

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE NINETEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT AND IN FOR
 SAINT LUCIE COUNTY, FLORIDA.

STAE OF (STATE))	CASE NO: _____
(Respondent))	
VS.)	
)	UCC FILE NO: _____
(Your Free Name))	
(Affiant/Secured Party creditor))	
_____)	

AFFIDAVIT TO INVOKE RIGHT TO TRAVEL

The affiant, **Amunhotep El Bey**, in Propria Persona (my own proper self), formerly known as the artificial person, **Eugene James Williams**, deposes as follows under oath:

The affiant is not a lawyer and his pleadings cannot be treated as such. In fact, according to *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519 (1972), a complaint "however inartfully pleaded," must be held to "less stringent standards than formal pleadings drafted by lawyers" and can only be dismissed for failure to state a claim if it appears "beyond doubt that the plaintiff can prove no set of facts in support of his claim which would entitle him to relief." *Id.*, at 520-521, quoting *Conley v. Gibson*, 355 U.S. 41, 45-46 (1957).

“Indeed, no more than affidavits is necessary to make a prima facie case.” (See *United States v. Kis*, 658 F. 2nd, 526, 536 (7th Cir. 1981): *Cert Denied*, 50 U.S.L.W. 2169; S. Ct. March 22, 1982.)

This affidavit is submitted upon demand of a driver’s license, registration or proof of insurance, and/or tag, as part of the official record of any ensuing action and must be introduced as evidence in said action.

That I, Amunhotep El Bey, do not under any circumstances utilize the public highways for commercial purposes. I am not a 14th Amendment legal “Person” engaged in interstate commerce, nor do I derive income from travel and transport of goods. I am not a driver, nor am I an operator of a Commercial Motor Vehicle. The Driver’s License is for Commercial Motor vehicles involved in commerce only. My Private, self-propelled contrivance/carriage is not involved in commerce; therefore, it is not a “Commercial Motor vehicle.” The corporate state of, Florida, does not disclose the true intent and purpose of the statutes through a “Commercial Motor Vehicle,” as is adequately and clearly defined in the 49 United States Code (USC) section 31301.

The affiant asserts that he is not an employee as defined by 49 USC Section 31301(7), “An employee means an operator of a Commercial Motor Vehicle, including an independent contractor who is employee by an employer.”

The affiant asserts that he is not an employer as defined by 49 USC Section 31301 (8), “Employer means a person (including the United States Government, a State, or a political subdivision of a state) that owns or leases a Commercial Motor Vehicle or assigns employees to operate a Commercial motor Vehicle.”

The affiant doesn't not have or need a driver's license, because the state is not his employer and nor is he an employee of the state. The state would have to pay me if I had a driver's license, because I would then be an employee. According to the 49 USC Section 31301, only people who are engaged in commerce need a driver's license. A Commercial Motor Vehicle is for commerce and for employers who are paying drivers' wages. The affiant doesn't qualify for a driver's license, according to the said Unites States Codes, and therefore, he doesn't have or need a driver's license.

Shapiro vs. Thomas, 394 U.S. 618 April 21, 1969. Further, the right to travel by private conveyance for private purposes upon the common way cannot be infringed. No license or permission is required for travel when such travel is not for the purpose of commercial profit or gain on the open highways operating under license in commerce.” Murdock v. Penn, 319 U.S. 105, (1943) “No state shall convert a liberty into a privilege, license it, and attach a fee to it.”

“The privilege of using the streets and highways by the operation of motor carriers for hire can be acquired only by permission or license from the state or its political subdivision.” (See Black's Law Dictionary, 5th ed. Page 830.)

I cannot in good faith apply for and accept a driver's license, as I would be committing perjury. I would have to swear under oath that I am a member of, citizen of, franchisee of, or resident (agent) of the corporate state of Florida when the already established facts by affidavit have evidenced that I am not a member of, citizen of, franchisee of, or resident.

Therefore, I have determined and hereby affirm by affidavit and under oath, by virtue of my declared Sovereignty supported by American case law, Constitution, and United States Codes that I am not required to have government permission to travel, not required to have a driver's license, not required to have vehicle registration of my personal property, tag, nor Insurance. Additionally, affiant is not required to surrender the lawful title of my duly conveyed property to the state as security against government indebtedness and the undeclared federal bankruptcy. Any administrative rule, regulation or statutory act of any state legislature or judicial tribunal to the contrary is unlawful and clearly unconstitutional, thus null and void.

NOTICE TO ALL LAW ENFORCEMENT: American Nationals and Citizens are not required to show identification to a police officer. The Police Officer swears by oath to uphold the United States Constitution as an Officer of the Law. US Supreme Court Decisions are considered the Law of the Land in regards to constitutionally protected rights, and they cannot be interpreted, or re-interpreted, as they are 'stare decisis' (already reviewed and clearly described as Law).

SUPREME COURT CASE:

Kolender v. Lawson (461 U.S. 352, 1983) in which the United States Supreme Court ruled that a police officer could not arrest a citizen merely for refusing to present identification. There is no such thing as "Failure to identify." You can sue the police for an illegal arrest and resist arrest with impunity!

"An illegal arrest is an assault and battery. The person so attempted to be restrained of his liberty has the same right to use force in defending himself as he would in repelling any other assault and battery." (State v. Robinson, 145 ME. 77, 72 ATL. 260).

"Each person has the right to resist an unlawful arrest. In such a case, the person attempting the arrest stands in the position of a wrongdoer and may be resisted by the use of force, as in self-defense." (State v. Mobley, 240 N.C. 476, 83 S.E. 2d 100).

"One may come to the aid of another being unlawfully arrested, just as he may where one is being assaulted, molested, raped or kidnapped. Thus it is not an offense to liberate one from the unlawful custody of an officer, even though he may have submitted to such custody, without resistance." (Adams v. State, 121 Ga. 16, 48 S.E. 910). . "These principles apply as well to an officer attempting to make an arrest, who abuses his authority and transcends the bounds thereof by the use of unnecessary force and violence, as they do to a private individual who unlawfully uses such force and violence." Jones v. State, 26 Tex. App. 1; Beaverts v. State, 4 Tex. App. 1 75; Skidmore v. State, 43 Tex. 93, 903

The right to Park or Travel is part of the Liberty of which the *Natural Person*, citizen cannot be deprived without "due process of law" under the Fifth Amendment of the United States Constitution. (See Kent v. Dulles 357 US 116, 125)

"Even the legislature has no power to deny to a citizen the right to travel upon the highway and transport his property in the ordinary course of his business or pleasure, though this right may be regulated in accordance with the public interest and convenience ("Regulated" here means traffic safety enforcement: stop lights, signs, etc.). The use of the highways for the purpose of travel and transportation is not a mere privilege, but a common and Fundamental Right of which the public and *Natural Beings* cannot be deprived." (See Chicago Motor Coach v. Chicago, 337 Illinois 200, 169 NE 22, ALR; Ligare v. Chicago 139 ILL. 46, 28 HE 934; and also see Boone v. Clark 214 SW 607, 25 AM jur (1st), Highways, sec. 163.)

"The right of the citizen to travel upon the public highways and to transport his property thereon, either by carriage or by automobile, is not a mere privilege which a city may prohibit at will, but a common right which he has under the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."(See Thompson v. Smith, 154 SE 179.)

State Police Power extends only to immediate threats to public safety, health, welfare, etc., (See *Michigan v. Duke* 266 US, 476 Led. At 449) which driving and speeding are not (See *California v. Farley* Ced. Rpt. 89, 20 CA3d 1032 (1971)).

The state is prohibited from violating Substantive Rights (See *Owens v. City*, 445 US 662 (1980)); and it cannot do by one power (e.g. Police Power) that which is, for example, prohibited expressly to any other such power (e.g. Taxation / Eminent Domain) as a matter of Law. (See *US and UT v. Daniels*, 22 p 159), nor indirectly that which is prohibited to it directly. (See *Fairbanks v. US* 181, US 283, 294, 300.)

"With regard particularly to the U.S. Constitution, it is elementary that a Right secured or protected by that document cannot be overthrown or impaired by any state police authority." -- *Connolly vs. Union Sewer Pipe Co.* 184 US 540.

"Undoubtedly the right of locomotion, the right to move from one place to another according to inclination, is an attribute of personal liberty, and the right, ordinarily, of free transit from or through the territory of any State is a right secured by the 14th amendment and by other provisions of the Constitution." (See *Schactman v. Dulles*, 96 App DC 287, 293.)

Traveling in an automobile on the public roads was not a threat to the public safety or health and constituted no hazard to the public, and such a traveler owed no other duty to the public (e.g. the State); he / she and his / her auto, having equal right to and on the roadways / highways as horses and wagons, etc.; this same right is still Substantive Rule, in that speeding, running stop signs, traveling without license plates, or registration, are not threats to the public safety, and thus, are not arrestable offenses (See *Christy v. Elliot*, 216 I 131, 74 HE 1035, LRA NS 1905—1910; and also see *California v, Farley* 98 CED Rpt. 89, 20 CA 3d 1032 (1971)).

Under the United States Republic's Constitutional system of Government and upon the individuality and intelligence of the citizen, the State does not claim to control one's conduct to others, leaving one the sole judge as to all that affects oneself. (See *Mugler v. Kansas* 1213 US 623, 659—60.)

Where Rights secured by the Constitution are involved, there can be no rule - making or legislation, which would abrogate them. (See *Miranda v. Arizona* 384 US 436, 125.)

The claim and exercise of Constitutional Rights cannot be converted into a crime. (See *Miller v. Kansas* 230 F 2nd 486, 489.)

"The right to travel on the public highways is a constitutional right." -- *Teche Lines v. Danforth*, Miss. 12 So 2d 784, 787

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

If any Tribunal (court) finds absence of proof of jurisdiction over a person and subject matter, the case must be dismissed. (See *Louisville v. Motley* 211 US 149, 29S. CT 42. “The Accuser Bears the Burden of Proof Beyond a Reasonable Doubt”.)

“Lack of Federal Jurisdiction cannot be waived or overcome by agreement of parties.” (See *Griffin v. Matthews*, 310 F Supra 341, 342 (1969): and “Want of Jurisdiction may not be cured by consent of parties”. (See *Industrial Addition Association v. C.I.R.*, 323 US 310, 313.)

“Public officials are not immune from suit when they transcend their lawful authority by invading rights.”(See *AFLC10 v. Woodward*, 406 F. 2d 137 t.)

“Officers of the court have no immunity, when violating a Constitutional right, from liability. For they are deemed to know the law.” *Owen v. Independence*, 100 S.C.T. 1398, 445 US 622.

Any Municipal Officer, Person, Personnel, Employee or Contractor who violate the Rights of the People or Citizens are subject to suit in their personal and/or official capacity, to wit: Title 18, Part 1, Chapter 13 §241 of United States Codes of Law, *“If two or more persons conspire to injure, oppress, threaten, or intimidate any person in any State, Territory, commonwealth, Possession, or district in the free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege secured to him by the Constitution or Laws of the United States, or because of his having so exercised the same; or... If two or more persons go in disguise on the highway, or on the premises of another, with the intent to prevent or hinder his free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege so secured - They shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both; and if death results from the acts committed in violation of this section, or if such acts include kidnapping or an attempt to kidnap, aggravated sexual abuse or an attempt to commit aggravated sexual abuse, or an attempt to kill, they shall be fined under this title or imprisoned for any term of years or for life, or both, or may be sentenced to death.”*

According to, Title 18, Part 1, Chapter 13 §242 of United States Codes of Law: *“Whoever, under ‘color’ of any law, statute, ordinance, regulation, or custom, willfully subjects any person in any State, Territory, Commonwealth, Possession, or District to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured or protected by the Constitution or Laws of the United States, or to different punishments, pains, or penalties, on account of such person being an alien, or by reason of his color, or race, that are prescribed for the citizens, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than one year, or both; and if bodily injury results from the acts committed in violation of this section, or if such acts include the use, attempted use, or threatened use of a dangerous weapon, explosives, or fire, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than ten years or for life, or both, or may be sentenced to death.”*

The fee for illegal incarceration according to *Trezevant v. City of Tampa*, 741 F.2d 336(11th cir.1984), is \$65,217 dollars per hour, and \$1,800,000 (\$1.8 Million) dollars per day. The

defendant came to this conclusion, because in Trezevant, a Motorist illegally held for 23 minutes in a traffic charge was awarded \$25,000 in damages (Note: multiply the total number of days defendant served behind bars with the going fee of \$1.8 million dollars per day, in order to determine how much money to ask for).

“The Officers of the law, in the execution of process, are obliged to know the requirements of law, and if they mistake them, whether through ignorance or design, and if anyone is harmed by their error, they must respond in damages.” (See *Roger v. Marshall* (United States use of *Rogers v. Conklin*), 1 Wall. (US) 644, 17 Led 714.).

“Traffic Infractions are not a crime or public offense.” (See *People v. Battle*, 50 Cal.App.3d Supp.1).

"It is a general rule that an officer, executive, administrative, quasi-judicial, ministerial, or otherwise, who acts outside the scope of his jurisdiction, and without authorization of law may thereby render himself amenable to personal liability in a civil suit." (See *Cooper v. O`Conner*, 69 App DC 100, 99 F (2d).

The high Courts, through their citations of authority, have frequently declared, that “...where any state proceeds against a private individual in a judicial forum it is well settled that the state, county, municipality, etc. waives any immunity to counters, cross claims and complaints, by direct or collateral means regarding the matters involved.” (See *Luckenback v. The Thekla*, 295 F 1020, 226 Us 328; *Lyders v. Lund*, 32 F2d 308.)

"Where there is no jurisdiction there is no judge; the proceeding is as nothing. Such has been the law from the days of the Marshalsea, 10 Coke 68; also *Bradley v. Fisher*, 13 Wall 335,351." *Manning v. Ketcham*, 58 F.2d 948.

Any action involving a citation or ticket issued, confiscation, impoundment or illegal search and seizure of private property by a police officer, or any other public servant or employee which carries a fine, jail time, or the posting of exorbitant bail, will be considered a penalty or sanction against this sovereign natural being. Thus, you must have probable cause that I have in fact, not in theory, committed a crime to justify such actions, and be willing to sign such information under oath. The Common Law definition of a crime is to injure a human being or damage someone’s property. If the affiant has not injured someone or damaged someone’s property there will be no Common Law jurisdiction for an arrest and conviction.

The affiant explicitly reserves, asserts and defends his Right to Travel. The Affiant has exercised this right by expatriating from UNITED STATES citizenship of the federal United States and its political subdivisions, including municipal, county and state corporations. I the affiant, (Your Free Name), have reclaimed my lawful, human Rights and Common Law rights, under Article IV Section IV of the Constitution (Republican form of Government). The Affiant is an American Nation of the (Your State’s name) Republic. As such, Affiant enjoys diversity of citizenship, and qualifies as federal custody only.

Take judicial Notice of the Procedures concerning diversity of citizenship, the jurisdiction of the subject matter, and person required to appear. Corporate, administrative courts and tribunals have no original jurisdiction over private individuals/natural beings whatsoever, because such courts are colorable and the only deal with colorable law, which is things that appear to be real, but are not real, e.g., codes, statutes, Rules, Regulations, Policies, and ordinances. Such law is designed for code breakers of the corporation of the US, which is an administration due to the presidential declared State of Emergency (the 1959 Executive Order 10834 placed this court under the State of Emergency and under jurisdiction of the presidential flag and of military jurisdiction). Now, the gold military fringe around the US flag makes sense now, because the courts are under military jurisdiction.

This affiant is not part of the administration and is not subject to its jurisdiction whatsoever. This is a constructive lawful notice submitted upon demand of driver's license, vehicle registration, tag, or proof of insurance. Anyone who violates the affiant's rights will be held liable in both their individual and official capacity. This affiant strongly advises you proceed with caution and full knowledge of the consequences of your actions upon this private individual/Natural being.

WHEREFORE, based upon the foregoing evidence and the authority cited therein, the affiant respectfully declares for the public record his God given rights as a private individual/natural being, that the affiant doesn't need driver's license, tag, and insurance to take advantage of his federally secured Fundamental Right to Travel, and nor can he be taxed, arrested, detained, or prosecuted civilly or criminally in any colorable court of law for the expressed exercise of his Right to Travel. Let all of the above be known.

The Respondents have 30 days to refute this affidavit point by point. Failure to do so will result in it being deemed true and correct at law.

VERIFICATION

STATE OF (STATE'S NAME)

SS. AFFIDAVIT

COUNTY OF (COUNTY'S NAME)

I, (**Print your Free name**), pursuant to title 28, USC Section 1746 (1) and executed "Without the United States," I affirm under the penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct, to the best of my belief and informed knowledge.

Signed on this ____ day of _____ 2013, by the undersigned authority:

Secured Party Creditor/Authorized Representative
All Rights Reserved Without Prejudice;
U.C.C. 1-207/1- 308, U.C.C. 1-103.
(Your Free Name)
(Your Address)
(City), (State). [Zip].

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing has been furnished by US Mail to: The Clerk of the Circuit Court , P. O. Box 700, Fort Pierce, Florida, 34954; the State Attorney's Office, 411 South Second Street, Fort Pierce, Florida, 34950; the Office of the Attorney General, Sate of Florida, The Capitol PL-01., Tallahassee, FL 32399-1050; the Florida Department of State, Secretary of the State, R. A. Gary Building, 500 S. Bronough, Tallahassee, FL. 32399-0250; The US Department of the Treasury, 1500 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20220; The Florida Department of Highway Safety & Motor Vehicles – DMV, 1210-G Capitol Circle, Tallahassee, FL 32301; the US Department of Transportation, 1200 New Jersey, SE Washington, DC. 20590; The United States District Court, Southern District of Florida, 101 South US Highway 1, Room #1016, Fort Pierce, FL. 34950; and The Florida Supreme Court, 500 Duval Street, Tallahassee, FL. 32399 -1927, on this ___day of _____, 2013.

Respectfully Submitted

by: _____
Plaintiff/Affiant/Secured Party, (Your Free Name).
All Rights Reserved Without Prejudice;
U.C.C. 1-207/1-308, U.C.C. 1-103.
(Your Free Name)
(Your Address)
(City), (State). [Zip].

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE NINETEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT AND IN FOR
 SAINT LUCIE COUNTY, FLORIDA.

STATE OF (STATE))	CASE NO: _____
(Respondent))	
VS.)	
)	
(Your Free Name))	UCC FILE NO: _____
(Affiant/Secured Party/Plaintiff))	
_____)	

AMENDED AFFIDAVIT TO INVOKE RIGHT TO TRAVEL

The affiant, **Amunhotep El Bey**, in Propria Persona (my own proper self), formerly known as the artificial person, **Eugene James Williams**, is a Noble of the Washitaw Nation of Muurs (Moors), better known as, “Uaxashaktun de Dugdahmoundyah,” also known as, “Amurru Washitaw de Dugdahmoundyah,” which is an off branch of the Kushite Empire, the Ottoman Empire, and the Songhai Empire, which later became the Al-Moroccan Empire; to wit: North, South, Central America, and including the adjoining Islands; upon his inherited Nobility, and upon his private Aboriginal/Indigenous, “In Full Life,” status and commercial liability, I, Your real name, being duly affirmed under Consanguine Unity; pledge my national, political, and spiritual allegiance to my Moabite/Moorish Nation; being the archaic Aboriginals/Indigenes of Amexem/Ameru/Amurru/Al-Moroco/Amaru-Ka/Amen-Ra-Ka (the Americas), standing squarely affirmed upon my Oath to the ‘Five Points of Light’ - Love, Truth, Peace, Freedom, and Justice; deposes as follows:

The affiant is not a lawyer and his pleadings cannot be treated as such. In fact, according to *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519 (1972), a complaint "however inartfully pleaded," must be held to "less stringent standards than formal pleadings drafted by lawyers" and can only be dismissed for failure to state a claim if it appears "beyond doubt that the plaintiff can prove no set of facts in support of his claim which would entitle him to relief." *Id.*, at 520-521, quoting *Conley v. Gibson*, 355 U.S. 41, 45-46 (1957).

“Indeed, no more than affidavits is necessary to make a prima facie case.” (See *United States v. Kis*, 658 F. 2nd, 526, 536 (7th Cir. 1981): Cert Denied, 50 U.S.L.W. 2169; S. Ct. March 22, 1982.)

This affidavit is submitted upon demand of a driver’s license, registration or proof of insurance as part of the official record of any ensuing action and must be introduced as evidence in said action.

That I, Amunhotep El Bey, do not under any circumstances utilize the public highways for commercial purposes. I am not a 14th Amendment legal “Person” engaged in interstate

commerce, nor do I derive income from travel and transport of goods. I am not a driver, nor am I an operator of a Commercial Motor Vehicle. The Driver's License is for Commercial Motor vehicles involved in commerce only. My Private, self-propelled contrivance/carriage is not involved in commerce; therefore, it is not a "Commercial Motor vehicle." The corporate state of Florida, does not disclose the true intent and purpose of the statutes through a "Commercial Motor Vehicle," as is adequately and clearly defined in the 49 United States Code (USC) section 31301.

The affiant asserts that he is not an employee as defined by 49 USC Section 31301(7), "An employee means an operator of a Commercial Motor Vehicle, including an independent contractor who is employee by an employer."

The affiant asserts that he is not an employer as defined by 49 USC Section 31301 (8), "Employer means a person (including the United States Government, a State, or a political subdivision of a state) that owns or leases a Commercial Motor Vehicle or assigns employees to operate a Commercial motor Vehicle."

The affiant doesn't not have or need a driver's license, because the state is not his employer and nor is he an employee of the state. The state would have to pay me if I had a driver's license, because I would then be an employee. According to the 49 USC Section 31301, only people who are engaged in commerce need a driver's license. A Commercial Motor Vehicle is for commerce and for employers who are paying drivers' wages. The affiant doesn't qualify for a driver's license, according to the said United States Codes, and therefore, he doesn't have or need a driver's license.

Shapiro vs. Thomas, 394 U.S. 618 April 21, 1969. Further, the right to travel by private conveyance for private purposes upon the common way cannot be infringed. No license or permission is required for travel when such travel is not for the purpose of commercial profit or gain on the open highways operating under license in commerce." Murdock v. Penn, 319 U.S. 105, (1943) "No state shall convert a liberty into a privilege, license it, and attach a fee to it."

"The privilege of using the streets and highways by the operation of motor carriers for hire can be acquired only by permission or license from the state or its political subdivision." (See Black's Law Dictionary, 5th ed. Page 830.)

I cannot in good faith apply for and accept a driver's license, as I would be committing perjury. I would have to swear under oath that I am a member of, citizen of, franchisee of, or resident (agent) of the corporate state of Florida when the already established facts by affidavit have evidenced that I am not a member of, citizen of, franchisee of, or resident.

Therefore, I have determined and hereby affirm by affidavit and under oath, by virtue of my declared Sovereignty supported by American case law, Constitution, and United States Codes that I am not required to have government permission to travel, not required to have a driver's license, not required to have vehicle registration of my personal property, tag, nor Insurance. Additionally, affiant is not required to surrender the lawful title of my duly conveyed property to the state as security against government indebtedness and the undeclared federal bankruptcy.

Any administrative rule, regulation or statutory act of any state legislature or judicial tribunal to the contrary is unlawful and clearly unconstitutional, thus null and void.

NOTICE TO ALL LAW ENFORCEMENT: American Nationals and Citizens are not required to show identification to a police officer. The Police Officer swears by oath to uphold the United States Constitution as an Officer of the Law. US Supreme Court Decisions are considered the Law of the Land in regards to constitutionally protected rights, and they cannot be interpreted, or re-interpreted, as they are 'stare decisis' (already reviewed and clearly described as Law).

SUPREME COURT CASE:

Kolender v. Lawson (461 U.S. 352, 1983) in which the United States Supreme Court ruled that a police officer could not arrest a citizen merely for refusing to present identification. There is no such thing as "Failure to identify." You can sue the police for an illegal arrest and resist arrest with impunity!

"An illegal arrest is an assault and battery. The person so attempted to be restrained of his liberty has the same right to use force in defending himself as he would in repelling any other assault and battery." (State v. Robinson, 145 ME. 77, 72 ATL. 260).

"Each person has the right to resist an unlawful arrest. In such a case, the person attempting the arrest stands in the position of a wrongdoer and may be resisted by the use of force, as in self-defense." (State v. Mobley, 240 N.C. 476, 83 S.E. 2d 100).

"One may come to the aid of another being unlawfully arrested, just as he may where one is being assaulted, molested, raped or kidnapped. Thus it is not an offense to liberate one from the unlawful custody of an officer, even though he may have submitted to such custody, without resistance." (Adams v. State, 121 Ga. 16, 48 S.E. 910). . "These principles apply as well to an officer attempting to make an arrest, who abuses his authority and transcends the bounds thereof by the use of unnecessary force and violence, as they do to a private individual who unlawfully uses such force and violence." Jones v. State, 26 Tex. App. 1; Beaverts v. State, 4 Tex. App. 1 75; Skidmore v. State, 43 Tex. 93, 903

1. The affiant attests his nationality is Amurru Washitaw de Dugdahmoundyah. The affiant is a Tribal Moor and his tribe is Amurru Washitaw de Dugdahmoundyah.
2. According to the Black's Law Dictionary, 4th edition, deluxe, the word Moor is specifically designated in the definition of Land.

3. According to the Webster 1936 Universal Dictionary, the word America is defined as an Aboriginal or one of the various copper color natives found on the American Continents by the Europeans. The original application of the name was Amurru.
4. The book, "Africans and Native Americans," by Dr. Jack Forbes, states, "The slave trade started in America and the slaves were taken mostly to Spain and Europe. When the Spanish came to America they found the Indios (Indians), the black people who are with God."
5. Empress Verdiacee Tiacee Tiari Washitaw (Washington) – Turner (Tunica) Goston El Bey (the current heiress, by and through blood, and Supreme Sovereign of the de bourbon Estate, also known as The Emperial International Estate of the Bourbon Hapsburg Empire, later as a whole called The Empire of Amurru Washitaw de Dedugdahmoundyah Muurs), wrote in her book, "The Return of the Ancient Ones," "That 85% of the blacks in America were already here before the slave trade. Only 15% of blacks come from Africa." We all come from Africa but there is a suppressed history of blacks being a global people. Pangaea proves that all of the continents were connected, so migration to and from Africa and to other places was simple and easy. Here is a picture of Pangaea from an ancient map, please scroll down to page 10, thank you: (See <http://chapmanresearch.org/PDF/The%20Strange%20ICA%20Stones%20of%20Peru.pdf>). (I gave a website link because there are pictures on the site that are worth a thousand words. Pictures are evidence according to the evidence code.) The evidence in the above link is scientifically tested evidence of an ancient and advanced Black Civilization interacting with dinosaurs, conducting brain surgery, and even watching the stars with a telescope. The dinosaurs lived during the Jurassic Era, which was millions of years ago. The evidence proves that Moors have been here for millions of years
6. Furthermore, the Ra Expeditions: (See <http://www.plu.edu/~ryandp/RAX.html>). The Ra Expeditions proves that the ancient Egyptian Sun-boats were capable of crossing the Atlantic Ocean; therefore, travel from Africa and to the Americas and other places would have been easy.
7. Additionally, temples have been built and named after Egyptian Gods, and hieroglyphics have been found in the Grand Canyon: (See http://www.crystalinks.com/gc_egyptconnection.html).
8. In Oklahoma in the 1800's, a stele of Pharaoh Akhenaton (Amenhotep IV, aka, Moses of the Bible) was found (See "Ice: the Ultimate Disaster," by Richard Noone).

9. In the book, "America BC," there is an alabaster egg of a cartouche of King Tut found in Idaho: (See <http://www.mysteryglyphs.com/pages/Articles/20061029-002A.pdf>).
10. The Amurru Washitaw de Dedugdahmoundyah Muurs (Moors) were originally a group of priest from Egypt, also known as the Dogon/Olmecs/Mayans/Ica. The term Washitaw is a corruption of Ursahtaw, which means the father and mothers of the mystics. In Egyptian, Ursahtaw is Urrashet, the winged sun disk, which symbolizes the highest knowledge, the pineal gland being open.
11. Amurru is actually a corruption of Amaru, which is the root Ameri-ca. America is actually a corruption of Amen-Ra-Ka. It is strange how everything comes from Egypt. Well Egypt was once the capitol of the world, this was the First World Order. The Pharaohs once ruled the world. In fact, the Pharaoh gave the ancient Moabites (Moors) permission to settle Morocco, which is now North Africa. The Moabites migrated to modern-day America, and called her Al-morocco, which is another root for the word, America. Their Dominion and Inhabitation extended from North-East and South-West Africa, across the great Atlantis even unto the present North, South and Central America and also Mexico and the Atlantis Islands; before the great earthquake, which separated Pangaea, causing the continents to drift apart in their present location and formed the great Atlantic Ocean.
12. The 'Great Seal Pyramid' on the back of the dollar is the 'National Emblem and Insignia' of The Moorish Nation/Empire of North America (geographical location). The Great Pyramid is also the archaic symbol for Civilization on the planet Earth. The honorable Moors' acknowledgement of our 'Great Seal' indicates those Heirs who own up to, who support, and who proclaim, our 'Free National Government.' Moors who are 'Active' and not 'Passive' in the Social, Civilization, Culture and Custom matters, involving Law, Order and Governmental Principles, are hereby entreated to support this affirmation.
13. Two seals for one government is strong evidence that there were once two governments. In fact, the two governments were formed under The Treaty of Peace and Friendship between the United States and Morocco -Seventeen Eighty-Seven (1787) - superseded by the Treaty of Eighteen Thirty-Six (1836). This said treaty was signed by Moors and Europeans to form a two system government for the purpose of free trade, commerce, and stopping wars over land. The seal of the Eagle holding the olive branch and 13 arrows is the Great Seal for Europeans. The Great Pyramid Seal of the eye above it is the Seal for the Moors.
14. The Noble Moors/Muurs (Heirs Apparent) are the Natural Members/Citizens of the ancient Al-Moroccan Empire (North America) and are duty-bound to recognize and to

support our ‘Great Seal’ Sovereign Moorish Government and Nation of the Natural People, and command the enforcement of our Constitution. Thus, such organized communication Orders are referred to as “The Great Seal National Association of Moorish Affairs”. The Free Moorish Nation - inclusive of all the Aboriginal / Indigene Tribes and Provinces of the Natural People, etc., are the rightful bearers of the Names and Titles, Ali, El, Bey, Dey, and Al. The Free Moors/Muurs, by Freehold Inheritance, retain all Substantive Rights and Immunities; enjoy the exercising of Substantive Rights, and operate upon consummated, Right-Law, Isonomi - Principles; having vested Constitution - secured Rights and Immunities from taxation, and from Criminal and Civil Jurisdiction by, and of, the Union States Rights Republic (U.S.A.), pursuant to, but not limited to, the United States Republic Supreme Court, and the ‘Acts of State’ to wit: *“Every Sovereign State (People) is bound to respect the independence of every other Sovereign State (People) and the courts of one country (People) will not sit in judgment on the acts of the government of another, done within (the same or) its own territory...”*

15. The present Union States Municipal and Civil Laws and Codes of the Land are an ‘incorporated unit of self-government’ established by the political powers of the ‘General Assembly’ of each State of the Union, and initiated at Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, North America, in the year Eighteen fifty-four (1854). It governs only the rights and conduct of white people, Christians and Jews, of the Eighteen sixty-three (1863) Union States Rights Republic, under the Magna Charta (Charter), the Knights of Columbus Code, and the Ku Klux Klan Oath. Forever said Union States Rights Republic denies citizenship in the United States Republic (U.S.A.) to the descendants of the Moorish Nation in the Western Hemisphere, erroneously referred to, and ‘branded’ and mislabeled as, Negroes, Blacks, Coloreds, and African-Americans, etc., etc. In addition, the Supreme Court of the United States (in the landmark case) of “Dred Scott v. Sandford” 60 US (19 Howard) 393 (1857) held that Negroes—whether held to slavery or free— were not included and were not intended to be included in the ‘category’ of ‘citizen’ (subjects) of the Union States Rights Republic. Resultantly, the True Indigene Nobles of the Al-Moroccan Empire (Free Moors), bearers of the Names / Titles, Ali, El, Bey, Dey and Al, are excluded from the Union States Rights Republic (U.S.A.) jurisdiction. The True Nobles of the Al-Moroccan Empire are Sovereign, Private, and Self-Governed, by ‘Right-Law’ Principles and customs; and only obligated to the ‘Free Moorish Zodiac Constitution’ - Circle 7 - archaically established by our Ancient Fore-Mothers and Fore-Fathers. Such extended allegiance and ‘Obligation’ includes ‘The Great Seal’ and the High Principles and Moorish (Moral) Standards, embodied in the Moorish National Flag (Standard) - Love, Truth, Peace, Freedom, and Justice. The True Al-Moroccan Noble Indigenes of the Land maintain a constitutional and lawful, non-obligatory tax ‘Status’ and position, relative to ‘Foreign Entity Taxation’ (Indigenes Not Taxed) and maintain a non-obligatory respect for the Union States Rights Republic (U.S.A.), its members, its laws; its ordinances; its

codes; its customs and its traditions, pursuant to: The Free Moorish American Zodiac Constitution - Articles IV and VI; The Treaty of Peace and Friendship Between the United States and Morocco -Seventeen Eighty-Seven (1787) - superseded by the Treaty of Eighteen Thirty-Six (1836); Resolution 75: Journals of The House of Representatives; United States - April 17, 1933 A. D. - Moorish American Society of Philadelphia and the Use of Their Names; The United Nations “Declaration of the Rights of the Child” General Assembly Resolution 1386 (XIV), 14 U.N. GAOR Supp. (No, 16) at 19, U.N. Doc. A/4354 (1959); The United Nations “Universal Declarations on Human Rights” Article XV, General Assembly Resolution 217 A (III) of 10, December 1948 A.D.; “Executive Order 13107”—United States Republic, North America -The Implementation of Human Rights Treaties; The National Constitution for the Continental United States, Article III, Section 2; Amendment V - Liberty Clause; Amendment IX—Reservation of the Rights of the People; The United States Department of Justice Moorish Credentials; Free Moorish Zodiac Constitution, Truth A-1 Classified; The United States Copyright Certificate Number AA222141 Clock of Destiny; The Moorish Nationality and Identification Card; Moorish Holy Temple of Science/Moorish Science Temple Identification Card, Washitaw Nationality Identification Card, and etc.

16. Furthermore, I assert my full birthrights - sovereignty and substantive rights and claim to hereditaments - being a Sundry Free Moor/Muur and a (Natural Being) pursuant to: Moabite/Moorish Pedigree; The Free Moorish Zodiac Constitution; The Great Seal of the Moorish Nation (Ab Antiquo); The Treaty of Peace and Friendship - 1787 / 1836; The Sundry Free Moors Act of 1790; The 1781 Organic United States Constitution; The Moorish Federal Financiers Act (Union States Army: 1861 -1863); The 1854 Roman Catholic Magna Charta; the Knights of Columbus Code; The Ku Klux Klan Oath; The United Nations Charter, Article 55(c); The Rights of Indigenous People: Part I, Articles 1, 2, 3, 4, 5; Part II, Article 6; The United States Supreme Court - ‘Acts of State’; The foreign Sovereign Immunities Act 28 USC 1601; et Sequa., The Convention on International Road Traffic -Day 19, September 1949, The World Court Decision, The Hague, Netherlands - Day 21, January 1958 A.D = 1378 M.C. In reference to the Rights of the Natural People and Substantive Rights, etc., the following are pertinent Supreme Court Decisions, (Stare Decisis) to wit:
 17. The right to Park or Travel is part of the Liberty of which the *Natural Person*, citizen cannot be deprived without “due process of law” under the Fifth Amendment of the United States Constitution. (See Kent v. Dulles 357 US 116, 125)
 18. “Even the legislature has no power to deny to a citizen the right to travel upon the highway and transport his property in the ordinary course of his business or pleasure, though this right may be regulated in accordance with the public interest and convenience

(“Regulated” here means traffic safety enforcement: stop lights, signs, etc.). The use of the highways for the purpose of travel and transportation is not a mere privilege, but a common and Fundamental Right of which the public and *Natural Beings* cannot be deprived.” (See *Chicago Motor Coach v. Chicago*, 337 Illinois 200, 169 NE 22, ALR; *Ligare v. Chicago* 139 ILL. 46, 28 HE 934; and also see *Boone v. Clark* 214 SW 607, 25 AM jur (1st), Highways, sec. 163.)

19. “The right of the citizen to travel upon the public highways and to transport his property thereon, either by carriage or by automobile, is not a mere privilege which a city may prohibit at will, but a common right which he has under the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.”(See *Thompson v. Smith*, 154 SE 179.)
20. State Police Power extends only to immediate threats to public safety, health, welfare, etc., (See *Michigan v. Duke* 266 US, 476 Led. At 449) which driving and speeding are not (See *California v. Farley* Ced. Rpt. 89, 20 CA3d 1032 (1971).
21. The state is prohibited from violating Substantive Rights (See *Owens v. City*, 445 US 662 (1980); and it cannot do by one power (e.g. Police Power) that which is, for example, prohibited expressly to any other such power (e.g. Taxation / Eminent Domain) as a matter of Law. (See *US and UT v. Daniels*, 22 p 159), nor indirectly that which is prohibited to it directly. (See *Fairbanks v. US* 181, US 283, 294, 300.)
22. "With regard particularly to the U.S. Constitution, it is elementary that a Right secured or protected by that document cannot be overthrown or impaired by any state police authority." --*Connolly vs. Union Sewer Pipe Co.*184 US 540.
23. “Undoubtedly the right of locomotion, the right to move from one place to another according to inclination, is an attribute of personal liberty, and the right, ordinarily, of free transit from or through the territory of any State is a right secured by the 14th amendment and by other provisions of the Constitution.” (See *Schactman v. Dulles*, 96 App DC 287, 293.)
24. Traveling in an automobile on the public roads was not a threat to the public safety or health and constituted no hazard to the public, and such a traveler owed no other duty to the public (e.g. the State); he / she and his / her auto, having equal right to and on the roadways / highways as horses and wagons, etc.; this same right is still Substantive Rule, in that speeding, running stop signs, traveling without license plates, or registration, are not threats to the public safety, and thus, are not arrestable offenses (See *Christy v. Elliot*,

216 I 131, 74 HE 1035, LRA NS 1905—1910; and also see *California v. Farley* 98 CED Rpt. 89, 20 CA 3d 1032 (1971).

25. Under the United States Republic's Constitutional system of Government and upon the individuality and intelligence of the citizen, the State does not claim to control one's conduct to others, leaving one the sole judge as to all that affects oneself. (See *Mugler v. Kansas* 1213 US 623, 659—60.)
26. Where Rights secured by the Constitution are involved, there can be no rule - making or legislation, which would abrogate them. (See *Miranda v. Arizona* 384 US 436, 125.)
27. The claim and exercise of Constitutional Rights cannot be converted into a crime. (See *Miller v. Kansas* 230 F 2nd 486, 489.)
28. "The right to travel on the public highways is a constitutional right."--*Teche Lines v. Danforth*, Miss. 12 So 2d 784, 787
29. For a crime to exist there must be an injured party (*Corpus Delicti*). There can be no sanction or penalty imposed on one because of this Constitutional Right. (See *Sherer v. Cullen* 481 F. 945.)
30. If any Tribunal (court) finds absence of proof of jurisdiction over a person and subject matter, the case must be dismissed. (See *Louisville v. Motley* 2111 US 149, 29S. CT 42. "The Accuser Bears the Burden of Proof Beyond a Reasonable Doubt".)
31. "Lack of Federal Jurisdiction cannot be waived or overcome by agreement of parties." (See *Griffin v. Matthews*, 310 F Supra 341, 342 (1969): and "Want of Jurisdiction may not be cured by consent of parties". (See *Industrial Addition Association v. C.I.R.*, 323 US 310, 313.)
32. "Public officials are not immune from suit when they transcend their lawful authority by invading rights."(See *AFLC10 v. Woodward*, 406 F. 2d 137 t.)

33. "Officers of the court have no immunity, when violating a Constitutional right, from liability. For they are deemed to know the law." *Owen v. Independence*, 100 S.C.T. 1398, 445 US 622.

34. There is documentation in The National Archives in Washington, D.C. and elsewhere that confirm the Washitaw Moor presence right here in North American lands, thousands of years before the arrival of the first European(s), and their advanced civilization identified them as The Ancient Ones, geophysical mound builders (Uaxashaktun de Dugdahmoundyah), and their prior claim to the land was never disputed, evil deeds stole away their possession of and their control of their Ancient lands, partially identified in the record as (1) 1848 U.S. Supreme Court ruling in the case of the "U.S. Government vs. The Heirs of Henry Turner" (Tunica), in which the High Court found that "The Neutral Strip" (2,961,983.5 acres of land) was definitely not a part of the territory ceded to the United States" (Louisiana Dept. of Transportation, 1940), (2) the 1992 return of 68,883 acres of land by the State of Louisiana (Land Grant #923/1991), designated "Washitaw Proper;" and (3) "Washitaw Terra" including the Floridas.

35. The United Nations High Commission for Human Rights recognizes the self-declarations of indigenous peoples, and acknowledges Uaxashaktun (Empire Washitaw) as "The oldest indigenous people on Earth," and assigned UN Grant Application #215 (1993) to the Washitaw Moors.

36. The United States has recognized Amurru Washitaw de Dugdahmoundyah as an indigenous people of North America and had under consideration in the 105th Congress (H.R. #260), The Guadalupe-Hidalgo Treaty Land Claims Act of January, 1997.

37. A series of Congressional Bills/Acts and US Supreme Court cases reaffirm national sovereignty for the heirs of Henry Turner de Bourbon (1848, Case #191: *United States v. Henry Turner's Heirs*); and the claim has been recorded before the World Court at The Hague (1996), that since the Treaties of Utrecht (1713) in which the Spanish de Bourbon had established themselves as the Protectorate of lands known as the Floridas, on behalf of Amurru Washitaw de Dugdahmoundyah.

38. John Jay, the 1st chief justice of the US Supreme Court once said, "Those who own the country ought to govern it." The said chief Justice of the US Supreme Court asserted the highest right reasoning possible when he stated, "Those who own the country ought to govern it."
39. According to The Declaration of Indigenous Rights, indigenous people are those who embody historical continuity with societies which existed prior to the conquest and settlement of their territories by Europeans. As well as people bought involuntary to the new World (See The Declaration of Indigenous Rights).
40. According to The Declaration of Indigenous Rights, all black people are indigenous. This means that the affiant is a natural person only subject to natural law and Human Rights. Colorable Law - De Facto Law (Government/Democracy), which is legal but unlawful, does not apply to the affiant. De facto Law falls under Colorable Law, which is rules, regulations, statutes, codes, policies, and ordinances. All natural persons are human beings and sovereigns of the land, because they rightfully own the land. According to the Black's Law Dictionary, a natural person is Indigenous or native, the original or national inhabitant.
41. What makes The Declaration of Indigenous Rights so powerful? Well, it is a treaty and according to Article VI of the United States Constitution, "Treaties are the Supreme law of the land." The United States of America is a part of the United Nations, so the Government is bound by it.
42. Sovereignty resides in your nationality. Your Nationality ties you back to the land. The affiant's nationality is Amurru Washitaw de Dugdahmoundyah.
43. According to International Law, the Washitaw has established itself as a Sovereign Independent Nation (United Nations, NIS-21/593) apart from corporate union of 1781 and the corporate United States of 1787. The land claim of the Washitaw has been affirmed by the Spanish and French, as well as British, pursuant to Spanish Land Grants of 1762 and 1795.

44. The Washitaw Tribal Moors are listed at the United Nations under the Indigenous People Organization Number 21593. This became effective in 1993. The seat number for the Washitaw at the United Nations is 215.

45. According to Federal Law, the land of the Washitaw has been defined as "Indian Country," and the people regarded as Indians. Both the people and their land have been placed under the authority of the United States government via the Bureau of Indian Affairs within the Department of Interior, which is governed by both Executive and Congressional Plenary powers. As a result, the United States has assumed the "Trust responsibility" for the Washitaw Nation of Muurs (Moors) via Spanish Land Grant of Henry Turner.

46. The Washitaw Moors enjoy Diversity of Citizenship Jurisdiction, because they are a nation within a nation. All Washitaw Moors enjoy dual citizenship status. The Washitaw Moors are citizens of the United States of America, also known as The Republic, and Citizens of their tribe, which is Washitaw.

47. Moors/Moorish-Americans/Muurs have and possess the unalienable, substantive rights and birthright - inheritance to our Al-Moroccan names and nationality by Nature's Laws, Divine Law, primogeniture, and by the recognized Laws of the Nations of the Earth (International). Being the true, ancient, Aboriginal/Indigenes of the Land (America) - North, being the heart-land of the Moroccan Empire. Moors/Muurs are the 'De jure' Freeholders by birthright, Inheritance and Primogeniture Status; and have, claim and possess the secured Rights to Travel upon the public roadways, byways and highways of our Continental United States (the Organic Land) absent of foreign 'colored' or imposed excise taxation constructs invented, by the racketeering States' Legislators, to abridge and steal Rights belonging to the Natural Peoples. These substantive rights are supported by, and asserted by, Royal Law; Moorish Law; Moslem/Muslim Law; The Law of the Great Peace; The Laws of Nature; Divine Law; Nature's God; The Laws of Nations; The Free Moorish Great Seal Zodiac Constitution; and affirmed by Articles IV and VI of the Constitution Covenant of 1774 - 1781 A.D. = 1201 M. C., as lawfully adopted for The United States Republic, establishing its Republican Form of Government. Said Constitution established the Peoples' 'Supreme Law of the Land' to secure the Rights of

the People, and to keep government bound and in check by Official Oath, and by Official Bond. Down from the Ancients Ones, our Primogenitors, comes the Supreme Law of the Land.

48. That the Organic United States Republic Constitution (derived from Ancient Moabite/Moorish Law) remains ‘The Supreme Law of the Land,’ and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of The United States Flag of Peace, pursuant to United States Code, Title 4, Chapter 1; and any law that is repugnant to the Constitution, shall remain forever ‘colorable’ and is null and void. (See *Marbury v. Madison* 5 U.S. 137, 174, 176 (1803).
49. Any Municipal Officer, Person, Personnel, Employee or Contractor who violate the Rights of the People or Citizens are subject to suit in their personal and / or official capacity, to wit: Title 18, Part 1, Chapter 13 §241 of United States Codes of Law, “*If two or more persons conspire to injure, oppress, threaten, or intimidate any person in any State, Territory, commonwealth, Possession, or district in the free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege secured to him by the Constitution or Laws of the United States, or because of his having so exercised the same; or... If two or more persons go in disguise on the highway, or on the premises of another, with the intent to prevent or hinder his free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege so secured - They shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both; and if death results from the acts committed in violation of this section, or if such acts include kidnapping or an attempt to kidnap, aggravated sexual abuse or an attempt to commit aggravated sexual abuse, or an attempt to kill, they shall be fined under this title or imprisoned for any term of years or for life, or both, or may be sentenced to death.*”
50. According to, Title 18, Part 1, Chapter 13 §242 of United States Codes of Law: “*Whoever, under ‘color’ of any law, statute, ordinance, regulation, or custom, willfully subjects any person in any State, Territory, Commonwealth, Possession, or District to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured or protected by the Constitution or Laws of the United States, or to different punishments, pains, or penalties, on account of such person being an alien, or by reason of his color, or race, that are prescribed for the citizens, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than one year, or both; and if bodily injury results from the acts committed in violation of this section, or if such acts include the use, attempted use, or threatened use of a dangerous weapon, explosives, or fire, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than ten years or for life, or both, or may be sentenced to death.*”
51. The fee for illegal incarceration according to *Trezevant v. City of Tampa*, 741 F.2d 336(11th cir.1984), is \$65,217 dollars per hour, and \$1,800,000 (1.8 M) dollars per day. The defendant came to this conclusion, because in *Trezevant*, a Motorist illegally held for 23 minutes in a traffic charge was awarded \$25,000 dollars in damages (Note: multiply the total number of days defendant served behind bars with the going fee of \$1.8 million dollars per day, in order to determine how much money to ask for).

52. "The Officers of the law, in the execution of process, are obliged to know the requirements of law, and if they mistake them, whether through ignorance or design, and if anyone is harmed by their error, they must respond in damages." (See *Roger v. Marshall* (United States use of *Rogers v. Conklin*), 1 Wall. (US) 644, 17 Led 714.).
53. "Traffic Infractions are not a crime or public offense." (See *People v. Battle*, 50 Cal.App.3d Supp.1).
54. "It is a general rule that an officer, executive, administrative, quasi-judicial, ministerial, or otherwise, who acts outside the scope of his jurisdiction, and without authorization of law may thereby render himself amenable to personal liability in a civil suit." (See *Cooper v. O`Conner*, 69 App DC 100, 99 F (2d).
55. The high Courts, through their citations of authority, have frequently declared, that "...where any state proceeds against a private individual in a judicial forum it is well settled that the state, county, municipality, etc. waives any immunity to counters, cross claims and complaints, by direct or collateral means regarding the matters involved." (See *Luckenback v. The Thekla*, 295 F 1020, 226 Us 328; *Lyders v. Lund*, 32 F2d 308.)
56. "Where there is no jurisdiction there is no judge; the proceeding is as nothing. Such has been the law from the days of the Marshalsea, 10 Coke 68; also *Bradley v. Fisher*, 13 Wall 335,351." *Manning v. Ketcham*, 58 F.2d 948.
57. Any action involving a citation or ticket issued, confiscation, impoundment or illegal search and seizure of private property by a police officer, or any other public servant or employee which carries a fine, jail time, or the posting of exorbitant bail, will be considered a penalty or sanction against this sovereign natural being. Thus, you must have probable cause that I have in fact, not in theory, committed a crime to justify such actions, and be willing to sign such information under oath. The Common Law definition of a crime is to injure a human being or damage someone's property. If the affiant has not injured someone or damaged someone's property there will be no Common Law jurisdiction for an arrest and conviction.
58. The affiant explicitly reserves, asserts and defends his Right to Travel. The Affiant has exercised this right by expatriating from UNITED STATES citizenship of the federal United States and its political subdivisions, including municipal, county and state corporations. I the affiant, (Your Free Name), have reclaimed my lawful, human Rights and Common Law rights, under Article IV Section IV of the Constitution (Republican form of Government). The Affiant is an American Nation of the (Your State's name) Republic. As such, Affiant enjoys diversity of citizenship, and qualifies as federal custody only.
59. Take judicial Notice of the Procedures concerning diversity of citizenship, the jurisdiction of the subject matter, and person required to appear. Corporate, administrative courts and tribunals have no original jurisdiction over private individuals/natural beings whatsoever, because such courts are colorable and the only deal with colorable law, which is things that appear to be real, but are not real, e.g., codes, statutes, Rules, Regulations, Policies, and ordinances. Such law is designed for code breakers of the corporation of the US, which is an administration due to the presidential declared State of Emergency (the 1959 Executive Order 10834 placed this court under the State of Emergency and under jurisdiction of the presidential flag and of

military jurisdiction). Now, the gold military fringe around the US flag makes sense now, because the courts are under military jurisdiction.

60. This affiant is not part of the administration and is not subject to its jurisdiction whatsoever. This is a constructive lawful notice submitted upon demand of driver's license, vehicle registration, tag, or proof of insurance. Anyone who violates the affiant's rights will be held liable in both their individual and official capacity. This affiant strongly advises you proceed with caution and full knowledge of the consequences of your actions upon this private individual/Natural being.
61. Therefore, in preservation of 'The Rights of Indigenous Peoples' and the Preservation of the Rights of the People, in accord and defence of the Constitution for the United States Republic of North America and its Republican Form of Government - being the 'Supreme Law of the Land'; and primal to the contractual liabilities, Oath - bound Obligations, and Fiduciary Duties of the Officers of the Courts - Federal, State, City, Municipal, and etc., I respectfully request the enforcement of the De jure Laws of the United States, and all Treaties made under the Authority of The United States, in accord with Article VI of the Constitution; The Bill of Rights; The Declaration of the Rights of the Child; The Rights of Indigenous Peoples; The Universal Declaration of Human Rights; The United Nations Charter, Article 55(c); The United States Supreme Court - 'Acts of State'; The Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act 28 USC 1601; et Sequa., The Convention on 'International Road Traffic'—Day 19, September 1949; The World Court Decisions, The Hague, Netherlands, Day 21, January 1958 A.D = 1378 M.C.; "Executive Order 13107" - United States Republic, North America: the Implementation of Human Rights Treaties; The National Constitution for the Continental United States, Article III, Section 2; Amendment V - Liberty Clause; Amendment IX; and etc.
62. Additionally, I respectfully request dismissal of any and all unconstitutional sanctions, claims, or other warrants or charges made or issued, which are devoid of true identity personages; a denial of 'Due Process' of a 'Trial' by a Jury of my own National Peers; or absent of a verified and lawful Indictment, sanctioned by an assembled Grand Jury; and that I be availed all lawful Constitutional - secured safeguards, established by the Supreme Law; with documented proper jurisdiction and venue confirmed and in place.
63. Whereas, there is no question that a 'Bench Appearance Summons', detention, arrest and ticket or citation issued by a Police Officer or others for traveling with no driver's license, foreign driver's license, not having current registration, or mandatory insurance, etc., which carries a fine or jail time, is a penalty or sanction and is indeed "converting a right into a crime"; thus violating Substantive Rights. Furthermore, it is reasonable to assume that these Supreme Court judicial decisions and other authority are straight and to the point, that there is no lawful method for government to put restrictions or limitations on Rights belonging to the People; therefore, affiant is absolutely immune for such colorable actions and taxation.
64. Whereas, In light of the foregoing Jurisprudence 'Stare Decisis' Supreme Court Decisions, Facts, and Law; and counter to the negative and 'colorable' social conditions instituted by State Persons of the Union States Society, there exists a blatant 'Want of

Jurisdiction' on the part of the Union States Rights Republic (U.S.A.), its agents, personnel, contractors, and assigns. Axioms are legally in force under National and International Law attending these issues, and this affiant (Natural Person - In Propria Persona) does not waive any rights; does not transfer power of attorney; and does not willingly consent to any public trial or hearing in any 'colorable' tribunal venue or non-Article III, unconstitutional jurisdiction. The Official Oaths, the Obligations, and the Fiduciary duties of all accusers and bound 'claimants' to National Law and Order; Civilization Principles fixed in Constitution Law, still stands. Definition and Truth still Rules. Non-compliance is a Federal and International Law offence.

65. Therefore, all parties of interest are authorized by this Writ, pursuant to National and International Law, to honor all substantive rights and constitutional immunities reserved for, and to, this Aboriginal/Indigenous free and sovereign Moor/Muur. All officials are to enlist all available and appropriate measures to ensure, and assure, that all my substantive rights and constitutionally - secured rights and immunities are not violated, not breached, nor abridged. The Sovereign, Natural Being, named herein, is not to be arrested nor held for detention under any 'colorable' circumstances. You are to notify the active Ministers of the Aboriginal/ Indigenous Moorish Nationals of the Territory (Organic Land). The Natural Person named herein is non-obligatory and thus exempt from Customs, Tariffs, Taxation, 'Owner in Fee' permit-deception Constructs, and from any other hindrance or restriction of his freedoms, Allodial Properties, Compensations, Rights of Travel, or Freedom of Movement on, in, or within, any member or non-member States of the United States Union, etc. The Moor/Muur (bearer of this Indigenous Peoples' Document) is to be treated with all due respect and 'Due Process' Rights under the Law. All available and appropriate measures are to be taken to prevent injustice, harm, false arrest, trumped -up charges, or attack on the Natural Being's Person, Property, Personalty, Conveyances, Freedoms, and/or Dignity.
66. Explicit Reservation and use of 'All Rights Reserved Without Prejudice' U.C.C. 1- 207/ 308, U.C.C. 1-103, is noted to all Federal, State, City, and Municipal Peace Officers; in harmony with State's Statutes, and indicates the Reservation of My Rights. Whereby, I may reserve my substantive rights and constitutional - secured rights and immunities to not be compelled to perform under any contracts or agreements that I have not entered into knowingly, voluntarily, willingly, or unintentionally. I do not accept any actual or implied 'Liabilities' associated with any 'Compelled - Benefits' of any 'unrevealed' or deceptively-imposed commercial contracts. I, furthermore, do not sanction any 'unconstitutional' rules or policies, nor acts of Misprision committed by any U.S. Government or State Officials, at any level, claimed by any of them, in the name of the United States Republic, nor do I assent to any implied colorable policies made by alleged representatives, as being sanctioned by the People and Citizens. Consider any formerly-assumed constructs alleged to be related to me as being misrepresentations and thusly 'Cured' forthwith. Let it be known...

WHEREFORE, based upon the foregoing evidence and the authority cited therein, the affiant respectfully declares for the public record his God given rights as a natural person, that the affiant doesn't need driver's license, tag, and insurance to take advantage of his federally secured Fundamental Right to Travel, and nor can he be taxed, arrested, detained, or prosecuted civilly or criminally in any colorable court of law for the expressed exercise of his Right to Travel. Let all of the above be known, "In The Interest of Justice."

The Respondents have 30 days to refute this affidavit point by point. Failure to do so will result in it being deemed true and correct at law.

VERIFICATION

STATE OF (STATE'S NAME)

SS. AFFIDAVIT

COUNTY OF (COUNTY'S NAME)

I, **(Print Free Name)**, pursuant to title 28, USC Section 1746 (1) and executed "Without the United States," I affirm under the penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct, to the best of my belief and informed knowledge.

Signed on this ____ day of _____ 2013, by the undersigned authority:

Secured Party Creditor/Authorized Representative
All Rights Reserved Without Prejudice;
U.C.C. 1-207/1-308, U.C.C. 1-103.
(Your Free Name)
(Your Address)
(City), (State). [Zip].

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing has been furnished by US Mail to: The Clerk of the Circuit Court , P. O. Box 700, Fort Pierce, Florida, 34954; the State Attorney's Office, 411 South Second Street, Fort Pierce, Florida, 34950; the Office of the Attorney General, Sate of Florida, The Capitol PL-01., Tallahassee, FL 32399-1050; the Florida Department of State, Secretary of the State, R. A. Gary Building, 500 S. Bronough, Tallahassee, FL. 32399-0250; The US Department of the Treasury, 1500 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20220; The Florida Department of Highway Safety & Motor Vehicles – DMV, 1210-G Capitol Circle, Tallahassee, FL 32301; the US Department of Transportation, 1200 New Jersey, SE Washington, DC. 20590; The United States District Court, Southern District of Florida, 101 South US Highway 1, Room #1016, Fort Pierce, FL. 34950; and The Florida Supreme Court, 500 Duval Street, Tallahassee, FL. 32399 -1927, on this ___day of _____, 2013.

Respectfully Submitted

by: _____
Plaintiff/Affiant/Secured Party, (Your Free Name).
All Rights Reserved Without Prejudice;
U.C.C. 1-207/1-308, U.C.C. 1-103.
(Your Free Name)
(You Address)
(City), (State) [Zip].