Unified United States Common Law Grand Jury
AL, AK, AZ, AR, CA, CO, CT, DE, FL, GA, HI, ID, IL, IN, IA, KS, KY, LA, ME, MD, MA, MI, MN, MS, MO, MT, NE, NV, NH, NJ, NM, NY, NC, ND, OH, OK, OR, PA, RI, SC, SD, TN, TX, UT, VT, VA, WA, WV, WI, WY:
PO Box 64, Valhalla, New York 10595-9998

ADDENDUM TO GRAND JURY PRESENTMENT TO THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

• First Street NE, Washington DC, DC 20543 •

TO: John G. Roberts, Jr., Chief Justice, Ketanji Brown Jackson, Associate Justice, Sonia Sotomayor, Associate Justice, Samuel A. Alito, Jr., Associate Justice, Brett M. Kavanaugh, Associate Justice, Amy Coney Barrett, Associate Justice, Elena Kagan, Associate Justice, Neil M. Gorsuch, Associate Justice, Clarence Thomas, Associate Justice

RE: MEMORANDUM OF LAW SOVEREIGNTY, JURISDICTION, LAW, & DUE PROCESS

COPIED: Judge Advocate General, Vice Admiral Darse E. Crandall, NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU, Gen. Daniel R. Hokanson; NORAD/US. NORTHCOM PA, Gen. Glen D. VanHerck, Office of the Air Force Inspector General, Maj Gen Junius Jones, Lieutenant General Joseph B. Berger, Judge Advocate General, US Army, President Donald J. Trump, Tom Fitton, Donald Trump Jr., Robert F Kennedy, Kash Patel, Senator Mike Lee, Senator Ted Cruz, Senator John Kennedy, Senator Rand Paul, Senator Josh Hawley, Senator JD Vance, Congressman Mike Johnson, Congressman Jim Jordan, Congresswoman Marjorie Taylor, Congressman Matt Gaetz, Congressman Steve Scalise, Congressman Andy Briggs, Congressman Chip Roy, Congressman Eli Crane, Congressman Corry Mills, Congressman Jim Banks.

NOTICE TO AGENT IS NOTICE TO PRINCIPAL[1]

18 USC § 2071 (a) *Whoever willfully and unlawfully conceals, removes, mutilates … shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than three years, or both.*

[1] Montana Code Annotated 2023

MEMORANDUM OF LAW

SOVEREIGNTY, JURISDICTION, LAW, & DUE PROCESS

Jurisdiction is the authority by which courts and judicial officers take cognizance of and decide cases.[1]

THE PURPOSE OF THIS MEMORANDUM OF LAW is to give judicial notice, or knowledge upon which a judge is bound to act without having it proved in evidence;[2] concerning sovereignty, jurisdiction, Law courts, equity courts, de-facto civil law court aka chancery courts, and due process.

THE DECREE OF THE SOVEREIGN MAKES THE LAW

"The very meaning of 'sovereignty' is that the decree of the sovereign makes law.[3] A consequence of this prerogative is the legal ubiquity of the king. His Majesty (Jesus Christ) in the eye of the law is always present in all His courts, though he cannot personally distribute justice.[4] His judges (*Jury*) are the mirror by which the king's image is reflected."[5] "Sovereignty' means that the decree of sovereign makes law, and foreign courts cannot condemn influences persuading sovereign to make the decree."[6] "Sovereignty itself is, of course, not subject to law, for it is the author and source of law; but in our system, while sovereign powers are delegated to the agencies of government, sovereignty itself remains with the people, by whom and for whom all government exists and acts and the law is the definition and limitation of power. … For, the very idea that man may be compelled to hold his life, or the means of living, or any material right essential to the enjoyment of life, at the mere will of another, seems to be intolerable in any country where freedom prevails, as being the essence of slavery itself."[7] "The state cannot diminish rights of the people."[8] No authority can, on any pretence whatsoever, be exercised over the citizens of this state, but such as is or shall be derived from and granted by the people of this state."[9]

"We The people are the rightful masters of both Congresses, and courts not to overthrow the Constitution, but to overthrow the men who pervert it."[10] Samuel Adams said, "The Natural Liberty of man is to be free from any superior power on earth and not to be under the will or legislative authority of man but only to have the Law of nature for his rule."

WE THE PEOPLE ORDAINED AND ESTABLISHED[11] and codified the Supreme Law of the Land under Article VI Clause 2 where we said, "This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which

---

[1] Board of Trustees of Firemen's Relief and Pension Fund of City of Marietta v. Brooks, 179 Okl. 600, 67 P.2d 4, 6. Morrow v. Corbin, 122 Tex. 553, 62 S.W.2d 641; State v. Barnett, 110 Vt. 221, 3 A.2d 521, 526.
[2] Black's Law Dictionary, 5th Edition, page 760.
[3] American Banana Co. v. United Fruit Co., 29 S.Ct. 511, 513, 213 U.S. 347, 53 L.Ed. 826, 19 Ann.Cas. 1047.
[4] Fortesc.c.8. 2Inst.186.
[5] 1 Blackstone's Commentaries, 270, Chapter 7, Section 379.
[6] Moscow Fire Ins. Co. of Moscow, Russia v. Bank of New York & Trust Co., 294 N.Y.S. 648, 662, 161 Misc. 903.
[7] Yick Wo v. Hopkins, 118 US 356, 370.
[8] Hurtado v. People of the State of California, 110 U.S. 516.
[9] NEW YORK CODE - N.Y. CVR. LAW § 2: NY Code - Section 2.
[10] Abraham Lincoln.
[11] Preamble US Constitution.

shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every state shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding."

WE THE PEOPLE PROVIDED FOR ONLY TWO LAWFUL JURISDICTIONS in the United States codifying under Article III Section 2 where we said, "*The judicial power shall extend to all cases, in law and equity, arising under this Constitution, the laws of the United States, and treaties made, or which shall be made, under their authority*."

WE THE PEOPLE CODIFIED UNDER ARTICLE VI SECTION 4 that, "The United States shall guarantee to every state in this union a [*Common Law*] Republican form of government, and shall protect each of them against invasion." Whereas, the Declaration of Independence, being a covenant with God where we agreed to live under His Law and thereby receive His blessings of Liberty. And whereas, "We the People" instituted and vested judges with powers to secure our courts of Justice and the blessings of liberty that, all court officers took an oath to uphold and protect. But in its stead the Federal Judiciary, followed by the state judiciaries robbed God and His people by covertly replacing civil law analogous to a malignant tumor, nibbling away at the Laws of nature and of nature's God along with our unalienable rights.

> Hebrews 8:10 - "*For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of My Son after those days, saith the Lord; I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts: and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people*:"

WE THE PEOPLE ARE SOVEREIGN, whereas judges are vested with authority,[12] by the sovereign, defined by the Constitution, controlled and restricted by the "Rules of Common Law," and guided by American Jurisprudence. "The doctrine of Sovereign Immunity is one of the Common-Law immunities and defenses that are available to the Sovereign."[13] "In United States, sovereignty resides in people. The Congress cannot invoke the sovereign power of the People to override their will."[14] "The sovereignty of a state does not reside in the persons who fill the different departments of its government, but in the People, from whom the government emanated; and they may change it at their discretion. Sovereignty, then in this country, abides with the constituency, and not with the agent; and this remark is true, both in reference to the federal and state government."[15] "No man in this country is so high that he is above the law. No officer of the law may set that law at defiance with impunity. All the officers of the government, from the highest to the lowest, are creatures of the law and are bound to obey it."[16] "When a judicial officer acts entirely without jurisdiction or without compliance with jurisdiction requisites, he may be held civilly liable for abuse of process even though his act involved a decision made in good faith, that he had

[12] Authority: Permission - People v. Howard, 31 Cal.App. 358, 160 P. 697, 701. Control over, jurisdiction. - State v. Home Brewing Co. of Indian-apolis, 182 Ind. 75, 105 N.E. 909, 916.
[13] Yick Wo v. Hopkins, 318 US 356, 371 and Terry v. Ohio, 392 US 1, 40.
[14] Perry v. US, 294 U.S330.
[15] Spooner v. McConnell, 22 F 939 @ 943.
[16] U.S. v. Lee, 106 U.S. 196, 220 1 S. Ct. 240, 261, 27 L. Ed 171 (1882).

jurisdiction."[17] "When a judge knows that he lacks jurisdiction, or acts in the face of clearly valid statutes expressly depriving him of jurisdiction, judicial immunity is lost."[18]

James Madison the 4th President, hailed as the Father of the Constitution said; "We have staked the whole future of American civilization, not upon the power of government, far from it. We have staked the future of all of our political institutions upon the capacity of mankind for self-government; upon the capacity of each and all of us to govern ourselves, to control ourselves, to sustain ourselves according to the Ten Commandments of God."

WE THE PEOPLE CODIFIED ONLY TWO JURISDICTIONS COURTS OF RECORD (LAW) AND COURTS NOT OF RECORD (EQUITY)

"Equity courts and law courts, the former being such as possess the jurisdiction of a chancellor, apply the rules and principles of chancery law, and follow the procedure in equity; the latter, such as have no equitable powers, but administer justice according to the rules and practice of the Common Law.[19] "As to the construction, with reference to Common Law, an important cannon of construction is that constitutions must be construed to reference to the Common Law." The Common Law, so permitted destruction of the abatement of nuisances by summary proceedings and it was never supposed that a constitutional provision was intended to interfere with this established principle and although there is no common law of the United States in a sense of a national customary law as distinguished from the Common Law of England, adopted in the several states. In interpreting the Federal Constitution, recourse may still be had to the aid of the Common Law of England. It has been said that without reference to the common law, the language of the Federal Constitution could not be understood."[20]

"Courts may be classified and divided according to several methods, the following being the more usual: 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… 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."[21]

"A 'court of record' is a judicial tribunal (*We the People*) 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."[22] In a court of record the acts and judicial proceedings are enrolled, whereas, in courts not of record, the proceedings are not enrolled. The privilege of having these

---

[17] U.S. Fidelity & Guaranty Co. (State use of), 217 Miss. 576, 64 So. 2d 697.
[18] Zeller v. Rankin, 101 S.Ct. 2020, 451 U.S. 939, 68 L.Ed 2d 326.
[19] Blacks Law 4th.
[20] 16Am Jur 2d., Sec. 114.
[21] 3 Bl. 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.
[22] Jones v. Jones, 188 Mo.App. 220, 175 S.W. 227, 229; Exparte Gladhill, 8 Metc., Mass., 171, per Shaw, C. J. See, also, Ledwith v. Rosalsky, 244 N.Y. 406, 155 N.E. 688, 689.

enrolled memorials constitutes the great leading distinction between courts of record and courts not of record."[23]

"'Inferior courts" are those whose jurisdiction is limited and special and whose proceedings are not according to the course of the common law. Criminal courts proceed according to statutory law. Jurisdiction and procedure are defined by statute. Likewise, civil courts and admiralty courts proceed according to statutory law. Any court proceeding according to statutory law is not a court of record, which only proceeds according to Common Law; it is an inferior court."[24]

"An inferior court is a court whose judgments or decrees can be reviewed, on appeal or writ of error, by a higher tribunal, whether that tribunal be the circuit or supreme court."[25] "The decisions of a superior court may only be challenged in a court of appeal. The decisions of an inferior court are subject to collateral attack. In other words, in a superior court one may sue an inferior court directly, rather than resort to appeal to an appellate court. Decision of a court of record may not be appealed. It is binding on ALL other courts. However, no statutory or constitutional court (whether it be an appellate or supreme court) can second guess the judgment of a court of record. The judgment of a court of record whose jurisdiction is final, is as conclusive on all the world as the judgment of this court would be. It is as conclusive on this court as it is on other courts. It puts an end to inquiry concerning the fact, by deciding it."[26]

Judges are magistrates,[27] "an official entrusted with administration of the laws."[28] "It is the duty of all magistrates to exercise the power, vested in them for the good of the people, according to law, and with zeal and fidelity. A neglect on the part of a magistrate to exercise the functions of his office, when required by law, is a misdemeanor."[29] In a "Court of Record aka Court of Law judges are magistrates and not the tribunal. The tribunal is a fully empowered jury having the Right to determine both the law and the facts."[30] "The constitutions of most of our states assert that all power is inherent in the people; that they may exercise it by themselves, in all cases to which they think themselves competent, (as in electing their functionaries executive and legislative, and deciding by a jury of themselves, both fact and law, in all judiciary cases in which any fact is involved) or they may ask by representatives, freely and equally chosen; that it is their right and duty to be at all times armed; to freedom of person; freedom of religion; freedom of property; and freedom of the press."[31]

---

[23] Ex parte Thistleton, 52 Cal. 220. As to what are "courts of common-law jurisdiction" within the meaning of the federal naturalization act, see Alienage and Citizenship, Vol. 1, p. 911.; Hahn v. Kelly, 34 Cal. 391, 94 Am. Dec. 742, per Sawyer, J., concurring. See infra, §§ 26-28, as to records.
[24] Ex parte Watkins, 3 Pet., at 202-203. cited by SCHNECKLOTH v. BUSTAMONTE, 412 U.S. 218, 255 (1973).
[25] Nugent v. State, 18 Ala. 521.
[26] Ex parte Watkins, 3 Pet., at 202-203. cited by SCHNECKLOTH v. BUSTAMONTE, 412 U.S. 218, 255 (1973).
[27] N.Y. CRC. LAW §30.
[28] Black's Law 4th Ed.
[29] Vide 15 Vin. Ab. 144; Ayl. Pand. tit. 22; Dig. 30, 16, 57; Merl. Rep. h. t.; 13 Pick. R. 523.
[30] Samuel Chase, U.S. supreme Court Justice, 1796, Signer of the unanimous Declaration; NY Constitution Article I bill of rights §8.; John Jay, 1st Chief Justice United States supreme Court, 1789; Oliver Wendell Holmes, U.S. supreme Court Justice, 1902.
[31] Thomas Jefferson, letter to John Cartwright; June 5, 1824; "The Thomas Jefferson Papers," Library of Congress.

"Any proceeding by which a controversy is settled, case disposed of, or trial conducted, in a prompt and simple manner, without the aid of a jury, without presentment or indictment, or in other respects out of the regular course of the Common Law"[32] is repugnant to the Law of the Land. When a judge seizes control of a Court of Law via summary proceedings "the judge acts as a trespasser of the law, when a judge does not follow the law, the Judge loses subject-matter jurisdiction and the judges' orders are not voidable, but VOID, and of no legal force or effect. … When a state officer acts under a state law in a manner violative of the Federal Constitution, he comes into conflict with the superior authority of that Constitution, and he is in that case stripped of his official or representative character and is subjected in his person to the consequences of his individual conduct. The State has no power to impart to him any immunity from responsibility to the supreme authority of the United States."[33]

"Any judge who does not comply with his oath to the Constitution of the United States wars against that Constitution and engages in acts in violation of the supreme law of the land. The judge is engaged in acts of treason."[34] "No judicial process, whatever form it may assume, can have any lawful authority outside of the limits of the jurisdiction of the court or judge by whom it is issued; and an attempt to enforce it beyond these boundaries is nothing less than lawless violence."[35] "Judges have no more right to decline the exercise of jurisdiction which is given, than to usurp that which is not given. The one or the other would-be treason to the Constitution."[36]

"If then the courts are to regard the constitution; and the constitution is superior to any ordinary act of the legislature; the constitution, and not such ordinary act, must govern the case to which they both apply. Those then who resist the principle that the constitution is to be considered, in court, as a paramount law, are reduced to the necessity of maintaining that courts must close their eyes on the constitution, and see only the law. This doctrine would subvert the very foundation of all written constitutions. It would declare that an act, which, according to the principles and theory of our government, is entirely void, is yet, in practice, completely obligatory. It would declare, that if the legislature shall do what is expressly forbidden, such act, notwithstanding the express prohibition, is in reality effectual. It would be giving to the legislature a practical and real omnipotence with the same breath which professes to restrict their powers within narrow limits. It is prescribing limits, and declaring that those limits may be passed at pleasure. … It is in these words: 'I do solemnly swear that I will administer justice without respect to persons, and do equal right to the poor and to the rich; and that I will faithfully and impartially discharge all the duties incumbent on me as according to the best of my abilities and understanding, agreeably to the constitution and laws of the United States.' Why does a judge swear to discharge his duties agreeably to the constitution of the United States, if that constitution forms no rule for his government? if it is closed upon him and cannot be inspected by him. If such

[32] Sweet see Phillips v. Phillips, 8 N.J.L. 122.
[33] Scheuer v. Rhodes, 416 U.S. 232, 94 S. Ct. 1683, 1687 (1974).
[34] Cooper v. Aaron, 358 U.S. 1, 78 S. Ct. 1401 (1958).
[35] Ableman v. Booth, 21 Howard 506 (1859).
[36] Cohen v. Virginia, (1821), 6 Wheat. 264 and U.S. v. Will, 449 U.S. 200.

be the real state of things, this is worse than solemn mockery. To prescribe, or to take this oath, becomes equally a crime." [37]

Courts without authority are null - "Under federal Law, which is applicable to all states, the U.S. Supreme Court stated that "if a court is without authority, its judgments and orders are regarded as nullities. They are not voidable, but simply void, and form no bar to a recovery sought, even prior to a reversal in opposition to them. They constitute no justification and all persons concerned in executing such judgments or sentences are considered, in law, as trespassers."[38]

COMMON LAW -V- LEGISLATED LAW AKA EQUITY

The Rules Enabling Act of 1934 "unlawfully passed by Congress" gave the Supreme Court the power to make rules of procedure and evidence for federal courts as long as they did not "abridge, enlarge, or modify any substantive right." According to the Federal Judicial Center, a government agency, on September 16, 1938, pursuant to its fictional authority under the repugnant Rules Enabling Act of 1934, "the Supreme Court enacted uniform rules of procedure for the federal courts. Under the new rules, suits in equity and suits at Common Law were grouped together under the term civil action, claiming that rigid application of Common-Law Rules brought about injustice."[39] This was an Act of Treason whereas the Supreme Court and Congress under the teachings and guidance of the treacherous subversive American Bar Association, in an Act of Treason, a silent coup, claiming the abrogation of Common Law, aka "Natural Law," with its unalienable rights that were endowed by our Creator covertly substituted them with civil rights legislated by lawless men. Thereafter all fifty states, their counties, cities, towns, and villages having incorporated thereby becoming municipalities which wrote "municipal law" aka "civil law."

"The general rule is that an unconstitutional statute, though having the form and name of law, is in reality no law, but is wholly void and ineffective for any purpose, since its unconstitutionality dates from the time of its enactment… In legal contemplation, it is as inoperative as if it had never been passed… Since an unconstitutional law is void, the general principles follow that it imposes no duties, confers no right, creates no office, bestows no power or authority on anyone, affords no protection and justifies no acts performed under it… A void act cannot be legally consistent with a valid one. An unconstitutional law cannot operate to supersede any existing law. Indeed, insofar as a statute runs counter to the fundamental law of the land, (the Constitution) it is superseded thereby. No one is bound to obey an unconstitutional law and no courts are bound to enforce it."[40]

---

[37] MARBURY v. MADISON, 5 U.S. 137 (1803) 5 U.S. 137 (Cranch) 1803.

[38] Basso v. UPL, 495 F. 2d 906; Brook v. Yawkey, 200 F. 2d 633; Elliot v. Piersol, 1 Pet. 328, 340, 26 U.S. 328, 340 (1828).

[39] **The Federal Judicial Center** is the research and education agency of the judicial branch of the United States Government. The Center supports the efficient, effective administration of justice and judicial independence. Its status as a separate agency within the judicial branch, its specific missions, and its specialized expertise enable it to pursue and encourage critical and careful examination of ways to improve judicial administration. The Center has no policy-making or enforcement authority; its role is to provide accurate, objective information and education and to encourage thorough and candid analysis of policies, practices, and procedures. https://www.fjc.gov/history/timeline/federal-rules-civil-procedure-merge-equity-and-common-law.

[40] Bonnett v. Vallier, 116 N.W. 885, 136 Wis. 193 (1908); NORTON v. SHELBY COUNTY, 118 U.S. 425 (1886).

"The common law is the real law, the Supreme Law of the land, the code, rules, regulations, policy and statutes are "not the law."[41] "Civil Law," "Roman Law" and "Roman Civil Law" are convertible phrases, meaning the same system of jurisprudence. That rule of action which every particular nation, commonwealth, or city has established peculiarly for itself; more properly called municipal law, to distinguish it from the law of nature, and from international law."[42] "Common law as distinguished from equity law, it is a body of rules and principles, written or unwritten, which are of fixed and immutable authority, and which must be applied to controversies rigorously and in their entirety, and cannot be modified to suit the peculiarities of a specific case, or colored by any judicial discretion, and which rests confessedly upon custom or statute, as distinguished from any claim to ethical superiority.[43]

"Common Law as distinguished from law created by the enactment of legislatures, the Common Law comprises the body of those principles and rules of action, relating to the government and security of persons and property, which derive their authority solely from usages and customs of immemorial antiquity, or from the judgments and decrees of the courts recognizing, affirming, and enforcing such usages and customs; and, in this sense, particularly the ancient unwritten law of England.[44] "A Court of 'Law' means Court of Common Law - a court for the People 'coram ipso rege' (*before the king himself*)."[45] "A court of Law in a wide sense, any duly constituted tribunal (*jury*) administering the laws of the state or nation; in a narrower sense, a court proceeding according to the course of the Common Law and governed by its rules and principles, as contrasted with a "court of equity."[46]

"'At Law,' this phrase is used to point out that a thing is to be done according to the course of the common law; it is distinguished from a proceeding in equity.[47] Common Law as distinguished from the Roman law, the modern civil law, the canon law, and other systems, the common law is that body of law and juristic theory which was, originated, developed, and formulated and is administered in England, and has obtained among most of the states and peoples of Anglo-Saxon stock."[48] "Statutes that violate the plain and obvious principles of common right and common reason are null and void."[49]

"Commercial law, is a phrase used to designate the whole body of substantive jurisprudence applicable to the rights, intercourse, and relations of persons engaged in commerce, trade, or mercantile pursuits. It is not a very scientific or accurate term. As foreign commerce is carried on by means of shipping, the term has come to be used occasionally as synonymous with "maritime

---

[41] Self v. Rhay, 61 Wn (2d) 261.
[42] Bowyer, Mod. Civil Law, 19; Sevier v. Riley, 189. Cal. 170, 244 P. 323, 325.
[43] Black's Law 4th edition, 1891, Klever v. Seawall, C.C.A.Ohio, 65 F. 395, 12 C.C.A. 661.
[44] Black's Law 4th edition, 1891 1 Kent, Comm. 492. Western Union Tel. Co. v. Call Pub. Co., 21 S.Ct. 561, 181 U.S. 92, 45 L.Ed. 765; Barry v. Port Jervis, 72 N.Y.S. 104, 64 App. Div. 268; U. S. v. Miller, D.C.Wash., 236 F. 798, 800.
[45] Blacks Law 4th.
[46] Blacks Law 4th.
[47] Black's Law 4th edition, 1891.
[48] Lux v. Haggin, 69 Cal. 255, 10 P. 674.
[49] Bennett v. Boggs, 1 Baldw 60.

law;" but, in strictness, the phrase "commercial law" is wider, and includes many transactions or legal questions which have nothing to do with shipping or its incidents.[50]

"All codes, rules, and regulations are for [fictions and] government authorities only, not human/Creators in accordance with God's laws. All codes, rules, and regulations are unconstitutional and lacking due process…"[51] "All laws, rules and practices which are repugnant to the Constitution are null and void."[52] "Every man is independent of all laws, except those prescribed by nature. He is not bound by any institutions formed by his fellowman without his consent."[53]

DUE PROCESS

Law in its regular course of administration through courts of justice is due process.[54]

"Law of the land, due course of law, and due process of law are synonymous."[55] "'Due course of law,' this phrase is synonymous with 'due process of law' or 'law of the land' and means law in its regular course of administration through courts of justice.[56] By the law of the land is more clearly intended the general law, a law which hears before it condemns; which proceeds upon inquiry and renders judgment only after trial.[57] "Law in its regular course of administration through courts of justice is due process."[58]

"It is said that these constitutional provisions do not mean the general body of the law as it was at the time the Constitution took effect; but they refer to certain fundamental rights which the system of jurisprudence of which ours is derivative has always been recognized; if any of these are disregarded in the proceedings; by which a person is condemned to the loss of property, etc., then the deprivation has not been by due process of law, and it has been held that the state cannot deprive a person of his property without due process of law through a constitutional convention any more than it can through an act of legislature."[59]

"Amendment V of the Constitution of the United States provides: "No person shall---be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law. A similar provision exists in all the state constitutions; the phrases "due course of law", and the "law of the land" are sometimes used; but all three of these phrases have the same meaning and that applies conformity with the ancient and customary laws of the English people or laws indicated by parliament,[60] "The Due Process Clause has its origin in Magna Carta. As originally drafted, the Great Charter provided

---

[50] Watson v. Tarpley, 18 How. 521, 15 L.Ed. 509; Williams v. Gold Hill Min. Co., C.C.Cal., 96 F. 464.
[51] Rodriques v. Ray Donavan (U.S. Department of Labor) 769 F. 2d 1344, 1348 (1985).
[52] Marbury v. Madison, 5th US (2 Cranch) 137, 174, 176,(1803).
[53] Cruden v. Neale, 2 N.C. 338 May Term 1796 2 s.e.
[54] Leeper vs. Texas, 139, U.S. 462, II SUP CT. 577, 35 L ED 225.
[55] People v. Skinner, Cal., 110 P.2d 41, 45; State v. Rossi, 71 R.I. 284, 43 A.2d 323, 326; Direct Plumbing Supply Co. v. City of Dayton, 138 Ohio St. 540, 38 N.E.2d 70, 72, 137 A.L.R. 1058; Stoner v. Higginson, 316 Pa. 481, 175 A. 527, 531.
[56] Kansas Pac. Ry. Co. v. Dunmeyer 19 KAN 542.
[57] Dartmouth College Case, 4 Wheat, U.S. 518, 4 ED 629.
[58] Leeper vs. Texas, 139, U.S. 462, II SUP CT. 577, 35 L ED 225.
[59] Brown v. Levese Com'rs, 50 MIS 479.
[60] Davidson V. New Orleans 96 U.S. 97, 24, L Ed 616.

that 'no freeman shall be taken, or imprisoned, or be disseized of his freehold, or liberties, or free customs, or be outlawed, or exiled, or any otherwise destroyed; nor will we not pass upon him, nor condemn him, but by lawful judgment of his peers, or by the law of the land. Magna Carta, ch. 29, in 1 E. Coke, the Second Part of the Institutes of the Laws of England 45 (1797).'"[61]

"The adoption of the XIV amendment completed the circle of protection against violations of the provision of Magna Carta, which guaranteed to the citizen his, life, liberty, and property against interference except by the "law of the land," which phrase was coupled in the petition of right with due process of law. The latter phrase was then used for the first time, but the two are currently treated as meaning the same. This security is provided as against the United States by the XIV and V amendments and against the states by the XIV amendment."[62]

"The privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States, protected by the IV Amendment, are those arising out of the nature and essential character of the federal government, and granted or secured by the Constitution; and due process of law and the equal protection of the laws are secured if the laws operate on all alike, and do not subject the individual to an arbitrary exercise of the powers of government.[63] The natural inherent principles of justice and forbids the taking of one's property without compensation, and requires that no one shall be condemned in person or property without opportunity to be heard."[64]

IN CONCLUSION, reiterating the aforesaid main points. The doctrine of Sovereign Immunity is one of the Common-Law immunities and defenses that are available to the sovereign. Sovereignty means that the decree of sovereign makes law. We the People are not subject to legislated law, for we are the author and source of law and the rightful masters of both Congresses, and courts. We the People codified only two jurisdictions, Courts of Record (Law) and Courts Not of Record (equity). 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. 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. On September 16, 1938, pursuant to its fictional authority under the repugnant Rules Enabling Act of 1934 the Supreme Court enacted uniform rules of procedure for the federal courts. This was an Act of Treason, a silent coup, that claimed the abrogation of Common Law and replaced it with civil law thereby enslaving the People. Whereas, the Natural Liberty of man is to be free from any superior power on earth and not to be under the will or legislative authority of man but only to have the Law of nature for his rule. Civil law courts are without authority and lacking due-process and therefore null and void. The aforesaid facts can only conclude that all People that have been tried, convicted, fined, or imprison in civil law courts aka courts "not of record" have been convicted in jurisdictions unknown without due process and therefore must be released, restored or re-trialed. No freeman shall be imprisoned or disseized but by lawful judgment of his "Free and Independent Peers."

---

[61] Opinion of SCALIA, J. KERRY v. DIN Decided June 15, 2015.
[62] Davidson vs. Orleans 96, U.S. 97, 24 L ED 161.
[63] Duncan vs. Missouri, 152, U.S. 382,14 SUP. CT. 570, 38 L. ED. 485.
[64] Holden vs. Hardy, 169, U.S. 366, 18 SUP. CT. 383, 42 L ED. 780.; Kinney V. Beverly, 2 Hen. & M(VA) 381, 336.