Superior Common law

Court of Record, *nisi prius* Court

Montcalm County Venue

MRE Rule 202

Andrew Stuart Ouwenga, Sui Juris Case No.

 Grievant,

 Hon. \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

 vs. Judge/Magistrate

Reynolds Township Board Re: Tacit Agreement by ‘Default’.

Members, Sui Juris, et al. MCL 440.3601, NIHIL DICIT

 Respondents.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_/

**WRIT IN THE NATURE OF**

**MANDAMUS**

REQUEST FOR ACCOUNTING, MCL 440.9210

**DEFAULT JUDGMENT** F.R.C.P. Rule 55, MCR 2.603(A)(1), MCR 2.116(G)(3)

**OR**

**ORDER TRIAL BY THE JURY**

7th. Amendment

MCR 2.603 (B)(3)(b)(iv), MCR 2.605 (B)

**STATEMENT OF ACCOUNT**

By AFFIDAVIT

**FACTS:** I, Andrew Stuart: Ouwenga, here in the Grievant; the ‘Attorney in Fact’, am here by special appearance and hereby evoke the common law jurisdiction of the Court, as secured by the Northwest Territorial Ordinance of July 13, 1787 Article II and the 1963 constitution for “The State Of Michigan” Article I section 23. As the prosecuting witness I am one of the ‘People’, a ‘Man’, having a ‘Natural Person’ in the State of Michigan, and in my Superior Court of Record under Common Law.

 It is the wish of the Superior Court that the inferior *‘corporate municipal court’* recognize the jurisdiction of the subject matter of this Superior Court as denoted on the heading of this instant document.

 The present matter before the Court of Equity is to ORDER a DEFAULT Judgment regarding unrebutted Affidavits, [MCR 2.116(G)(3) & MCR 2.603 (A)(1)]. If the attached DEFAULT ORDER is not signed, the Superior Court demands to have the Jury adjudicate the FACTS and Reynolds Township Default until such time as the issues in the Superior Court are settled by the Jury as noted in MCR 2.603 (B)(3)(b)(iv) & MCR 2.605 (B).

 [BLD 4th.] - A **‘Court’,** - In **‘International Law’** is “the person [Name] and suite [Body] of the sovereign [Man created]; the place where the sovereign sojourns with his regal retinue, wherever that may be.” - [The triad being of Man, regal retinue, Gen. 1:26,27 & 2:7]

 - It is the Court of the People described at Article 4, Sec. 2 of the United States Constitution in their Sovereign status as it is defined, and not those ‘U.S. citizen’ who are subject to the Inferior Corporate Court of Equity.

 [BLD 4th.] “A **‘court of record’** is a judicial **tribunal** having attributes and exercising functions **independently** of the person of the magistrate designated generally to hold it, and proceeding according to the course of common law.” - [The Man is of the Sovereign as defined in *United States Supreme Court* decisions, and he is the court, making a special appearance]

**SUBJECT MATTER:** The Grievant’s ‘Court of Record’ cites the following in pursuit of an ‘Order’ from Reynolds Township Board to direct Montcalm County Board of Supervisors as noted in Section 238 of ‘**THE LAW OF TAXATION IN MICHIGAN’** [See pg. 11]**;** to remove the assigns to patented private properties listed below from the public tax roll and to have 2015 and 2016 tax bills expunged as agreed upon by Reynolds Township and the Grievant due to the Township’s lack of ‘Verification’, ‘Attestation’ and ‘Authentication’, and to award damages according to agreement.

**AGREEMENT BY DEFAULT**

‘The ‘attached’ Statements of Account have all gonewithout response or rebut by Affidavit, which is evidenced by the Board’s complete silence. The Board’s silence establishes an ESTOPPEL BY SILENCE and therefore is in agreement with Grievant’s conclusions that ‘private’ property is not subject to property taxes. [Michigan’s Constitution **Article. 9, Sec. 5**, & F.R.C.P. Rule 55, MCR 2.603] - (See attached)

 1. Invoice No. 01925795 Nisi Showcase Statement. 2. Invoice No. 01925054 Notice of Default. 3. Invoice No. 01925788 Notice of Default, Opportunity to Cure. 4. Invoice No. 01925702 Cost of Damages in FRNs caused by Fraudulent Receipts. 5. NOTORIAL PROTEST.

Under **THE GENERAL PROPERTY TAX ACT (EXCERPT) Act 206 of 1893**, - MCL 211.78k regarding the **“validity . . . to County’s claiming an interest”** in one’s private property there are three options to challenge the County’s claim, the first is under - **(a),** ‘No law authorizes the tax’, the second is from, **(c),** ‘The property was exempt from the tax in question, or the tax was not legally levied’, and the third under, **(e),** ‘The tax was assessed fraudulently’.

 Each of these requirements are addressed within the following list of **FACTS.**

**FACTS**

**1.]** The Grievant is the ‘holder-in-due course’ and ‘Secured Party Creditor’ of the properties in controversy filed with the Secretary of State’s UCC Office, ‘Document Filing Numbers’, 2005213105-1.

**2.]** [NO DIRECT TAX]The alleged ‘Property Taxes’ on these private properties are in violation of the **U.S. Constitution Article 1, Sec. 8, Cl. 4,** which states, “No Capitation, or other direct, Tax shall be laid, unless in Proportion to the Census or enumeration herein before directed to be taken.”

**3.]** [PRIVATE PROPERTY EXEMPT] According to **Michigan’s Constitution Art. 9, Sec. 5**, it gives notice as to the ‘class’ or ‘classes’ upon which property taxes are applied, it states that an ‘ad valorem tax’ can only be applied to **commercial, industrial, and utility property,** not private property.

 **Section 5** - “. . . The rate of taxation on such property shall be the average rate levied upon **other commercial, industrial, and utility property** in this state under the **general ad valorem tax** law . . .”

**4.]** [NON-NEGOTIABLE] - The Grievant is in possession of six alleged property tax ‘Bills’ of the assigns to patented private property, twelve alleged ‘Bills’ for 2015 and 2016; alleged ‘Bills’ that were sent and received, without **any ‘signature’** [MCL 440.1201 (‘kk’-Signed)] to validate said ‘claims’; a requirement necessary to authenticate ‘Bills of Exchange’, [UCC 3-401] supporting the fact that said private properties are not subject to taxation, all of which have been returned and refused for cause. [See Exhibits].

 **UCC 3-401**, (a) A person is not liable on an instrument unless (i) the person signed the instrument.

 **UCC Section 3-104, ‘Official Comment’** – “. . . Thus, the term “negotiable instrument” is limited to a **signed** writing that orders or promises payment of money.

 [BLD 4th.] **‘BILL OF EXCHANGE’**, “An unconditional order in writing addressed by one person to another, signed by the person giving it, requiring the person to whom it is addressed to pay on demand or at a fixed or determinable future time as sum certain in money to order or to bearer.”

[BLD 4th.] **SIGNATURE**, “The act of putting down **a man’s name at the end of an instrument** to attest its validity, the name thus written. A “signature” may be written by hand, printed, stamped, typewritten, engraved, photographed, or cut from one instrument and attached to another, and a signature lithographed on an instrument by a party is sufficient for the purpose of signing it; it being immaterial with what kind of instrument a signature is made.

**5.]** [FRAUD] - According to these ‘Statements of Account’ the Township Board and in particular the Treasurer is in violation of MCL 750.157v regarding ‘false statements’, has “failed to state a claim in which relief can be granted” [Article 1, Sec. 10, Cl. 1].

 Payments and Obligations Due to Michigan come under **Act 20 of 1842**, which states, “No receiving officer shall be required to receive **in payment** of any debt, taxes or other obligation collectible or receivable by him any tender other than gold or silver coin of the United States, United States treasury notes, gold certificates, silver certificates **or federal reserve bank notes”**, (FRBN’s).

With only Federal Reserve Notes available, the Grievant is left without any means by which to make lawful payment.

 In the absence of any response from Reynolds Township Board to validate their claim against my private property, they have agreed by default, that the alleged ‘bills’ that were sent are voidable; are in fact ‘fraudulent receipts’ as noted in MCL 750.278 being non-negotiable.

**6.]** [MAIL FRAUD] - The ‘fraudulent receipts’ that I am in receipt of came to me by U.S. Mail

Service and according to **18 USC Sec. 1341,** the fraudulent use of the U.S. Mail is considered mail

fraud.

**Section 1341** states in pertinent part:

 “Whoever, having devised or intending to devise any scheme or artifice to defraud, or for obtaining money or property by means of false or fraudulent pretenses, representations, . . . or anything represented to be or intimated or held out to be such counterfeit or spurious article, for the purpose of executing such scheme or artifice or attempting so to do, places in any post office or authorized depository for mail matter, . . . shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than 20 years, or both.

**7.]** [NOTARIAL PROTEST] - In granting the Treasurer and the Reynolds Township Board members, Sui Juris, et al, one last opportunity to cure their present default, as a witness to this present matter, Brian Campbell, a notary public in and for the county of Montcalm in the state of Michigan, sent a ‘Notarial Protest’ [Section 250 ‘PROTEST’ No. 14, ‘The Notary’s Manual’] challenging Reynolds Township claim/bills for taxes; by the use of **‘non-Negotiable Instruments’, absent of ‘signatures’** [MCL 440.1201 (‘kk’-signed) & UCC Sec. 3-401] to validate and authenticate said claims. The requirement for a ‘signature’ is noted in Section 158 for ‘bills of exchange’ found in ‘The Notary’s Manual’, Ninth Edition andUCC 3-104 on ‘negotiable instrument’. **8.]** [NO CONTRACT] – The Board Members have failed to produce evidence of being the ‘holder-in-due course’ [MCL 440.3305] of a **contract** [MCL 440.3305 (3) and MCL 440.1203] that the Township has with the Grievant that would validate the alleged ‘Bills’ received by the Grievant, which are rescinded [MCL 440.3202 & 3204]; as such all claims against said private properties must be expunged for lack of contract and validation of lawful authority.

 **MCL 440.3305(3),** “. . . An obligor is not obliged to pay the instrument if the person seeking enforcement of the instrument does not have right of a ‘holder in due course’ . . .”

 The alleged bills have a **coupon** attached which indicates that there is a ‘contract’ to support it. I am not aware of any contract between the Township and me.

 [BLD 6th.] **COUPONS**, “Interest and dividend certificates; also those parts of a commercial instrument which are to be cut, and which are evidence of something connected with the **contract** mentioned in the instrument.”

 There is a **‘MORT CODE’** on the COUPON which applies to a dead person, a CORPORATE legal entity; a ‘private person’, a ‘Corpse’, so it’s not something that I would use. Because it’s codified [MORT CODE], this whole instrument comes under suspension.

**NO COMMERCIAL AGREEMENT**

 **Regarding the Reynolds Township Corporation:** - “**Governments** descend to the level of a mere private corporation and takes on the character of a mere private citizen where private corporate commercial paper (securities) are concerned.” “This entity cannot compel performance upon its corporate statute or rules unless it, like any other corporation or person is the holder-in-due course of some contract or commercial agreement between it and the party upon whom the payment and performance are made and thereby, willing to produce said documents and place the same evidence before trying to enforce its demands called statutes.　For purposes of suit, such corporations and individuals **are regarded as entities entirely separate from government.”**

 - - *Bank of US v. Planters Bank, 9 Wheaton (22 US) 904, 6 L. Ed. 24, Clearfield Trust Co. v. United States 318 U.S. 363-371 (1942).*

 "The state citizen is immune from any and all government attacks and procedure, absent contract." see, Dred Scott vs. Sanford, 60 U.S. (19 How.) 393 - - or as the Supreme Court has stated clearly, “…every man is independent of all laws, except those prescribed by nature. He is not bound by any institutions formed by his fellowmen without his consent.” *CRUDEN vs. NEALE, 2 N.C. 338 2 S.E. 70*

**9.]** [LAND PATENT EXCLUSION] **MCL 211.1 Property subject to taxation.** Sec. 1, “that all property, real and personal, within the jurisdiction of this state; not expressly exempted, shall be subject to taxation.”

 **MCL 211.135, Recording of conveyances; tax certificate; excepted conveyances; register of deeds; violation; penalty.** (6) This Section **does not apply** to any of the following:

 (f) To any **patent** executed by the president of the United States or the governor of this state.

 The assigns to PATENTED property which has been removed from PUBLIC DOMAIN are not within the jurisdiction of this State.

 - **‘Land patent’** is defined [BLD] as, *“a muniment of title issued by a government or state for the conveyance of some portion of the* ***public domain****.”*

 - **‘Letters patent’** is defined [BLD] as *“open letters as distinguished from letters close. An instrument proceeding from the government, and conveying a right, authority, or grant to an individual, as a patent for* ***a tract of land****, or for the* ***exclusive right to*** *make and sell a new invention.”*

The **GRANT OF PRE-EMPTION RIGHTS** in the United States: [BLD 4th.] - “A privilege accorded by the government to the actual settler upon a certain limited portion of the public domain, to purchase such tract at a fixed price to the exclusion of all other applicants”

**Nine Court cases which validate the land patent:**

 1.] - - “A patent issued, by the government of the United States is legal and conclusive evidence of title to the land described therein. No equitable interest, however strong, to land described in such a patent, can prevail at law, against the patent.” - *[Land patents, opinions of the United States Attorney General’s office, Sept (1869)]*

 2.] - - “A patent is the highest evidence of title, and is conclusive against the government and all claiming under junior patents or titles, until it is set, aside or annulled by some judicial tribunal.” - *[(Stone v United States, 2 Wallace (69 U.S.) 765 (1865)]*

 3.] - - “Issuances of a government patent granting title to land is the most accredited type of conveyance known to our law.” - *[(United States v Creek Nation, 295 U.S. 103 (1935); see also United States v. Cherokee Nation, 474 F.2d 628 (1973)]*

 4.] - - “A patent of the United States; as a deed its operation is that of a quitclaim or rather of a conveyance of such interest as the United States possessed in the land.” - *[(Beard v. Federy, 70 U.S. 478, 3 Wall, 478, 18 L.Ed.88. (1865)]*

 5.] - - “A patent is absolute title to land, an exclusive title, or at least a title which excludes all others not compatible with it. A Perfect Title to land cannot exist at the same time in different persons or in different governments, a land patent excludes all others and governments. (BLD 4th) - - See *Bovey-Shute Lumber Co. v. Erickson, 41 N.D. 465, 170, N.W. 628, 630.*

 6.] - - “A patent is a complete appropriation of the land it describes; and at law, no defect in the preliminary steps can be tried.” - *Stringer’s Lessee v. Young, 3 Peters, 320; Boardman v. Reed’s Lessees, 6 Peters, 328; 10 Cond. Reps. 135.*

 7.] - - “Whatever may be the equities in third person, the patentee has the legal title; and a State law cannot confer on the equitable owner the rights to maintain an action of ejectment against the patentee.” - *Bagnell v. Broderick, 13 Peters, 436; 13 Condl Reps. 325.*

8.] - - “If the defendant have the prior patent for the land, the plaintiff can prevail in equity only by showing prior valid entries.” - *Hunt v. Wickliffe, 2 Peters, 201; 8 Cond. Reps. 85.*

9.] - - “The fee of lands sold by the United States, remains in the Government, until transferred by patent, which is a better legal title than a prior entry.” – *Carman v. Johnson, 20 Missouri Reports, 108.*

 **10.]** [ABSOLUTE OWNER]I have ‘Warranty Deeds’ for these properties, and according **to MCL 750.275,** a ‘warranty deed’ is considered an **‘absolute warranty deed’** having the same status as that of the original ‘PATENT’ as noted in the following quote:

 **Section 275** - - “Use of words **"warranty deed"** or similar words--Any person who shall print, sell or keep for sale any blank forms of deeds containing the words "warranty deed", or "warranty-deed-covenant-own-acts", or any similar words printed or written thereon, unless such deed is in fact an **absolute** **warranty deed**, and any person who shall knowingly use any such deed for the purpose of conveying title unless the same is an absolute warranty deed, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor.”

 [BLD 4th.] - “**Absolute** property is where a man hath solely and exclusively the right and also the occupation of movable chattels; distinguished from a qualified property, as that of a bailee.” - “In the law of insurance that is an **absolute** interest in property which is so completely vested in the individual that there could be **no danger of his being deprived of it** without his own consent.”

**11.]** [MAXIMS OF COMMERCE] Agreement or consent is addressed in MCR 2.603 and ‘Under Rules of Civil Procedure’ [Fed.R.Civil P. Rule 55]. Reynolds Township has not submitted an ‘Affidavit’ in their defense.

 [BLD 4th.] DEFAULT-JUDGMENT, “Judgment entered against a party who has failed to defend against a claim that has been brought by another party. Under Rules of Civil Procedure, when a party against whom a judgment for affirmative relief is sought has failed to plead (i.e. answer) or otherwise defend, he is in default and a judgment by default may be entered either by the clerk or the court.”

 The **MAXIMS OF COMMERCE** exists and functions without respect to courts or legal Systems, four of its principles are:

 1. ‘In Commerce truth is sovereign’.

 2. ‘Truth is expressed by means of an affidavit’.

 3. ‘An unrebutted affidavit stands as the truth in Commerce’.

 4. ‘An unrebutted affidavit becomes the judgment in Commerce’.

 **12.]** In that there are no opposing Affidavits, I have attached a Default Judgment ORDER for the Court to sign as authorized under F.R.C.P. Rule 55 and MCR 2.603.

**13.]** In the event that the ‘Default Judgment ORDER’ is not signed, this ‘Statement of Account’ will continue and move forward before a trial by Jury as prescribed under MCR 2.605 (B).

**DAMAGES INCURRED**

 According to the ‘Statement of Account’, ‘Invoice Number 01925795’, the Reynolds Township Board has by tacit agreement, agreed that it has perpetrated a fraudulent claim against the ‘Secured Party Creditor’, an imposition on private property under the ‘color of law’; making false statements, a violation ofMCL 750.157v; by assessing and taxing the assigns to patented properties list below; causing damages of historical proportions as far back as 1979 by the use of fraudulent ‘non-negotiable’ instruments.

 1.] 72 times mailing a false and unauthorized non-negotiable ‘bills of exchange’.

 2.] 72 times under the ‘color of law’ demanding and accepting payment in violation of Article 1, Section 10, Cl. 1.

 3.] 72 times using the mail to extort FRNs from me by the use of the U.S. Mail service; ‘mail fraud’, which must be returned.

 4.] 72 times applying a direct tax to private property in violation of Article 1, Sec. 9, Cl. 4.

 Total cost for damages: 25,000,000.00 Dollars in FRNs by ‘assignment’, a sum certain consistent with the value of said ‘Statement of Account’; Invoice No. 01925795 and 01925702, per our agreement; for the return of Federal Reserve Notes that were extorted and for the damages caused by this extortion which has limited the financial potential of Grievant’s ‘estate’.

**CONCLUSION/REMEDY**

 [BLD 4th.], DEFAULT, meaning “The state of a person who does not speak, or of one whorefrains from speaking”, “The omission or failure to perform a legal duty”.

 “In the law of estoppel, ‘silence’ implies knowledge and an opportunity to act upon it, “ESTOPPEL BY SILENCE”; embraces the idea of dishonesty.”

 WHEREFORE, Pursuant to the present agreement with the Reynolds Township, the Court has judicial authority to **‘order’** that the alleged ‘bills’ be expunged, and **‘order’** Reynolds Township Board to have the 6 ‘PARCELS’ of private real property listed below removed from the Montcalm County Public tax roll. This responsibility is noted and authorized in - ‘**THE LAW OF TAXATION IN MICHIGAN’**, **Section** **§238, ‘Presumptions’.** - - - states,

 “The tax rolls are facie evidence of the regularity of the tax. Hence, taxes will be presumed to be assessed for a public purpose and not for a purpose forbidden by law“. Inasmuch as the board of supervisors have no control over township taxes, a township tax will be presumed legal without an **order** or certificate from the board. . . ”

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

**DEFINITIONS**: Bill of exchange, Draft, Negotiable, Holder in due course, Signature and False Statements.

 **MCL 440.3305(3),** “. . . An obligor is not obliged to pay the instrument if the person seeking enforcement of the instrument does not have right of a ‘holder in due course’ . . .”

 **UCC Sec.3-104. Negotiable Instrument**. (a) Except as provided in subsections (c) and (d), “negotiable instrument,” means an unconditional **promise** or **order to pay** a fixed amount of money, with or without interest or other charges described in the promise or order.

 **UCC Sec. 3-104, ‘Official Comment’** – “. . . Thus, the term “negotiable instrument” is **limited to a signed writing** that orders or promises payment of money. (4) Instruments are divided into two general categories; drafts and notes. A draft is an instrument that is an order. A note is an instrument that is a promise. Section 3-104(e).

 **UCC Sec. 3-401** **Signature**. (a) A person is not liable on an instrument unless (1) the person signed the instrument, or (2) the person is represented by an agent or representative who signed the instrument and the signature is binding on the represented person under Section 3-402.

 [BLD 4th.] **SIGNATURE**, “The act of putting down **a man’s name at the end of an instrument** to attest its validity, the name thus written. A “signature” may be written by hand, printed, stamped, typewritten, engraved, photographed, or cut from one instrument and attached to another, and a signature lithographed on an instrument by a party is sufficient for the purpose of signing it; it being immaterial with what kind of instrument a signature is made.

 **MCL 440.1201 Definitions. (39)** **“Signed”** includes any symbol executed or adopted by a party with present intention to authenticate a writing, including a carbon copy of his or her signature.

 **NOTARY’S MANUAL**, [N.M.] ‘Bills of Exchange’, SECTION 158, - “Definition and nature of, a **bill of exchange** is an unconditional order in writing addressed by one person to another, **signed by the person** giving it, requiring the person to whom it is addressed to pay on demand or at a fixed or determinable future, a sum certain in money to order or to bearer.” - “**Bearer**”. One who bears, carries, or holds a thing. Defined by the ‘Negotiable Instruments Act’ as the person in possession of a bill or note which is payable to bearer. - [BLD 4th.] “**Draft**” is the common term for **a bill of exchange**; as being drawn by one person on another. - **“Bill”** means ‘bill of exchange’, and **“note”** means negotiable promissory note. - A **bill** of itself does not operate as an assignment of the funds in the hands of the drawee available for the payment thereof, and the drawee is not liable on the bill unless and until he accepts it.

 **MCL 750.157v, False statement of identity for purpose of procuring issuance of financial transaction device**. **Sec. 157v -**  A person who, knowingly and with intent to defraud, makes or causes to be made, directly or indirectly, a false statement in writing regarding his or her identity or that of any other person for the purpose of procuring the issuance of a financial transaction device, is guilty of a felony.

 **MRE, Rule 202. JUDICIAL NOTICE OF LAW** **(a) When Discretionary.**  A court may take judicial notice without request by a party of (1) the common law, constitutions, and public statutes in force in every state, territory, and jurisdiction of the United States; (2) private acts and resolutions of the Congress of the United States and of the Legislature of Michigan, and ordinances and regulations of governmental subdivisions or agencies of Michigan; and **(3) the laws of foreign countries**.

 **(b) When Conditionally Mandatory.** A court shall take judicial notice of each matter specified in paragraph (a) of this rule if **a party** requests it and (1) furnishes the court sufficient information to enable it properly to comply with the request (2) has given each adverse party such notice as the court may require to enable the adverse party to prepare to meet the request.

 **MCL 440.3601 Discharge; effect against holder in due course.** Sec. 3601. (1) The obligation of a party to pay the instrument is discharged as stated in this article or by an act or agreement with the party which would discharge an obligation to pay money under a simple contract. (2) Discharge of the obligation of a party is not effective against a person acquiring rights of a holder in due course of the instrument without notice of the discharge.

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

**List of private properties:**

PARCEL CODE NUMBER: 59-017-008-009-21

POSSIBLE OVERLAP IN DESC--SEE COMMENTS 682-822&695-1271 009-00/1992 009-20/1993PART OF S DES AS COM AT S 1/4 COR OF SEC 8; TH N 89 DEC W 1077.1 FT ALONG S SEC LINE TO POB; TH CONT FT; N 233.35 FT; S 89 DEC E 280 FT; S 233.35 FT TO P OF BEG SEC8 T12N RIO W 1.5 AC M/L 1/2 OF SW ¼ N 89 DEG W 280

PARCEL CODE NUMBER: 59-017-008-009-50

PARCEL B PART OF S 1/2 OF SW 1/4 DBS AS COM AT SW COR OF SEC 8; TH N 01 DEG W 300.02 FT ALONG W SEC LINE TO POB; TH N 85 DEG E 300 FT; N 01 DEG W 346.15 FT; 8 84 DEG W 300.08 FT TO W SEC LINE; S 01 DEG E 344.56 FT TO P OF BEG SEC 8 T12N R10W 2.38 AC *MIL*

PARCEL CODE NUMBER: 59-017-008-009-40

PARCEL A PART OF S 1/2 O F S W 1/4 DES A S C O M AT S W COR OF SEC 8: T H N 01 D E C W 644.58 FT A L O N G W SEC LINE T O ROB; TH N 85 DEC E 300.08 FT; N 01 D E C W 346.15 FT; S 84 DEC W 300.17 FT TO W SEC LINE; S 01 D E C E 344.56 FT TO P OF B E G SEC 8 T 1 2 N R 1 0W 2.38 AC M/L

PARCEL CODE NUMBER: 59-017-008-009-30

773-959 009-11/1996 PART OF SW 1/4 OF SW 1/4 DES AS COM AT SW COR OF SEC 8; TH N 01 DEC W 980.2 FT ALONG W SEC LINE TO POB; TH CONT N 01 DEC W ALONG W SEC LINE 330 FT TO W 1/8 COR OF SW 1/4; N 85 DEG E 660.77 FT ALONG S 1/8 LINE; S 01 DEG E 330 FT; S 85 DEG W 660.77 FT TO P OF BEG SEC 8 T12N R10W 5 AC M/L

PARCEL CODE NUMBER: 59-017-008-010-11

PART OF W 1/2 OF SE 1/4 DES AS COM AT E 1/4 COR OF SEC 8; TH N 89 DEC W 1302.58 FT ALONG E-W 1/4 LINE; S 02 DEG E 33 FT TO FOB; TH CONT S 02 DEG E 512.07 FT; S 87 DEG W 569.14 FT; S 04 DEG E 542.63 FT; S 86 DEG W 177.36 FT; S 04 DEG E 1238.15 FT; N 89 DEG W 637.81 FT TO N-S 1/4 LINE; N 01 DEG W 1704.98 FT; N 84 DEG E 474.69 FT; N 01 DEG W 463.64 FT TO A POINT 33 FT S OF E-W 1/4 LINE; N 83 DEG E 827.46 FT TO P OF BEG SEC 8T12N R10W 35.1 AC M/L

PARCEL CODE NUMBER: 59-017-008-009-13

S **1/2** OF SW **1**/4 EX COM AT S IM COR OF SEC 8; TH N 89 DEC W 1077**.1** FT ALONG S SEC LINE TO POB; TH CONT N 89 DEC W 280 FT; N 233.35 FT; S 89 DEC E 280 FT; S 233.35 FT TO P OF BEG & EX COM AT SW COR OF SEC 8; TH N **01** DEG W 980.2 FT ALONG W SEC LINE TO POB; TH CONT N 01 DEG W ALONG W SEC LINE 330 FT TO W **1**/8 COR OF SW 1/4; N 85 DEG E 660.77 FT ALONG S **1**/8 LINE; S 01 DEG E 330 FT; S 85 DEG W 660.77 FT TO P OF BEG & EX BEG AT SW COR OF SEC 8; TH N 85 DEG E 1307.04 FT ALONG S SEC LINE; TH N 01 DEG W 300 FT; N 85 DEG E 1006.68 FT; N 01 DE

 “I declare that the statements above are true to the best of my information, knowledge, and belief.”

 - Without Prejudice & Without Recourse -

See attached: By:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, Sui Juris

UCC-1 Andrew Stuart Ouwenga, Auth. Rep., Affiant, 3 Statement of Accounts Secured Party Creditor, Attorney in fact,

6 2015 winter Tax Bills Michigan National

Notarial Protest Mailing Address:

Cost of Damages c/o: 10213 Dagget Rd.

ORDER FOR DEFAULT JUDGMENT

 Howard City, Michigan [49329]

 Common Law Right Thumb Print Seal: -- >

Cc: Reynolds Township Board Members, Sui juris.

c/o: 215 E. Edgerton St.

 Howard City, Mich. [49329]