***William Henshall***

***P. O. Box 281676***

***San Francisco, California***

***650-267-9350//youwinincourt@gmail.com***

To; Presiding judge US District Court

In re: In Re Matter of ***\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_*** -- Filing documents

Please find enclosed documents, including, in effect, a Petition for a ***NON***-statutory ***federal*** Writ of Habeas Corpus, which invokes the concurrent ***judicial*** power of the united States in an ***Article III*** Circuit Court.

As per other Briefs and Affidavits, available on request to be filed, which will ***NOT*** have a chance to filed or be heard in a trial ‘court’, ***at least Article I, Section 9 or 10*** of, as the case may be and/or the ***9th Article of Amendment*** to, the ***Constitution for the united States {1787-1791} (CuS)***, secures the ***Right*** to invoke the ***judicial*** power of the united States in the ***first*** instance, as well as invoking the ***Right*** to trial by Jury according to the course of the common law, a ***Right*** secured to even ‘***inhabitants of territories’*** by ***Article II of the Northwest Ordinance of 1787*** as reenacted by the first Congress, will be violated if not obliterated..

You should take ***CLOSE*** notice of the very recent decision in the Covid Vaccine case, ***Ohio et al v OSHA***, by the US supreme Court (my highlighted and lightly annotated version of concurring opinion accompanying), if you haven’t already ‘gotten the message’, in which they ***clearly and unambiguously*** acted as an ***Article III judicial court*** ordained and established by ‘***this Constitution’,*** for the first time in, ***VERY*** arguably, ***90 years,*** and will now expect you to do likewise.

Among other things, this means that lower courts once again have at least ***Article III case or controversy*** jurisdiction and that ***ALL*** ‘official’ actors, in positions of “***honor***, profit and ***trust***” in the ***de facto*** government have the ***SWORN*** duty to act accordingly.

To do now otherwise, would be, for all apparent intents and purposes, not only refusing to exercise jurisdiction with which this court is vested, but to continue to ***actively aid and abet*** ‘courts’ /aka/ administrative tribunals, to exercise jurisdiction they do ***NOT*** have, which the supreme Court succinctly opined, in a unanimous decision of the Court, by Chief Justice John Marshall, ***Cohens v Virginia 6 Wheat 264***, that:

***“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***.”

And

“The case of a State which pays off its own debts with paper money no more resembles this than do those to which we have already adverted. The Courts have no jurisdiction over the contract. They cannot enforce it, nor judge of its violation. ***Let it be that the act discharging the debt is a mere nullity, and that it is still due***. But suppose a State to institute proceedings against an individual which depended upon the validity of an act emitting bills of credit; ***suppose a State to prosecute one of its citizens for refusing paper money***, who should plead the Constitution in bar of such prosecution. If his plea should be overruled, and judgment rendered against him, his case would resemble this; and, unless the jurisdiction of this Court might be exercised over it, the ***Constitution would be violated***, ***and the injured party be unable to bring his case before that tribunal to which the people of the United States have assigned all such cases***.”

Well worthy of note at the outset is the ***ASTOUNDING*** fact that, in effect, two different heads of two ***purportedly*** different departments of government have reached ***irreconcilably*** different ***documented*** conclusions as to whether California is a State admitted into “***this Union***”, with the office of the Secretary of State, ***THE*** department of government in which this matter would be ***peculiarly well known***, stating that “***The*** ***California Constitution of 1849*** has ***NOT*** been repealed”, which ***clearly and unambiguously*** means, for openers, that the sovereign body politic of the State of California, as set forth in ***Article II, Section 1*** thereof, is “***free, white male and 21 years old*** (see e.g. ***Van Valkenburg v Brown 43 Cal. 43; Scott v Sandford 19 How. 393***), ***ALL*** of which is true in any State.

At one and the same time, we have the CALIFORNIA supreme court having stated, albeit ‘courtesy’ of, in effect, summary, ex parte 12(b)(6) “denials” of my ***UNOPPOSED*** Petitions for ***NON***-statutory ***Federal*** Writs of Habeas Corpus, one by ***DEPUTY ~~jerk~~ clerk***(??) of the CALIFORNIA supreme ‘court’ (***separation of powers***, anyone ?) and/or now, ‘courtesy’ of the ***BS Covid ‘Plandemic***’, refusal to ***FILE*** any documents making a ‘timely’ challenge to jurisdiction, in any ‘court’ whatsoever, that “the questions presented are ***BEYOND*** the jurisdiction of California courts as they appear to present federal questions” .

With serious claims being advanced these days that a ‘transgender’ entity has the right to select its own ***public*** bathroom since taking a crap in a ***government funded*** (??) bathroom ***affects interstate commerce’***, seemingly the ***ONLY*** way this is possible is ***IF*** California has, on who knows ***WHAT*** provision(s) of the ***CuS***, been relegated, for all apparent intents and purposes, to, at ***BEST*** (!), a ***federal (insular) territorial possession***, if not merely ‘***appurtenant***’ to the United States (see e.g. ***Jones v US 137 US 202***) and at least the sovereign body politic of California reduced to a condition of ***statelessness*** !(“***CONSENT*** of the governed”, anyone ??)

If ***THIS*** isn’t the ***Black’s Law Dictionary*** definition of an ***Article III case or controversy***, one especially cognizable in the ***ORIGINAL*** jurisdiction of the US supreme Court, then the Nation and Republic has been extinct for ***160*** years and with no one, ***outside of 120 Broadway, NY, NY***, apparently any the wiser.

Take close notice here that the transgender case ***also*** emanates from the “interstate” commerce clause power of ***CON***gress, and with the Justices, having ***overtly*** cited ***ALA Schechter Poultry v US***, seemingly poised to entertain such cases, as the instant case, almost certainly with the same, ***albeit long overdue***, result ***consistent*** with the ***CuS***, ***NOT*** in ***direct contravention*** of it.

We then come to the recent ‘dissenting’ opinion of ***Justices Alito and Thomas*** in ***Texas v California Case No. 153 Original*** jurisdiction, that this was not then, nor is it now, only us saying this, since the opinion ***clearly*** and ***unambiguously*** recited ***exactly*** the same language from ***Cohens, supra***.

And on further discussion of, in effect, how “***ALL***” in ***Article III, Section 2*** somehow does ***NOT*** mean ***ALL***, seems to admit of only 2 possibilities, either or both of which ***ADD*** more substance to our positions as ‘timely’ set forth in our ***UNOPPOSED*** pleadings: 1) that the US supreme Court has somehow ***usurped*** the power to amend the ***CuS***, heretofore thought to have been vested ***solely*** in ***Article V*** thereof.

Or 2) that there are in fact ***NO*** States remaining which ***were*** admitted into “***this Union***”, again ***seemingly*** without any ***KNOWN*** authority, but in all likelihood yet another ***fatuous fiction of law*** which was ***carefully concealed*** from ***ALL*** who ‘ratified’ the ***NON***-existent 14th ***war*** “amendment” (***NEFWA)***, ‘conveniently creating’ a ***SUBORDINATE*** corporate body politic, except the ***NY Bank$ter$*** and their ***sycophantic, serpentine, sphincteresque satraps*** /aka/ members of the ***Secret Committee of 15 on Reconstruction***, which provides a ***very*** ‘plausible’ explanation for the actions of the Court in this area, including denying another attempt by Texas, and other States to even ***FILE*** documents in the recent “election” case, let alone hear the case, in that ***WITHOUT*** any States remaining, there ***seems*** to be ***NO*** Petitioner who would retain status and standing to challenge such violations of the court’s ***mandatory*** ***original*** jurisdiction (see e.g. ***Ashwander v TVA 297 US 288,341***).

And ***THIS*** is the big deal ! The mainstream media were just off by ***FIVE*** words (cases in which a ***State***…”), since State does ***NOT*** mean State, but it can’t be that the Justices would make this type of mistake, especially in view of the history of the ***RAT***ification of ***NEFWA***.

“Mistakes” were made by ***ALL*** ‘official’ actors in the instant case as they would have been confronted with ***800*** (!) pages of ***UNOPPOSED*** challenges to the jurisdiction of the trial ‘court’, with such actors having ***at least*** the ***SWORN*** duty to be ***BOUND*** by “***this Constitution*** and the laws enacted ***in pursuance thereof***” (***Article VI, Sec. 2***), to sustain ***at least*** the government’s burden of proof on ***jurisdiction and venue of the trial ‘court***’., notwithstanding the ***FACT*** that these documents are in accord with, indeed amplified by, the opinion in ***Texas v California***.

As the record will enlighteningly establish, this ***never*** occurred, most ***conspicuously*** with no opportunity to file a ***Demand for a Bill of Particulars***, which made it ***IMPOSSIBLE*** for Petitioner to put on ***ANY*** defense, assuming arguendo that he ***had*** been served, let alone a ***meaningful*** and ***substantive*** defense ***mandated*** by the ***CuS***, as set forth, infra.

And for a variety of reasons, which include the present and ongoing Democrat court-packing plan, with the possibility of the current occupant of the White House /aka/ Biden, adding as many Justices to the Court as he would like, perhaps ‘courtesy’ of an Executive Order acting as ***Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces***, apparently having learned nothing from like, albeit equally ***ILL advised*** efforts of ***FDR*** in an earlier era, and this a ***dead-bang*** giveaway as to the true jurisdiction of the trial ‘court’ in the instant case, this long awaited train of thought on the supreme Court is likely ***not*** limited to 2 justices, as the recent decision in ***Ohio vs OSHA proves***, about which a ***LOT*** more can and will be said in any ensuing action, ***IF*** one is necessary.

Addressing some of the ***allegedly*** applicable issues which might arise, we first address the decision of the US supreme court in ***Eerie RR v Tompkins 304 US*** ***64***, which was based on the “equal protection of the law”, which clearly emanates from Section 1 of ***NEFWA***, a fortiori with ***Eerie***, an artificial, corporate entity, “owing its ***birthright citizenship***” to Section 1 of ***NEFWA*** (see e.g. the opinion of Justice Hugo L. Black in ***Connecticut Insurance v Johnson 303 US 77,87***), not to mention its ***privileged*** existence, being limited to legislative tribunals and ***NOT*** being able to present any ***judicial*** questions (accord ***US v Rhodes 27 Fed Cases 785***).

Putting it more succinctly, ***Eerie***, like a long train of ***BS*** decisions by the US supreme court on ***NEFWA***, is ***easily*** distinguishable from the instant case, as the Justices noted in their opinion in ***Ashwander v TVA 297 US 288, 341***, when they opined: “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***”.

Ditto for the ***Federal Rules of Civil Procedure*** which, like so much legislation of ***CON***gress was enacted without anything ***remotely resembling*** either a quorum to do business in either House and/or a ratio of representation in the House, with the FRCP very likely removing any and all ***judicial*** power from federal courts (see e.g. ***Dissents from the adoption of amendments to the FRCP by Justices Black and Douglas at 374 US 865 and 383 US 1032***).

Also duly noted, with ***documented, relevant, admissible*** evidence being filed in this case, is that there are ***NO*** States remaining which ***were*** admitted into “***this Union***”, noting that the California supreme court has conceded that California is ***NOT*** a State, supra, and that the US supreme court has ruled, in ***Snow v US 85 US 317 and Ex Parte Crow Dog 109 US 665***, that territorial tribunals have ***dual*** jurisdictions, one as a territorial tribunal and the other as an ***Article III*** Circuit Court, and these platinum authorities seem to leave ***NO*** room for doubt.

In the alternative, and with ***judicial*** Courts ***REQUIRED*** to exist in any State admitted into “***this Union***”, if you can produce a ***viable*** factual foundation and legal basis for there being ***NO*** judicial power of the united States in your court, I would be much obliged if you would forward these documents to, at least in California, the County Clerk, an office designated in ***Article VI, Section 10*** of the California Constitution as ‘***ex officio clerk of the District court’***, a constitutional common law court established by ***Art. VI, Section 1***, which would recognize the claims being made, and which was ***contemporaneously*** recognized by the California supreme court in ***Ex Parte Knowles 5 Cal. 300***.

In addition this officer should be ***ordered***, in ***NO*** uncertain terms to ***FILE*** any and all documents ***without regard*** to any ***allegedly applicable*** forms, fees or any statutory ***BS*** created by the legislature and/or the ‘state’ Bar Association, since any such actions would plainly result in at least the suspension of the ***non***-statutory ***federal*** Habeas Corpus ***WITHOUT*** any ***known***, declared state of ***rebellion or invasion*** which ***MIGHT*** provide grounds for even a ***temporary*** suspension of the Great Writ of Liberty (see e.g. ***Ex Parte Merryman 17 Fed. Cases 144***).

Furthermore, there is ***NO*** need for any statutory authority, most especially civil “rights” statutes, all ***war*** acts of ***CON***gress, when common law actions like ***trespass vi et armis*** and ***assumpsit*** are readily available, this in a common law court and with a Jury that can rule on the facts ***and the law*** (see e.g. ***Brailsford v Georgia 3 Dallas 1; “Essay on Trial by Jury” (1850) by Lysander Spooner).***

And how, one might well ask, is it reasonable to presume that a ***CON***gress which is totally bereft of anything ***remotely resembling*** either a quorum to do business or a ratio of representation and without anyone in positions of “***honor***, profit and ***trust***” in government, only those who “owe their ***birthright citizenship***” to Section 1 of the ***NON***-existent 14th ***war*** “amendment”, which I can destroy in front of a ‘judge’, Jury or the US supreme Court in ***a cappella fashion***, would pass ***ANY*** laws to help ***at least*** lawful, de jure, ***jus sanguinis*** State Citizens with whom ***ALL*** members of government have ***irreconcilable conflicts of interest*** with our ***Rights*** secured by ***ALL 6 Articles of the*** ***CuS*** ?

Notably in the instant case, it does ***NOT*** matter that Petitioner was not served, a ***MAJOR*** ***structural, jurisdictional*** error in any event, since s/he would not have enjoyed the ***Right*** to ***effective*** assistance of counsel, who would have been ***reasonably*** expected to know all of the ***UNOPPOSED*** Constitutional issues presented here, as mentioned in the ***Bill of Particulars, Motion to Dismiss, Brief on 14th Amendment and Conditional Acceptance of Counsel***, digital copies of which are cheerfully available on request.

You can dispense with any claim that Congress is ***NOT*** required to create any ***Article III judicial courts***, as evidently expressed in ***Cary v Curtis 3 How. 245*** and/or ***Sheldon v Sill 8 How. 441***, distinguishable cases both (***Ashwander***), with the paramount authority of the supreme Court holding otherwise in ***Martin v Hunter’s Lessee 1 Wheat. 304***, as also set forth in ***Story’s Commentaries***, noting his ***cogent and compelling dissent*** in ***Cary,*** and noting the opinion of Chief Justice John Marshall, that infallible icon of Harvard and Yale, who was ***NEVER*** wrong (was he ?) for the court, in ***Cohens, supra***, in the following excerpts:

While weighing arguments drawn from the nature of government and from the general spirit of an instrument, and urged for the purpose of narrowing the construction which the words of that instrument seem to require, it is proper to place in the opposite scale those principles, drawn from the same sources, which go to sustain the words in their full operation and natural import. One of these, which has been pressed with ***great force*** by the counsel for the plaintiffs in error, is that ***the judicial power of every well constituted government must be coextensive with the legislative, and must be capable of deciding every judicial question which grows out of the Constitution and laws***.

***If any proposition may be considered as a political axiom, this, we think, may be so considered***. In reasoning upon it as an abstract question, there would, probably, exist ***no*** contrariety of opinion respecting it. Every argument proving the necessity of the department proves also the propriety of giving this extent to it. We do not mean to say that the jurisdiction of the Courts of the Union should be construed to be coextensive with the legislative merely because it is fit that it should be so; but we mean to say that this fitness furnishes an argument in construing the Constitution ***which ought never to be overlooked***, and which is most especially entitled to consideration when we are inquiring whether the words of the instrument which purport to establish this principle shall be contracted for the purpose of destroying it.

 (***Exactly*** the argument being presented here and consistent with the ***original intent*** of the Framers of the Constitution !! Where did we “waive” this right ?)

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

“It has been generally held that the State courts have a ***concurrent jurisdiction with the federal Courts***, in cases to which the judicial power is extended, unless the jurisdiction of the federal Courts be rendered exclusive by the words of the third article. If the words, "to all cases," give exclusive jurisdiction in cases affecting foreign ministers, they may also give exclusive jurisdiction, if such be the will of Congress (***NO, NO, NO*** -- discussion for another day !), in cases arising under the Constitution, laws, and treaties of the United States”

Where can we find this concurrent jurisdiction ***NOW*** ?

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

“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 it’s 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.”

 ***THE*** best quote of all time from the Court !

 ***And just where did we “waive” THIS Right ????***

1. A reminder that as a ***purported*** judicial officer of an ***Article III judicial Court***, you have not only the power, but the ***SWORN*** duty, being ***BOUND*** by “***this Constitution*** and the laws enacted ***in pursuance thereof***”, to file all documents in chambers, perhaps in the ***miscellaneous*** (?!?) docket of the Court.

The Court made this ***quite*** clear in ***Nashville RR v Wallace 288 US 249*** when they opined:

“The issues raised here are the same as those which, under old forms of procedure, could be raised only in a suit for an injunction or one to recover the tax after its payment. ***But the Constitution does not require that the case or controversy should be presented by traditional forms of procedure, invoking only traditional remedies. The judiciary clause of the Constitution defined and limited judicial power, not the particular method by which that power might be invoked.*** It did not crystallize into changeless form the procedure of 1789 as the only possible means for presenting a case or controversy otherwise cognizable by the federal courts. ***Whenever the judicial power is invoked to review a judgment of a state court, the ultimate constitutional purpose is the protection, by the exercise of the judicial function, of rights arising under the Constitution and laws of the United States.*** The states are left free to regulate their own judicial procedure. Hence, changes merely in the form or method of procedure by which federal rights are brought to final adjudication in the state courts are not enough to preclude review of the adjudication by this Court, so long as the case retains the essentials of an adversary proceeding, involving a real, not a hypothetical, controversy, which is finally determined by the judgment below.”

And notwithstanding any purported opposition which could possibly be presented against these ***platinum*** authorities, the absence of any possibility to invoke ***at least*** the ***judicial*** power of the united States, every law on the books would, ***res ipsa loquitor***, be ***NULL and VOID*** as a ***Bill of Attainder***, /aka/ ***Writ of Praecipe***, which is prohibited by ***Article I, Section 9 or 10***, as the case may be of, and/or the ***9th Article of Amendment*** to, the ***CuS***.

In conclusion, if you do ***NOT*** file ***ALL*** documents as hereinabove mentioned, I demand that you issue an order of denial ***ON THE RECORD*** and with any and all ***allegedly applicable*** factual foundations and legal bases as would defeat any and all of those presented herein and ***UNOPPOSED*** every time they have been presented to de facto ‘courts’.

This order will assure, to the ***maximum practicable extent***, that the matter ***WILL*** be reviewed in the US supreme Court as set forth in ***Cohens*** excerpts, supra and pursuant to their ***sanctimoniously self-proclaimed DUTY*** to say “what the law ***IS***” (***Marbury v Madison 1 Cr. 137***).

Your ***PROMPT*** attention to this matter will be expected, with ***ALL*** documents ***FILED***, ***WITHOUT any purportedly required forms or fees***, with any needed hearings set, and stamp ***FILED*** copies of the accompanying Title Pages of ***ALL*** documents returned to me in the ***SASE*** provided for this purpose, in order that I can then effect service of process on any Respondents having standing.

Constitutionally,

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

***William Henshall*** -- ***Private Attorney General***

***Section 35 of the Judiciary Act of 1789, 1 Statutes at Large 73, et seq.***

***First Judicial District***

***P. O. Box 281676***

***San Francisco, California, united States***

***cc/ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_***

 ***\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_***

 ***\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_***