The Clause 14

TEST

(Article I, Section 8, Clause 14)

AKA

<u>The</u> - <u>Rules For The Government</u>

TEST

The Power of the [alleged] United States Congress to make "Rules for the Government" is established in the Constitution's Clause 14, of Article I, Section 8. (which means and includes all three branches thereof). This principle is extended hereby to the proposed State in which the Demandant shall reside or have domicile.

2. The Power to make Rules is provided to neither of the other two branches of "the Government," neither the judicial branch, nor the executive branch. To provide either of the other two branches any form of Power to make Rules for "the government," which each and both are the same, would be to provide an additional Power (not merely the making of laws as provided for within The Clause 18 TEST, Part I) not granted to either of the same, and would exist in violation of the Constitution's granting of Powers to all three branches of "the government" of the United States, and an Exigent or States-Life violation of States' Rights, and the people therein, to have the United States central government - extended to Demandant's own State - obey the Constitution precisely as it was written, not as individuals in power would like it to be, that this be ever a Nation and a State of Laws, and NOT as a Nation-State of "Men," as the Demandant's State government is prohibited from being at the proposed Constitution's Article IV, Section 4 demanded Guarantee for a Republican Form of Government..

3. By examining the State's constitution, which derives its pure power from the proposed United States Constitution, we discover no form of Power that equates to the legislature of either governmental entity, State or "federal," hereby proposed, which arises to the level of the Executive having or being granted any Power or allowance to make Rules *for either* of the other two branches of the government, or even for itself, the executive branch of the government, at all.

4. The Federal Rules Enabling Act of 1934, becoming the errant role model for the Several States. The fact that the judicial branch of government, in the United States Constitution, to which the

Demandant's own State constitution is bound under, was not provided an Extended Power of its own accord to make Rules of Government is demonstrated by the very federal Rules Enabling Act of 1934 itself, wherein the Congress, derelict of its own duty to maintain this specific Power for and of itself (as the several States, each of them, are compelled to do), conveyed unlawfully such Power to the judicial branch of the government of the proposed United States, paralleling acts also done by the proposed State legislature also, done in the wake, and by its errant model, of the aforesaid federal Rules Enabling Act of 1934.

5. By examining Article III, Section 2, Clause 1 (see "The Extended Powers TEST) of the proposed Constitution, we discover **no** form of **Power** present in the Judicial branch that **equates** to the Congress' Power (or is equal to - compare to the State legislature's power) at Clause 14 of Section 8, Article I, which arises to the level of any Power or allowance to make Rules for either of the other two branches of the United States government, or even for itself, the judicial branch of government, at all.

8. **Extended Powers**. In the United States Constitution, there are seven (7) net Extended Powers of eight (8) original Extended Powers found at Clause 1 of Section 2, of Article III, **to which the judicial branch of the government of the United States are limited**, *or* **Constrained** to. Within such Seven Extended Powers, there is found **No** Reference, as the same might pertain to any case arising up to and before the United States supreme Court itself, of the Extended **Power** for the judicial branch, any part thereof, to make "Rules for the People" and not for the Government, nor is there any provision contained in any of the certain Seven (7) Extended Powers that allows for the judicial branch of United States government to make rules for government either; **it isn't there** (Power of the Negative); it can't be found (Power of the Negative); it does not exist (Power of the Negative) for the same, and so is not to be had by it, the "United States Judicial Branch," that Same

Judicial Branch whose Like Constrained Powers ALL State Courts must be finally subject to, under Extended Power **One**, found at Phrase 1, of Clause 1, of Section 2, of Article III.

9. Clause 14, Section 8, of Article I of the proposed Constitution provides to the Congress the Power to "make Rules for Government." The officials of the Government for the United States, required to be sworn by each and all such officials thereof, along with all of the officials of the State government also, as per the requirement that the same do so, are set forth at Article VI, Clause 3 of the proposed Constitution. This distinct requirement at said Clause 3 does not provide for any failure to take such required Oath or Affirmation in support thereof; it is presumed to have been done by every State and United States official, regardless of whether or not a written transcript of said Oath may be found; each such official is undeniably bound to Obey the United States Constitution, *without exception*, except by any exception it be regarded instantly as Contempt of Constitution, prosecutable directly at the discretion of the people themselves alone.

10. At said Clause 3 of Article VI, no entry is made therein to expose the people themselves, of any of the Several States, as being a part of the Government for whom "Rules" [for the People] can be made for by either the Congress or a State's legislature, as the Congress is and was constrained to by Clause 14, of Section 8, Article I; the State's legislature, likewise, by such extended Clause 14 principle, may make "Rules for the State government," which may not, under the **requirements** of Article IV, Section 4, replace or act as though it were law, the People of the State being **Guaranteed against** such a "practice of law," **Not** Law.

11. Further recognizing the Constraints placed on the United States and the Several States, of which Demandant's State has been proposed to be one, it does not arise to a debatable question that a judicial officer, as referred to in said Clause 3, would include a

person as a Juror, irrespective of the nature or classification of Jury in which the same might be called to serve, for any such "Rules made for the Government" to be extended to, at any time, for any purpose of the proposed United States. To hold that a Juror is or could be construed as a "judicial officer," State or United States, under said Clause 3 of Article VI, as included therein changes the entire legal equation of the Constitution itself, creates a condition for unsettled stare decisis within the framework of the case at hand, and except there be a valid argument justifying any such a claim as that, exists as an Abuse of Discretion and is – **Not** Law.

12. The Clause 14 Power **extended** to the [alleged] United States Congress, as well as, in equal right, to Demandant's proposed State also, is a Power to make Rules **for** the **government**. NO Power is recognized therein to make "Rules for 'the people'" at all.

Consequently, any form of Rules made by any government of and within the United States cannot be made by Either, or Any, of the three branches thereof, and subsequently extended to the people as though such Rules were now "made for the people" as well, except by way of Jurisdiction Fraud, which goes also to Standing Fraud.

13. Consequently, the [Federal/State] Rules of Civil Procedure, the [Federal/State] Rules of Criminal Procedure, the [Federal/State] Rules of Appellate Procedure, and even the [Federal/State] Rules of the United States/State supreme Court, being Rules for "the government," canNOT be made for the people of the several States at all, except by way of a violation of the pure Truth **constraining** the United States, and Demandant's State along with it, to one (1) form of Rulemaking Power only; NOT the People, or else by admitted to Jurisdiction Fraud, no less.

14. Being unable to make Rules "for the people" but for the government only, it arises to a serious form of Jurisdiction Fraud where a proposed State government attempts, or actually commits the act, of applying any form of "Rules" to any person or persons of

any of the Several States of the United States, and not purely to the government of proposed State itself, all three branches thereof, alone.

15. Not being included within either of the Seven (7) Net Extended Powers for the United States supreme Court at Article III, Section 2, Clause 1, extended to all State courts concurrently by rights of appeal evident at Article III, Section 2, Clause 2, Phrase 2, both the federal judiciary and the proposed State judiciary have no power or authority to make Rules "for the People," of which "People" Demandant is one.

THE INHERENT RIGHT FOR IGNORANCE.

16. Formal Definition. There are now in force rules promulgated by the State courts, allegedly being empowered to govern civil and criminal cases in the same State courts, district courts, courts of appeals, and the State supreme Court itself, which are made for officers or officials of the courts, of which the People of Demandant's own State of domicile, or residence, are none..

I.

17. THE TRUTH. The State's legislature is limited to its own powers for any use for any purpose. It may not use or call upon powers, for its own specific use, that belong to the other two branches of government of the proposed State itself.

18. Not only is there No Rulemaking Power by the acclaimed State legislative branch, nor by the proposed State's judicial branch, nor by the proposed State's executive branch, to *make* or *proclaim* or *compel* any statutory "Rules for the [people]," there is likewise no Power evident, any way at all, anywhere in either the United States Constitution or in Demandant's State constitution, that provides for any ability of the State to "contract" with any "private citizens" of "anywhere."

19. This being the truth of the case, it is a logical question and concern to ask the question, If the legislative and the judicial branch of the proposed State government, neither one, have the authority to make "Rules for the [people]," how is it that the acclaimed State courts are able to impose the "State Rules of Civil Procedure" and the "State Rules of Criminal Procedure" upon those very same "People" who they, the two proposed State branches, or even three branches, cannot make ANY "Rules" for?

20. The answer to this exigent question is simple, and comes to us, from every means of compulsion, without evidence or basis for denial, and is answered in three parts:

> 1) Simple Ignorance. The failure to realize that the acclaimed State government never had the Power, and therefrom the Right, to make “rules” (not laws) for any private person, only government, which a private person is not.
>
> 2) Corruption, or Malversation (Official Corruption) by committing the crime, against the People and the Republic thereof themselves, of Contempt of Constitution, possibly to the highest degree thereof.
>
> 3) By the use of attorneys at bar, “courtesy” of one or more “applicable” federal bars along with the applicable local State bar thereto, the same “attorneys at bar,” by their “support,” whether knowing or unknowing, of this ongoing state of Official Corruption, or Malversation, being admitted to the bar association applicable to the said particular court wherein any matter, or accused private person, is being tried, ***by which and through*** such Bar membership, which involves agreements requiring **THEY**, such attorneys at bar - members to be bound to those same Rules of the government, or “Rules

> of the Government," that the private person is ***otherwise* not** bound to, the proposed government is able to thus **transfer** its own **rule** and trial procedures made for itself, government, ***though*** such "attorney at bar," as an **unsuspected liability** to the naive private citizen, whether such private citizen is, as a private citizen only, of any of the Several States, of which Demandant's State has been proposed to be one, or even of the Territory of Washington, District of Columbia, itself.

21. It is indisputable that this wicked and unconscionable relationship between State and United States government's bar attorneys and the proposed State itself has cost millions of private persons to be damaged, or injured, Unlawfully, UnConstitution[ally], in their own rights as persons not existing as officials of either State or United States government, being, under the exclusion principle found at Article VI, Clause 3, over the proposed Constitution for the United States, or either of them, and not under the same whatsoever.

22. The misuse or mis-application of Rulemaking Power is merely representative of that kind of convoluted thinking that has come to mark many law schools - that follow many, if not all, erring bar association's misleads of demeritorious acts throughout the several States of the United States themselves, of which the Demandant's State has been proposed to be one.

23. To further demonstrate and establish the error of the proposed State government's alleged right for rulemaking authority, to be applied directly over the people themselves, in Cheek v. The United States, (1991), the U.S. supreme Court stated, regarding as to the complexity of "tax law," that "ignorance of the law is no defense" [or excuse] when such ignorance is applied to the "Common Law," which Common Law certainly goes to the matters of moral turpitude, the violation of Society's mores, as such.

24. What was stated in "Cheek" was not new; it had long been held before that court that, in violations of the Common Law, that "ignorance of the law is no excuse, or defense." When we think and understand this, we are compelled to agree, for otherwise it would make our society a constant travesty of wrongdoings, with no one being able to be held accountable for anything simply by stating that he or she was "ignorant of the law against the same."

This would be an unthinkable reality if such were to be allowed for, but being this is not the case, it must be agreed that such an statement by the said supreme Court in Cheek is the understood requirement of the people, by the people, and for the people, just as Abraham Lincoln portrayed it to be.

25. However, the claim against "ignorance" loses ground, absolutely, against the **Inherent** (natural) **Right To Be Ignorant** *Of* Government Rules of Procedure – of Any Kind, Outside of the Rules or Procedures of the Common Law Itself Only.

26. The Inherent Right To BE Ignorant – Of "The [Government's] Rules," unlike the "Common Law" as proclaimed by "Cheek," cannot be denied. Think. If it were not true, then this would mean that it would be government's "right" to take a person, *any* person, who had decided not to retain *their*, government's, "Bar attorney" (by and through which one may be bound to *their*, government's, rules), and to require that such person go to a particular place, and to therein sit down in a seat for learning, for whatever amount of time it might be necessary, and Involuntarily Learn ALL of the statutory "rules" that they, the government, had prescribed for the use of the court's own contrived proceedings, UNTIL that private person had learned, without question or exception, ALL of the "rules," no matter how extensive and comprehensive they might be, that they, the otherwise Ignorant Person, would have Right, under such involuntary procedures, to know, before being able to proceed a single day in *any* trial procedure without them.

27. For anything less than this level of project, extended to each and every person to be compelled to go through a court's system outside of the Common Law Procedures only, would of a dire necessity, be recognized as an Abuse of Process, and from that, a Misuse of Process for any proceeding where such Rules were to be used, without possibility of denial; that without that knowledge of the "former ignorant" person made "knowledgeable of the government rules," any use of such a condition of "rules" without that particular learned – at government expense and behest – knowledge thereof, would establish an utterly unlawful and illegal Advantage, ***Severe*** Advantage, too great to be ignored and allowed for, for the government in question, without either question or doubt, from the very precise point of beginning of the same.

28. As to this point, if trying to propose that government could do such a thing at all, we would immediately run into citizens whose ability to learn anything at all as pertains to any "rules of government" would be severely limited, if not impossible altogether. These particular people, short of being actually mentally incompetent to a legal and physiological extent, would hamper all efforts to proceed in any case involving them, where they were not connected first, involuntarily, to such Rules made for Government, by way of use of a bar attorney, whether for the plaintiff's side or the defendant's side, in whatever case it might be for them to participate in, which unsuspecting relationship *of* connection of the People **to** Government's Rules ***made For*** The Government constitutes "Bar Attorney Fraud," and "Bar Fraud," no less, and is actionable before an impartial Jury, called to Try the Crime of Contempt of Constitution, which is the Inherent Right of the impartial Jury alone, or the People direct where the impartial Jury shall fail, to Try.

29. Of course, we understand that this is not an issue to be concerned with, as it would constitute a sheer impossibility for the government to force the people, all of them, together or individually,

to be compelled to learn the "rules of government," any of the "rules of government" whatsoever, *forcing* us to abandon such "rules of government procedures" altogether, as a requisite of court or judicial procedures, in spite of the carefully conspired and contrived laws that have lead us away from the truth of this matter, and to return to the practices of the Common Law, under which this country was born, for we see the encompassing and inclusion of that same Common Law contained in the supreme Court's own Extended Power also, to which IT has the Right to embrace and hold, at Article III, Section 2, Clause 1, Phrase 1, or Extended Power One, of the proposed Constitution for the United States, of America.

Return To The Common Law Procedures or "'Rules' of Common" Law Required.

30 In the event a person, to be tried for any matter, were to demand his or her right against the claim for "Force of Counsel" as against the actual concept of "Assistance of Counsel" in the Sixth Amendment, and therefore refused, altogether, any attorney who existed as a member of any bar association (Step 1), and then Averred (swore to by Official Oath) his or her own absolute, undeniable, Inherent (as set forth above) Right To BE *And* To **Remain** IGNORANT of THEIR Official Rules, Being In Fact Rules For The Government And NOT For The IGNORANT People At All, Whatever They May Be, then the court could not proceed with anything at all except that (1) in its doing so, where one was Certifiably (Averred) Ignorant of ALL of its Rules of Proceeding (remember, neither an attorney nor a judge cannot be called in to coach on such Rules at all, and the Right to BE Ignorant (not to be shaken from the proceeding's participant to any degree), then that court's act to proceed would constitute an irrevocable Abuse of Process and a Misuse of Process, as well as an **Offense** of Discretion (not just an Abuse of), not having an actual "discretion to Abuse" (no such thing as a "judicial right" for a "Discretion to **Abuse**"), which offenses would be immediately actionable, or

prosecutable, in a separate action, and (2) that the court, instead of engaging in prohibited abusive conduct as this represents, would be required to return to the use of the Common Law procedures that the people were, and still are, entitled to underneath the Power of the Ninth Amendment's Retention of Rights so Retained By the First Generation of People for whom it was Originated.

31. Being outside of the question as to any claimed right, by government, to hold the common people to their, government's, own standard of government rules, of any kind, where the retaining of an attorney at bar (member of the bar) has not been done in order to bind the person to such government's rules – through, the court proceedings, in spite of corrupt, and reckless, and ignorant, legislators' efforts to do away with the Common Law itself, where the people, one by one, then two by two, then five by five, then a hundred by a hundred, and so on, render, by this demanded procedure, begin to render "the Rules" entirely "Inert," or VOID for use against the people (saving themselves much money in the doing so), and so useless for any procedural purposes, then we have done away with the most critical mechanism by which bar associations, and their attorney members, take to "market" to proclaim for themselves the noble titles for knowing that which was never lawfully required to be known by anyone (ie., the Rules made for Government) *outside of government* to begin with.

32. The governments' "Rules of Procedures" being required to be utterly withdrawn from among the people, that leaves us with only two things left to recognize; the laws or statutes themselves, which allegedly we are all accountable to, the "ignorance of" being denied as to the common law – only - itself, and that thing which we recognize to be called "case law."

33. The statutory or actual-laws-passed side of the matter is taken here first. Considering that everyone is required to "know" this form of law, the teaching of such law, from one person to another,

as to exactly how the law reads and what that law means, as it is stated literally therein, is a fundamental right of the people in order that, as the United States supreme Court itself has asserted, in "Cheek v. the United States," that it is demanded to be, the people might not be "ignorant" of the common **law**, for it is certain that the United States supreme Court was not proposing that everyone be required to retain an attorney, full time, to "teach them" all about the law – for the future – just in case they might ever need it - knowledge of statutory laws.

34. With this form of realization, it cannot be argued that the people would have, and therefore have, no right to teach one another, to whatever degree of necessity it might take, all laws, statutory or common, that they are to be held to by the standard of "ignorance is no defense" of whatever the issue is to be defended against from.

35. This, then, strikes down the Bar associations' hold over the statutory and the common law as to any unique claim over, for teaching and exercising assistance in (assistance is only another form of "teaching" anyway), and leaves us with one final thing to consider, which is that which is called, by whatever alleged claim, "case law."

36. To claim that case law is actually law that *must be* learned about, and therefore used in pleading for any gainful purpose, FAILS with the understanding and knowledge that the decisions of the United States supreme Court or of the State supreme Court, even in the most "precedent" of case, has never been proven to be held to by every lower court of existence, State or federal, for actual practices of attorney and non-attorney litigants alike has demonstrated that judges routinely ignore them for their own individual decisions instead, even if such pre-decided decisions should be reversed by a later, higher court.

37. In fact, the people, the Still Every-Right-To-Be Ignorant People, have Every Right to proceed without ever quoting or relying upon a single prior case, of any court, as long as their legal resounding is sound, is the truth, and bears out indisputable integrity; any case, State or United States supreme Court otherwise, notwithstanding.

38. Without either the concise power over the Requirement for the Knowledge of *the Rules*, or without the right of power over the teaching of either Statutes and/or the Common Law, and its proceedings, or over the necessity of knowing any case law itself, it would seem that the purpose for *any* Bar association is utterly useless, and are to be dismantled as some sort of unlawful, former derision, bringing All Bar associations legally down, everywhere, altogether.

39. The **Inherent Right To BE Ignorant** – Of the Government's "Rules of Procedure" - Prevails Over All Claims For Procedures, and leads us, by this discovery of the true facts of the matter, to conclude that the people are far better off when they are Ignorant of Government's own "Rules of Procedure" against them, forcing us all back to the very Common Law that the Constitution itself provides for, and demands by its own Inherent Structure of Higher Law, to be retained, in spite of all insidiously designed efforts to the contrary, by those who have anything but their own selfish interests at heart, showing forth, by open exposure to all, what *their* hearts were actually all about in the first instance.

40. Indeed, it can be said, that, under these conditions prescribed, for each average American, [the Legal Right of] **Ignorance Is Bliss**.

41. We find further that there has been a denial of courts to impose the government's own rules upon private citizens, as was expressed, such principle now extended to the State:

> In Erie Railroad Co. v. Tompkins, 304 U.S. 64 (1938), 58 S. Ct. 817, 82 L. Ed. 1188 the United States supreme Court ruled that . . . courts do not have the power to formulate their own rules of law.

42. This would be true in review of the fact that there exists within the scope of the Seven (7) Extended Powers at Article III, Section 2, Clause 1 of the proposed Constitution, extended subsequently, through judicial channels, to State courts as well, NO judicial branch rulemaking power, not for the government, not for the people either of the Several States or the United States itself; not for any Jury, either grand jury or trial jury; not for any form of case, civil or criminal, or not for any State Militia.

43. What if, not knowing the "Rules" passed by government for government, a private citizen (commonly referred to as "pro se") was - for NOT knowing said "Rules" - to perform with such inefficiency as to place his or her life or property in grave danger. Such a danger or risk would incontestably indicate that such private citizen, before being compelled to proceed on his or her own without an Absolute Knowledge of such Rules, would have the undeniable Right to have ALL of such Rules taught him or her by the most competent authority representing the government who made them, "Rules," ***before*** one (1) step of procedure could be taken in the case in which the private citizen became engaged, whether civil or criminal, lest there be an Abuse of Discretion leading imminently to an Abuse of Process and a Misuse of Process, for each and every Rule, or part thereof, so employed by the government's court under whom the said Case was being adjudicated.

44. The acclaimed State government, whether allegedly under the proposed States' judicial branch's vested Power, for to any claim for such Rulemaking Power by the said judicial branch itself, as along with the legislature, has, and has at no time had, any power or

authority to make "Rules for the People," **or** for the proposed impartial Trial Juries, whether as alleged Trial Juries or as grand juries, except that the same has been unlawfully committed as Collateral Attack against the Inherent Rights of the People arising under the said Constitution, and as Jurisdiction Fraud, and more, as stated in the other exigent Exhibits hereto.

45. Denial of a[ny] auspices or aegis of a bar to intervene or exist as an auspices or aegis in the factum, for the alleged purposes or pretext of any assistance of counsel, whether or not by any attorney at bar, given or to be given, at any time, during the proceedings being compelled, by either side, in this Case, is a right of Demandant; no presumption of any competent knowledge of the Rules made for Government, not for the people, may be presumed for any purpose or to any extent or degree as to Demandant, whether or not ever as any defendant in any case before any State court of any proposed State;

46. Failure for the Rules Made for Government to be connected to an alleged accused, ***except*** by way of bar association or attorney at law Connection Fraud thereto, to the people *as though* government, demands that such matter revert to the Rules that came before such said Rules for Government, extended de facto to the people, or that is, the Common Law Rules themselves, of which ignorance of the Common Law Rules will constitute no condition denying an accused all rights of due process in procedures arising within and under the proposed Constitution for the United States itself alone.

47. Whereas, the advent of any assistance of counsel or else attorney at law or lawyer, entering this case as though on the behalf of Demandant, alleged as Defendant, where there be no lawful Standing and proven constructive Subject Matter Jurisdiction over the requirement that said Demandant be construed as a person for whom the Rules of Government was made for, by any or either of the three branches of the same;

48. And so being Failed in its ability to be properly applied to Demandant as though the same Rules were and could be made for the same Demandant, being one of the people and not of the government of the proposed State of wherein the Demandant resides and/or has domicile itself, such Rules of Government, not being applied nor Constitution[ally] applicable to the people, and not applicable to the people in accordance to the constraints imposed by the proposed Constitution for the United States itself, and the proposed constitution for the proposed State of the Demandant, being subject to the foregoing same;

49. Where it has been or is perceived in any form of half-light, or obfuscation, that such Rules of Government are to be applied to Demandant by way of his having (1) retained an attorney at law who is also a member of a State-Name or else "federal" Bar Association of a proposed district court of the proposed State of Demandant's Residency or Domicile, and by that means extending said "Rules of Government" to Demandant **where such extension could not exist otherwise** for Demandant, or (2) where such a condition for extending "Rules for Government" to Demandant is, has been, or will be done under Color of Authority, under Color of Law, under Color of Court, under Color of Legislature, done in conjunction with under Color of Governor, and under Color of the State itself, the result of such extension being UnLawful, and Illegal, in accordance to law;

50. Shall extend, convey **and subject** such "Rules of Government," instead, to *and under* the Common Law Rules - (as distinguished from "the Common Law") - of proper distinction as the same, themselves only;

51. Which Common Law Rules only shall apply, without denial or post retribution against the same for so embracing same under the law of the Constitution itself, to any assistance of counsel, or else attorney at law or lawyer, retained by Demandant, alleged as

Defendant, which assistance of the same shall not work an impairment or form of bill of attainder, whether ipso facto or de facto, upon the Constitution[al] rights of Demandant, upon the instance of the appearance of the aforesaid same assistance of counsel, or attorney, or lawyer, if any, in this case.

52. This is a challenge for Immediate Proof, not speculative conjecture of claim, Of Standing, not based upon the mere speculation or claim for it, but based upon all prior arguments, pleadings, and Facts, both in law and in real, and not either as an interlocutory or appeal oriented issue that would otherwise be allowed where an Invalidly Constructed Court or court proceeding was found to be working under the now known **Illegal Faction Directive** of:

"**IGNORE THE LAW; OBEY THE FRAUD**."

THEREFORE,

Cease To Ignore The LAW;

DISOBEY The Fraud(s).

DULY SUBMITTED AND INCORPORATED BY THIS REFERENCE;

This TEST and Exhibit Is SEALED, And INCORPORATED, Against That Which Is Found To Be Untrue In The Constitution For The United States, And For That Which Is True In The Said Same Constitution, Into This Case, Now *ARISING*, Before The Lawful Courts of the Several States of the Union of "them," And Not Lawfully Concurrently Elsewhere.