virtue of law, a person is clothed, not as an incidental or transient authority, but for such time as de- notes duration and continuance, with Independent power to control the property of the public, or with public functions to be exercised in the supposed interest of the people, the service to be compensated by a stated yearly salary, and the occupant having a designation or title, the position so created is a public office. State v. Brennan, 49 Ohio.St. 33, 29 N.E. 593.


7.5. Because private and constitutional rights are unalienable within a constitutional state, any use of government identifying numbers to alienate private or constitutional rights shall be deemed:
7.5.1. Private commercial activity by the government.
7.5.2. Not consensual on the part of the non-governmental party using said number. This is especially true if the status of the number cannot be changed to reflect the fact that the participant is NOT a franchisee or a public officer and is immune from the civil jurisdiction of the national government under the terms of any and every civil franchise.
7.5.3. Not within the delegated authority of the government actor requesting or compelling their use. Therefore 28 U.S.C. §2679 does NOT apply and the Department of Justice has NO delegated authority to determine otherwise.
7.5.4. A criminal attempt to solicit a bribe to a government actor to treat the otherwise private party compelled to use them as a de facto public officer in criminal violation of 18 U.S.C. §§210 and 211.
7.5.5. A criminal attempt to tamper with a witness, because most government forms have perjury statements and are signed under penalty of perjury and constitute testimony of a witness. A failure to use a number on a government form or a refusal to accept a form without a number is tampering with the witness by compelling them to procure a public office in order to have their form accepted or processed. 18 U.S.C. §1512.
7.5.6. Not a government function but an ANTI-GOVERNMENT function of a de facto government. See: De Facto Government Scam, Form #05.043
https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm

8. Any attempt to offer or enforce taxable or regulatable civil franchises within states of the Union is stipulated by the parties to be an “invasion” within the meaning of Article 4, Section 4 of the United States Constitution:

United States Constitution
Section 4. Obligations of United States to States
The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a Republican Form of Government, and shall protect each of them against Invasion; and on Application of the Legislature, or of the Executive (when the Legislature cannot be convened) against domestic Violence.

The first and most important function of any government is to maintain a perpetual and inviolable separation between PUBLIC and PRIVATE. All of the above criminal tactics by de facto government actors break down that separation, as described in:

Separation Between Public and Private Course, Form #12.025
https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm

8.7 Presumptions Established and Stipulated by All Parties

For the purposes of any dispute relating to this or any other government franchise or civil law:

1. Parties stipulate that any attempt to enforce this agreement by Protected Party and against the Government Actor shall NOT be classified and IS NOT classified as:
   1.1. A criminal obstruction of justice of any kind.
   1.2. Any form of witness tampering, if the Government Actor is a witness in the action.
   Any claim to the contrary by Government Actor or any third party is hereby stipulated by parties to this agreement to be FALSE, PERJURIOUS, and FRAUDULENT. If any government attempts to prosecute the above types of crimes against the Protected Party and in conflict with the above, then the Government Actor agrees to become the substitute Defendant in such an action and hold the Protected Party harmless.
2. All parties shall be presumed to be innocent until proven guilty with physical evidence and not presumption. This means that they are presumed to be all the following until evidence of consent to acquire a different status is introduced on the record of the proceeding:
   2.3. Equal in every respect in rights in relation to every state and federal government until evidence of consent to become UNEQUAL is established on the record of the proceeding.
3. All government tax forms sent by Protected Party to Government Agent and/or his employer shall be subject to the terms and conditions described in the following form and the definitions appearing in section 2 earlier:

Tax Form Attachment, Form #04.201
http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm

4. All parties are presumed to be equal under the law with the following exceptions:
   4.1. Parties may only become UNEQUAL through their EXPRESS WRITTEN CONSENT.
   4.2. All parties are human beings protected by the Bill of Rights and state Constitutions. Government as an artificial being has no constitutional rights.
   4.3. All parties have no delegated authority to consent to government franchises and therefore may not have any government franchise enforced against them in the context of these proceedings. Even written evidence of an application shall not constitute consent. Franchises include the income tax, Social Security, Medicare, Unemployment insurance, government healthcare, driver’s licenses, marriage licenses, vehicle registration, contractor’s licenses, and professional licenses.
5. Any right or method of acquiring rights asserted by any government shall also be possessed by all parties to this agreement. For instance:
   5.1. If the government claims the right to assert sovereign, judicial, or official immunity, then parties shall also have the same right as an officer and fiduciary of God’s government and his family’s government under the Holy Bible trust indenture and the family private articles of incorporation.
   5.2. If the government claims the right to allow third parties to elect either party into a public office within a franchise without the express written consent of the Party, then that Party retains the same right against the government and all parties representing the government as individual human beings. An example of this phenomenon is the filing of information returns such as IRS Forms W-2, 1042-S, 1098, and 1099.
   5.3. If the government claims the right to reclassify his/her speech from nonfactual to factual and actionable, then the Parties shall have the same right and may classify the court’s orders or the statements of government as nonfactual, political, and IRRELEVANT.
   5.4. If the government alleges or asserts any of the following, then the Parties assert the same EQUAL right to make the government into a consenting party and therefore “resident” under this franchise.
5.4.1. That the Protected Party is a “resident” or “citizen” under any federal or state law.
5.4.2. That the Protected Party “purposefully availed” themselves of commerce within the jurisdiction of any federal or state court.
5.4.3. That the Protected Party availed themselves of any alleged commercial “benefit” or privilege offered by any government.
5.4.4. Government or court or judge redefines any word within used by the Protected Party on any government form or commercial correspondence to mean anything OTHER than that expressly defined here.

6. The declared nationality and domicile status declared by either party shall not be challenged or disputed by the other party. It shall be presumed to be accurate, correct, and conclusive as they declare it.

7. All property of the Protected Party shall be presumed to be absolutely owned PRIVATE property until evidence is introduced into the record that:
7.1. The Protected Party, IN WRITING, expressly consented to donate said private property to a public use, public purpose, and public office in the mode that he/she/it and not the court or the opposing party, specifies. . .AND
7.2. The Protected Party was domiciled outside of land protected at the time he or she or it consented. Rights protected by the Constitution are unalienable, according to the Declaration of Independence, and therefore one CANNOT lawfully consent to give them away.

8. All human beings shall presumed to be sovereign and no amenable to civil suit or judgment under anything other than the common law and the constitution. Human beings are the fountain and source of ALL political and legal power in the American form of government, as declared by the U.S. Supreme Court. If the other party to the litigation is the government, then:
8.1. The government must prove that the Protected Party EXPRESSLY CONSENTED to suit IN WRITING in the mode that he and not the court specifies.
8.2. No implied contracts may be presumed.
8.3. No right documented in the state or federal constitutions may be contracted away, alienated, or surrendered, even with consent of the Protected Party, because all such rights are identified in the Declaration of Independence as “unalienable”, meaning that they cannot lawfully be sole, bargained away, or transferred in relation to a REAL, de jure government.

9. Protected Party is a Christian is acting as an agent, fiduciary, trustee over God’s property, which is him/her self and all the Earth and has no delegated authority to either contract or consent to contract with any earthly government.

"Do you not know that friendship with the world is enmity with God? **Whoever therefore wants to be a friend ["citizen", "resident", "taxpayer", "inhabitant", or "subject" under a king or political ruler] of the world [or any man-made kingdom other than God's Kingdom] makes himself an enemy of God. "
[James 4:4, Bible, NKJV]

"You shall make no covenant [contract or franchise] with them [foreigners, pagans], nor with their [pagan government] gods [laws or judges]. They shall not dwell in your land [and you shall not dwell in theirs by becoming a “resident” in the process of contracting with them], lest they make you sin against Me [God]. For if you serve their gods [under contract or agreement or franchise], it will surely be a snare to you."
[Exodus 23:32-33, Bible, NKJV]

"Pure and undefiled religion before God and the Father is this: to visit orphans and widows in their trouble, and to keep oneself unspotted from the world [the obligations and concerns of the world]."
[James 1:27, Bible, NKJV]

"You shall have no other gods [including political rulers, governments, or earthly laws] before Me [or My commandments]."
[Exodus 20:3, Bible, NKJV]

"Then all the elders of Israel gathered together and came to Samuel [the priest in a Theocracy] at Ramah, and said to him, ‘Look, you [the priest within a theocracy] are old,
and your sons do not walk in your ways. **Now make us a king [or political ruler] to judge us like all the nations** [and be OVER them].

“But the thing displeased Samuel when they said, ‘Give us a king [or political ruler] to judge us.’ So Samuel prayed to the Lord. **And the Lord said to Samuel,** ‘Heed the voice of the people in all that they say to you; for they have rejected Me [God], that I should not reign over them.** According to all the works which they have done since the day that I brought them up out of Egypt, even to this day—with which they have forsaken Me [God as their ONLY King, Lawgiver, and Judge] and served other gods—so they are doing to you also [government or political rulers becoming the object of idolatry].”

[1 Sam. 8:4-8, Bible, NKJV]

“Do not walk in the **statutes of your fathers** [the heathens], nor observe their judgments, nor defile yourselves with their [pagan government] idols. I am the LORD your God: Walk in **My statutes**, keep My judgments, and do them; hallow My Sabbaths, and they will be a sign between Me and you, that you may know that I am the LORD your God.”

[Ezekial 20:10-20, Bible, NKJV]

“And **have no fellowship [or association] with the unfruitful works of [government] darkness, but rather reprove [rebuke and expose] them.**”

[Eph. 5:11, Bible, NKJV]

“But if you are led by the Spirit, **you are not under the law [man’s law].**”

[Gal. 5:18, Bible, NKJV]

“**Shall the throne of iniquity [the U.S. Congress and the federal judiciary], which devises evil by [obfuscating the] law [to expand their jurisdiction and consolidate all economic power in their hands by taking it away from the states], have fellowship with You?** They gather together against the life of the righteous, and condemn innocent blood [of “nontaxpayers” and persons outside their jurisdiction, which is an act of extortion and racketeering]. But the Lord has been my defense, and my God the rock of my refuge. He has brought on them their own iniquity, and shall cut them off in their own wickedness; the **Lord our God [and those who obey Him and His word] shall cut them off** [from power and from receiving illegal bribes cleverly disguised by an obfuscated law as legitimate “taxes”].”

[Psalm 94:20-23, Bible, NKJV. **QUESTION FOR DOUBTERS:** Who else BUT Congress and the judiciary can devise "evil by law"?]

“**Come out from among them [the unbelievers and government idolaters] And be separate, says the Lord. Do not touch [or contract with] what is unclean.**
And I will receive you.
I will be a Father to you,
And you shall be my sons and daughters,
Says the Lord Almighty.”

[2 Corinthians 6:17-18, Bible, NKJV]

’Nevertheless, God’s solid foundation stands firm, sealed with this inscription: ‘The Lord knows those who are His,’ and, ‘Everyone who confesses the name of the Lord must turn away from [not associate with or subsidize] wickedness [wherever it is found, and especially in government].’”

[2 Tim. 2:19, Bible, NKJV]
Not “walking in the statutes of your fathers” means not participating in government franchises or statutory law that is for GOVERNMENT and its officers only, but rather proceeding ONLY under the common law and in EQUITY. The government does the same thing, wherein it asserts “sovereign immunity” and requires “express written consent to be sued” before a suit against it can be entertained.

The above are the same requirements that governments imposes upon those who wish to sue it/them.

8.8 Enforcement Authority of Protected Party Against Government Actor

Government Actor consents to allow Protected Party or his agents or assigns to take any one or more of the following actions to enforce this franchise and agreement for any liabilities which might result from violations of the franchise and agreement:

1. File an administrative lien upon real property owned by Government Actor in the county recorder of any county.
2. Place a UCC lien against the name of Government Actor in one or more states of the Union.
3. Make withdrawals from any and all financial accounts in the name of the Government Actor.
4. Place an administrative lien against the government pay and benefits of the Government Actor.

Legal evidence of authority to take any of the enforcement above actions indicated above shall consist in presentation all of the following proofs:

1. Receipt of correspondence signed by the Government Actor or indicating the name of the Government Actor.
2. Presentation of a Certificate of Service showing that this signed agreement was served upon the Government actor.

8.9 Issues not subject to dispute, default answers stipulated

Government Actor agrees not to accuse Protected Party of making or relying upon any of flawed arguments identified in the following publications or raise them as an issue in any dispute between the parties:

1. Policy Document: Rebutted False Arguments Against This Website, Form #08.011
   http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm
2. Policy Document: Rebutted False Arguments About Sovereignty, Form #08.018
   http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm
3. Flawed Tax Arguments to Avoid, Form #08.004
   http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm
4. Rebutted Version of the IRS “The Truth About Frivolous Tax Arguments”, Form #08.005
   http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm
5. Rebutted Version of “Tax Resister Frequently Asked Questions”, Form #08.007
   http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm
   http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm

Parties stipulate that any allegation about Protected Party that is inconsistent with any of the above shall be interpreted as actionable fraud and slander.

Government Actor agrees not to impute or allege any obligation to any government or de facto government on the part of Protected Party, including any government, that the Protected Party did not expressly request and consent to in writing in the manner that Protected Party and no one else specifies.

Government Actor furthermore stipulates to the default answer to any and all admissions provided at the end of the Memorandums of Law appearing in the following:

SEDM Forms Page, Section 1.5, Memorandums of Law
http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm

Government Actor may dispute the default answer to any of the above by providing evidence consistent with that permitted under this agreement.
8.10 Authority conferred by Government Actor upon Protected Party

1. Government Actor delegates exclusive authority to Protected Party to declare and determine whether any government franchise or private law to which Protected Party is alleged to be a party is in fact a “benefit”. If Protected Party deems that it is not, no provision of the specific franchise may or shall lawfully be enforced against him or her. Such franchises include Social Security, income taxes, Medicare, unemployment compensation, welfare, etc.

2. Power of Attorney to Correct False Information Returns Filed Against Protected Party by Government Actor. Government Actor consents to allow Protected Party of this form to submit corrected information returns to the IRS or state revenue agencies which zero out any report of “trade or business” earnings and to sign said forms under power of attorney from the Government Actor. This includes, but is not limited to IRS Forms W-2C, W-3, 1042-S, 1096, 1098, 1099, and S300.

3. Power of Attorney to Execute IRS Form 56: Government Actor consents to allow the Protected Party of this form to submit IRS Form 56 on their behalf and under power of attorney, making the Government Actor liable and surety for all debts or obligations created by the unauthorized use, or abuse of information about him in the possession of Government Actor or his/her agents or assigns, including any attempts to use such information for a commercial or governmental purpose. This will make the Government Actor into the target for all collection notices directed at the “public office” fraudulently created by the duress, coercion, and unlawful actions of the Government Actor of this notice. Government Actor waives any right to disclaim liability for the IRS Form 56 so filed and agrees NOT to file an IRS Form 56 making Protected Party of this Notice liable for any of the taxes, debts, or other obligations that arise out of this correspondence, any of the attachments, or any of the alleged obligations that might arise out of the franchise established herein. If Government Actor files an IRS Form 56 to remove responsibility for his unlawful actions, he agrees to reimburse Protected Party for TWICE any monetary damages or injuries sustained by filing such a form.

4. Power of Attorney to Execute IRS Form 8822: Government Actor consents to allow the Protected Party to complete an IRS Form 8822 changing the address to his/her/its address, making the Government Actor liable and surety for collection notices and actions in connection with any tax liabilities that may be enforced against the Protected Party as a consequence of reports, actions, or omissions filed against Protected Party by Government Actor. This will make the Government Actor into the target for all collection notices directed at the “public office” fraudulently created by the duress, coercion, and unlawful actions of the Government Actor of this notice. Government Actor waives any right to disclaim liability for the IRS Form 8822 so filed and agrees NOT to file an IRS Form 8822 making Protected Party of this Notice liable for any of the taxes, debts, or other obligations that arise out of this correspondence, any of the attachments, or any of the alleged obligations that might arise out of the franchise established herein. If Government Actor files an IRS Form 8822 to remove responsibility for his unlawful actions, he agrees to reimburse Protected Party for TWICE any monetary damages or injuries sustained by filing such a form.

8.11 Stipulations regarding communications between Protected Party and Government Actor

1. All Statements Made by Government Actor are Material, Factual, Truthful, and Actionable Under Penalty of Perjury: Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. §1001, Materiality, the Government Actor of this form agrees to take complete, private, personal, and exclusive responsibility for the truthfulness and accuracy of the entire content of any correspondence sent by him or her or his or her employer as true, correct, and complete UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY. This provision thereby circumvents the disclaimer found on the IRS website and makes it of no effect: Internal Revenue Manual (I.R.M.), Section 4.10.7.2.8. The Government Actor described in this document as a private party, by virtue of accepting the “benefits” of this franchise, instead agrees to exercise their right to contract under this franchise agreement as a means to make their employer, the IRS, IRRELEVANT and agrees that all correspondence from them or their employer becomes their exclusive, personal, and private responsibility under this contract or agreement. This will prevent judicial tribunals from protecting and rewarding IRS agents and those representing the government such as “withholding agents” from telling lies or untruths to those they are supposed to have a fiduciary duty to help and protect the rights of. Your “trade or business” franchise turns me into a “public officer” without my consent, and likewise, my franchise changes YOU from a public officer into a private individual so you can be sued and have to take personal responsibility for your actions and cannot claim immunity of any kind. What is good for the goose is good for the gander.

2. Consent to recording of all audio conversations. Government Actor consents to recording of all audio communications, including but not limited to IRS summons hearings, examinations, visitations, court appearances, and telephonic communication, and recording mentioned in 26 U.S.C. §7521(a). This correspondence shall also constitute an advanced notification that all such recording shall be done in satisfaction of ten day period identified in 26 U.S.C. §7521. Protected Party is NOT the “taxpayer” mentioned in this statute, however, and is a “nontaxpayer” NOT subject to ANY provision of the Internal Revenue Code, Subtitles A through C.
8.12 Use of Information About Protected Party

Any unauthorized use and especially commercial use of information pertaining to the Protected Party and contained on this form, any attached form, or any information previously submitted to the government is subject to a $100,000 penalty per incident plus any tax or penalty liability that might result from the unauthorized use of said information. Authority to store or use all such information for any purpose MUST be procured in a writing signed by the Protected Party in advance of the disclosure or it does not exist. Unauthorized uses include:

1. Mailing any kind of notices other than abatement notices.
2. Sharing information with ANY agency or bureau OTHER than the one the Government Actor works for.
3. Performing tax or penalty assessment with the information.
4. Conveying any “benefit” to the Protected Party that might make him/her/it subject to any type of government franchise, license, or “public right”, including but not limited to the following:
   4.1. A graduated or reduced rate of tax pursuant to 26 U.S.C. §1.
   4.2. Earned income credits pursuant to 26 U.S.C. §32.
   4.3. “Trade or Business” deductions pursuant to 26 U.S.C. §162. I am NOT engaged and never have voluntarily engaged in a “trade or business”, which is defined in 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(26) as “the functions of a public office”.
   4.4. Treaty benefits under an income tax treaty with a foreign country.
   4.5. Any benefit, privilege, or immunity conferred by any provision within the Internal Revenue Code.
   4.6. A statutory refund pursuant to any provision within the Internal Revenue Code. There is no provision within the Internal Revenue Code that authorizes refunds of unlawfully withheld taxes or taxes paid under protest of “nontaxpayers” who are not subject to the Internal Revenue Code. All monies paid to the government have been paid ILLEGALLY and UNDER PROTEST and therefore are not as “taxes”. These unlawfully collected monies are therefore due back NOT because of any provision within the Internal Revenue Code, but ONLY under principles of justice and equity. It is NOT a “privilege” or “franchise” or “public right” to expect the government to RETURN money that was UNLAWFULLY STOLEN and sent to the government and which the government is not lawfully entitled to hold as the “transferee” or “fiduciary” over other people’s money. Keeping such proceeds would cause the government to be engaging in criminal money laundering and making the government into a protection racket rather than a protector.

“A claim against the United States is a right to demand money from the United States.18 Such claims are sometimes spoken of as gratuitous in that they cannot be enforced by suit without statutory consent.19 The general rule of non-liability of the United States does not mean that a citizen cannot be protected against the wrongful governmental acts that affect the citizen or his or her property.20 If, for example, money or property of an innocent person goes into the federal treasury by fraud to which a government agent was a party, the United States cannot [lawfully] hold the money or property against the claim of the injured party.21”

[American Jurisprudence 2d, United States, §45 (1999)]

4.7. An “election” to be treated as a “resident alien” and obtain a reduced tax liability pursuant to 26 U.S.C. §7701(b)(4)(B), or 6013(g) or (h).
5. Initiating civil or criminal litigation against the Protected Party.
6. Associating the Protected Party with any federally issued identifying number, including but not limited to Social Security Numbers as described in 20 C.F.R. §422.103(d), Taxpayer Identification Numbers as described in 26 U.S.C. §6109, or Employer Identifying Numbers as described in 26 U.S.C. §6109. Protected Party does not consent to take custody of these forms of public property, which 20 C.F.R. §422.103(d) says belongs to the government and not Protected Party. This would represent compelled association in violation of the First Amendment and involuntary servitude in violation

---


of the Thirteenth Amendment. Government Actor is reminded that Protected Party does not possess, voluntarily use, nor have a Social Security Number or Taxpayer Identification Number and never lawfully requested one.

8.13 Materiality of any perjury statements signed by Protected Party in the context of criminal enforcement by Government Actor

In order for a perjury statement to be material and result in successful criminal enforcement against the party who signed it, there must be a provable physical injury, property damage, or property loss that results from reliance upon it which can form the basis for standing to sue.

MATERIAL EVIDENCE. Such as is relevant and goes to the substantial matters in dispute, or has a legitimate and effective influence or bearing on the decision of the case. Porter v. Valentine, 18 Misc. 213, 41 N.Y.S. 507; Connecticut Fire Ins. Co. of Hartford, Conn. v. George, 52 Okl. 432, 153 P. 116, 119. "Materiality," with reference to evidence does not have the same signification as "relevancy." Pangburn v. State, Tex.Cr.App., 56 S.W. 72, 73.

MATERIAL FACT. (In contracts.) One which constitutes substantially the consideration of the contract, or without which it would not have been made. Lyons v. Stephens, 45 Ga. 143.

(In pleading and practice.) One which is essential to the case, defense, application, etc., and without which it could not be supported. Sandheger v. Hosey, 26 W.Va. 223; Davidson v. Hackett, 49 Wis. 186, 5 N.W. 459; Hansen v. Sandvik, 128 Wash. 60, 222 P. 205, 207.

One which tends to establish any of issues raised. Sherwood Bros. v. Yellow Cab Co. of Philadelphia, 283 Pa. 488, 129 A. 563. 564. The "material facts" of an issue of fact are such as are necessary to determine the issue. Woolman Const. Co. v. Sampson, 219 Mich. 125, 188 N.W. 420, 422.

(In insurance.) A fact which, if communicated to the agent or insurer, would induce him either to decline the - . insurance altogether, or not accept it unless a higher premium is paid. Berry v. Equitable Fire & Marine Ins. Co., Mo.ADD.d., 263 S.W. 884 886: Franklin Life Ins. Co. v. Dossett, Tex.Civ.App., 265 S.W. 259, 262. One which necessarily has some bearing on the subject-matter. Wittels Loan & Mercantile Co. v. American Cent. Ins. Co., Mo. APP., 273 S.W. 1084, 1086. A fact which increases the risk, or which, if disclosed, would have been a fair reason for demanding a higher premium: any fact the knowledge or ignorance of which would naturally influence the insurer in making or refusing the contract, or in estimating the degree and character of the risk, or in fixing the rate. Boaes v. Insurance Co., 30 Mo. 68; Clark v. Insurance Co., 40 N.H. 338, 77 Am.Dec. 721; Murphy v. Insurance Co., 205 Pa. 444, 55 A. 19; Penn Mut. L. Ins. Co. v. Mechanics’ Sav. Bank, 19 C.C.A. 286, 72 F. 413, 38 L.R.A. 33.


Parties hereby stipulate the following conditions in all their interactions which make both injury to the government and materiality of a false perjury statement by the Protected Party impossible in the context of all their legal interactions:

1. In all interactions between Protected Party and Government Actor and his/her employer, Protected Party shall be the ONLY “Merchant” (U.C.C. §2-104(1)) and the Government shall at all times be the “Buyer” (U.C.C. §2-103(1)(a)).

2. As an agent of his/her Creator 24 hours a day, seven days a week, Protected Party has NO DELEGATED AUTHORITY to consent to be anything BUT a Merchant in relation to any and all governments per their delegation of authority order as described below.22 Any attempt to violate that delegation of authority order shall constitute malicious interference with First Amendment protections and criminal damage to religious property:

---

22 Below are the commandments preventing God’s followers from being anything other than a Merchant and NEVER a Buyer in relation to any and every government. The term “nations” means GOVERNMENTS, not individual people:

“For the Lord your God will bless you just as He promised you; you shall lend to many nations, but you shall not borrow; you shall reign over many nations, but they shall not reign over you.” [Deut. 15:6, Bible, NKJV]
No civil statutes which might impose any kind of duty or transfer of property from Protected Party to Government may be cited as authority for any type of enforcement or legal action initiated against Protected Party by Government.

Any legal actions by the Protected Party against Government Actor or his/her employer for recovery of sums owed under this agreement shall be filed as a qui tam action on behalf of the God he or she represents, and not in their own private person.

All government forms shall not be relied upon as evidence of a legal obligation owed to any government because the government itself says you can’t trust and should not rely on any and all government forms, statements, and publications. This is true EVEN after the forms are signed under penalty of perjury by Protected Party. Hence, they are of no evidentiary value in any proceeding beyond that assigned to them here, even if signed under penalty of perjury. See:

Reasonable Belief About Income Tax Liability, Form #05.007
https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm

Any and all government forms, regardless of what they say, shall therefore be interpreted ONLY as a request by Protected Party for the immediate return all monies paid to the Government Actor and his/her employer by Protected Party plus compound interest in the amount of twice the inflation rate compounded annually. These monies are a repayment of a temporary loan at interest of property and services by the Protected Party to the Government. They are not a loan of property.

Government Actor and his/her employer may NOT pay back more than the amount in item 6 above and if they do, that amount becomes a GIFT with no conditions or legal strings or “quid pro quo” attached.

The net result is that it is impossible to interpret any monies or services received by the Protected Party from the Government Actor his/her employer as anything more than repayment of a temporary loan from the Protected Party to the Government.

Parties stipulate that because these monies are repayment of a loan, they can never form standing by Government Actor or his/her employer for fraud, theft, or injury against any government.

8.14 Other Terms and Conditions

Government Actor consents and agrees to:

1. Abide by this agreement in its entirety.

“The Lord will open to you His good treasure, the heavens, to give the rain to your land in its season, and to bless all the work of your hand. You shall lend to many nations, but you shall not borrow.” [Deut. 28:12, Bible, NKJV]

“You shall not charge interest to your brother—interest on money or food or anything that is lent out at interest.” [Deut. 23:19, Bible, NKJV]

“To a foreigner you may charge interest, but to your brother you shall not charge interest, that the Lord your God may bless you in all to which you set your hand in the land which you are entering to possess.” [Deut. 23:20, Bible, NKJV]

God even warned His followers in the Bible what would happen if they DIDN’T follow the above commandments:

Curses of Disobedience [to God’s Laws]

“The alien [Washington, D.C. is legislatively “alien” in relation to states of the Union] who is among you shall rise higher and higher above you, and you shall come down lower and lower [malicious destruction of EQUAL PROTECTION and EQUAL TREATMENT by abusing FRANCHISES]. He shall lend to you [Federal Reserve counterfeiting franchise], but you shall not lend to him; he shall be the head, and you shall be the tail.

“Moreover _all these curses shall come upon you and pursue and overtake you, until you are destroyed, because you did not obey the voice of the Lord your God, to keep His commandments and His statutes which He commanded you_. And they shall be upon you for a sign and a wonder, and on your descendants forever.

“Because you did not serve [ONLY] the Lord your God with joy and gladness of heart, for the abundance of everything, therefore you shall serve your [covetous thieving lawyer] enemies, whom the Lord will send against you, in hunger, in thirst, in nakedness, and in need of everything; and He will put a yoke of iron [franchise codes] on your neck until He has destroyed you. The Lord will bring a nation against you from afar [the District of CRIMINALS], from the end of the earth, as swift as the eagle flies [the American Eagle], a nation whose language [LEGAL] you will not understand, a nation of fierce [coercive and fascist] countenance, which does not respect the elderly [assassinate them by denying them healthcare through bureaucratic delays on an Obamacare waiting list] nor show favor to the young [destroying their ability to learn in the public FOOL system]. And they shall eat the increase of your livestock and the produce of your land [with “trade or business” franchise taxes], until you [and all your property] are destroyed [or STOLEN/CONFISCATED]; they shall not leave you grain or new wine or oil, or the increase of your cattle or the offspring of your flocks, until they have destroyed you. [Deut. 28:43-51, Bible, NKJV]
2. Produce evidence of consent to the surrender of the rights conveyed in writing with the signature of the Protected Party to any and all franchises or contracts sought to be enforced by the Government Actor as against the Protected Party and to dismiss all legal actions where this requirement is not met.

3. Accept, pay, and not remove from county records private contractual liens upon his real property, wherever situated when filed by Protected Party in order to enforce this agreement. These private contractual liens shall be filed by Protected Party under power of attorney as against the Government Actor.

4. Accept, pay, and not remove UCC contractual liens against the chattel property of Government Actor in order to enforce this agreement. These secured transactions shall be filed be Protected Party under power of attorney as against the Government Actor.

5. Respect all the provisions and constraints of the following two documents submitted previously to the recipient and the government. Proof of service upon the government is available upon request:

  5.1. Legal Notice of Change of Domicile/Citizenship and Divorce from the United States, Form #10.001
  http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm
  5.2. Resignation of Compelled Social Security Trustee, Form #06.002
  http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm

9 Dispute Resolution

Parties stipulate to all of the following terms and conditions governing disputes under this agreement.

9.1 Agency and Status of Parties

Parties under this franchise consent to be treated as all of the following in respect to federal civil jurisdiction:

1. Nonresident.

2. “Stateless person” because domiciled AND resident outside the statutory but not constitutional “United States”.

3. If the parties are domiciled in different states of the Union or foreign jurisdictions, Constitutional diversity shall apply under Article III, Section 2 and NOT statutory diversity under 28 U.S.C. §1332.

4. That described in the following:

   Tax Form Attachment, Form #04.201
   http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm

Protected Party has not consented and has no delegated authority to consent to represent an enfranchised or privileged government entity of any kind, including but not limited to all of the following kinds and therefore has no option but to proceed ONLY under the common law and equity:

1. Public officer of state or national governments.

2. Instrumentality or agent of any kind of state or federal governments.


4. Statutory “driver” under state motor vehicle code.

5. Statutory “spouse” under state family code.


7. Statutory “U.S. citizens” as described in 8 U.S.C. §1401 or 26 C.F.R. §1.1-1(c) or any other federal statute.

8. Statutory “U.S. resident” as described in 26 U.S.C. §7701(b)(1)(A) or any other federal statute.


10. Statutory “person” as defined in 26 U.S.C. §6671(b) or 26 U.S.C. §7343 or any other federal law.

11. Statutory “individual” as defined in 5 U.S.C. §552a(a)(2) and 26 C.F.R. §1.1441-1(c)(3) or any other federal statute.

12. Statutory “nonresident alien individual” per 26 C.F.R. §1.1441-1(c)(3).


Parties stipulate that any attempt to assign or presume or declare any of the above statuses or conditions to the Protected Party shall constitute:

1. FRAUD.

2. Unlawful duress.

3. Perjury, if such assertion appears in any pleading filed or evidence entered in a court of law.

4. Identity theft.
5. Compelled association.
6. Compelled contacting and/or involuntary servitude.

... with the state or federal governments.

Parties stipulate that neither Protected Party nor Government Actor were or are acting as an officer or “public officer” within any government or corporation in the context of their interactions or with any obligations associated with their relationship, including tax obligations.

“Private person. Term sometimes used to refer to persons other than those holding public office or in military services.”


Parties stipulate that any of the following actions on the part of the Government Actor shall constitute criminal impersonation of a public officer (per 18 U.S.C. §912) by the Government Actor, criminal conversion of private property to a public use, and theft against the Protected Party by the Government Actor:

1. Filing any kind of information return against the protected party under the authority of 26 U.S.C. §6041, including but not limited to IRS Forms W-2, 1042-S, 1098, and 1099. All such returns shall be deemed to be false and a criminal violation of 26 U.S.C. §7206 and/or §7207.

2. Requiring the disclosure or use of:
   2.2. Social Security Number (SSN) as defined in the Social Security Act in connection with their relationship as a precondition of engaging in a relationship or under threat of terminating said relationship. See 42 U.S.C. §408(a)(8).

3. Requiring that the Protected Party declare or represent his/her/its status as being anything other than that described herein as a condition of engaging in a relationship or under threat of terminating said relationship.

4. Honoring an IRS Levy or state levy under the authority of 26 U.S.C. §6331. Protected Party is not acting and does not consent to act as an agency or instrumentality of the national government subject to levy as described in 26 U.S.C. §6331(a) and it is a crime for him to act in said capacity.

Government Actor agrees to become the substitute defendant who is exclusively responsible for all penalty and tax assessments, or court judgments instituted against Protected Party.

Government Actor furthermore agrees NOT to either complain or prosecute any party to any dispute under this agreement for the “unauthorized practice of law”, and agrees to become the substitute defendant if any third party such as a government or government actor attempts to or succeeds in prosecuting any party to this agreement for the unauthorized practice of law. The term “practice of law” or “law practice” shall have the meaning prescribed earlier in section 2 of this franchise agreement.

9.2 Choice of Law

This section prescribes the choice of law which applies to all past, present, and future interactions between the Protected Party and the Government Actor. It also governs and controls all litigation in any court of justice between Protected Party and the Government Actor in both civil and criminal matters pertaining to this specific transaction:

1. Parties stipulate that neither are party to any government franchise, “benefit”, or privilege, including but not limited to government employment, Social Security, Medicare, unemployment insurance, or the Internal Revenue Code, Subtitle A income tax (“trade or business” franchise).

2. Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 17(b), the choice of law which applies is ONLY the law from the domicile of each party and NOT the laws of the “United States” or any “State” as used in any federal law. Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 17(b)(2) and (b)(3) do NOT apply to this proceeding.

3. Parties stipulate that their relationship does not involve a “federal question” and may therefore not be removed to a federal court and must be litigated only in a state court.

4. Parties stipulate that they are not and were not domiciled or “resident” within and did not occupy any of the following during any of their interactions:
   4.3. Any federal territory or possession.
5. Parties stipulate that they were not present in any of the following during any aspect of their interactions:

5.1. The “State” defined in 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(10) or 4 U.S.C. §110(d) or any other federal law.

5.2. The “United States” as defined in 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(9) and (a)(10).

6. Parties stipulate NOT to apply any provision of federal law, including but not limited to 26 U.S.C. §7408(d), or Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 17(b) to kidnap or transport his/her/its legal identity to the District of Columbia. He does NOT consent to represent any entity covered by these statutes.

6.1. Government Actor consents to be treated as a “resident” within whatever court, tribunal, or district that Protected Party files suit in against him.

Parties stipulate that this agreement has no illegal purpose and therefore may not be invalidated by any court. Its sole purpose is to avoid compelled association with or contracting with ALL governments, which is protected by the First Amendment.

In the event that any part of this agreement is found to be unenforceable, it is the intent of the parties that all remaining provisions shall be legally binding.

9.3 Venue

All disputes under this agreement shall proceed under the common law and equity RATHER than civil statutory law. A common law “court of record” shall be established and convened for the purposes of hearing this matter of PRIVATE and not PUBLIC rights:

*Courts of record and courts not of record.* The former being those whose acts and judicial proceedings are enrolled, or recorded, for a perpetual memory and testimony, and which have power to fine or imprison for contempt. Error lies to their judgments, and they generally possess a seal. Courts not of record are those of inferior dignity, which have no power to fine or imprison, and in which the proceedings are not enrolled or recorded. 3 B1. Comm. 24; 3 Steph. Comm. 383; The Thomas Fletcher, C.C.Ga., 24 F. 481; Ex parte Thistleton, 52 Cal. 225; Erwin v. U. S., D.C.Ga., 37 F. 488, 2 L.R.A. 229; Heininger v. Davis, 96 Ohio.St. 205, 117 N.E. 229, 231.

A "court of record" is a judicial tribunal having attributes and exercising functions independently of the person of the magistrate designated generally to hold it, and proceeding according to the course of common law, its acts and proceedings being enrolled for a perpetual memorial. Jones v. Jones, 188 Mo.App. 220, 175 S.W. 227. 229; Ex parte Gladhill, 8 Metc. Mass., 171, per Shaw, C. J. See, also, Ledwith v. Rosalsky, 244 N.Y. 406, 155 N.E. 688, 689.

Courts may be at the same time of record for some purposes and not of record for others. Lester v. Redmond, 6 Hill, N.Y., 590; Ex parte Gladhill, 8 Metc., Mass., 168. [Black's Law Dictionary, Fourth Edition, pp. 425-426]

Note that the distinguishing characteristic of a “court of record” is that it proceeds independently of the person of the judge or magistrate. The Sovereign who initiates the suit, who is the Plaintiff, executes the functions of the court and represents the court and the suit independent of the magistrate or judge. Final judgment is reserved for ONLY the jury, who are the ONLY true sovereigns and “the court”.

"The words 'people of the United States' and 'citizens,' are synonymous terms, and mean the same thing. They both describe the political body who, according to our republican institutions, form the sovereignty, and who hold the power and conduct the government through their representatives. They are what we familiarly call the 'sovereign people,' and every citizen is one of this people, and a constituent member of this sovereignty. ..."

[Boyd v. State of Nebraska, 143 U.S. 135 (1892)]

The distinguishing feature of a common law court is that it is convened for the enforcement of private rights and is done under equity and NOT statutory law. Parties stipulate that statutory civil law, in fact, only regulates public conduct of public officers within the government. See:
9.4 No Statutes of Limitation

No statutes of limitations shall be enforced to protect any violations of this agreement. All statutory civil law, in fact, is for government public officers and not private parties such as the Protected Party, as exhaustively proven in the following:

The following U.S. Supreme Court ruling establishes why statutes of limitations cannot undermine the protection of private rights and private property.

The police power cannot go beyond the limit of what is necessary and reasonable for guarding against the evil which injures or threatens the public welfare in the given case, and the legislature, under the guise of that power, cannot strike down innocent occupations and destroy private property, the destruction of which is not reasonably necessary to accomplish the needed reform; and this, too, although the legislature is the judge in each case of the extent to which the evil is to be regulated or prohibited. Where the occupation is in itself immoral, there can be no question as to the right of the legislature. 2 Kent, Comm. 340. Nor is it denied that every one holds his property subject to the proper exercise of the police power. Dill. Mun. Corp. 136; Tied. Lim. Police Power, 122, 122a; Com. v. Tewksbury, 11 Metc. 55. Nor that the legislature can destroy vested rights in the proper exercise of this power. Coates v. Mayor of New York, 7 Cow. 585. But the unqualified statement that when the legislature has exercised its right of judging, by the enactment of a [626-Continued.] prohibition, all other departments of the government are bound by the decision, which no court has a right to review, (Bish. St. Cr. 995,) cannot be true. The legislative power cannot authorize [OR PROTECT THROUGH A STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS] manifest injustice by positive enactment, or take away security for personal liberty or private property, for the protection on whereof government was established. Calder v. Bull, 3 Dal. 386. The state cannot deprive the citizen of the lawful use of his property if it does not injuriously effect others. Lake View v. Cemetery Co., 70 Ill. 191. The state cannot enact laws, not necessary to the preservation of the health and safety of the community, that will be oppressive and burdensome to the citizen. Railway Co. v. City of Jacksonville, 67 Ill. 37. The constitutional guaranty of life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness is not limited by the temporary caprice of a present majority, and can be limited only by the absolute necessities of the public. Intoxicating Liquor Cases, (BREWER, J.), 25 Kan. 765; Tenement - House Cigar Case, 98 N. Y. 98; Cooley, Const. Lim. (5th Ed.) 110, 445, 446. No proposition is more firmly established than that the citizen has the right to adopt and follow such lawful and industrial pursuit, not injurious to the community, as he may see fit. People v. Marx, 99 N.Y. 377, 386, 2 N.E. Rep. 29. The mere existence of a brewery in operation, or of beer therein in vats, or packages not intended for consumption in the state is not in any way detrimental to the safety, health, or morals of the people of Kansas; nor can it be said that there is anything immoral in the business of brewing, or in beer itself, as in gambling or lotteries. Stone v. Mississippi, 101 U.S. 814.

There is no question that this enactment does in the sense of the law deprive appellees of their property. Pumpelly v. Green Bay Co., 13 Wall. 177; Munn v. Illinois, 94 U.S. 141.

It is a fundamental principle that where a nuisance is to be abated, the abatement must be limited by its necessities, and no wanton injury must be committed. The remedy is to stop the use to which the building is put, not to tear down or destroy the structure itself. Babcock v. City of Buffalo, 56 N.Y. 268, affirming 1 Shedl. 317; Bridge Co. v. Paige, 83 N.Y. 188-190; Wood, Nuis. 738. The nuisance here is sale within the state. To that extent alone can the legislature authorize the nuisance to be abated or the property destroyed.
Consequently, parties stipulate that the statutes of limitations apply ONLY to the situation where BOTH the party injured AND the party injuring are BOTH public officers and also parties to the “social compact” sought to be enforced, which neither party agrees to act on behalf of for the purposes of this agreement. If the injured party is a PRIVATE party and not a public officer, a statute of limitations can only serve to:

1. Undermine the security and protection of PRIVATE rights, property and persons.
2. Protect and even promote wrongdoing by government actors.
3. Violate the fiduciary duty of a REAL de jure government in fulfilling the ONLY purpose of its creation, which is the protection of PRIVATE rights to life, liberty, and property.

9.5 All governments excluded from suit, joinder of parties

1. Government Actor agrees not to request the involvement of any government to any lawsuit against Protected Party, and to object and not consent to any involvement by any government in any suit between the two parties.
2. Government Actor agrees to disclose in full and in writing the nature and details of any and all written and verbal communication between his/her/it self and any government or government actor within one week of any such contact that might relate to or affect any dispute existing with Protected Party.
3. If Government Actor is serving on behalf of the United States Government in any capacity, he/she agrees not to allow the Attorney General to substitute the “United States” as defendant in the context of any dispute relating to the enforcement of this franchise under the authority of 28 U.S.C. §2679. Government Actor shall instead defend the case personally and out of their own funds.
5. If Government Actor is serving on behalf of any state of the Union or county government in any capacity, he/she agrees not to allow the Attorney General of his/her state or the District Attorney of his/her municipality to substitute the respective state or municipality as defendant in the context of any dispute relating to the enforcement of this franchise.

For the purposes of this section, parties stipulate that the following entities are presumed NOT to be part of any government, but instead to be PRIVATE commercial corporations interacting with the public in equity:

1. Internal Revenue Service (IRS).
2. State revenue agencies and department of revenue in those states participating in the federal income tax.
3. Social Security Administration, in the context of activities within constitutional but not statutory states of the Union.

The reason for the above is explained below:

Origins and Authority of the Internal Revenue Service, Form #05.005
http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm

Lastly, Parties to this agreement stipulate that any of the following activities by any government actor or his/her employer shall render all such activities as PRIVATE BUSINESS ACTIVITIES undertaken in equity and which may NOT be protected by any governmental law:

1. Enforcing federal civil law within the borders of a constitutional state of the Union on OTHER than federal territory.
   See:
   Federal Enforcement Authority Within States of the Union, Form #05.032
   http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm
2. Offering or enforcing any government franchise, license, or tax within the borders of a constitutional state of the Union on OTHER than federal territory. All such activities are hereby stipulated by the Parties to this agreement to be an “invasion” within the meaning of Article 4, Section 4 of the United States Constitution. See:
   Government Instituted Slavery Using Franchises, Form #05.030
   http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm
3. Any attempt to alienate PRIVATE rights that the Declaration of Independence declares to be UNALIENABLE. All such activities are OPPOSITE to the purpose for which governments are established. That purpose is to protect
PRIVATE rights. The first step in such protection is to prevent them from being converted into PUBLIC RIGHTS, with or without the consent of the owner.

4. Any franchise or public right offered extraterritorially which:
   4.1. Is offered to those not domiciled on the territory of the sovereign offering the franchise.
   4.2. Is only available to those domiciled on the territory of the sovereign offering the franchise, but which is administered in such a way that the domicile or residence prerequisite is waived as a matter of policy and flat and in contradiction to what the law permits.

5. Any franchise or public right which is implemented with that which is not “positive law”, and therefore which can therefore only acquire the “force of law” and the status of “legal evidence” with the CONSENT of those who are subject.

6. Any public right that is vindicated or protected in any court without a jury present or with a jury occupied by anyone with a commercial relation with the government. All courts that operate without the supervision of the ONLY true sovereigns, an impartial jury of We The People, are legislative franchise courts that do not operate in equity and whose officers always have a criminal and financial conflict of interest that ensures an unjust result.

"franchise court. Hist. A privately held [meaning NON-GOVERNMENTAL] court that (usu.) exists by virtue of a royal grant [franchise privilege], with jurisdiction over a variety of matters, depending on the grant and whatever powers the court acquires over time. In 1274, Edward I abolished many of these feudal courts by forcing the nobility to demonstrate by what authority (quo warranto) they held court. If a lord could not produce a charter reflecting the franchise, the court was abolished. - Also termed courts of the franchise.

Dispensing justice was profitable. Much revenue could come from the fees and dues, fines and amercements. This explains the growth of the second class of feudal courts, the Franchise Courts. They too were private courts held by feudal lords. Sometimes their claim to jurisdiction was based on old pre-Conquest grants ... But many of them were, in reality, only wrongful usurpations of private jurisdiction by powerful lords. These were put down after the famous Quo Warranto inquiry in the reign of Edward I." W.J.V. Windeyer, Lectures on Legal History 56-57 (2d ed. 1949)."


9.6 Stipulations Applying to all Litigation

The following rules shall apply to all disagreements, whether administrative, or judicial, between parties:

1. Duress:
   Parties stipulate that the following actions by any government actor shall constitute unlawful duress, theft, FRAUD, and perjury by said actor.
   1.1. Imputing any statutory status to the Protected Party absent their express written consent.
   1.2. Quoting or enforcing any federal civil statute against the Protected Party.
   1.3. Where terms are not defined, presuming that the definition includes or affects private rights or private property. Rather, parties hereby stipulate that ALL civil statutes can and do affect ONLY PUBLIC rights and PUBLIC property and exclude private rights and private property. This is a rebuttable presumption, and the presumption can be rebutted by producing a statute that EXPRESSLY identifies PRIVATE rights and “human beings” rather than “individuals” as its intended target. By default, the term “individual” is hereby stipulated to include ONLY public officers and public entities within the government.
   1.4. Adding any thing or class of thing to the statutory definition of any word that does not EXPRESSLY appear in the statute itself.

"When a statute includes an explicit definition, we must follow that definition, even if it varies from that term’s ordinary meaning. Meese v. Keene, 481 U.S. 465, 484-485 (1987) ("It is axiomatic that the statutory definition of the term excludes unstated meanings of that term"); Colautti v. Franklin, 439 U.S. at 392-393, n. 10 ("As a rule, a definition which declares what a term "means" . . . excludes any meaning that is not stated"); Western Union Telegraph Co. v. Lenroot, 323 U.S. 490, 502 (1945); Fox v. Standard Oil Co. of N.J., 294 U.S. 87, 95-96 (1935) (Cardozo, J.); see also 2A N. Singer, Sutherland on Statutes and Statutory Construction § 47.07, p. 152, and n. 10 (5th ed. 1992) (collecting cases)."
1.5. Reaching any inference or conclusion not based upon admissible evidence or which is based upon which is not “positive law” and therefore legal evidence.

2. Judgments:

2.1. Summary judgments are not permitted because they lack impartiality. Everything will be decided by an IMPARTIAL jury panel.

2.2. Court MUST address all issues raised by either party in the final order, and especially issues relating to the jurisdiction of the government over either party.

2.3. Parties stipulate that they will not invoke exclusions within the Declaratory Judgments Act, 28 U.S.C. §2201(a), as an excuse for the Court NOT to rule on any issue before the court that might affect the protection of PRIVATE rights. All such exemptions can and do only pertain to public rights and public officers and cannot and do not constrain the court from protecting PRIVATE rights. The ONLY type of rights the Protected Party has or may exercise, consistent with his delegation of authority order from God, are PRIVATE rights.

2.4. If judge indicates that the Declaratory Judgments Act constrains him from ruling, the jury can and will still rule and parties stipulate that said jury will NOT be so constrained. Parties stipulate that disallowing the jury from ruling on any issue that might protect PRIVATE rights shall be construed both by the Jury and by all parties as a conspiracy against PRIVATE rights and a tort.

3. Court Officers:

3.1. The judge shall have NO private meetings or in camera meetings with the attorneys. Everything he or she says to counsel, if during trial, must ALSO be heard by the jury and submitted into evidence for the jury to examine.

3.2. Attorneys for the government shall not be regarded as the real party in interest, but rather someone from the executive branch of the government shall be the real party in interest in a case where the opposing party is a government.

4. Evidence:

4.1. No government publication shall be admitted into evidence in the resolution of any dispute between the parties, and especially any IRS Publication, which the IRS itself says in Internal Revenue Manual (I.R.M.), Section 4.10.7.2.8 says is untrustworthy and unreliable.

4.2. Evidence admitted shall not be filtered or redacted in any way. Any publication from which any excerpt is made shall be admitted IN ITS ENTIRETY with nothing lined out or redacted or censored. For instance, if an excerpt from any document available from either of the following two website is made, then THE ENTIRE website and the ENTIRE DOCUMENT from which the excerpt is made shall ALSO be admitted into evidence:

4.2.1. http://sedm.org

4.2.2. http://famguardian.org

4.3. No judicial proceeding from any District or Circuit Court involving the enforcement of any government franchise shall be:

4.3.1. Admitted as evidence of any obligation on the part of the Protected Party.

4.3.2. Used as a means to establish what the Protected Party knew or should have known about his/her obligations.

4.3.3. Used as precedent to establish any obligation on the part of the Protected Party.

Instead, parties stipulate that there is no federal common law applying to those domiciled within a constitutional state of the Union. They also stipulate that no aspect of the arbitration of the relationship between the parties relate to a question under any federal statutory law. All U.S. District and Circuit Courts shall be regarded as franchise courts that can only hear federal questions relating to federal franchises and property, and this relationship does not involve either, but rather constitutes a PRIVATE franchise.

[Stenberg v. Carhart, 530 U.S. 914 (2000)]

"Expressio unius est exclusio alterius. A maxim of statutory interpretation meaning that the expression of one thing is the exclusion of another. Burgin v. Forbes, 293 Ky. 456, 169 S.W.2d 321, 325; Newblock v. Bowles, 170 Okl. 487, 40 P.2d 1097, 1100. Mention of one thing implies exclusion of another. When certain persons or things are specified in a law, contract, or will, an intention to exclude all others from its operation may be inferred. Under this maxim, if statute specifies one exception to a general rule or assumes to specify the effects of a certain provision, other exceptions or effects are excluded."

4.4. All correspondence sent by Government Actor or his/her employer to either Protected Party or to third parties but
relating to Protected Party shall be deemed to be signed under penalty of perjury and actionable against the
Government Actor if false, even if:

4.4.1. Government Actor did not prepare the correspondence or notice.
4.4.2. Employer of Government Actor disclaims responsibility for the accuracy of their publications, forms, or
correspondence. Example: Internal Revenue Manual (I.R.M.), Section 4.10.7.2.8.

4.5. Litigants shall not be prohibited or prevented from discussing ANY statute, regulation, or case law in the
courtroom or in front of the jury.

4.6. A failure to deny any assertion by either party shall constitute evidence of a conclusive admission of the thing not
expressly denied. This rule shall apply to the government AS WELL as the Protected Party because inequality
would result if it didn’t.

4.7. All denials must be signed under penalty of perjury by the real party in interest. In case of disputes under the
Internal Revenue Code, this is mandated by 26 U.S.C. §6065.

4.8. No statute or law or regulation or constitutional provision shall be prevented from being entered into evidence or
prevented from being viewed by the jury.

4.9. No “experts” in law shall be admitted to direct the jury about what the law means or implies. The jury is the only
party that may both READ and INTERPRET what any given legal provision means. Law is supposed to be
written to be understandable by the common man sitting on a jury, and if it is not, then:

4.9.1. It is void for vagueness.
4.9.2. Shall be treated as unenforceable.
4.9.3. Turns the judge into a priest of a civil religion within a state sponsored church.

4.10. All evidence gathered during discovery shall be admitted at trial and in the record and NOTHING shall be filtered
or restricted from viewing by the jury.

4.11. Parties stipulate to admit the following evidence in any judicial dispute between them involving their interactions
pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 29. They furthermore stipulate that all evidence listed shall be
deemed truthful, accurate, and consistent with prevailing law except that which they individually and specifically
rebut with court admissible evidence from ONLY the written law itself.

4.11.1. This document and all attached documents.
4.11.2. All correspondence between the parties.
4.11.3. Anything the Protected Party desires from the following website: http://sedm.org; http://famguardian.org.
4.11.4. All information and attachments submitted to the government by the Protected Party in any civil or criminal
dispute arising between the Protected Party and either the recipient or the entity he or she works for pursuant
to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 19 and the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure. This information must
also be presented to any and all grand juries that might convene about the Protected Party which are initiated
by either the Government Actor or his or her employer.

5. Materiality of Evidence

5.1. None of the forms submitted by Protected Party under any franchise at any time to any government shall be
regarded as being material or actionable under the original statutory franchise agreement. They shall NOT be
considered as having ANY commercial consequence or form the basis for any injury because the Protected Party
does NOT consent to participate and defines and describes any and all “benefits” as gifts rather than the product
of any statutory relationship of the parties. This includes but is not limited to:

5.1.1. Social Security.
5.1.2. Income Taxes.
5.1.3. Property Taxes.
5.1.4. Government healthcare.
5.1.5. Vehicle code.
5.1.6. Family code.

5.2. The only written thing that is both factual and actionable are:

5.2.1. The terms of this anti-franchise franchise.
5.2.2. Statements of the Government Actor meant to COMPEL or unlawfully impose participation in the above
franchises against the Protected Party.
5.2.3. Any and all statements by Protected Party and Government Actor responding to his or her duties or the
enforcement of those duties in a court of law.

6. Discovery:

6.1. None of the persons called as witnesses by either side at any trial involving this Ministry may:

6.1.1. Work for the federal or state government.
6.1.2. Receive retirement benefits from the government.
6.1.3. Receive financial benefits of any kind from the government.
6.1.4. Be statutory "taxpayers", "U.S. citizens", or "U.S. residents". This will ensure that the all witnesses called will be completely objective, neutral, and unbiased.

6.2. Each party shall pay for the cost of their own discovery and not ask the court to have the other party pay for their discovery under any circumstances.

6.3. There will be no limit upon the number of admissions, interrogatories, or Request for the Production of Documents (RFPDs), that may be served by either party against the other party. State or federal limitations such as the “Rule of 31”, for instance, shall NOT apply. All such discovery shall be timely and completely answered by either party and the answer shall be signed under penalty of perjury as required by 26 U.S.C. §6065 by a party who has legal authority to represent or obligate the government, if the party answering is the government.

6.4. All depositions prior to trial shall be conducted by deposition upon written questions and NOT using a court reporter. Responses shall be submitted under penalty of perjury by the party deposed. If the Government Actor is a federal worker, the authority for such a deposition shall be Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 31. This requirement is intended to minimize the cost of enforcing this agreement and to facilitate gathering of written evidence useful in prosecuting violations of law by Government Actor and his/her coworkers within the government he/she serves within.

6.5. Neither party to any dispute may request or receive any kind of sanctions relating to discover, excepting those involved in failure to provide information.

7. Parties who may participate as judges or jurists in litigation between the parties. None of the following criminal or unconstitutional conflicts of interest or injustices shall be permitted during any litigation between the parties:

7.1. Denying justice as a service to specific classes or groups of people based on some arbitrary criteria such as ethnicity, sexual orientation, gender, religious beliefs, etc.

7.2. Charging so much for the service that the people at the bottom of the economic ladder can’t afford it. Thus, the poor are discriminated against and can easily be abused by the rich without legal consequence.

7.3. Prosecuting people for failing to pay taxes that pay for police protection, while not prosecuting officers who fail to render the protection paid for. See:

   Why Domicile and Becoming a “Taxpayer” Require Your Consent, Form #05.002, Section 8
   https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm

7.4. Appointing and paying a court-appointed and court-selected attorney who is licensed and therefore beholden to the court at the expense of the best interests of the client. See:

   Petition for Admission to Practice, Family Guardian Fellowship
   https://famguardian.org/Subjects/LawAndGovt/LegalEthics/PetForAdmToPractice-USDC.pdf

7.5. The judge orders the court reporter to withhold the court transcript and then orders the text changed to remove something that he said that would undermine the government, get him in trouble. That way, you as the litigant discriminated upon or treated illegally by the judge do not have proof that he is doing it. This is criminal obstruction of justice and also criminally tampers with the court reporter as a witness.

7.6. Allowing judges to serve over both CONSTITUTIONAL issues and FRANCHISE issues and to decide which of the two types of law to apply. That choice is called “choice of law” and it is discussed in Form #05.018, Section 3. Judges whose pay and benefit derives from franchises will always try to switch the choice of law from CONSTITUTIONAL to STATUTORY FRANCHISE as a way to increase their own revenues or lower the taxes they pay for those franchises. For instance, allowing a state criminal judge whose revenues or commissions derive from traffic tickets to preside over a case involving unlicensed driving against someone who is PRIVATE and not a franchisee and who has CONSTITUTIONAL rights but wants not STATUTORY PRIVILEGES. This causes the judge to PRETEND that the party is subject to the statute when they are not in order to unlawfully enlarge government revenue and his own pay and benefits.

7.7. Instituting a commission program to reward police officers for writing tickets that produce revenue. This is an illegal abuse of the police power for civil or revenue purposes. See:

   Sovereignty for Police Officers, Form #12.022
   https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm

7.8. Censoring the court record by:

   7.8.1. Telling you what to say in a pleading.
   7.8.2. Denying the filing of specific types of pleadings.
   7.8.3. Rejecting the pleading because it is too long.

7.9. Hearing a case where one of the litigants before the court is a friend of the judge or has a commercial relationship with him/her. Judges are required to recuse themselves in such a case.

7.10. Sanctioning people OTHER than licensed attorneys for any of their activities in the court other than contempt relating to disobeying court orders. Court rules pertain only to officers of the court, including those relating to sanctions. Private humans are not officers of the court. See Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.
7.11. Causing a surrender of any right, and especially constitutional right, against the government or a specific
government actor in exchange for the ability to file suit. Examples might include:
7.11.1. Waiving the right of trial by jury in exchange for the PRIVILEGE of being able to file a suit. Traffic
court, Tax Court, and Family Court don’t have a jury or a jury box and you aren’t even allowed to request
one. You are presumed to have waived those rights when you signed up for the franchise, even though
those rights are UNALIENABLE, according to the Declaration of Independence.
7.11.2. Making the rules of court arbitrary or not publishing them. This deprives litigants of the constitutional
requirement for “reasonable notice” of what is expected of them and allows court officers to arbitrarily
discriminate. See Form #05.022.

7.12. Instituting a conflict of interest, usually financial, among those judging the case, acting as witnesses, or serving as
jurists. This would include:
7.12.1. Allowing judges or jurors to serve on trials involving taxes where they are either taxpayers or tax
consumers.
7.12.2. Allowing judges to preside over trials involving companies they invested in.
7.12.3. Subsidizing judges with financial incentives for a specific outcome of the case, such as commissions for
convictions.
7.12.4. Subsidizing court witnesses to testify in a way that produces a specific outcome of the case. For instance,
paying witnesses a money award if their testimony produces a conviction.
7.12.5. Tampering with or bribing jurists by telling them, for instance, that they will or will not be audited by the
IRS for testifying in a certain way.
7.12.6. Telling juries hearing tax cases that their tax bill will go up if they don’t convict the defendant and
thereby FORCE him or her to “pay their fair share”.
7.12.7. Recruiting witnesses against you who are in jail and who are told they will be released if they testify in a
certain way.
7.12.8. Telling a party among a group of people being convicted that they will get immunity and not be
prosecuted if they testify against their cohorts.

7.13. Destroying all constitutional rights and replacing them with privileges by:
7.13.1. Forcing you to invoke the statutory law in order to get a remedy INSTEAD of the Constitution. See
Form #05.037.
7.13.2. Dismissing or penalizing cases that invoke the Constitution as a remedy INSTEAD of the statutes. See
Form #05.010.
7.13.3. Refusing to hear cases of people present on land but not domiciled on that land. See Form #05.002.
7.14. Censoring people from filing future actions in court. This happens all the time with people who use arguments in
court that the courts don’t want to deal with and which expose and prosecute government corruption.
7.15. Making the ruling unpublished in cases against the government where the government loses. Thus, you and other
litigants may not use the win as an authority to win in future cases. This prejudices all cases in favor of the
government and usually involves criminal obstruction of justice by the judge who made his ruling unpublished.
See:

http://Nonpublication.com

7.16. Making presumptions about the litigant or his/her status without evidence on the record of the proceeding which
prejudice the litigant and favor the government. For instance, PRESUMING that they are a statutory “U.S.
citizen” instead of a non-resident state national, thus making them liable for every act of Congress instead of
immune from acts of Congress. See:
7.16.1. Why You are a “national”, “state national”, and Constitutional but not Statutory Citizen, Form #05.006
https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm
7.16.2. Presumption: Chief Weapon for Unlawfully Enlarging Federal Jurisdiction, Form #05.017
https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm
7.16.3. Non-Resident Non-Person Position, Form #05.020
https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm

9.7 Burden of Proof Upon All Government Officers

1. If either Government Actor or his/her employer wishes to assert consent by the Protected Party to a waiver of any
constitutional right, it shall have the burden of proving that:
1.1. The Protected Party was domiciled and physically present on federal territory not protected by the Constitution
and that therefore, the Protected Party had no unalienable rights but only privileges.
1.2. The Protected Party expressly consented in writing to waive the right indicated in the mode he specifies.
1.3. All the rights conveyed through the consent given are fully disclosed in the actual writing that was signed by the Protected Party.

2. All property held in the name of the Protected Party shall conclusively be presumed to be PRIVATE property beyond the control of any government or any government civil or tax statute. Government actor may only assert otherwise by satisfying the following burden of proof:

2.1. That the Protected Party consented in writing to donate the formerly private property to a public use, public purpose or public office.

2.2. That the domicile of the Protect Party was on federal territory not protected by the United States constitution at the time consent was given.

The provisions of this section are intended to enforce the requirement for equal protection and equal treatment by placing the Protected Party on an equal footing with any and every government. Those who wish to civilly sue any government must provide evidence of consent to be civilly sued. The above provisions ensure that any government suing the Protected Party must meet the same requirement when trying to sue the Protected Party in a civil court.

If the Government Actor uses the word “law” to describe a statutory civil obligation by either party, the word “law” shall mean a voluntary civil franchise available only to those domiciled within the exclusive jurisdiction of the government grantor of the civil franchise. Government as moving party enforcing any obligation under such “law” agrees to meet the burden of proof that the party against which they are enforcing said obligation:

1. Is lawfully serving in a public office in the government granting the franchise.
2. Is either consensually domiciled on federal territory or representing an entity so domiciled under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 17.
3. Has the capacity to alienate Constitutional rights because either physically present on federal territory OR occupying an office that is executed ONLY where EXPRESSLY authorized per 4 U.S.C. §72. They furthermore agree to provide the statute EXPRESSLY authorizing the exercise of the office in the PLACE they are trying to enforce.

In the absence of EXPRESSLY satisfying the above burden of proof with admissible evidence signed under penalty of perjury, both parties to any enforcement action stipulate that there is CONCLUSIVE PRESUMPTION against any civil enforcement authority of that civil statutory provision which is referred to with the term “law”. Parties also acknowledge that any attempt to enforce an obligation UNDER said franchise without the requirement of domicile is a PRIVATE contracting exercise that is NOT a government function and which may therefore NOT lawfully be protected with sovereign, official, or judicial immunity. For details, see and rebut:

```
Why Statutory Civil Law is Law for Government and Not Private Persons, Form #05.037
```

9.8  **Service of Process**

Government Actor agrees to accept service of legal process by any one or more of the following means:

1. By certified mail to the address that Government Actor last sent correspondence.
2. By Certificate/Proof/Affidavit of service to the address that Government Actor last sent correspondence.
3. By personal service upon the employer of the Government Actor.

Government Actor consents to provide a copy of their passport and driver’s license and dwelling place on all correspondence with Protected Party and when requested by Protected Party in order to effect proper service of process.

10  **Method of Amendment**

This franchise and agreement may only be amended with the express, written consent of both parties to it beyond the point that consent is manifested and agreement is made.

Parties stipulate to be subject to all future published versions of this franchise without notice by Protected Party or SEDM when or if they become available. Protected Party shall have discretion to modify, amend, or add any provision he or she sees fit to this agreement at any time without notice to the Government Actor, just like the government does with its franchise.
“We must conclude that a person covered by the Act has not such a right in benefit payments... This is not to say, however, that Congress may exercise its power to modify the statutory scheme free of all constitutional restraint.”

[Flemming v. Nestor, 363 U.S. 603 (1960)]

11 Severability and Affirmation

In the event that any part of this agreement is found to be unenforceable, it is my intent and the intent of the parties that all remaining provisions shall be legally binding.

I acknowledge that the obligations of this agreement are perpetual, supersede enacted law, and are superior to it. I voluntarily waive any and all benefit or immunity resulting from any statute of limitations, official, judicial, or sovereign immunity that might limit or destroy remedies or damages that could be claimed under this agreement in any court of law.

I voluntarily declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the state I am domiciled in and from without the “United States” identified in 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(9) and (a)(10) and under 28 U.S.C. §1746(1) that the foregoing facts are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief, so help me God.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROTECTED PARTY</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signature:</td>
<td>Date:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone:</td>
<td>Email address:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOVERNMENT ACTOR</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signature:</td>
<td>Date:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone:</td>
<td>Email address:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>