***Joe Sixpack***

***666 Styx Way***

***Cucamonga, California, united States***

[650-999-9999//YukFu@Gmail.com](mailto:650-999-9999//YukFu@Gmail.com)

To: ***Ham Burger***

***Cruel and Crabbage Law Firm***

***In Re: In Re Matter of Joe Sixpack***

On advice of Counsel, I have just become aware that the ***purported probate*** of the ***Estate of Jerry Jerkoff***, occurred in a ‘court’ which ***ALL*** ‘official’ actors knew, or ***SHOULD*** have known, acted ***coram non judice nunc pro tunc ab initio***.

As such, I now understand that the record in any ensuing action would establish, by ***at least clear and convincing relevant, admissible evidence***, ***ALL*** of the following ***structural, jurisdictional*** errors, any ***ONE*** of which a Jury could find justifies any and all of our claims of ***deceit, fraud*** and even ***Treason*** to the ***Constitution for the united States {1787-1791} (CuS)***, on the part of ***ALL*** such ‘official’ actors, to wit:

In this regard, I am hopeful of settling the ***purported*** matter of the Estate of ***Jerry Jerkoff***, most particularly with regard to the ***seemingly unprecedented*** situation existing in this matter in which I ***NEVER*** received (***effective)*** service of process or ***ANY*** opportunity to be heard, ***cardinal*** principles of American jurisprudence known and understood by the Framers of the ***CuS***, and “***We the people***”, who ordained and established “***this Constitution***”, and all government, “to establish the blessings of liberty to ourselves and ***OUR*** posterity:

That CALIFORNIA is ***NOT*** (!) a ***sovereign, independent State*** admitted into “***this Union***”, all the appearances to the ***apparent*** contrary notwithstanding;

That CALIFORNIA, and ***all like situated States***, admitted prior to 1860, have been relegated, on who knows ***WHAT lawful factual foundation and legal basis consistent with the CuS***, to, at ***best*** (!) ***federal*** (***insular*** ??) ***territorial*** possessions;

As such, ***CON***gress, assuming arguendo that it has a ‘quorum to do ***bu$ine$$*** in either House, does ***NOT*** have any authority to provide for elections in such ***territories*** for President (***Electoral College***, anyone ??), ***VOTING*** members of the House and with united States Senator ***remaining an appointed position by State legislatures***, which, alas, no longer exist;

In any event, there are ***NO*** ‘qualified’ members in either House of ***CON***gress, since ***ALL*** such members are ***REQUIRED*** to be ‘inhabitants of the ***State*** which they represent’

The ‘***coop de grass***’ is that there are ***NO*** elections in any event, since Voter Registration forms require the ***victim***, er ‘voter’, to declare, ***under penalty of perjury***, that he “owes” his “United States citizenship” to Section 1 of what the record will fully establish, in any ensuing action, no doubt in front of an ***inflamed*** Jury with the power to rule on the facts ***and the law***, is the **NON-existent** 14th ***war*** “amendment” (***NEFWA***).

Indeed, the ‘US supreme Court, ***contemporaneously*** ruled ***NEFWA*** unconstitutional, but were not ‘***permitted***’ (?!) to announce their decision in ***Ex Parte McCardle 7 Wall. 506***.

Today, however, your ***close*** attention to the ***VERY*** recent decisions of the US supreme Court in ***Texas v California*** and ***Ohio v OSHA*** (my annotated version of the “concurring” opinion accompanying), will reveal a Court which has, ***VERY*** arguably, acted as the ***Article III judicial Court*** it was ordained and established to be, this for seemingly the first time in ***90 years AND*** for reasons which it will be a ***great pleasure*** to explain to an ***inflamed*** Jury, what with a ***daunting amount of relevant, admissible documentary evidence***, in concert with the ***a cappella expert witness testimony*** of Counsel, in any ensuing action as might occur, knowing that the US supreme Court will ‘have our backs’, especially on matters involving ***LIMITS*** on the commerce clause powers of ***CON***gress.

This will include, for example, the ***FACT*** that the ***allegedly*** applicable CALIFORNIA Constitution of 1879, makes ***NO*** mention of the “***People of the State of California***”, and it does ***NOT*** vest the ***judicial*** power of the State of California in ***ANY*** Court, nor does it need to do so, since the all that ‘officially’ exists is the ***SUBORDINATE corporate*** body politic of ***NEFWA***, which the record would establish, in any ensuing action, that this was the ***carefully concealed*** intent of ***NEWFA***, members of which are “born or naturalized in the (Trust known as the) United States and ***SUBJECT*** to the jurisdiction thereof”, which ‘have ***NO*** Rights which the (***de facto*** ***national socialist***) government is bound to respect”.

Also well worthy of note is the fact that in any ensuing action, ***a long train of abuses***, not to mention violations of ***Rights*** secured by ***ALL 6 Articles of the*** ***CuS***, in many other cases, including a ***LOT*** of them from the San Mateo county superior “court”, ***WILL be relevant, admissible evidence***, and might even ‘wake up’ (***NOT*** ‘***woke***’ up !) even the ***mindless, mainstream media***, ‘encouraging’ journalists to do their jobs as members of the ***Fourth Estate*** to report the (***gasp*** !) ***TRUTH*** to the American people.

Your attention is directed to the fact that no ***KNOWN*** attempt to make ***effective*** service of process, this to ***likely probable beneficiaries*** of the Estate, yet another ***structural, jurisdictional*** error, perhaps because, as you will learn in any ensuing action, this was and is ***IMPOSSIBLE*** to do.

Accordingly, your ***very close*** attention is directed to the decision of the US supreme Court in ***Windsor v McVeigh 93 US 274***, pursuant to the denial of any opportunity to be heard at all, which leaves little to the imagination in this area, not to mention even more ***structural, jurisdictional*** errors all ‘official’ actors will not see coming, yet had the ***SWORN*** duty to know and discharge.

Notably, had I somehow been actively involved in the probate action, we would ***NOT*** have had any idea where we were or why; indeed there exists a ***striking discord*** between ***at least*** the “judicial” and Executive departments of the CALIFORNIA government, as an exemplar, assuming arguendo that they exist at all which, yet again, will be established by more of that ***relevant, admissible documentary evidence***, that the former has stated, albeit ‘courtesy’ of a ***summary, ex parte 12(b)(6) “denial***” of Counsel’s ***UNOPPOSED*** Petition for a ***Non***-statutory ***federal*** Writ of Habeas Corpus /aka/ since ***Magna Charta as the “Great Writ of Liberty***”, this by a ***DEPUTY*** ***~~jerk~~*** clerk (??) of the CALIFORNIA supreme Court, that:

‘the questions you ask are ***BEYOND*** the jurisdiction of California courts as they appear to raise ***federal*** issues’.

Not only is this correct, it is a concession that, ***exactly*** as we will be claiming, ***WITH attitude and WITH authority***, that CALIFORNIA, and all like situated States, is ***NOT a sovereign, independent State admitted into “this Union***”. Had the Justices any of this ***ON THE RECORD***, they would no doubt be in close proximity to ***Cell 2455 San Quentin prison***.

Yet in ***stark contrast*** to this, with the Secretary of State conceding that “***The California Constitution of 1849 has NOT (!) been repealed***”, more of that ‘***pesky***’ ***relevant, admissible documentary evidence***, would be assertively presented to a common law Jury, ***WITH*** the power to rule on the facts ***and the law***, to get their decision on this matter, ***EITHER*** way of which is a ***WIN*** for me, and all of us.

***Article VI, Section 1 clearly and unambiguously*** establishes the **California District Court** ***as a constitutional, common law Court, contemporaneously*** recognized as such by the California supreme Court (thankfully ***PRE***-Tani et al) – see e.g. ***Ex parte Knowles 5 Cal. 300***, and ***Article VI, Section 7*** provides that:

“The District Courts shall have ***original*** jurisdiction, in law and equity, in all civil cases where the amount in dispute exceeds two hundred dollars, exclusive of interest. In all criminal cases not otherwise provided for, ***and in all issues of fact joined in the probate courts, their jurisdiction shall be unlimited”***

No doubt this is true in ***ALL*** States admitted into “***this Union***”. Do you suppose that a Jury, assuming arguendo that you have any status and standing in a ***judicial*** Court, will have any problem understanding this ***clear and concise language*** ??

And we haven’t even discussed the multiple outright denials of ***UNOPPOSED*** ***Non***-statutory ***federal*** Writs of Habeas Corpus in other cases which have occurred, each one of which are ***acts of Treason*** – ***Cohens***, infra.

All of this, however, can be avoided if we can reach a ***good faith, timely, and mutually agreeable settlement***, one reflecting both the ***magnitude*** of the issues arising from ***ALL 6 Articles of the CuS***, ***punitive and exemplary*** damages and, very probably, including amounts stemming from ‘official’ actors in positions of “***honor***, profit and ***trust***” in the de facto government, like ***your Governor, your local Dumb Ass and black robed bastards ,*** committing multiple acts of ***Treason*** to the Constitution as per ***Cohens*** ***v Virginia 6 Wheat. 264***:

***“It is most true that this Court will not take jurisdiction if it should not***; but it is equally true that it ***must*** ***take jurisdiction if it should***. The judiciary cannot, as the legislature may, avoid a measure because it approaches the confines of the Constitution. We cannot pass it by because it is doubtful. With whatever doubts, with whatever difficulties, a case may be attended, ***we must decide it if it be brought before us. We have no more right to decline the exercise of jurisdiction which is given than to usurp that which is not given. The one or the other would be treason to the Constitution***.”

Not even mentioned yet is the fact that there was and ***IS*** no ***KNOWN*** right to ***effective*** assistance counsel, this in what would be established to be at least a ***quasi-criminal*** jurisdiction, simply ***NOT*** attainable from any ‘state’ ***Bar A$$***ociation attorneys /aka/ unregistered foreign agents of ***at least the City of London***, which have ***irreconcilable conflicts of interest*** with ***at least lawful, de jure, jus sanguinis State Citizens***, and without any ***meaningful and substantive curricula*** in the ***mandatory*** public “***education***” system for the study of the Constitution, history and laws of the united States,, no way to have known about any of these ***structural, jurisdictional*** errors, thus ***NO*** ***allegedly applicable statutes of limitation*** are involved here.

In closing, I note that in any ensuing action, both you and your cohorts, not to mention ***ALL*** of the other ‘official’ actors /aka/ ‘***perps***’, involved, will face a ***withering, unrelenting*** cross-examination by Counsel ***UNFILTERED*** (!) by any of your ‘***usually reliable***’ ‘state’ ***Bar A$$***ociation attorneys.

Your ***PROMPT*** attention to this matter will be expected.

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

***Joe Sixpack***