***Joe Sixpack***

***666 Styx Way***

***Cucamonga, California***

***650-999-9999//Yukfu@sbcglobal.net***

***Private Attorney General*** in re ***all like situated victims of the “Ju$t u$ $y$tem”***

***(Section 35 of the Judiciary Act of 1789; I Statutes at Large 73 et seq.)***

To: ***Numb Nutts – Your County Clerk***

***HAMilton Burger – office of Your County Counsel***

***Horatio Curmudgeon Frump – office of Your Chief “Ju$t u$”***

In Re: ***Judicial Courts – US supreme Court Update***

To date I have not been able to make any headway in presenting ***at least*** ***Petitions for Redress of Grievance*** to this office, noting that, as an example, the ***California Constitution of 1849***, which has ***NOT*** (!) been repealed (proof on request), the ***County Clerk*** is designated as the ‘***ex officio clerk of the California District Court***’. Read ***closely*** the accompanying letter to a Presiding ‘judge’ pursuant to ***filing*** documents, ***WITHOUT*** any ***allegedly*** required fees or forms.

In this regard, please also take notice of the following excerpt from the ***unanimous*** opinion of ***Chief Justice John Marshall*** in ***Cohens v Virginia 6 Wheat. 264***, ***directly*** related to this situation, to wit:

‘The Constitution gave to every person having a claim upon a State a ***right*** to present his case to the court of the Nation. However unimportant his claim might be, however little the community might be interested in its decision, the ***framers*** of our Constitution thought it necessary, ***for the purposes of justice***, to create a tribunal as superior to influence as possible in which that claim might be decided.’

 This relates here, since, as an exemplar, the ***California District Court (CDC)*** is, and was ***contemporaneously*** recognized by, the California supreme Court (thankfully pre ***Tani*** et al !), as a ***constitutional, common law Court*** (***Ex Parte Knowles 5 Cal. 300***), one which is ***REQUIRED*** to exist in every County of a ***sovereign, independent State*** admitted into “***this Union***” as per to ***Art. IV, Sec. 3***.

 Indeed, the existence of the ***CDC (equivalent)*** is also a ***VITAL*** element of the ***republican*** form of government guaranteed to the States by ***Article IV, Section 4,*** without which, among other things, ***ALL*** laws allegedly ‘on the books’ would be ***NULL and VOID nunc pro tunc ab initio as Bills of Attainder***, in plain violation of ***Article I, Section 9 or 10***, as the case may be, of the ***Constitution for the united States {1787-1791} (CuS)*** and, as an example, ***Article I, Section 16 of the California Constitution of 1849***, noting that ***Article I, Section 12*** states that “the military shall be ***subordinate*** to the civil power”.

 Also duly noted is that the CALIFORNIA Constitution of ***1879***, likely a universal exemplar, makes ***NO*** mention of the ***judicial*** power of California in ***ANY*** court, which makes perfect sense when one understands that it applies, ***IF*** at all, to the ***SUBORDINATE, corporate*** body politic, a ***carefully concealed*** agenda, ‘created’, ‘courtesy’, as it were, by what the record will prove, in any ensuing action, is the ***Non***-existent 14th ***WAR*** “amendment” (***NEFWA***).

 Yet it does ***NOT*** have any apparent need to do so, since pursuant to ***Section 1 NEWFA***, all ‘persons’ (“***PERSONS***”) born or naturalized in the (Trust known as) the United States and ***SUBJECT*** (?!?) to the jurisdiction thereof, are United States citizens and of the state wherein they ***reside***’.

In effect, this really means that these corporate ‘***shitizens***’ ‘have ***NO*** Rights which the ***de facto*** government is bound to respect’, with ***Section 5 of NEFWA*** limiting them to asking ***ONLY legislative*** questions, ***NOT*** ***judicial*** ones, as ***contemporaneously*** set forth in ***US v Rhodes 27 Fed. Cases 785***.

In yet another ***very revealing*** matter of “statutory interpretation”, 26 USC 7408(d) states that “if a “taxpayer” (“***CORPORATION***”) cannot be found in any United States judicial district (?? – ed), he (***IT*** !) can be found, for ***ALL*** jurisdictional purposes, in the ***District of Columbia***, likely the ***ONLY*** venue in which Income Tax ‘laws’ might be valid, ***IF*** then, and ***a LOT*** more will be said about this ***Constitutional conundrum***, ***WITH attitude and WITH authority***, about this – think ***Lieber Code*** here – before a common law Jury, in any ensuing action.

Counsel advises that this jibes perfectly with the ***FACT*** that ***NEFWA*** “citizenship” can be summarily removed ‘courtesy’ of an ***Executive Order*** of the President, acting as ***Commander-in-Fief of the Armed Forces***, ***exactly as publically threatened*** by President Donald Trump, on or about Nov/ 1st, 2018..

Another ***DIRECTLY*** related situation is the current and ongoing matter of perceived American jurisprudence is the ***egregiously evil, exponential expansion*** of the commerce clause powers of Congress in the ***New Deal*** era (would have been nice for the victims to have known that this ‘deck of cards’ consisted of ***54 military Jokers*** !), in such cases as ***NLRB v Jones & Laughlin Steel 301 US 1*** – see, however,. the ‘dissent’ of the ‘***4 Horsemen***’, ***which was and is*** consistent with (***gasp*** !) the ***original intent*** of the Framers of the ***Constitution*** and which the record ***WILL*** establish, in any ensuing action, was and is the ***Opinion*** of the Court !

Counsel further advises that things have gotten so far out of hand here that a serious argument was recently advanced by yet another ‘state’ Bar Association attorney /aka/ ***unregistered foreign agent*** /aka/ ***NONE*** of whom have been appointed by the President, a currently ***VACANT*** office in any event, as is ***REQUIRED*** in ***federal (insular) territories*** pursuant to the ‘appointments clause’ (***Article II, Section 2***), that “a ***transgender*** (?? – ed) entity has the right to select its ***public*** restroom, because taking a crap in a ***government funded*** ***bathroom*** (?!? – ed -- somehow – ed) affects “interstate commerce”.

Take ***CLOSE*** notice here that the US supreme court has ***RULED*** , in ***New Jersey Steam v Merchants Bank 6 How. 344***, that ‘the commerce clause powers of Congress are ***CLOSELY*** associated with the ***admiralty*** jurisdiction” /aka/ to the Framers as “a jurisdiction ***FOREIGN*** to our Constitution and ***unacknowledged*** by our laws”, very arguably the central cause of the American Revolution (which we ***DID*** win, right ?) ***AND*** a jurisdiction which ***ALL*** State courts are Constitutionally ***BARRED*** from exercising (***Article III, Section 2***).

You should think about ***THIS***: the record in any ensuing case ***WILL*** establish, by ***at least clear and convincing evidence,*** that there are ***NO*** States remaining which ***were*** admitted into “***this Union***”. Where, it might well be asked, can one find ***ANY*** ***lawful*** jurisdiction and venue for “***interstate commerce***” ???

What’s more is that any documents presented to you for filing will at least qualify, as it were, as constructive Petitions for a ***Non***-statutory ***Federal*** Writ of Habeas Corpus pursuant to ***Article I, Section 9, Clause 2 of the Constitution for the united States {1787-1791} (CuS)***, which does ***NOT*** need any statutory authority, most particularly ***NOT*** ***(!)*** to be ‘confused’ with 28 USC 2254, although ***Section 14 of the Judiciary Act of 1789*** was ***conspicuously*** cited therein, of this case weeks ago by have ***NOT*** received any response, especially when there is no ***KNOWN declared*** state of ***rebellion or invasion*** which might provide grounds for even a ***temporary*** suspension of the “***Great Writ of Liberty***’.

This is a ***BIG*** concern, yet Counsel advises that he has attempted to resolve by presenting multiple such Writs, all of which ***UNOPPOSED*** Writs have suffered written summary, ex parte 12(b)(6) dismissals, one by a ***DEPUTY ~~jerk~~ clerk*** (?!?) of the CALIFORNIA supreme court, ***relevant, admissible evidence*** in any ensuing trial by Jury, which will not go well for any ‘***perps***’, noting that suggested worthwhile reading for you here is ***Cell 2455 Death Row by Caryl Chessman***.

The same can be said, ***a fortiori***, for the office of County Counsel, for which Counsel would ***LOVE*** to run for, but for the ***FACT*** that there are ***NO*** elections anywhere in sight in what the record will ***ESTABLISH***, in any ensuing action, that CALIFORNIA (any State) is, ***at best*** (!) a ***federal (insular ??) territorial possession***.

But wouldn’t you know, County counsel is not only an ***APPOINTED*** position, one ***WITHOUT*** an Oath of Office or ***ANY*** bond ***AND*** an office which is ***REQUIRED*** to be filled by a ‘state’ ***Bar Ass***ociation member /aka/ ***unregistered foreign agent*** (***B***ritish ***A***ccreditation ***R***egistry).

A ***BIG*** problem here is locating either the ***factual foundation and legal basis*** for the ***UTTER exclusion*** of ***ALL*** members of the ***sovereign body politic*** of the Nation & Republic, not to mention California, as set forth in ***Article II, Section 1 of the California Constitution of 1849*** (see, as an exemplar ***Van Valkenburg v Brown 43 Cal. 43***), which has ***NOT*** (!) been repealed, who ordained and established “***this Constitution*** to ensure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and ***OUR*** posterity”, or to find ***one iota*** of the “***CONSENT of the governed***”, this with the relationship between the ***sovereign body politic*** and ***government officials*** being ***Principal*** and ***agent***.

You and I, however, ***KNOW*** better, since the equivalent of ***Article VI, Section 1*** of the ***California Constitution of 1849***, which has ***NOT*** been repealed, with documentary ***PROOF*** on request from the earlier letter from the office of the Secretary of State in Sacratomato, established the ***California District Court***”, a ***constitutional, common law*** Court ***contemporaneously*** recognized by the California supreme Court, supra and established ***County Clerk*** as “ex officio clerk” of this ***constitutional Court***, an exemplar for ALL such States.

And you also must know that ***Section 402 of the County Charter*** (exemplar) to the extent that it ***may*** be applicable, specifically provides, that “The Assessor-County Clerk-Recorder shall be elected by ***qualified electors***, ***NONE*** of whom are recognized in ***ANY*** department of any ***de facto territorial*** government: “the Board of Supervisors, at any time by ordinance, may transfer ***all non-court related County Clerk duties*** as authorized by General Law”.

Take ***VERY careful*** notice here, although you ***SHOULD*** be well aware, that such a Court, which thankfully has ***NOTHING*** to do with any of the ***serpentine, sphincteresque shenanigans*** occurring daily in ***administrative tribunals*** at 400 CC, is ***REQUIRED*** to exist in ***EVERY*** County in ***EVERY*** State admitted into “***this Union***” pursuant to at least ***Article IV, Section 3 of the CuS***.

And this is true a fortiori since ***NO*** Judicial Courts = ***NO*** judicial process = ***NO*** ***Right*** to trial by Jury according to the course of the common law, and this with California admitted into “***this Union***”, like all of its brethren, save Louisiana, as a common law State (see e.g., as an exemplar, ***Report on the Civil and Common Law 1 Cal. Rpts. 588*** et seq).

Yet this ***Right*** is nowhere in sight anywhere today, albeit secured to even “***inhabitants of territories***” pursuant to ***Article II of the Northwest Ordinance of 1787***, as reenacted by the 1st Congress.

Perhaps the reason why is that ***THIS*** trial by Jury would not only be by a Jury of our ***PEERS***, ***BUT*** one with the power to rule on the facts and ***THE LAW***, (see e.g. ***Georgia v Brailsford 2 Dallas 402; Essay on Trial by Jury” (1852) by Lysander Spooner***), ***THE ultimate check and balance*** on the ***treasonous federal regional martial law*** government which has been in existence for the past ***160*** years and with no end in sight.

In the end, this, as much as anything else, is the difference between the ***federative, republican*** form of government of ***defined and limited powers*** ordained and established by the ***original intent*** of the Framers and today’s much ballyhooed ***demockrazy*** /aka/ ***3 Wolves*** and ***2 sheep*** voting on what’s for dinner. Indeed, the record here will also establish that there is ***NO*** electorate and thus there are ***NO*** elections, which also raises further questions about your ‘compensation’ in this ***NON*** existent area as well.

Take ***close*** notice here that ***CON***gress, even assuming arguendo that it fully complied with ***ALL*** provisions of ***Article I*** (***NOT*** !), has ***NO*** authority in federal (***insular*** ?) territories to provide for elections for President (***Electoral College***, anyone ?), or ***VOTING*** members of the House, and with united States Senator remaining an ***appointed*** position, by the conspicuously absent State legislatures, the non-existent 17th ***war*** “amendment” to the contrary notwithstanding.

With this in mind, it should be clear that not only should we be on the same side, but that local government, when government authority is not ***specifically*** delegated elsewhere is the ***most efficient, least expensive and most responsive*** to the ***Creator endowed inalienable Rights secured by the CuS*** for ourselves, our families and ***OUR posterity***.

Accordingly, ***you*** should be ready, willing and able to do your ***SWORN*** duty as the ***ex officio clerk*** of the equivalent of the ***California District Court*** to ***FILE*** any and all documents presented to you by ***at least*** lawful, de jure, ***jus sanguinis*** State Citizens, which ***would*** be cognizable, one way or another, in ***ALL*** ‘other’ jurisdictions pursuant to ***at least the ‘full faith and credit’*** provision of ***Article IV, Section 1 of the CuS***, and let the chips fall where they may. Your ***PROMPT*** attention to this matter will be expected.

Constitutionally,

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

William Henshall