Joe Sixpack
666 Styx Way
Cucamonga, California
666-666-6666
Petitioner

Your County superior court

"People of the State of Confusion" Plaintiff vs. Joe Sixpack Petitioner	***Case No. 99999999*** ***Motion to Dismiss*** ***Denial of Right to*** ***Trial by Jury*** Date: _____ Time: _____ Dept. _____

COMES NOW Petitioner ***Joe Sixpack***, in propria persona, sui juris, appearing specially, to invoke the right to challenge the jurisdiction of the trial "court" …

(. This Court's Record Fails to Show that there has been presented Any Evidence, to the support the Prosecutions Accusation Against this Accused Defendant, that the Prosecution has Properly Invoked the Jurisdiction of this Court.)

… for which there is ***NOT*** one iota of evidence currently in evidence, and which the US supreme Court has ***RULED*** jurisdiction can be challenged ***at any time***.

This is in concert with Petitioner's Motion to Dismiss on jurisdictional grounds, and furnished further support for that Motion.

Since long before the formation of the Republic and ordaining of the ***Constitution for the united States {1787-1791} (CuS)***, this to "secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and ***OUR*** posterity", going back as far as the ***Magna Charta (1215)***, the Right to trial by jury according to the course of the common law, with the Jury able to rule on the facts ***and the law***, has been the bulwark of English liberty – see e.g. "***The Ordeal of Edward Bushell***" by ***Godfrey D. Lehman*** and "***Essay on Trial by Jury***" by ***Lysander Spooner***.

Today, however, the '***9 Old Farts***' /aka/ the US supreme court, has ***seemingly*** ruled that there is ***NO*** right to trial by jury in ***at least*** criminal misdemeanor cases (***Blanton v Las Vegas 489 US 538***), and perhaps ***NO*** right at all in ***ANY*** case (***Brown v Mississippi 297 US 278; Snyder v Massachusetts 297 US 91***).

Like the vast majority of case law BS by the '***9OFs***', the saving grace here is that these decisions are nothing but examples of the long train of abusive decisions thru at least the last 90 years, based on claims of "rights" emanating from Section 1 of the ***NON***-existent 14th ***war*** "amendment" (***NEFWA***).

Thankfully, we need ***NOT*** be detained by this case law BS here, since in the court's own words, from its ***sanctimoniously self-proclaimed "Ashwander Doctrine***" for status and standing (***Ashwander v TVA 297 US 288,341***):

> "The Court will not anticipate a question of constitutional law ***in the advance of the necessity of deciding it***. It is not the habit of the Court to decide questions of a constitutional nature unless ***absolutely necessary*** to a decision of a case.".
>
> (Noting that it ***IS*** absolutely necessary in the instant case for the '***9OFs***' to decide this issue and do their equally ***sanctimoniously self-proclaimed DUTY*** to "say what the law ***IS***" (***Marbury v Madison 1 Cr. 137***, perhaps for the first time in ***150*** years, evidently having '***gotten the me$$age***" from the NY ***Bankter*** in ***Ex Parte McCardle 7 Wall. 506***).
>
> "The Court will not formulate a rule of constitutional law broader than is required by ***the precise facts to which it is to be applied***" (in other words, any decision in a case brought by a corporation, or a 14th ***war*** "amendment" birthright ***shitizen***, will almost certainly ***NOT*** be applicable to at least lawful de jure, ***jus sanguinis*** State Citizen (privileges vs. ***RIGHTS*** !)
>
> (Noting that there are ***NOT*** any claims in the instant case emanating from rights "secured" by ***NEFWA***, which thus eliminates yet another '***Ashwander Rule***':
>
> "The Court will not pass upon a constitutional question although ***properly*** (!) presented by the record ***if there is also present some other ground (UNDEFINED -- application for a social (in)security account ??? -- ed) upon which the case (not to mention the Rights of the victim, er Accused)***

may be disposed of."

Making a ***special*** appearance, and eschewing the ***ASS***istance of counsel secured by ***NEFWA*** (a 'state' ***BAR ASS***ociation (***sBA***) attorney who has not only ***NOT*** been appointed by the President, as ***required*** in territories (***Art. II, Sec. 2*** "appointments clause"), will either ***NOT*** understand the ***structural, jurisdictional*** issues Petitioner wishes to present and/or has an ***irreconcilable conflict of interest*** with ***Rights*** secured by the ***CuS***, ***at least*** to the extent that they threaten the ***malignant, malevolent monopoly*** of the ***sBA*** on the "practice of law" see Petitioner's ***CONDITIONAL Acceptance of Counsel***), Petitioner cannot be 'judicially' construed to have made a ***GENERAL*** appearance, as would be true using an ***sBA*** attorney who is an 'ossifer' (officer) of the 'court', and thus a "***stipulation***" to the jurisdiction of the trial court in could get in ***NO*** other way and/or be construed as a "***hypothecator of goods or stipulator in the admiralty***" (***Bank of Columbia v Okely 4 Wheat. 235***).

NO Right to Trial by Jury -- NO qualified Jurors

(Under the presiding judge's de-facto militariced perversion of this courts other-wise legitimate public-interest jurisdiction;) Even assuming arguendo that there is a ***perceived*** 'right' to trial by Jury somehow (still here-under) exists, there are several reasons why this is ***NOT*** the Right to trial by Jury according to the course of the common law, a ***Right*** secured by ***Article II of the Northwest Ordinance of 1787***, as reenacted by the 1st Congress, this to "***inhabitants of territories***", let alone ***State Citizens***.

First, there has ***NOT*** been anything ***remotely related*** to a "***voluntary, knowing and intelligent***" waiver of Rights, (& This Is) ***THE*** reference standard of the US supreme court (***Johnson v Zerbst 304 US 458***), most particularly not (a waiver of) the Right to trial by Jury.

Second, ALL members of the Jury Pool are drawn from "motor-voter" lists and ALL members of these lists is a "***PERSON***" within the meaning of Section 1 of ***NEFWA*** and thus ;owe' their "birthright (corporate) "***shitizenship***" to ***NEWFA***, and thus (& there-by are) ***SUBJECT*** to the jurisdiction of the (Legal-Fiction Private Corporation & Maliciously Deceptive) Trust known as "The United States".

That said, (& under these militarized & despotic influences) they will be very ~~perceptive~~ (receptive) to any statements by the local ***D***umb ***A***ss (Criminally Corrupted District Attorney) and/or ***purportedly*** neutral magistrate (Tumey v Ohio 273 US 510) labelling Petitioner as a "scofflaw", "racist" opponent of demockrazy, or even a domestic terrorist.

And all of this is exacerbated by the (very likely) ***FACT*** that ***NONE*** of Petitioner's Jury Instructions, currently ***572*** (!) will be 'permitted' to reach a Jury which has the power to rule on the facts ***and the law*** (***Brailsford v Georgia 3 Dallas 1***) and present Petitioner's ***theory of the case*** (see ***Exhibit A,*** Affidavit of ~~William Henshall~~ (Joe Sixpack) on denial of Jury Instructions in other cases, sometimes ***ALL 572*** at the ***stroke of a pen*** !).

Add to this that a large percentage of Jury Pool members will also be victims of a ***mandatory*** public "education" system which does ***NOT*** have

any ***meaningful*** and ***substantive*** curricula for the study of the Constitution, history and laws of the united States, which 'conveniently', for the NY ***Bankter*** and their ***sycophantic, serpentine, sphinctereqsue sBA satraps***, results in a mass ***dumbing down*** of Jury Pool members making it improbable, if not ***impossible***, for them to ***KNOW*** the law, let alone act on it.

Accordingly, all of these facts (***NOT*** (!) a complete list) combine to assure what the "***Ju$t u$ $y$tem***" regards as a "fair trial", which, alas, bears a ***strikingly strong*** resemblance to a ***Directed Verdict of Guilt*** (see e.g. ***Bass v US 784 Fed. 2nd 1282***).

And all of this is NOT surprising, when one considers recent events, what with Biden being advised that, IF he takes office, he would have the unilateral, discretionary power to add Justices to the US supreme Court, evidently acting with an Executive Order as Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces, which means that ONE "person" would have complete control over an ostensibly separate, coordinate department of government, something ***NOT*** considered by FDR in an earlier era, which raises grave questions about even the availability of the ***ORIGINAL*** jurisdiction of the Court, this in the ***ONLY*** judicial Court established by ***Article III***.

And this ***unprecedented*** situation is ***strikingly*** followed by the recent summary denial of ***FILING*** the Texas case in the ***original*** jurisdiction of the Court, pursuant to the recent "election", by the US supreme Court, ***nauseatingly*** noted in the mainstream media as a "***technicality***".

The painfully obvious conclusion (clearly implied) here is that with ***NO Article III*** courts exercising the judicial power of the united States

anywhere in sight, (which seemingly results in) ***ALL*** laws 'on the books' (being reduced to, & there-by) are, ***quod erat demonstrandum***, Bills of Attainder /aka/ ***Writs of Praecipe***, the taking of life, liberty or property without judicial process.

Unless ***Article I, Section 9 and/or 10***, as the case may be, and/or, indeed, ***ALL 6 Articles of the CuS*** are also "technicalities as well.

Without an iota of jurisdiction anywhere in sight, ***ALL*** charges against Petitioner should be dismissed ***WITH prejudice*** to the cause.

_____

Joe Sixpack/Petitioner

WH281676