In the "Court of the Justice of the Peace", for Precinct-2, of Midland County, Texas; & in the "441st District Court for Midland County"; & in the "Texas State Supreme Court"; & in the "Midland County Commissioners Court"; & in Such Other Courts of More Pure & Un-Adulterated Common-Law Jurisdiction "As May Be Provided By Law", which would include such possibly Newly-Created Courts, as a 'Texas State Supreme Court of Law', &/or a "JoP Court for Precinct-1 of Coleman-County"; all as Concurrent-Jurisdiction Courts.

Proceeding in the Name of, & on the Behalf of: the "People of Texas", aka the "State of Texas", "Midland County", "Precinct 2 of Midland County", all De-Jure & Ex-Relatione; by & through our Organic Body-Politic Constituent Relation: as: Christine Huddleston Moore, Michael Moore, & Charles Stewart; all Proceeding In Propria-Persona, Sui-Juris; & as "Private Attorneys General", & "In the Public Interest", as: Constituent Texas State Organic Body-Politic Counter-Plaintiffs; **Vs:** **"Federal National Mortgage Association", a Private Corporate Legal-Fiction entity; Including All Officers, Employees, & Board-Members, especially: "Priscilla Almodovar", "Peter Akwaboah"; & also including their Supportive Corporate Legal-Fiction Law-Firm, of: "Barrett Daffin Frappier Turner & Engel", & specifically their Attorney "Joseph M . Vacek", as Texas Bar #: 24039948; & also Corporate Legal-Fictions "LRS Financial Network", & "Ocwen Loan Servicing", & their Supportively Complicit Law-Firm, of: & "Mackie Wolfe Zientz & Mann, P.C.", & their specific Attorney of: "Israel Saucedo", TxBar: # 24042221; & Shelly Nail; & also Corporate Legal-Fiction "Aldridge Petite, LLP"; & their Attorney of: "William Jarrell", Bar #: 290271; & "Mortgage Electronic Registrations Systems", & all of their officers & attorneys similarly; also including yet un-known John & Jane Does who are benefiting from this Criminal Enterprise of Routinely Placing Criminally Coercive Pressures on the Good Public-Servants of Texas, all in Willful Conspiracy to Further Their Peace-Breaching Common-Law Crimes; Counter-Complaint Defendants.**	**Court of JoP Precinct-2 Case #: E2160017, 441st District Court Case #: CV51464, County Court-At-Law Case #: CV29882, County-Commissioners-Court Case #: _____, Texas State Supreme Civil Court Case #: _____, Texas Supreme Court-of-Law Case #:_____.** **First Version, of: Sworn Affidavit, Answer, & Criminal Counter-Complaint, Claim, & Suit; & here-by Invoking Due-Process, in the nature of Quo-Warranto, Qui-Tam, State-Ex-Rel, County-Ex-Rel, & Precinct-Ex-Rel; all "In the Public-Interest", & as Class-Action; & alleging Felony Crimes Against the State & Public Justice, including Racketeering; Obstruction of Justice; Obstructing Governmental Administration; Coercion of Public Servants; Breach of the Peace; Massive Conspiratorial Fraud; & this all in the nature of statutory "Trespass to Try Title", "Quiet-Title Complaint", & "Suit to Remove Cloud"; & this all involving Multitudes of Other Crimes, partially including: Extortion; Criminal Trespass; Robbery; Theft; Un-Just Enrichment; Damages; Unlawful Debt Collection; Barratry; Simony; Violations of Common-Law, Bible-Law; Conspiracy to Terrorize & En-Slave the Common-People of Texas, Midland County, & of Precinct-2; & this all in manners which Endanger the "National Security" of the USA.** **Action-At-Law; & Action-In-Law; Concurrent-Jurisdiction, Multiple Venues, Trial-by-Jury, Demanded.**

1: Opening Formalities: All Parties Take Note: This Is a 'Sworn Criminal-Complaint':

Before All-Mighty God, & in the Name of our Lord & Savior Christ Jesus; & as Ex-Rel Co-Plaintiffs with our Constitutional 'State of Texas', all words presented in this Class-Action/Ex-Rel Affidavit, Answer, & Criminal-Counter-Complaint, are "Sworn" to, as being "True", to the best of our knowledge, & as reasonably interpreted, by these Co-Counter-Plaintiffs, "Christine Huddleston Moore", "Michael Moore", & "Charles Bruce Stewart".

Christine & Michael Moore do hereby Publicly Declare our Solemn Affirmation, that, to the best of our reasonable ability, we are participating responsibly in our own voluntary & self-governing common-law jurisdiction communities, known as: "Precinct-2", "Midland County", & the "State of Texas"; all by way of our Socially-Compacted & "Ex-Rel" Relationship. Charles Stewart affirms similarly, based on his similar efforts in Precinct 1, of Coleman County, Texas.

Here-under; & as reasonably interpreted, under the full context of this document; all three of us, have all signed this document; & (similarly as established under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure, Rule 13), each of us do here-by solemnly Swear, that, to the best of our knowledge, information, & beliefs, formed after reasonable inquiry, All Declarations presented here-in, are here-by presented in Good-Faith, & they are Well Grounded in the Situational-Facts which are Declared in this Complaint; & they are also Well Grounded, Justified, & Warranted, by Good Faith Arguments for the un-tainted Application, Extension, Modification, or Reversal of what is fashionable for the Judicial Officers of the Municipal/Civil Government of this State of Texas, to consider as being existing "Law"; & No Declarations in this Complaint are 'Fictitious', Nor are any of these Declarations Intended for any Bad Purpose, such as for that of Harassment.

2: The Plaintiffs: in this action are Common-Law Compliant & Organic Body-Politic Corporate Jural-Society Communities, known as the "State of Texas", "Midland County", & "Precinct 2" there-under; with the Natural-People Actually Constituting these Bodies-Politic being named, again, as: "Christine Huddleston Moore", "Michael Moore", & "Charles Bruce Stewart".

Here-under; & because this complaint is of direct "Public Interest" for Our Common People who organically Constitute our "State of Texas"; we do here-under invoke our constituent/component-member Right to "Speak Law" in the Name & on the Behalf of the People of our "State of Texas"; & also similarly under our Texas "Political-Sub-Divisions", of "Midland County", & "Precinct 2". On the last page of this complaint document, under each of our signatures, is contained both our printed names, & also our mailing-addresses, phone-numbers, & email-addresses.

All parties take further notice, that, each & all of we Co-Plaintiffs do here-by commence & proclaim this "Complaint at Law"; & we further proclaim that we are in the Full Possession of All of our Constitutionally-Guaranteed & Natural "Rights", especially concerning those of "Due Process of Law", aka: "Due Course of Law"; as well to as our similar Rights to the "Equal Protection of the Laws". Take notice also please, that, we Demand Respect for All of our Rights, at All Times; & we do Not Waive or relinquishing Any of our Rights, At Any Time, Nor for Any Reason.

Take further notice, please, also, that here-under; "No Presumptions" are to be taken against we Counter-Plaintiffs; including any to the effect that we may have some-how "Consented to be Governed" by any sort of a "Private Jurisdiction"; & this especially concerning those which do not respect our common-law & natural-law based Rights. Those Foreign Municipal/Civil Jurisdictions seem especially entrenched in Dis-Respecting our Rights to have Disputes Resolved by "Due Course/Process of Law", which includes our Right to have this dispute settled by the Unanimous Judgement from a Twelve-Member Jury. We have Not "Contracted Away" any of our Rights. We have Not established any form of

"Legal Nexus" or "Minimal Contacts" with any sort of "Private Jurisdiction", which would include any sort of a "De-Facto Governmental Jurisdiction"; all where-under might seem to be justified a secondary Presumption that we have agreed to Submit our Constitutional & Public Rights to any such Private & due-process dis-respecting jurisdiction.

Those forms of presumptions seem to us to be epidemic in the modernly available "Civil Courts". This seems due largely from the Influences of Private Corporations, which are franchisees of our various jurisdictions of civil-government; & this includes the "Federal Reserve Banking System", & State "Bar Associations". In these available Courts, multitudes of un-knowing litigants seem to be routinely & secretively "Presumed" to have established entanglements with these sorts of "Private Jurisdictions". Here-under; these innocent people are secretively & routinely Presumed to have "Contracted" to be treated as what has been referred to as "Fourteenth Amendment Citizens"; &, where-under, those hapless litigants are routinely Obstructed from the Respect of All of their Natural, God-Given, & Constitutionally-Guaranteed "Rights". This is precisely the sort of a jurisdictional-entanglement that the powerfully influential Defendants named here-in are routinely using to advance the Criminal & Peace-Breaching Racketeering-Scheme which they are later here-in more fully accused.

We here-by demand that we do Not be treated in any of those constitutionally-lawless manners.

We Are here-by legitimately Proceeding 'In the Name Of', & 'On the Behalf Of', "The People", who Organically Compose & Constitute, the Living/Breathing Organic Body-Politic, commonly known as the "State of Texas".

3: Introductory-Notes: State-Ex-Rel/Quo-Warranto, Qui-Tam, & Private-Attorney-General:

Further; & because this unique Complaint is "In the Public-Interest", for our Larger Communities of the "State of Texas", "Midland County", & "Precinct 2, of Midland County"; here-under, we also here-by invoke our Constitutional Right to Proceed "In the Name of", & "On the Behalf Of", each of these larger Jurisdictional "Communities of People". Here-under; we proceed as "State-Ex-Rel" Constituents of each of these Communities, by way of our Organic Body-Politic 'Relationship' there-with. Greater detail explaining this un-fashionable but more natural/organic 'Relationship', is incorporated in-to this complaint, by way of this reference to the research document which is available through the web-link, here:

https://ConstitutionalGov.us/Archive/Charles/QWMemorandum/QWMemoGeneral.pdf

Expanding directly there-on; each & all of us are also & similarly proceeding as a "Private Attorneys General", as briefly described here:

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Private_Attorney_General

"A private attorney general is an informal term originating in common law jurisdictions for a private attorney who brings a lawsuit claiming it to be in the public interest, i.e., benefiting the general public and not just the plaintiff, on behalf of a citizen or group of citizens. … The rationale behind this principle is to provide extra incentive to private attorneys to pursue suits that may be of benefit to society at large. Private attorney general suits are commonly … brought as class actions …

Historically in English common law, a writ of qui tam was a writ through which private individuals who assist a prosecution can receive for themselves all or part of the damages or financial penalties recovered by the government as a result of the prosecution. Its name is an abbreviation of the Latin phrase qui tam pro ..., meaning "[he] who sues in this matter for the king as well as for himself."

… it remains current in the United States under the False Claims Act, 31 U.S.C. § 3729 et seq., which allows a private individual, or "whistleblower" (or relator), with knowledge of past or present fraud committed against the federal government to bring suit on its behalf. This allowance

and, in some cases, reliance on private individual litigation to enforce the law has also been referred to as a "bounty" system due to the private citizen's potential financial gain if the suit is successful. ...

Contemporary private attorney general lawsuits are an outgrowth of the rationale underlying the writ of qui tam that enabling private citizens to enforce the law will strengthen enforcement and contribute to the rule of law. … Another example of the "private attorney general" provisions is the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act (RICO). RICO allows average citizens (private attorneys general) to sue organizations that commit mail and wire fraud as part of their criminal enterprise.

President Clinton sought to find common ground between liberals who support stronger enforcement of civil rights and consumer protection law and conservatives skeptical of expensive government regulation, stating in his second State of the Union Address "That it was time for the American People to be given more power while the Federal Government down sizes". One approach to compromise that rose to prominence was providing for private citizens to act as "private attorneys general" for the enforcement of civil rights law, thereby delegating both the task and the financial burden of regulation to civil society.

… the use of "private attorney general" … where the role of private lawyers and organizations has generally been welcomed by federal authorities. … the Supreme Court has determined that Congress intended several civil rights statutes to be enforceable by private parties.

The U.S. Congress codified the private attorney general principle into law with the enactment of Civil Rights Attorney's Fees Award Act of 1976, 42 U.S.C. § 1988. The Senate Report on this statute stated that the Senate Committee on the Judiciary wanted to level the playing field so that private citizens, who might have little or no money, could still serve as "private attorneys general" and afford to bring actions, even against state or local bodies, … . The Committee acknowledged that, "[i]f private citizens are to be able to assert their civil rights, and if those who violate the Nation's fundamental laws are not to proceed with impunity, then citizens must have the opportunity to recover what it costs them to vindicate these rights in court." …"

Building even further there-on; each & all of us are similarly proceeding as a “Cause Lawyers”, as briefly described here:

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cause_Lawyer

“A cause lawyer, also known as a public interest lawyer or social lawyer, is a lawyer dedicated to the usage of law for the promotion of social change to address a cause. Cause lawyering is commonly described as a practice of "lawyering for the good" or using law to empower members of the weaker layers of society. …

Cause lawyering is frequently practiced by individual lawyers or lawyers employed by associations that aim to supply a public service to complement state-provided legal aid.

Cause lawyering is performed by a lawyer or a firm that is "most frequently directed at altering some aspect of the social, economic, and political status quo." The content of the issue is not particularly relevant, only the advocacy of an issue and the attempt to bring about social change through legal or even quasi-legal avenues. Cause lawyering can include dedicated advocacy by public interest firms, pro bono work by attorneys in private practice and other non-traditional forms of law practice that advocates a cause.

Lawyers who work for the government, whether federal, state, or local, can also be cause lawyers; although the majority of cause lawyering tends to be adversarial towards the state.”

There. These Citations Set the Stage nicely for the manner in which we intend to prosecute this

Criminal Counter-Complaint. The arguments & citations presented in the first web-linked document above, describing the Quo-Warranto & State-Ex-Rel Process, is particularly powerful. Our Main Two Complaining-Parties Are Constituent-Members of the Organic Body-Politic of the State of Texas, Midland County, & of Precinct-2 there-under.

Our Third remaining Complaining Party, "Charles Stewart" has much less directly suffered any trauma or damage as the result of the criminal activities generally complained of here-in; but, as a patriotic member of our Organic Body-Politic of the State of Texas, he is suffering from these Crimes also; because of the common-law maxim, that, "A Crime Against One, is a Crime Against All". It is "In the Interests Of Justice". Texas Statutory Penal-Codes Title 2, Sections 02, 21, & 22, all Affirm the Natural-Law & Common-Law Right of All People in Texas to Do Anything Which Might Be "Justified".

Co-Plaintiff Stewart does here-by declare further, for the Public Record of All Courts so involved; that, I do Reserve my Natural & Traditional Common-Law Right to Vacate my position as Co-Plaintiff in this Complaint; & here-under, promptly, & with-out un-reasonable delay, to begin exercising a General-Jurisdiction "Judicial Power" , in the "Interests of Justice", all on behalf of Christine & Michael Moore, & the State & People of Texas, & of Midland County. This scenario may well develop quickly; for perhaps such reasons as if Any of the numerous Courts before which this Complaint is being presented & filed, & After Reasonable Time to respond has passed, & still, No Judicial Officers Can be Found to Responsibly Exercise their "Judicial Powers", in manners which Actually Follow Legitimate & Traditional & Constitutionally-Guaranteed "Due Process of Law", aka "Due Course of Law".

4: Preliminary Orientation & Abbreviated Summary Notes:

The "Main Point" which we Ex-Rel Co-Plaintiffs here-in present as being the Central-Issue of the "Rights & Title of Possession" to the Real-Property in question in this case,.

The Presiding Judicial-Officers in both the 441st District Court, & the Midland County Court-At-Law, have Adjudicated Economic & Commercial Security-Interest Issues related to this case, all in manners which were Brutally Insensitive to the Interests of Justice & Fairness to these Co-Counter-Plaintiffs. Those Judicial-Officers there-by lent Color-of-Legitimacy for the JoP-Judicial-Officer later involved with this Case, to Confuse those essentially Irrelevant "Security-Interest" concerns, in such manners as to Brutally Destroy the "Rights of Possession" Issues raised in the Detainer Complaint of the Counter-Defendants named here-in. Those Common-Law Rooted "Rights of Possession" Issues, are inherently Designed to Protect the Deeper Common-Law Rooted Rights of the People, including we Counter-Plaintiffs, to retain "Quiet & Peaceable Possession" of our Real-Property, all entirely Un-Related to such Commercial Security-Interest Issues.

This Routine Mis-Application of the Well-Settled Law related to the "Rights of Peaceable-Possession of Real-Property" is the Central Theme of this Entire Counter-Complaint; & this is all Rooted in Deep & Massive Conspiracy, Criminally Syndicated, among the Powerful Banking & Financial Interests, & their Moral-Prostitute/Mercenary Attorneys, & at least a few Knowingly Complicit & Corrupted Holders of Judicial Adjudicatory Public-Offices.

These Same Evils are Routinely Happening in Multitudes of Similar Cases all across Texas & the USA; & this case is designed to serve as a vehicle for remedying not only the evils involved in this specific case, but also to set the new precedent for quickly & efficiently driving a sword through the very heart of that Evil Class-Warfare Conspiracy as contrived by Rich Fat-Cats, as Against the Common-Law Rights of our Common-People, including we Counter-Plaintiffs.

The central & pivotal issue here, is that, We Counter-Plaintiffs Possess a "Superior Title", to that of the Counter-Defendants named here-in, because, Our Title is a "Title of Possession", which is rooted firmly in the "Rights of Possession, as related to the ancient & well-settled concept of "Seisin". Here-under; the simple Commercial "Security-Interest" issues of the Counter-Defendants named here-in, is an

"Inferior Interest", at least when it comes to the "Rights of Possession of Real-Property" issues, such as are the central-focus of all of the issues involved in this case.

All of this is Presented More Effectively & Clearly in the Later Pages of this Complaint. Other-wise than this brief introductory-note, ex-rel Plaintiffs here-under present our complaint in the more civilized manner of addressing these legal concerns, as follows:

5: Jurisdiction; Jurisdiction is invoked at this time in Multiple Jurisdictions of Multiple Courts, at the same time, & in parallel; all as a "Concurrent Jurisdiction", being collectively shared among all of these Courts. This un-fashionable mode of procedure is being embraced by we Counter-Plaintiffs, because, in our Efforts to Counter the Epidemic of Judicial-Corruption complained of generally here-in, we are here-by launching our own Vigilant Efforts to obtain Constitutionally Lawful "Justice", all under the "Rule of Law", & by "Due Course of Law", & in manners which are "Open", "Public", & "Speedy".

The fashionable practice in the Texas Court Procedures are largely derived from the Roman Empire based Texas Municipal Codes & Statutes, all of which generally set forth issues of 'Jurisdictional Concern' near the start of the Complaint, in a section like this. Here-under, this section of our Complaint has grown to become a bit lengthy.

The First Court with-in which we intend to prioritize our prosecution of this Case, is the "Justice of the Peace Court", for Precinct 2, of Midland County. There-in, we intend to explain to the JoP presiding there-in, how the presiding Judicial-Officer in that JoP-Court has "Errored", in his Issuance of the document which Threatened the Forcible Eviction of the Moors from their Home of many years. Through our filing of this Counter-Complaint in that Court, we seek to give the Judicial-Officer there-in Opportunity to Cure That Error, the Common-Law Violation, & the Breach of the Peace, that directly resulted there-from.

This JoP-Court is commonly operated as a Delegated Franchise, of the Municipal/Civil Government of Texas; &, there-under, as Only being Capable of exercising the inherent "Limited Jurisdiction" of that Municipal/Civil Government. Yet this same JoP-Court has an Inherent & Traditional Constitutional "Common-Law Jurisdiction", which is an All-Powerful "General Jurisdiction"; as specifically & clearly described as the "Judicial Power of This State", of Texas, in "Article 5, Section 1", of our Texas State Constitution document.

This Constitutional Text Clearly describes these JoP-Courts as Possessing the "Judicial Power of This State" of Texas. Our State of Texas Possesses Full Sovereignty; except, perhaps, for the few & limited delegations of authority surrendered to the Federal Government. None of those possible Federal delegations of authority infringe on the issues raised in this complaint. This means this JoP-Court for Precinct-2 of Midland-County, possesses not only the previously-referenced "General Jurisdiction", which is inherently Capable of Adjudicating Fully Any Dispute Properly Presented before it, as is being done here-in; but it also possesses the Traditional Common-Law "Original & Exclusive Jurisdiction", as inherent in the critically important procedural concern of "Venue"; especially concerning disputes involving Real-Property, as, again, is the case here-in.

If & when such might become necessary, we intend to press these precise issues. As Article 5 Section 1 clearly Constitutionally-Mandated, that, the General-Jurisdiction Judicial-Power of this State of Texas Was/Is "De-Centralized", right on down to each & every one of the "Precincts" of this State.

This Case is About More than just the Home of the Moors. Multitudes of good Texan People are Routinely being Abused of their Constitutionally-Guaranteed Rights, including their Rights to Peaceable Possession of their Real-Property, by the Corrupted Bar-Monopoly Attorneys, & Municipal/Civil Judicial Officers, who routinely dominate & monopolize the Judicial Process in this State of Texas. This complaint is being prosecuted in manners which seek to bring an end to this evil.

The presiding Judicial-Officers of both the "Midland County Court-at-Law", & the "441st District-Court", in Midland County; have also entangled them-selves in the Criminal Racketeering Conspiracy complained of generally here-in; & by our filing copies of this complaint with them also, under their original case-numbers; we are presenting the Judicial-Officers there-in with Opportunity to Cure what other-wise might be presumed by a competent Jury to be their presiding Judicial-Officers Complicity in the Criminal Racketeering Conspiracy & Breach-of-the-Peace Crimes complained of generally here-in.

To build a bit further there-on; we Ex-Rel Plaintiffs are Fully Aware, that, there does likely exist many fundamentally Good Judicial-Officers & Other Public-Servants In All of these Courts of this State; but, we have also come to know, that, all such good Public-Servants are modernly suffering under "Coercive Pressures", from those same "Powerful Private Interests" which are generally complained of here-in.

These "Coercive Pressures", on the Public-Servants in these Courts, emanate directly from our National & State Government's "Civil" Jurisdictions, as is the nature of that Roman-Empire based Civil-Government's inherent "Top Down" & "Authoritarian" manner of Governing. That Top/Down "Civil Jurisdiction" is in Inherent & Fundamental "Opposition" to the more natural, organic, grass-roots, & bottom/up "Common-Law Jurisdiction", under which our Counties, Precincts, & Townships, are Constitutionally Designed to function. All of this is specified in much greater detail, in "Article 3 Section 56" of our "Texas Constitution"; where-in is declared, basically, that, the Texas State Legislative Assembly shall Not Pas Any "Special or Local Laws".

As explained in the documents web-linked immediately following; the very Nature of that Roman-Empire based Model of "Civil" Judicial Administration, is inherently Designed To Establish Parasitical Working-Relationship Among Powerful Private-Interest-Groups which routinely engage in "Criminal Coercion" of our Common People, & also of any honorable Texas Judges & other Public-Servants which might become entangled in Court-Cases such as this. That "Criminal Coercion" was the main tool which was used by the Slave-Traders of the Roman Empire; & this Legacy of essentially Criminal Despotism through the problematic "Civil Jurisdiction" has been vigilantly supported from the inception of our National & State Constitutions, by the very same Powerful Private-Interest-Groups which are generally complained of here-in.

All of these evils, & their solutions, are explained more fully, in the two documents web-linked as follows:

http://ConstitutionalGov.us/SupremeCourtOfLaw/Treason-USA/1-TreasonComplaint-ConstrctiveNotice-AllOfficers&Agents-V1.5.pdf

http://ConstitutionalGov.us/SupremeCourtOfLaw/Treason-USA/3-TreasonRemedy-BuildingSelfGoverningCommonlawCommunities-V4.pdf

The full text there-in, is incorporated in-to this document, by way of this reference to them.

And similarly incorporated in-to this document, by way of this reference to them; are another two documents, each of which contains Additional Supportive Citations to the two documents immediately above, all web-linked respectively, as follows:

http://ConstitutionalGov.us/SupremeCourtOfLaw/Treason-USA/2-TreasonConstrctvNtc-CitationsSupportive-V1.2.pdf

http://ConstitutionalGov.us/SupremeCourtOfLaw/Treason-USA/4-TreasonRemedy-Building-Communities-Citations-V1.3.pdf

These citations are directly related to, how, at our Texas State Government level, our form of Constitutionally "Limited Government", aka "Civil Government", has become Diverted from the much

More Fundamental & Organic form of State Government which our Texas State Constitution Originally-Intended to Establish for the Governing of our Texan People.

In the near future; we expect to produce a document which focuses specifically on the multitude of Problems with the manner in which Texas State Civil-Government routinely Operates; but, for the time being, many of these State-Level Problems are at least touched-on, very solidly, by our four documents web-linked last above. Those documents provide vast repositories of information, citations, & arguments; all of which we expect to be referring to frequently here-in; & all of which are incorporated in-to this document, by way of this reference to them.

Here-under; we ex-rel Co-Plaintiffs find "Justification", for "Invoking in Parallel", the numerous Courts identified in the header of the front page of this complaint. Here-under; we Ex-Rel Co-Plaintiffs expect to find greater opportunity for escaping the afore-mentioned "Coercive Pressures" which Saturate the Limited-Jurisdiction Courts which have been Franchised to operate through the De-Facto Municipal/Civil Government of our State of Texas. This process is expected by us to allow the Common People of our County & Precincts to follow "Due Process of Law" in much more quick, efficient, & un-adulterated manners. This is all as was "Originally Constitutionally Intended" by the Framers of our State Constitution; because it all allows for our Common People to "Responsibly Self-Govern", all under our own more "Organic/Constitutional-Law"; emanating up-wards, from each of our County's politically-sub-divided "Precinct Jurisdictions".

Further here-under; Jurisdiction is Invoked under our Public & General Common-Law, as Guaranteed to us at (but not dependent for ultimate authority on) literal multitudes citations from our Texas State "Constitution" document; all of which we hope to be able to more fully set forth in Amended versions of this complaint, as these Plaintiffs are so able. Also, one very powerful citation, reads as follows:

"When the Court is one of General Jurisdiction, its Jurisdiction is presumed and need not be expressly asserted by the plaintiff; … ."

"Common Law Pleading"; Koffler & Reppy, West Publishing Company, St Paul, Minnesota; 1969. Page 69.

All of the Courts described in Article 5 Section 1 of our Texas State Constitution, seem to we Co-Plaintiffs to be of this "General Jurisdiction"; because, as is clearly implied, the "Judicial Power" of this State" of Texas, Is, a "General-Jurisdiction Judicial-Power". And, to expand even a bit further on this critically-important & foundational point, we present also multiple web-links supportive of the following citation:

"General Jurisdiction: Such as extends to all controversies that may be brought before a court within the legal bounds of rights & remedies; as opposed to special or limited jurisdiction, which covers only a particular class of cases, or cases where the amount in controversy is below a particular sum, or which is subject to specific exceptions. ..."

https://ConstitutionalGov.us/Blacks5th.htm
https://definitions.USLegal.com/g/General-Jurisdiction/
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/General_jurisdiction
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ordinary_Court

6: The Property: which is being brought into controversy through this complaint is commonly known by its street-address, of: "1001 South County Road 1060", in "Precinct 2", under the "County Law" of "Midland County", De-Jure/Lawful Jurisdiction, & this all as originally-intended with-in our Constitutional "State of Texas". (This property is also commonly but falsely considered to be under the municipal city police-state jurisdiction of the "City of Midland", [79706]).

6: **The Defendants:** in this action, are both Natural-Persons & Corporate Legal-Fictions. The natural persons involved here are frequently using their Legal-Fiction/Corporation Names, in their malicious efforts to secure "Limited Liability" from the common-law "Breach of the Peace" based "Crimes" which they are here-in accused of routinely Committing against the Common People of our various afore-referenced Public Communities.

The main Natural-People here-in Accused of Conspiring to perpetrate these evil Crimes against the common-people of our State, County, & Precinct, are here-in named in their Capacity as Private-Persons, & also in their Capacity as "Corporation Officers or Agents", & also perhaps even some named as "Public Servants", especially the later, under amended versions of this complaint, perhaps. Others yet unknown may be added also to this Criminal Counter-Complaint, as they are discovered and identified, in amendments here-to.

The main legal-fiction/corporation & natural-person entities here-in named, are:

"Federal National Mortgage Association", which is frequently referred to as "Fanniey Mae", or here-in, more simply, as: "FNMA"; & is a Private Corporate Legal-Fiction entity; & Including: Priscilla Almodovar & Peter Akwaboah; & all of whom maintain mailing addresss at: Granite Park VII; 5600 Granite Parkway, Plano, Texas [75024].

"LRS Financial Network, Inc."; of which maintains a mailing-addresses at: 2101 West Wadley Avenue, Ste 33; Midland, Texas, [79705-6439].

"Barrett Daffin Frappier Turner & Engel"; & including "Joseph M . Vacek", who is a Texas State Bar Attorney # 24039948; & all of these maintain mailing-addresses at: 4004 Belt Line Road, Suite 100; Addison, Texas [75001].

"Ocwen Loan Servicing", which maintains a mailing-addresses at: 1661 Worthington Road, Ste 100; West Palm Beach, Florida, [33409-6493].

& also "Mackie Wolfe Zientz & Mann, P.C.", & the specific Attorney working under them, to actually commit the crimes here-in complained of, & here named as: "Israel Saucedo", Texas Private Corporation Attorneys Monopoly Bar #: 24042221; & all of whom maintain mailing addresss at: 14160 North Dallas Parkway, Suite 900; Dallas, Texas [75254-4319].

"Mortgage Electronic Registrations Systems", aka: "MERS", aka: "MERSCORP Holdings, Inc.". This entity maintains a business-address at: 1818 Library Street, Suite 300; Reston, Virginia, [20190]. The Corporate Directors & Shareholders there-in are also named as individual co-defendants; even though they are not specifically named here, we expect to name them more fully in an amended & up-dated version of this complaint; &:

"Shelley Nail"

also including yet un-known John & Jane Does, each of whom are benefiting from this larger collective Criminal Modus-Operandi of Routinely Placing Criminally Coercive-Pressures on the numerous Good Public-Servants of Texas, all in willful Conspiracy to Further Their Peace-Breaching Common-Law Crimes.

In efforts to more quickly & efficiently secure "Justice" in this case, Socially-Compacted Ex-Rel Members of our Organic People's State of Texas have acted (relying largely on efforts from these

Counter-Plaintiffs, by "necessity"), to post on the internet, an inventory of files directly related to this case, all of which can easily be reviewed by the Public, here:

http://ConstitutionalGov.us/sub/PoliticalSubdivisions-Local/09-TexasSS/1-Cases/Moores/

~~~

Temporary Peace-Offering: Each & all of these here-in named & accused Counter-Defendants will be Abandoned & Exonerated in & from this prosecution; if, they will but make Public-Apology for their participation in their evil racketeering schemes described here-in; & Take the Reasonable Steps which are necessary in order for them to Restore these Plaintiffs to their standing before these evils were perpetrated by them, against us. This includes that these Counter-Defendants must take prompt & meaningful steps to Return these Children to the care & custody their blood-line Grandmother, immediately, to restore our regular payments from CPS for taking care of these Children, & to 'Change CPS Policy' for Compliance with our Texas State Constitution's Mandate that "Probable Cause" & "Due Course of Law" be scrupulously followed before these sorts of drastic actions be taken against Family Units, & so that these sorts of evils are not further perpetrated against other similarly innocent Texas house-holds & families.

****

The Situational/Historical "Facts" which Lawfully "Justify" this Counter-Complaint: Preliminary Procedural Concerns:

(Much of this following text, from # 7 through # 52, has been copied & pasted from other similar documents, & it has not been completely re-edited for this case, but the general arguments presented here-in do fully apply to this case. We expect to up-date these edits in an amended version of this complaint.)

7: On or about the date of June of 2001, a number of People doing business as a Legal-Fiction Corporate Lender named "LRS Financial Network", completed acts, together with Counter-Plaintiffs here-in, Christine & Michael Moore; which, all together, gave color of legitimacy to a presumption, that, the Moores were acting as "Grantors", under a "Deed of Trust" document, to that "LRS Financial Network" institution.

The Moores did this, in exchange for a loan of money with a value denominated in modern "Federal Reserve Note Dollars" in an amount of approximately $140,000.00. At that same time, the Moores also completed acts which gave color of legitimacy to a "Promissory Note" in this same amount of approximately $140,000.00.

8: There-after; "LRS Financial Network", (here-in after "LRS"), then Transfered Ownership of these "Deed of Trust" & "Promissory Note" Documents, to one of their Alter-Ego/Doing-Business-As Legal-Fiction Corporations, known as "HNB Mortgage Services", (here-in after "HNB"); which, in turn, transferred these same documents to another Legal-Fiction Corporation named "Sunwest Mortgage", (here-in after "Sunwest").

There-after; on the date of 2005-February-23, Sunwest then transfered these documents to another Legal-Fiction Corporation named "IndyMac Bank", (here-in after "IndyMac"). IndyMac has since gone bankrupt, & failed as a financial institution; but, prior to IndyMac completely failing; IndyMac then transfered these documents to another Legal-Fiction Corporation named to "Ocwen Loan Servicing", (here-in after "Ocwin").

9: From the beginning, in 2001-June; the promissory note document which the Moores then & originally placed writing on for this loan, was accompanied by actions of either direct verbal affirmation or omission by one or more of the officers or agents of "LRS Financial Network", where-under the Moores were led to believe, that, the Defendants were gaining only that reasonable rate return of interest upon the Federal Reserve Notes that they were there-by contracting to part with.

10: During the time-period surrounding this date, LRS were functioning under "Reserve
~~~

Requirements" that their Negotiable Instruments be stood behind by themselves, by their being ready to present Federal Reserve Notes to the public, only up to approximately 1/10th or 10% of their outstanding debts. This obligation is here-in-after referred to as their "Fractional Reserve Requirement".

Based on color-of-legitimacy lent through emergency/war-powers declarations from various federal offices, the private-corporation known as the "Federal Reserve Banking System" has been granted an un-constitutional monopoly over our American and Texas Monetary Systems. Here-under; those Private-Corporate Federal-Reserve Bankers have distributed Franchises to almost every banking or other financial institution in the USA & Texas, including LRS & the other here-in named Counter-Defendants .

11: Here-under, "Un-Equal Protection of the Laws" are dispensed amongst the Franchisees of the Federal Reserve Banking System; & there-under, "Federal Reserve Notes" are routinely "Leveraged" by these powerful banking institutions. Here-under; these banking institutions do routinely gain approximately Ten/10 Times the value of the Federal Reserve Notes that they actually part with, in comparison to the value attached there-to in the public market-place, as compared with & extracted from the Common People of America & Texas.

The Federal Reserve Bankers benefit from this arrangement, because, they do not have to be directly involved with the millions of individual loans in this nation; but their smaller banking franchisees, such as LRS & the other Counter-Defendants named here-in, obediently handle those burdens for their masters, in exchange for the handsome-rewards which their private-corporate franchise allows for them. These smaller banking institutions are here-under allowed to "Leverage" the actual Federal Reserve Notes in their possession, by "Creating Money Out Of Thin Air", when-ever they go through the motions of "granting a loan". Due to their advantageous monopoly-franchised position in the market-place, these smaller bankers are only limited in the amount of loans that they can "create out of thin air", by their "Reserve Requirements"; which, again, are only approximately 10%. This very small "reserve requirement" allows for them to harvest very significant economic-rewards from the Common People of America & Texas, much to our detriment.

12: During the above stated time-period of this loan, it was a common & strategically-beneficial practice for LRS & the other here-in named Counter-Defendant Financial-Institutions, to "Leverage" their Required Reserves of Federal Reserve Notes as much as they could, and right down to only their actual "Reserve Requirement Level", in order that they might Gain the Maximum amount of Profits possible from the Federal Reserve Notes they were required to hold.

13: On the original contracting date in June-2001; the Moores agreed to repay to the holder of the promissory note the amount listed in that note as having been lent to them, plus interest; by repaying with money which to them & all common Americans, of equally as precious, & at par-value, to All Americans, as then were Federal Reserve Note currency. These were the terms of the promissory-note contract which the Moores reasonably believed, in good-faith, that they were entering into; just as similarly with All Americans, when-ever any among us sign mortgage-papers related to our homes.

14: During this time period, Counter-Defendant LRS Created Negotiable-Instruments &/or Electronic Credits, which they then lent to the Moores, & which were only of approximately 10% of the value to the Lenders, as were the "reserve requirement" of Federal Reserve Notes which were then in the possession of LRS. Either by direct verbal affirmation, or by omission, LRS officers &/or agents lead the Moores to believe, that, the Moores were being loaned money that was "equally as precious" & "functioning at par-value" with Federal Reserve Notes, & that Lenders would only be receiving the reasonable return in "Interest" on that loan that was indicated in that actual contracting document.

15: On or about that original contracting date in June-2001; the Moores received from LRS, or had disbursed to third parties, approximately $140,000.00, in the form of Negotiable Instruments &/or

Electronic Credits, which LRS had "Created out of Thin Air", & concerning which LRS had Only Incurred the Singular Liability of Holding in Reserve approximately Ten Percent, aka: 10% , of that amount in so-called "Federal Reserve Notes", the total of which would there-by calculate to be approximately $14,000.00 .

16: The Negotiable Instruments &/or Electronic Credits that were issued & put into circulation in the marketplace, on account of this newly contracted indebtedness of the Moores; were eventually circulated back to the LRS, by some party or parties unknown, who were asking for some kind economic value from the LRS, in return there-on. When all of the Fractionally Reserved Negotiable Instruments &/or Electronic Credits which were issued by LRS finally came circulating back to LRS for payment, LRS frequently Just Issued More Credits, which they again "Created Out Of Thin Air"; & so LRS then actually paid out less than 10%, or about $14,000.00 in so-called "Federal Reserve Notes".

This is all a larger federal extra-constitutional emergency-war-powers monetary dynamic, which all modern Americans are burdened with; & here-under, these "Federal Reserve Note" Dollars may accurately be considered as our de-facto American "Ultimate Unit of Economic Accounting"; at least at this time, & "for the time-being".

17: Due to their Fractional-Reserve "Leveraging" Practices, & when this loan was issued to the Moores, LRS Institution Officers &/or agents, in their corporate capacity were not standing ready to redeem the entire 100% face value of this & all of the other debts which they then had in circulation at that time, & which they had contracted to redeem. During this time, Lender's corporate executives were not standing ready to redeem & pay-out in their "Ultimate Unit of Accounting" of so-called "Federal Reserve Notes", any amount more than Ten-Percent, aka: 10%, of their outstanding & circulating Negotiable Instruments & Electronic Debts/Credits.

This was true, because, LRS were striving to achieve "Maximum Profits" with-in the parameters of their "Fractional Reserve Requirements". During this time, LRS's executives knew, that, if they had an unexpectedly high demand for Federal Reserve Notes form those people making presentment of the debts, that LRS could quite quickly exercise their Privileged Franchise to go to the Federal Reserve Bank's "Discount Window", & there-in secure an "Un-Leveraged Loan", of the extra amount of "Federal Reserve Notes" which then needed to meet the un-expected demands of the people who wanted payment in that "Ultimate Unit of Accounting" of so-called "Federal Reserve Notes".

18: Because all of the here-in named Lender-Counter-Defendants are "Privileged" in this manner, to Leverage their Federal-Reserve-Notes by "Ten-Fold", as franchisees of the Federal-Reserve-Banking-System; & because the Moores & all Common Americans are Not so "Privileged"; here-under, exists a "Private-Law Jurisdiction" system, of "Un-Fair Advantage", & which is routinely pillaging & plundering our Common American People, including these Counter-Plaintiffs.

19: Here-under; & by using the "Ultimate Unit of Accounting" of "Federal Reserve Notes", which all modern Americans have become burdened with, by & through federal emergency-war-powers declarations; & "By Operation of Law", or "By Operation of Accounting-Law", which is just simple & logical mathematics; here-under; the payments which the Moores had made since the date of the loan in question has more than Completely "Paid Off" the True Amount of Federal Reserve Notes that LRS & the other Counter-Defendant Financial-Institutions referenced here-in actually parted with, as the result of those Financial Institutions going through the motions of granting this loan.

20: Here-under; all lawful "Interest" agreed to, upon for the true amount of Federal Reserve Notes actually parted with by these Financial-Institutions, was also paid off by the Moores.

21: At the time when this loan was issued, LRS's Officers, in their corporate capacity, Intended to Receive a Greater Sum or Value in "Interest" by a multiple of at least Ten Times, than that which LRS

had contracted to receive, all as calculated based on the actual use of the Federal Reserve Notes, which LRS had actually "Placed In Hazard". This was also an amount of interest that is in excess of that generally recognized as being "Usurious", & it roughly approximated "100% Per Year" in Interest, as calculated based on the actual Federal Reserve Notes which they actually parted with, as the direct result of this loan.

22: As the direct result of this agreement for the loan of approximately $140,000.00 from LRS, to the Moores; a paper document was issued which purported to obligate the Moores, to repay the full loan with amounts money, which, to the Moores, was equally as precious & functioning at par value with Federal Reserve Notes.

23: As the direct result of the agreement for this loan, there was a paper document composed which was entitled as a "Deed of Trust" document, & which was intended to place into a legal "Trust" relationship, some rights relating to the Title of the Property which is in controversy as the result of this complaint, & concerning which Trustees are capable of holding by way of paper title. This "Deed of Trust" document was issued as the direct result of a presumed "Meeting of the Minds" that LRS Officers were acting in Good Faith to issue this Loan to the Moores; & there-under for LRS (or their assignees) to Secure the repayment of the indebtedness evidenced by the Moores Promissory Note.

24: Later Assignee Financial-Institution Counter-Defendants, including Ocwen & FNMA ; have since been colorably assigned the Promissory Note document & a Beneficial Interest in the Deed of Trust document, which were originally issued by the Moores to LRS, likely all through here-in named Counter-Defendant Mortgage Electronic Registration Systems, Inc. .

25: All of these Financial-Institution Counter-Defendants have habitually & now presently do continue to use similarly unconscionable & lawless Fractional Reserve Leveraging Practices as did the Original Lenders in their actions which have resulted their gaining their interest in these assets.

26: More specifically; Purchaser/Assignees Ocwen & FNMA, in their actions, have habitually & now presently do continue to use similarly unconscionable & lawless Fractional Reserve Leveraging Practices as did the Original Lender, LRS. Those lawless practices have resulted in these institutions Gaining Excessive Interest Payments under the Promissory Note and Deed of Trust Contracts which the Moores placed writing on, & through which the last of those institutions now claim an interest in the property in this case.

27: Neither Ocwen nor FNMA can document, that, they actually parted with the full amount of the Federal Reserve Notes which their re-financing or other actions added to the debt-obligation listed in the later Promissory Note involved in this case.

28: From Original Lender LRS, to the last financial institution involved; None of these Financial Institutions can document, the actual true & accurate "Interest Rate" which they actually gained, as calculated based upon the actual amount of Federal Reserve Notes which they actually parted with when they obtained their interest in the Promissory Note & Trust Deed which are in question in this case.

29: All of these Financial-Institution Counter-Defendants, actually gained an amount of yearly "Interest" on the amount of Federal Reserve Notes which they actually parted with as the direct result of their involvement in this loan, in a vast and un-conscionable excess of the amount which was actually contracted for under their portions of the total debt listed at that time in the promissory note.

30: All of these Financial-Institution Counter-Defendants, actually gained an amount of yearly "Interest" on the amount of Federal Reserve Notes which they actually parted with, of approximately ten times the interest rate listed in the promissory note related to this case.

31: The Later Financial Institution Counter-Defendants were similarly privileged as was the Original Lender, LRS, when they gained their in the Trust Deed to this property. This is true because the

credits with which these Defendants used to purchase their interests in these documents was of only approximately 10 % of the value to them as were the "Federal Reserve Note" based ultimate-economic-accounting-units, which common Americans and Texans, such as the Moores are disenfranchised and un-fairly coerced in-to seeking out, in our handicapped-efforts to re-pay these loans.

32: Here-under, Purchasing-Defendants were each allowed to purchase this Promissory Note, and its accompanying and related beneficial interest in the Trust Deed to this property in this case, with funds which were only 10% as valuable to them in comparison to the "Federal Reserve Note" based ultimate-economic-accounting-units which the Moores were & are being coerced in-to seeking-out.

33: The Corporate Officers in control of these Financial Institutions, All "Knew" that they were competing for this interest in this property of these Plaintiffs on an "Un-Equal" and "Un-Conscionable" basis; yet they did not care, because they were Exclusively Concerned about "Ultimate Profits", and they were not concerned about good-faith or conscience-bound standards of behavior in their relations with any members of the American or Texas Public with whom they were then doing business, including the Moores.

34: The interest or estate claimed in this property by this Present Claimed-Owner is invalid and un-lawful, because, the Promissory Note and the Deed of Trust through which they derive their interest in this property are fraudulent, usurious, unconscionable, and there-by un-lawful.

35: The history between the Defendants, and the Moores, shows that, the Moores have been treated in un-ethical and manipulative manners. The honest efforts of the Moores to address the issues involved with the Promissory Note related to this case, have been met only with elitist, aristocratic, and arrogant indifference or disdain. All of the specific instances of this un-ethical, bad-faith, and "Un-Clean-Hands" behavior are not fully presented here-in, because of those Counter-Defendants refusal to engage in discussing the issues in this case, & because of "time constraints" which cause we Plaintiffs to reasonably fear an unlawful detainer action being lawlessly brought against us, if we do not file our complaint promptly.

36: Counter-Plaintiffs Moores made numerous good-fath efforts to satisfy the debts alleged against them, as explained in more detail else-where-in.

37: Counter-Defendants Refused to Respond Reasonably or Conscionably, to the Efforts Made by the Moores to satisfy the debts alleged against them, as related to this real-property.

38: There-after; one of the here-in named Counter-Defendants, has acted to issue a document entitled "Notice of Trustee's Sale" concerning the property in question in this case.

39: On the date of 2015-December-6, officers &/or agents of "Federal National Mortgage Association", aka: "Fannie Mae", aka: "FNMA" (& here-in after "FNMA"), went through actions which reslted in a presumption that all lawful interest in this real-property was purchased by their corporation through a "Foreclosure Sale", conducted on that date.

One natural-person specifically involved in this event was one "Shelly Nail", who was acting as a "Substitute Truste", under her presumed color of authority allegedly granted by the "Deed of Trust" document which we Counter-Plaintiffs Moores had originally produced in 2001-June.

40: By the acts of Defendants/Trustees, they have committed a "Breach of their Fiduciary Duties" to we Ex-Rel Plaintiffs.

41: Here-under; those Defendant/Trustees were & are No Longer Acting as Lawfully Recognizable "Trustees" of any Title to the Real-Property in question in this case.

42: In the light most favorable to the Defendants, they have only a "Security Interest" in the property in question in this case; & they have no lawful basis or claim up-on which to "state a cause of action" for having these Plaintiffs forcibly removed from this property in question in this case. These Co-Plaintiffs are sure there is similar statutory codes here in Texas; but for the present, this fundamental & Universal Common-Law Principle of Real-Property Law, is well-stated in an Oregon Statute, which reads as follows:

ORS: 164.105: Right of possession. … (3) … a person in lawful possession of property shall be deemed to have a right of possession superior to that of a person having only a security interest in the property, even if legal title to the property lies with the holder of the security interest pursuant to ... security agreement.

43: Counter-Defendants also have "Caused Actions Injurious to" these Plaintiff's "Business"; as Prohibited by the deeper common-law/due-process points of "Law" which this Statute is clearly intended to Prohibit. Those Defendants have also there-by "Obstructed Justice" & "Hindered Prosecution" of formally accused Criminals; in bold-violation of Texas Equivalent Statutes, ... Felony.

44: Here-under; Counter-Defendants did use its legal-fiction corporate umbrella to give color-of-legitimacy to the acts of one of their agents; & under those acts, further color-of-legitimacy was given a so called "Trustee's Sale" of the real-property in question in this case.

45: Of particular significance in this case, is the Role in this Evil-Empire Class-Warfare Conspiracy of among the real flesh & blood people named among the Co-Counter-Defendants in this complaint, is that of the people involved with "Mortgage Electronic Registration Systems", aka "MERS".

In a future & amended version of this complaint, we do expect to provide more details concerning the people involved with that MERS entity. But here, we will say, that, the people behind this MERS entity have become involved in this case, not only by their assuming roles in the chain-of-custody of the trust-deed &/or the promissory-note involved here-in, but also, it seems, by actually acting as the plaintiff in the criminally lawless eviction scheme, where-under the previous JOP-Court was fraudulently deceived in-to issuing eviction documents against these counter-plaintiffs, where-inder we were lawlessly & criminally forced by armed but constitutionally illiterate executive officers from our home.

While there are massive volumes of powerful evidence & arguments supporting our accusation here-in, that, the Massively Lawless Criminal-Conspiracy known as this "MERS" entity, a very few of these are set forth in the following summary:

46: As of 2010, MERS holds approximately 66 million American mortgages; and is a Delaware corporation whose sole shareholder is Mers Corp. The people behind this legal-fiction corporate viel, have conspired to use the MERS corporate name in place of the names of any of their members who are also lenders named in any mortgage loans they make. MERS is really nothing more than a name that is used on mortgage instruments in place of the names of the actual lenders.

MersCorp was created in the early 1990's by the former C.E.O.'s of Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac, Indy Mac, Countrywide, Stewart Title Insurance and the American Land Title Association. The executives of these companies lined their pockets with billions of dollars of unearned bonuses and free stock by creating so-called mortgage backed securities using bogus mortgage loans to unqualified borrowers thereby creating a huge false demand for residential homes and thereby falsely inflating the value of those homes. This MERS system is just another crooked rip-off scheme that is has been seen used for thousands of years in the corrupted financial world. MERS was created in the boardrooms of the most powerful and controlling members of the American financial institutions. This gigantic scheme completely ignored long standing law of commerce as relating to mortgage lending; and they did so for their own personal gain.

That the inevitable collapse of the crooked mortgage swindles would lead to terrible national repercussions was a matter of little or no interest to those at the upper levels of America's banking and financial world; because, the only interest of those people was to grab the money, and keep it in the form of ficticious bonuses, real estate, and very large accounts in foreign banks. The effect of this system has led to catastrophic meltdown on both the American and global economy.

In many civil cases, Mers has been proven to not hold any promissory notes of any kind. As a "Matter of Law", Commercial-Law, a party must have physical possession of the promissory note, in order for them to have the legal-standing necessary in order to enforce and/or otherwise collect on any debt that is owed to any party. Given this clear-cut legal definition, MERS does not have legal standing to enforce or collect on the millions mortgages it controls.

MERS has been taken to civil courts across the country and charged with a lack of standing in repossession issues. When the mortgage debacle initially, and inevitably, began, MERS always routinely brought actions against defaulting mortgage holders purporting to represent the owners of the defaulted mortgages. But then, the courts discovered MERS was only a front organization that did not hold any deed, nor was aware of who or what agencies might actually hold those deeds; &, here-under, the courts have routinely denied attempts by MERS agents to force foreclosure.

In the past, persons alleging they were officials of MERS in foreclosure motions, purported to be the holders of the mortgage, when, in fact, they not only were not the holder of the mortgage; &, under court orders, they could not actually produce the identity of the actual holder. These so-called MERS officers have usually been just employees of entities who are servicing the loan for the actual lender.

It is now widely acknowledged by courts, that, MERS has no legal right to foreclose or otherwise collect debt which are evidenced by promissory notes held by someone else. The American media routinely identifies MERS as a mortgage lender, creditor, and mortgage company; when in point of fact MERS has never loaned so much as a dollar to anyone, is not a creditor, and is not a mortgage company. MERS is merely a name that is printed on mortgages, purporting to give MERS some sort of legal status, in the matter of a loan made by a completely different and almost always, a totally unknown entity.

The infamous collapse of the American housing bubble, was due, in largepart, to the MERS moral-prostitute & mercenary officers & agents conspiring involved in this evil-empire class-warfare conspiracy.

MERS does not make or originate mortgage loans, it does not extend any credit to consumers, it has no role in the original funding of the mortgages or deeds of trust for which it serves as "nominee"; it is not an investor who acquires mortgage loans on the secondary market; it does not ever process any mortgage applications; it simply holds mortgage liens in a nominee capacity; and, is designed to simply track changes in the ownership of mortgage loans, and servicing rights related thereto.

MERS is never the owner of the promissory note for which it seeks foreclosure; it has no legal or beneficial interest in the promissory note which underlies the security instrument for which it serves as "nominee"; & it has no legal or beneficial interest in the loan instrument there-to; & it has no legal or beneficial interest in the mortgage indebtedness there-to; & it has no interest at all in the promissory note evidencing the mortgage indebtedness.

MERS' national data center is located in Plano, Texas.

47: Here-under; Law-firm Counter-Defendant & their Attorney, did file in the Midland County Precinct-2 JoP-Court, against these Plaintiffs, a Complaint of "Forcible Entry & Detainer"; against we Plaintiffs, under "Case #: E2160017".

48: In their "Forcible Entry & Detainer" Complaint, effectively; these Defendants Claimed that we Counter-Plaintiffs are in the Physical Possession of certain real-property which is located in a defacto/military police-state & admiralty/maritime Jurisdiction, which is indicated by the use of a "Zip-

Code", & "All-Capital Letters"; which those Defendants abbreviated as: "1001 SOUTH COUNTY ROAD 1060, MIDLAND, TX 79706".

49: As an issue of general public constitutional law; we Counter-Plaintiffs are in the physical-possession of the property which is commonly-known by a similar street-address; but our real-property is Not located in that De-facto, Summary, Military-Police-State Admiralty/Maritime Jurisdiction; but rather, our property is located "on the land", under the "law of the land", in pure Constitutional Common-Law Jurisdiction. Here-under; All Real-Property Cases are governed by the general "Law of Ejectment", or, in Texas Statutory Terminology: "Trespass to Try Title"; & even regarding the brutal Summary/Military Proceeding Clone there-under, which is known as "Forcible Entry & Unlawful Detainer"; all of these proceedings in Texas find their Legitimate Roots under these same General Common-Law Princples, as the case-law quoted else-where here-in, & in supportive documents, clearly establishe.

50: In the brief FED complaint, which Counter-Defendants first used to un-lawfully get us evicted from this real-property; those CounterDefendants Claimed that they were "entitled to possession" of that same real-property, as which they described by their militarized defacto zip-code & capitalization Jurisdictional Designations.

51: There-by; those Counter-Defendants have Maliciously & Criminally pursued a Bad-Faith Agenda which sought to use that De-facto Police-State's Secretive Private/Civil Summary/Military Jurisdiction's Adversarial & Arbitrary Court Procedural Process, so-as-to Circumvent the Constitutionally-Guaranteed Rights of we Plaintiffs to "Due Course/Process of Law". Those Counter-Defendants there-by did Fast-Track their "Eviction" of we Counter-Plaintiff Moores, from this real-property, through their Criminally Conspiratorial Abuse of the the Limited-jurisdictional Scope of forcible-entry-and-detainer process against us.

This ends the general out-line listing of the specific situational/historical "Facts", which, as they are directly related to this case concerning the Claims & Complaints of we Counter-Plaintiffs to the specific real-property in question, as we Plaintiffs are here-in presenting them before these courts.

~~~~~~

Broader Issues Concerning:
Fundamental Principles of Lawful Procedure & Jurisdiction, Vs:
Purposefully Municipally Institutionalized Judicial Procedural Confusion:
(The following section of text is here presented in these Counter-Plaintiffs efforts to paint a complete picture for all Judges honorably concerned with this case.)

52: In efforts to paint a complete picture for all Judicial-Officers who are honorably concerned with securing legitimate "Justice" in response to our presentation before them of this case; a few Citations are here presented, which provide valuable insight into the importance of "Due Process of Law", under the "Rules of the Common-Law"; all as the "Constitutionally-Preferred Method" of "Dispute-Resolution" in our American & Texas Constitutional Systems of Government.

Please here Refer Again to the Four Documents referenced in the Four Web-Links presented on Page-7 of this Counter-Complaint. The Arguments & Citations presented more fully there-in, are again here more briefly inserted, by way of this reference to them; as follows:

There is a very ancient & Opposing Body of so-called "Laws" in place, which are continuously battling against our Anglo/American Common-Law, from behind the scenes, and with powerful supporters; all of which are derived from the very powerful & ancient Roman System of "Slave Trading", but which is routinely packaged in the friendly seeming term of so-called "Civil -Law", but which, in
~~~~~~

more accurate legal terms, is referred to as "Municipal-Law". This entire subject of these Fundamentally "Opposing Bodies of Law" are described in detail in scholarly legal texts which are referred to as "Conflict of Laws"; & it is very ancient, reaching back literally for thousands of years. It has Profoundly Influenced our modern American concepts of "Constitutional-Law". This "Conflict" between the so-called "Civil-Law", and the "Common-Law"; is also between Individual People who advocate that our American People view one or the other of those diametrically-opposed bodies of law as "Constitutional". Our first Citation here presents an important legal insight from reputable "Black's Law Dictionary", 5th edition, which renders an important Definition, as:

"Civil Law: That body of law … ; more properly called municipal law, to distinguish it from the law of nature, and from international law. Laws concerned with civil or private rights and remedies, as contrasted with criminal laws. The system of jurisprudence held and administered in the Roman empire, … collectively denominated the *Corpus Juris Civilus*,- as distinguished from the common law of England …"
https://ConstitutionalGov.US/Blacks5th.htm

Please note here-under, that: "Civil Law", is "More Properly Called Municipal Law".

Once this important point of "Legal Terminology" is firmly grasped, then, the reader can proceed forward with a much more Broad Indictment, as against the Complete Bankruptcy of 'Moral, Ethical, & Intellectual Integrity', as modernly & routinely manifesting under this 'Roman-Empire Model of Governing', & the civil/municipal 'Court-Structures' there-under established. These points are presented with cutting judicial scholarship, as quoted in this text composed in 1871, under the title: "Of the Civil-Law and the Common-Law", by a Professor of Law at Columbia College, named Samuel Tyler II,D.; as follows:

"**There have grown up in the history of nations only two great systems of law, the civil law of ancient Rome, & the common law of England. All the most civilized nations in the world are governed by either of these two great schemes of justice. Though the civil law and the common law have much in common, yet in many important particulars they are the opposites of each other. In the course of his studies, the student of law finds so much said, in an incidental way, about the civil law, that is calculated to mislead his judgment in regard to the true character of that scheme of justice, that it is important, at the outset of his walks over the fields of the common law, to give him some account of the civil law, and point out in what it differs essentially from the common law. This is a matter of much importance to every student who aspires to a comprehensive and enlightened knowledge of jurisprudence. ...**

... it was under the empire, when the glory of the republic was gone, that the jurists attained their eminence, and in fact became the architects of the great system of Roman law. ... Oratory was no longer, as it had been during the glorious period of the republic, the great art by which men rose to eminence in the state. Its voice was now silent; when to speak of the rights of Roman citizens was treason. …

The administration of the law, too, was subordinate to the imperial authority, not only in theory but in practice, the courts being organized accordingly. Under the republic, the courts were open to the public in both civil and criminal trials. Under the empire, open courts disappeared, and an appeal lay in all cases to the emperor in his imperial court. Thus a perfect system of despotism, disguised under forms of law, was built up on the ruins of the republic. …

If we now turn to the common law of England, we will find that, as far as administrative principles and forms of procedure are concerned, it is the opposite of the Roman civil law as it was molded under the empire. The principle which, in the practical administration of the two systems, marks the primary essential distinction between them, is the relative obligatory force under them of precedent or former decisions. Under the common law, former decisions control the court unconditionally. It is deemed by the common law indispensable that there should be a fixed rule of decision, in order that rights and property may be stable and certain, and not involved in perpetual doubts and controversies.

Under the civil law the principles is different. Former decisions have not so fixed and certain an operation, but are considered as only governing the particular case, without establishing as a settled rule

the principle involved in it. When a similar case occurs, the judge may decide it according to his personal views of the law, or according to the opinion of some eminent jurist. …

Let anyone, who wishes to examine a specimen of this perplexity in regard to a fundamental classification which the civilians make of laws into personal statutes and real statutes, refer to the opinion of the supreme court of Louisiana, by Mr. Justice Porter, in Saul v. His Creditors, in 17 Martins' Reports. After referring to the jurists of the different European countries who have treated of this distinction, Justice Porter says:

"The moment we attempt to discover from these writers what statutes are real and what personal, the most extraordinary confusion is presented. Their definitions often differ; and, when they agree in their definitions, they dispute as to their application."

And Mr. Justice Story, in his "Conflict of Laws," when speaking of the civilians who have treated of the subject of his book, says:

"The civilians of continental Europe have examined the subject in many of its bearings with a more comprehensive philosophy, if not with a more enlightened spirit. Their works, however, abound with theoretical distinctions, which serve little purpose than to provoke idle discussions and metaphysical subtleties, which perplex, if they do not confound the inquirer. * * *

Precedents, too, have not, either in the courts of continental Europe or in the judicial discussions of eminent jurists, the same force and authority which we, who live under the influence of the common law, are accustomed to attribute to them; and it is unavoidable that many differences of opinion will exist amongst them, even in relation to leading principles." Such is the fluctuating wind of doctrine with which the judicial mind is liable to veer under the civil-law institutions where precedents have but little force. …

The common law, in broad contrast to the civil law, has always wholly repudiated anything as authority but the judgments of courts deliberately given in causes argued and decided. "For (says Lord Coke, in the preface to his 9th Report) it is one amongst others of the great honors of the common law that cases of great difficulty are never adjudged or resolved in tenebris or sub silentio suppressis reationibus, but in open court: and there upon solemn and elaborate arguments, ... where they argue ... seriatim, upon certain days openly and purposely prefixed, delivering at large the authorities, reasons, and causes of their judgments and resolutions in every such particular case, ... a reverend and honorable proceeding in law, a grateful satisfaction to the parties, and a great instruction and direction to the attentive and studious hearers."

Nothing less elaborately learned & cautiously considered than such a judgment of a court has a legitimate place in the common law. By such adjudication has that great system of jurisprudence been built up. The opinion of no lawyer has a place in the system of common law. And this wise principle of the common law is never lost sight of by those bred in its spirit. When Lord Coke wrote his commentaries upon certain statutes of England, from Magna Charta to Henry VIII, which are called his II Institutes, he did not give his personal opinions of their meaning, but gave the judicial interpretations of them, which had been made. In the conclusion of the preface to the II Institutes he says:

"Upon the text of the civil law there be so many glosses and interpretations, and again upon those so many commentaries, and all written by doctors of equal degree and authority, and therein so many diversities of opinions, as they rather increase than resolve doubts and uncertainties, and the professors of that noble science say that it is like see full of waves."

"The difference, then, between those glosses and commentaries are written by doctors, and which be advocates, and so in a great manner private interpretations; and our expositions or commentaries upon Magna Charta and other statutes are resolutions of judges in courts of justice in judicial courses of proceeding, either related and reported in our books or extant in judicial records, or in both, and therefore, being collected together, shall ... produce certainty, the mother and nurse of repose and quietness."

Such is the doctrine of the common law! Nothing but the solemn voice of the law itself, speaking through its constituted tribunals, is of any judicial authority. And how august is that authority, reposing

as it does upon the solemn decisions of courts which have administered justice in the very same halls for nearly eight hundred years! In vain shall we search the history of nations for a parallel to this stability of law amidst the fluctuating vicissitudes of empire. It is this stability of law, ruling over the prerogative of the crown and administering equal justice to the high and the low through so many centuries, that vindicates the "frame and ordinary course of the common law" to the consideration of the present times.

It is this primary difference in the principles of practice, under the two systems of law, which gives to the common law its great superiority over the civil law, as a practical jurisprudence regulating the affairs of society. It has the great advantage of producing certainty in regard to all rights and obligations which are regulated by law. But, above all, it excludes private interpretations and controls the arbitrary discretion of judges. In the common law the principles of interpretation are fixed and certain. Rules of interpretation were early adopted, and have never been departed from. Other rules from time to time have been adopted, but when once introduced into practice they become precedents."

53: A slightly more-complete abbreviated-summary is presented in the first web-link following; & the second web-link following presents the entire original text from the original published book; as follows:

https://constitutionalgov.us/Citations-Longer/CommonLaw&CivilLaw-TylersIntroduction-FullCleanOriginal.pdf

https://constitutionalgov.us/Citations-Short/CommonLawVsCivilLaw-TylersIntroduction-Abbreviated&Underlined.pdf

Note-worthy points to summarize here-from, are that: "Common-Law" is said to produce a process where "rights and property may be Stable and Certain, and not involved in perpetual doubts and controversies"; and that the opposing Roman-based "Civil-Law" seems Purposefully Designed to generate "Confusion" and "Despotism".

54: In efforts to bring all of these citations in-to a sharp focus on the case involved here-in, the Defendants & their accomplices here have been repeatedly using obscure legal technicalities, in their efforts "To Create Confusion". Their Malicious-Intent here, is to "Mis-Prioritize" the Perversions of the Roman-Empire Summary/Military Process, over our Common People's Constitutionally-Guaranteed Rights to "Due Process of Law".

This concern is especially exacerbated under the additionally complicating factors of the so-called "Merger of Law & Equity", as discussed more fully in the four linked supportive documents previously referenced.

One of the central arguments of these Counter-Plaintiffs, is, that, the "Civil Jurisdiction" of basically all modern American & Texas Courts, have been purposefully & maliciously infected with "Confusion" there-in; in order to Pervert the Well-Settled Course of our More Traditional & Honorable-Standards of Judicial-Procedure. The Only Way that these sorts of maliciously obscured but well-documented Evils can continue to exist in our Nation & States, is through Maliciously Fabricated & Fraudulent "Declarations of Emergency"; as is well-documented in the following Citation:

"U.S. Senate Report 93-549; … on … the National Emergency.

… A majority of the people of the United States have lived all of their lives under emergency rule. For 40 years, freedoms and governmental procedures guaranteed by the Constitution have, in varying degrees, been abridged by laws brought into force by states of national emergency. The problem of how a constitutional democracy reacts to great crisis, however, far antedates the Great Depression. As a philosophical issue, its origins reach back to the Greek city-states and the Roman Republic. And, in the United States, actions taken by the Government in times of great crisis have - from, at least, the Civil War - in important ways shaped the present phenomenon of a permanent state of national emergency.

American political theory of emergency government was derived from John Locke, the English-political-philosopher whose thought influenced the authors of the Constitution. Locke argued that the threat of national crisis - unforseen, sudden, and potentially catastrophic - required the creation of broad executive emergency powers to be exercised by the Chief Executive in situations where the legislative authority had not provided a means or procedure of remedy. Referring to emergency power in the 14th chapter of his *Second Treatise on Civil Government* as "prerogative", Locke suggested that it:

... should be left to the discretion of him that has the executive power ... since in some governments the lawmaking power is not always in being and is usually too numerous and too slow for the dispatch requisite to executions, and because, also it is impossible to foresee and so by laws to provide for all accidents and necessities that may concern the public, or make such laws as will do no harm, if they are executed with an inflexible rigour on all occasions and upon all persons that may come in their way, therefore there is a latitude left to the executive power to do many things of choice which the laws do not prescribe. ... "

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Senate_Report_93-549
http://www.ncrepublic.org/images/lib/SenateReport93_549.pdf
http://barefootsworld.net/war_ep1.html

Please note in the opening-line of the above-quoted text, that: "freedoms and governmental procedures guaranteed by the Constitution have, in varying degrees, been abridged by laws brought into force by states of national emergency. Please note that constitutionally-guaranteed "Due Process of Law" is a "Governmental Procedure". Please note that the words "Process" & "Procedure" are both phonetically & etymologically related.

And this Problem goes much deeper than to just the issues raised through the accusations presented in this specific case. This case involves numerous "Public Interest" Issues. Perhaps the single most significant "Public Interest" issue related to this case, is what has been described by reputable law scholars as a "War on the Judiciary", mostly by people usurping authority to act as Government Executive Officers, but also by the largely dysfunctional "Legislative Assemblies"; & certainly concerning the mega-wealthy & "Wall Street" centered "Private Banking Organizations".

A number of Case-Law Citations which support these Important Points, read as follows:

"Does 9/11 Justify a War on the Judicial Branch?"
http://www.gibbonslaw.com/Files/Publication/4547af23-03ba-4b15-b964-96953c11a960/Presentation/PublicationAttachment/c43242b4-21f9-417a-97d5-9956d7880773/Gibbons%20Speech_PDF%281%29.pdf

"... it was the executive branch's position that claims made on behalf of people detained outside the territorial limits of the United States were simply non-justiciable because the United States lacked sovereignty over the places of confinement. In the Supreme Court, the government elected not to defend the White House and Justice Department's extreme positions on executive branch authority to ignore the law but rather chose to challenge the judicial power to enforce it. Thus, I opened my argument to the Court:

What is at stake in this case is the authority of the Federal courts to uphold the rule of law. Respondents assert that their actions are absolutely immune from judicial examination whenever they elect to detain foreign nationals outside our borders. Under this theory, neither the length of the detention, the conditions of their confinement, nor the fact that they have been wrongfully detained makes the slightest difference. Respondents would create a lawless enclave insulating the executive branch from any judicial scrutiny now or in the future." Page 1105.

"What is clear is that the war by the executive branch and the legislative branch against the authority of the judicial branch to uphold the rule of law did not end ..." Page 1114.

~~~

"Administrative Justice & the Supremacy of Law in the United States'; By John Dickenson; 1927, …
~~~

with .. Harvard College; 1955, Russell & Russell, Inc; … Harvard University Press; Studies from Princeton, Johns Hopkins, Columbia & Harvard Universities. (Pages: 34, 35, 36, 37, & 38)

"The multiplication in recent years of public bodies … has raised anew for our law … the problem of executive justice. That government officials should assume the traditional function of courts of law, and be permitted to determine the rights of individuals, is a development so out of line with the supposed path of our legal growth as to challenge renewed attention to certain underlying principles of our jurisprudence. ...

In the age of Coke such questions as these arose in connection with what has since been called "executive justice." To-day the term "executive" seems fitted to a narrower need, and "administrative justice" suggests itself a better name for the broader current legal development. (Chapter 1, Page 3)

"The introduction of administrative justice has encountered in our constitutional doctrine of the "separation of powers" a barrier which has been evaded only by the invention of a new set of glaring legal fictions embodied in such words as "quasi-legislative," "quasi-judicial," and the like. To review the development of these fictions would supply an instructive commentary on an important branch of American constitutional law, but it would not shed helpful light on the more fundamental problems presented by the substitution of administrative justice for adjudication by courts of law. These problems reach below the special limitations of American constitutional law and turn up for inspection some of the deepest principles of the Anglo-American legal system.

"In Anglo-American jurisprudence, government and the law have always in a sense stood opposed to each other; the law has been rather something to give the citizen a check on the government than an instrument to give the government control over citizens. There is a famous phrase, which has long been attributed to Bracton, ... that "the king has a superior, to whit, the law; and if he be without a bridle, a bridle ought to be put on him, namely, the law." This "rule of law" as Dicey calls it, or "supremacy of law," in Libeler's phrase, has uniformly been treated as the central and most characteristic feature of Anglo-American juristic habit; and nothing has been held more fundamental to the supremacy of law than the right of every citizen to bring the action of government officials to trial in the ordinary courts of the common law. That government officials, on the contrary, should themselves assume to preform the functions of a law court and determine the rights of individuals, as is the case under a system of administrative justice, has been traditionally felt to be inconsistent with the supremacy of law. It was the ground of attack on the Court of Star Chamber, in the days when the Chancellor was still mainly an administrative officer of the King. Lieber mentions freedom from "government by commissions," and from the jurisdiction of executive courts, as one of the elements of Anglo-American Liberty." Ch 2, Pg 32.

"The orthodox doctrine of the supremacy of law has been stated by Dicey as including two principles: "It means in the first place that no man can lawfully be made to suffer in body or goods except for a distinct breach of law established in the ordinary courts of the land." It means in the second place "that no man is above the law, but that every man, whatever his rank or condition, is subject to the ordinary law of the realm, and amenable to the jurisdiction of the ordinary tribunals . . . With us, every official, from the Prime Minister down to a constable or collector of taxes, is under the same responsibility for every act done without legal justification as any other citizen." (Law of the Constitution, 8th edition. p. 185 & 189)

"In short, every citizen is entitled, first, to have his rights adjudicated in a regular common-law court, &, secondly, to call into question in such a court the legality of any act done by an administrative official." ...

"The substantive difference between administrative procedure and the procedure by law is that the administrative tribunals decide controversies coming before them, not by fixed rules of law, but by the application of governmental discretion or policy.

It is this last point which is of capital interest here. The competition between administrative & legal justice, is ... a phase of the age-old struggle between discretion and fixed rule, between *vouops* and *ekleiakela*, between equity and the strict law."

In so far as administrative adjudication is coming in certain fields to take the place of adjudication by law courts, the supremacy of law as formulated in Dicey's first proposition is overridden. But a possible way of escaping this result is left open by his second proposition. An administrative determination is an act of a governmental officer or officers; & if it be true that all the acts of such officers are subject to be questioned in the courts, it is then possible to have the issue of any questionable administrative adjudication raised & decided anew in a law court, with the special advantages guarantees of the procedure at law. We see here the reason why the question of court review of administrative determinations has become of such central importance and has been the focus of so much discussion since the rise of the administrative procedure. For just so far as administrative determinations are subject to court review, a means exists for maintaining the supremacy of law, though at one remove and as a sort of secondary line of defense. The special advantages of the administrative procedure may be substantially retained, while at the same time, in a given case, the result can be brought to the test of the procedure at law. Administrative justice exists in defiance of the supremacy of law only in so far as administrative adjudications are final and conclusive, and not subject to correction by a law court."

Concerned readers please keep in mind, that, Cold-Blooded Tyrants, such as Joseph Stalin & Pol Pot, have No Reason to retain the services of any "Judicial Officers". Tyrants have No Need for Judicial Officers. Tyrants have only needs for Obedient Administrative & Military Officers, who "Follow Orders", Blindly, & with zero functionality of "Conscience", & with zero concern for constitutional "Justice".

This author believes that he has read, some-where, that, one of the first things that Adolph Hitler did, after he came to power, was to use his new military-police-state powers to incarcerate & otherwise persecute members of Germany"s Judiciary. Although citations escape me; it should be easy for honorable readers to comprehend, how a Military-Tyrant would have "Little Use" for Officers who were attempting to legitimately exercise "Judicial Powers". Historically, & in their perverse nature; Multitudes of Tyrants & Despots have lusted after massive Centralized-Power; & they there-under have purposefully Brought "Confusion" to Maliciously Thwart their Mandate to Serve the Public-Interest by Preserving Access to Constitutional "Due Process of Law" for our Common People.

Further here-under; these Plaintiffs here embrace the task of attempting to Communicate Clearly to all honorable Judges that might become involved with this case, precisely Why & How the deeper & more Constitutionally Powerful Concepts of Public "Due Process/Course of Law", aka: "Common-Law", aka: "Law of the Land", should properly be brought to bear, in Resolving the Dispute manifesting here-in.

****

Shielding Texas's Sovereign People From
Dismissals of their Due-Process-of-Law Rights:

55: There seems to be a common mis-conception amongst professional bar-member attorneys, that, "Law", Flows, in a top/down, authoritarian, & essentially despotic manner. We Plaintiffs theorize that this mis-conception exists, because, the very nature of the "bar association" under which professional attorneys operate, is similarly top/down, authoritarian, & despotic. We have seen how, with reference to honest bar-member attorneys, who might be so bold as to insist on constitutionally-guaranteed & natural/organic "Rights" for the people they are assisting, these attorneys are frequently "Terrorized" away from insisting on the Rights of their litigants in the Courts; & this all simply because these attorneys are threatened with the Loss of their "License to Practice Law".

Dis-honest attorneys seem to thrive in these sorts of top/down authoritarian & despotic environments. All that they have to do is to continue selling-out our common people, & to there-by enable the devils at the top of that despotic power-pyramid, to continue to run their slave-trading

disneyland legal-fiction evil-empire. This class-warfare strategy gives those corrupted attorneys a feeling of assurance that they will continue to be able to maintain their very comfortable but essentially criminal standard of living.

But this is not harmonious with the "Original Intent" of those who fought & died to make Texas, America, England, & Israel, "Free". In 1776, America reverted back to a very pure & ancient form of Common-Law, that was in-place in England, prior to the "Norman Conquest" of 1066-ad; & which was actually based on the even more ancient "Torah Laws" of Israel. America's average founders had a fresher "genetic memory" flowing through their veins, of the realities of those more noble time-periods; in stark contrast to the Institutionalized Propaganda that now saturates the blood which flows through the veins & brains of our average modern American. America's founders, as with Texas's founders, thirsted for these very perfected forms of ancient due-process-of-law related freedoms; & that is precisely what they did their level best to codify, in our written "Constitution" documents.

Yet most modern bar-member attorneys seem to have been programmed by despotic new-world-order conspirators, to function like robots, in coldly mechanical manners, as they process hapless litigants through gauntlet-like tortures, all in purposefully & needlessly complicated court proceedings. How-ever; we now live in a new 'information-age'; where-in people all over the planet are becoming aware of these realities; & they are 'self-organizing', to take steps to put an end to this ability of this aristocratic & babylonian-whore-like parasite-class to pillage & plunder our planet's common-people.

It seems clear to we Plaintiffs, that, "The Courts" of our nation & state, are the Only really Possible Theaters in which these sorts of Evils have any sort of a Chance for being 'Settled in Non-Violent Manners'. This is the precise reason why Common-Law/Due-Process Fixates on the Core-Issue of Preventing "Breach of the Peace". This is the modern equivalent of "International Law". In those ancient Christian/Protestant times; Preventing "Breach of the Peace" was the Singular Concern for the entirety of society. Here-under; the common-law monarchs there-in governing had "zero tolerance" for those with legal skills who purposefully deceived commoners, in their efforts to pervert these supreme & international "Laws of Nature". And these ideas were firmly embraced in early America & Texas, as the following Citations show:

"In America ... (t)he right of juries to decide questions of law was widely accepted in the colonies, especially in criminal cases. Prior to 1850, the judge and jury were viewed as partners ... . The jury could decide questions of both law and fact, ... Legal theory and political philosophy emphasized the importance of the Jury in divining natural law, which was thought to be a better source for decision than the "authority of black letter maxim." Since natural law was accessible to lay people, it was held to be the duty of each juror to determine for himself whether a particular rule of law embodied the principles of the higher natural law."

Civil Procedure; West Publishing Company, Friedenthal, Kane & Miller,
West Hornbook Series on Civil Procedure, 1985: Page 476 & 477:

"Fair Trial: A proceeding before an impartial and disinterested tribunal; a proceeding which hears before it condemns, which proceeds upon inquiry and renders judgement only after trail consideration of evidence and facts as a whole. A basic constitutional guarantee ... . A legal trial or one conducted in all material things in substantial conformity to law. A trial which insures substantial justice. A trial without prejudice to the accused. An orderly trail before an impartial jury and judge whose neutrality is indifferent to every factor in trial but that of administering justice. One conducted according to due course of law. A trail before an impartial judge, and an impartial jury, and an atmosphere of judicial calm. In such trial, the judge may not extend his activities so far as to become, in effect, either an assistant prosecutor, or a thirteenth juror." …

Black's Law Dictionary; 5th Edition.

Also see: "The Lawfinding Power of Colonial American Juries". Ohio State Law Journal. https://kb.osu.edu/server/api/core/bitstreams/c9af1210-b137-57a6-b1b2-2b576b7c79b1/content

~~~~~~

56: Jurisdiction, More Fully Explained:

This section is a Continuation of section 4, from page 5, of this same complaint. This section presents technical legalistic details to people especially concerned with the Mechanics & "Venue Issues" involved in the larger concept of "Jurisdiction"; & it is especially focused on communicating with Judicial Officers, Court Clerks, & Attorneys. Here-under, these legalistic "Jurisdictional Issues" are presented, as follows:

57: While we are also filing & prosecuting our case here in the "441st District Court, for Midland County"; we presently consider the court/venue most which is most likely to efficiently produce the Natural/Organic/Constitutional "Justice" which we seek, is that of the First Court which we are pressing forward in with this Criminal Counter-Complaint, which is that of the "Court of the Justice of the Peace for Precinct-2 of Midland County"; as presently governed by the man acting as the legitimate "Justice of the Peace" there-in, & named as one "David Cobos"; all as represented by the web-page for this Public Office, here:

https://www.co.midland.tx.us/507/Precincts-2-4

Complaints related to this JOP-Court have already been invoked under Case #: E2160017.

With just two exceptions/reservations; Traditional/Organic/Constitutional Common-Law provides very deep Roots for this "Court of the Justice of the Peace"; which is known under various other names, including "Courts of Justice", "Justice Courts", & "Hundred Courts". We Co-Plaintiffs believe, that, this is the Only Court that presently exists in Midland County that has True "Original & Exclusive Jurisdiction" to try such serious Criminal Charges as are presented in this Criminal-Counter-Complaint. "As a Matter of Law", & with regard to the proceedings being invoked here-in; this "Justice-of-the-Peace Court" Is the Single Most Legitimate & Influential Court from among all of the Courts Jurisdictions here-by being invoked.

We are optimistic, that, in light of the more scholarly advanced arguments presented in this Counter-Complaint document, that, the Judicial-Officer presiding there-in, will come to Recognize, that, the judicial-proceedings previously adjudicated there-in, were erroneously decided, & that, all judgements & orders & warrants issued there-from are null & void.

It is useful here to reference a few citations which point-out the Power of this JoP-Court.

In our 'Texas State Constitution', & in 'Article 5', which governs our State's Judicial System, & at Sections 1, 12, & 19, is declared, respectively:

"The judicial power of this State shall be vested in … District Courts, in County Courts, in Commissioners Courts, in Courts of Justices of the Peace, and in such other courts as may be provided by law."

"All judges of courts of this State, by virtue of their office, are conservators of the peace throughout the State. ..."

"Justice of the peace courts shall have original jurisdiction in criminal matters of misdemeanor cases punishable by fine only, exclusive jurisdiction in civil matters where the amount in controversy is two hundred dollars or less, and such other jurisdiction as may be provided by law. …"

One more Citation that is important for us to slip-in here, is again from our Texas State Constitution, at 'Article 3', which governs our Municipal-Government's "Legislative Department", &
~~~~~~

which in "Section 56", declares, that:

"The Legislature shall not, except as otherwise provided in this Constitution, pass any local or special law, authorizing: … Regulating the affairs of counties, cities, towns, wards or school districts; … Changing the venue in civil or criminal cases; … Incorporating cities, towns or villages, or changing their charters; For the opening and conducting of elections, or fixing or changing the places of voting; … Creating offices, or prescribing the powers and duties of officers, in counties, cities, towns, election or school districts; … Regulating the practice or jurisdiction of, or changing the rules of evidence in any judicial proceeding or inquiry before courts, justices of the peace, sheriffs, commissioners, arbitrators or other tribunals, … or the enforcing of judgments, or prescribing the effect of judicial sales of real estate; Regulating the fees, or extending the powers and duties of aldermen, justices of the peace, magistrates or constables; … Summoning or empanelling grand or petit juries; For limitation of civil or criminal actions; ..."

From these Texas Constitutional Citations, reasonable people may reasonably deduce that our Texas State Constitution has Constitutionally Guaranteed the Right of our People in our Local Communities to Establish & Responsibly Operate Our Own "Courts of Justices of the Peace", all there-under obtain Legitimate Judgements & Orders Directing Our Local Community Peace-Officers to Enforce Local Community Conscience-Bound & Reasonable "Justice".

In support of these unfashionably bold claims, another set of Powerful Texas State Constitutional Citations, reads as follows:

Article 1; Bill of Rights: That the general, great and essential principles of liberty and free government may be recognized and established, we declare:

Section 1. Freedom and Sovereignty of State: Texas is a free and independent State, subject only to the Constitution of the United States, and the maintenance of our free institutions and the perpetuity of the Union depend upon the preservation of the right of local self-government, unimpaired to all the States.

Section 2. Inherent Political Power; Republican Form of Government. All political power is inherent in the people, and all free governments are founded on their authority, and instituted for their benefit. The faith of the people of Texas stands pledged to the preservation of a republican form of government, and, subject to this limitation only, they have at all times the inalienable right to alter, reform or abolish their government in such manner as they may think expedient.

Please note there-in, in Section 1, the specific & powerful mandate for the Preservation of the "Right of Local Self Government''. Please note that the Exercise of the General-Jurisdiction "Judicial Power" is a Sub-Set of this "Right of Local Self Government"; as also clearly implied is the Executive & Legislative Powers; all of which makes these Precinct level "Courts of Justice" the Governing Body of a Fully Sovereign & Responsibly Self-Governing Community. The following web-linked citation clearly declares this:

https://constitutionalgov.us/Citations-Short/OregonLawCitations/JusticesCourt-HealdBy-JoP-InPrecinct-LordsOregonLaws.pdf

This is the "Original Constitutional Plan" for "Responsible Local Community Self-Governing". This Sovereign Power is precisely what is referenced in the 'Sixth Amendment' of the 'U. S. Constitution', where the wording there references that "All Criminal Prosecutions" are lawfully Required to be Prosecuted in "the State and District wherein the Crime shall have been Committed". The county-law & common-law concept of the "Precinct" is firmly with-in the parameters of this word of "District", & case-law indicates that this is the most legitimate translation.

Here, in this section, sufficient historical back-ground to comprehend the ancient Common-Law & Biblical-Law Rooted Process which is here-in being invoked, (for those inclined to explore the issue fully), is explained in another document composed by this same author, on the web-page web-linked here:

https://constitutionalgov.us/OrganizingUSA/OrganicHierarchiesUSA-V4.pdf

Please note there-in, on the first page, the reference to "William Blackstone", where-in he quotes the ancient Israelite Torah-Laws of Social-Organizing, as set forth in the Book of Exodus, in chapter 18, verses 17 thru 26. Please note further, the Conclusion Logically Drawn from this Blackstone Citation, that, modern American & Texas "Counties" are all Based On this Same Hierarchical-Structure of "Responsibly Self-Governing Communities" of "Tens, Fifties, Hundreds, & Thousands". Here-under; a modern American & Texas "County" should be composed of "One Thousand Households", each headed by One "Qualified Elector", & Supported by One "Able Bodied Man", to serve in the County's "Posse Comitatus". And each of the Precincts under this legitimately & constitutionally organized governmental structure should consist of "One Hundred Households"; & the "Chief Officer" of that Hundred Household Jurisdiction should there-in be recognized as the Office of the "Justice of the Peace".

How-ever; in their modern incarnation, these "Justice Courts" are no longer Grass-Roots People-Powered, but rather they have become "Municipal Corporate Franchises", where-under they have become Un-Naturally Adulterated & Perverted from their Natural, Organic, & Traditional Anglo/American Constitutional Form. Here-under, we find our cause for our previously referenced 'Two Exceptions/Reservations' to our generally enthusiastic support for this "Precinct-2 Justice of the Peace Court" for Midland-County; as follows:

Exception/Reservation 1: We Co-Plaintiffs here again draw attention to our Texas State Constitution, at Article 5 Section 19; where-in is presented words which clearly imply that these "Justice of the Peace Courts" are only legitimately empowered to exercise a what amounts to a 'Limited Jurisdiction'; involving only the lower priority & there-in referenced "misdemeanor cases punishable by fine only", & "civil matters where the amount in controversy is two hundred dollars or less". From the complete wording of this text, the lay reader would be lead to believe, that, this Court is Not Constitutionally Authorized to Exercise either: (1:) that Powerful "Criminal Jurisdiction" which is above referenced similarly in the "Sixth Amendment" to the U.S. Constitution; Nor (2:) to act as the Legitimate Vehicle for the Exercise of the significant Power which is clearly implied in the text of Article 1 Section 2 of our Texas State Constitution, which clearly mandates that "All Power is Inherent in the People", & there-by clearly implies, that, our Local Texas Courts are Vehicles for "Free Governments" to be set up for our responsibly self-governing "Free People".

Here-under; the general thrust derived from this Constitutional passage of text, would seem to imply that this Local 'Justice Court' possesses nothing similar to the power which we Co-Plaintiffs are here-in claiming. How-ever; hidden at the very end of this other-wise confusing passage of Texas Constitutional Text of Article 5, Section 19, is the clearly visible wording of "and such other jurisdiction as may be provided by law". It is our position here, that, this phraseology 'Grand-Fathers In' the more Ancient & Powerful System of 'Common-Law Jurisprudence' which had seriously Decentralized the Sovereign Power of Government, all of which was firmly in existence in England before the Roman Empire's municipal-jurisdiction was brutally imposed there-in, through the so-called 'Norman Conquest of England' in 1066-ad.

This purposefully obscured version of History is the most accurate one, as numerous documents show, including the powerful ones web-linked previously in section 24, at the bottom of page-17, of this same document.

The fact that our American & Texas system of "County Government" is firmly "Based On" this precise More Ancient & Purified form of 'Common-Law County Governing' is implied from many sources, & it is clearly declared by Oregon's Secretary of State, in the web-linked document here:

https://constitutionalgov.us/Citations-Short/OregonLawCitations/County-American-BasedOnAngloSaxonsEngland-NormanConquest-OrBluBk.pdf

This specific historical focus has been purposefully hidden from our common honest American People; & they will here-under likely find this history to be shocking. More complete discussion of these powerful but little-known 'issues of law & history' are intended to be made available to all good-faith people who so make their desires known to we Co-Plaintiffs.

Here-under; it is our position, that, the here-in referenced "Justice of the Peace Courts", aka 'Courts of Justice", are Rooted Firmly in traditional Anglo/American 'Common Law'; & here-under, that, they inherently possess All "Original & Exclusive Jurisdiction" & "Judicial Power"; including that completely Un-Obstructed "Criminal Jurisdiction" & Power, which is referenced in the "Sixth Amendment" to our U.S. Constitution. Here-under; the numerous Socially Responsible & Qualified 'Electors' from among the People who reside in each of the Precincts in all of the USA, possess this Constitutionally Guaranteed Right to Establish & Operate Their Own such 'Court of Justice'; & this includes the four presently recognized Precincts of Midland County.

58: The Second Court which we are also filing & proseduting this case in, is that of the "441st District Court, for Midland County". That 'District Court' is the Court in which first originated the Malicious Prosecution against we Counter-Plaintiffs; under Case #: CV51464.

There-in; the main Counter-Defendants who are listed & so accused here-in, achieved significant assistence in he advancement of their Criminal Racketeering Conspiracy. One Copy of this 'Answer & Criminal Counter Complaint' is also being filed in that 'District Court' of the municipal-government of our common people's 'State of Texas'; but this act is only being done through & under our good-faith efforts to present Opportunity to the presiding Judge of that District Court, with an Opportunity to Correct what we are willing to presume as merely being his honest 'Errors'. We are here-under invoking this Court's juris-diction; but only for purposes of invoking that Court's authority to Review & Correct the "Fraud on the Court" accusations which are set forth more fully in this Criminal Counter-Complaint.

We here-by are offering Opportunity for the Judicial-Officers of this District Court to "Correct the Errors" which have prompted we Counter-Plaintiffs to file & prosecute this Felony Criminal Counter-Complaint. Judicial-Officers in that District-Court have Duties to "Correct the Errors" which were previously perpetrated with-in & under their limited-jurisdiction. Unless those Judicial-Officers do precisely this, then, that same gross "Mis-Carriage of Justice" which is here-by being complained of, will be presented for adjudication in one of the "Alternative Courts", which are also listed here-in.

Specifically; our act of filing a copy of this Criminal Counter-Complaint in that 'District Court', does Not Include our "Consent to be Governed" by the un-naturally perverted & municipally-tainted judicial-process which routinely emanates there-from. Again; our act of filing in that District Court is only for the specific & limited purpose of allowing the Judicial Officers of that District "Court to Correct Their Errors", as generally complained of here-in.

Please Note that, various Other Courts are also named above as also having their Juris-diction invoked through our filing in the documented Records of those Courts copies of this Criminal Counter Complaint. This is being done because of our well-considered opinion, that, as compared against that municipally tainted 'District Court', at least some of these Other Courts are surely More True to the Spirit of our Texas State Constitution. This includes especially the mandate there-in, that, important issues of Public-Concern, (such as are raised here-in), should all be resolved by way of traditional Anglo/American "Due Process of Law", aka "Due Course of Law", as mandated & guaranteed to us in Texas's State Constitution, at Article 1 Section 13.

If the Judicial Officers of that District Court see fit to Reverse that Court's obvious Errors, which have directly resulted in the panorama of Evils complained of here-in; & that Court further there-under promptly also orders some modest but reasonable additional protections & compensations for the

damages which these Counter-Plaintiffs have suffered as the direct result of that court's presiding Judicial-Officer's Incompetence &/or Corruption; then, we Counter-Plaintiffs will promptly consider de-escalating our prosecution of this entire counter-complaint.

59: The Third Court's Jurisdiction here-by being invoked is that of the "Midland County Court-At-Law"; which, again, is of a similarly limited-jurisdiction nature inherent in the source of their municipal franchise, from the municipal "Civil-Government" of our "State of Texas". Again; this is all in similar efforts as with the previously referenced "441st District Court", to provide the Judicial Officers of this County Court-At-Law with Opportunity to 'Correct the Errors' of their Court"; where, under Case #: CV29882, their Court was used maliciously by the here-in accused counter-defentants, to lend color-of-legitimacy to the abuses which said conspirators achieved through their filing & prosecution of their FED-Complaint in the "Justice-of-the-Peace Court", for Precinct-2 of Midland-County.

As is well-settled; & when-ever they are made aware of such errors & injustices being perpetrated there-in; the Judicial-Officers in that 'Court-At-Law' have Duties to promptly 'Correct the Errors' of their Lower Courts. Those Duties are here-by publicly & openly being made quite clear to each & all of those Judicial Officers; & the possible failure by any among them to respect those Duties may result in future lawful complaints & actions being taken against them.

60: The Jurisdiction of two other Courts is akso here-by being invoked; including that of the "Midland County Commissioners Court"; & that of the "Supreme Court" of our present Texas State Government's Limited Municipal/Civil/Statutory Jurisdiction. The problems complained of here-in, & in the previously referenced "Constructive Notice of Treason" document, would Not Exist, Unless, these Powerful Courts had also become Compromized by Corrupted Influences from Private Criminally-Syndicated & essentially Treasonous Conspirators, as described in that "Notice of Treason" Document.

If this case is still not resolved through our presentation of its merits to these Courts; then, we Counter-Plaintiffs intend to open direct & provocative communications with the judicial-officers presiding there-in, about the absolute Disaster in the Administration of Justice, & the accompanying Routine Abuse of the Rights of the People of Texas, all of which is Habitually Transpiring in All of the Courts of this State, & over which They Preside & Have Duties to Cure.

61: One final Court & Jurisdiction here-by possibly being invoked, is our own newly-created 'Texas State Supreme Court-of-Law' of pure Common-Law Jurisdiction. If our previously here-in described efforts in our previously-named Courts, meets with failure; then, we intend to form our own Assembly of Constituents of our Organic Body-Politic of the People of this State of Texas; & there-by, to assume the General-Jurisdiction Judicial-Power of this State; & to begin Administering Justice in manners which Completely Eradicates from this State, All Influences of the Powerful Criminal Conspirators which are complained of in both our peviously-referenced "Notice of Treason" document, & also in This Complaint.

We realize these are bold claims. We do not under-take this complaint lightly.

We expect, one way or the other, to achieve tha Natural/Organic "Justice" which is Mandated, under each of our powerful "Constitution" document of this State, our general Common-Law Tradition of this State, & the Biblical Torah-Laws which inherently Govern All professed Christians, Jews, & Muslims in this State.

62: In Conclusion of this section on "Jurisdiction", please note, a bright ray of sunshine, providing hope that truly conscionable "Justice" might actually become commonly available for our Common People of Texas; as, our research has indicated, that, we Common People have the

Constitutionally-Guaranteed Right to Convene various Less-Adulterated & More-Honorably-Controlled 'Courts". These sorts of Rights are recognizable under General Common-Law, Constitutional-Law, Statutory-Law, & Commercial-Law; as applicable in both All of Texas, & All of the USA.

And, another very Powerful Citation regarding this Right of our Common People to Easily & Promptly Invoke this Very Powerful "General Jurisdiction", reads as follows:

"When the Court is one of General Jurisdiction, its Jurisdiction is presumed and need not be expressly asserted by the plaintiff; … ."

"Common Law Pleading"; Koffler & Reppy, West Publishing Co., St Paul, Minnesota; 1969. Page 69.

****

The "Main-Point" of these Counter-Plaintiff's Complaint & Suit,
is our "Title-of-Possession", aka: "Seisin" Claim.
Here-In, we Plaintiffs attempt to Clarify & Emphasize how
this "Main Point" Proves the Legitimate "Standing" of we Plaintiffs
to bring our Quiet-Title/Remove-Cloud & related Complaints.

63: We Natural-Person Co-Plaintiffs, Christine Huddleston Moor, & Michael Moore, are Co-Tenants or "Tenants in Common", with both "Title of Possession" interests in this property; & also with "Title by Contract" of this property. Our Larger Communities also have "Ownership Interests" in this Real-Property & Land; & these include our Constitutional "Precinct 2", "Midland County", "State of Texas", & even our "United States of America". Here-under; this complaint is "In the Public-Interest", for all of these larger communities; & there-under this includes the public interest for our entire earth. …

64: The here below quoted "Maxims of Law" are all directly Supportive of what we Co-Plaintiffs are here-by declaring to be the "Main Point of Dispute" in this case, as follows.

Our Anglo/American & Texas Constitutional System of "Property-Law", aka: the "Law of the Land", is fundamentally in favor of Preserving the Natural-Rights of those in the "Physical Possession" of Real-Property, such as we Plaintiffs.

Reputable Law Texts clearly indicate, that, there is much ancient, traditional, & constitutional "Law" based support for our claim, that, we Plaintiffs Posses both the "Superior Title", & the "Right-of-Possession" of this property; at least in comparison with the here-in named Defendants. Many of these texts are so Ancient & "Well-Settled", that, they are known as "Maxims of Law"; & a few choice examples, directly related to the issues of concern in this case; read as follows:

"Possession Vaut Titre: ... the fact of possession raises a prima facie title or a presumption of the right of property in the thing possessed."

"Possession is Nine Tenths of the Law. … every claimant must succeed by the strength of his own title, and not by the weakness of his antagonist's."
Black's Law Dictionary. Common-Law-Maxims.

There are literal multitudes if similar citations available, all of which affirm & support this same general principle. Building even further on these powerful citations; the Defendant's, named here-in, can Not proceed on any allegations that the "Title", which is claimed by we Plaintiffs, of Our Legitimate Ownership of This Real-Property, is "Weak". Rather, those Defendants Can Only Lawfully Claim, that,

their en-Title-ment to this real-property, is based on what-ever "Strength" that They Can Show in support of their alleged "Title" to this property.

65: More specifically; Applicable "Law" Was Violated, when, during the Unlawful-Detainer Proceeding in which the Counter-Defendants (named here-in) pressured &/or bamboozled that acting JoP-Judge there-in, & he Issued the Documents, which, resulted in, We Counter-Plaintiif, Michael & Christine Moore, being Coercively & Criminally Terrorized in-to Vacating their home of many years.

We Plaintiffs Admit, that, we have previously Failed to Articulate Clearly, our Lawful "Standing" to Resist the process being invoked against us during that UnLawful-Detainer proceeding.

There-in; the Counter-Defendants named here-in, did present arguments, which seemed to be framed exclusively with-in the parameters of Statutory Civil/Municipal Roman-Empire Codes, & there-under, on "Contract Law", &/or "Commercial-Law". The Presiding Judicial-Officer in that JoP Court, in essence, Failed to Consider the Common-Law Root-Principles Constitutionally Mandated in Texas Property-Law; all of which the parameters of that Un-Lawful Detainer Proceeding are Specifically-Designed to Not Violate.

66: Applicable Texas Law recognize Other Forms of "Title" than that to which the Defendants are here attempting to constrain the focus of this Court. Texas Statutes affirm Similar Common-Law Rooted Principles, as that found in Oregon Statute, at ORS 164.105(3), which reads as follows:

"… [A] person in lawful possession of property shall be deemed to have a right of possession superior to that of a person having only a security interest … "

By the very nature of their Un-Lawful-Detainer Complaint; all Lawfully Proceeding Courts Will Recognize, that, the Banksters & their Attorneys are Claiming a "Right of Possession Superior …" to the Rights of we Counter-Plaintiffs here-in. This "Right of Possession Superior …" is a form of an "En-Titlement", which clearly authorizes these Plaintiffs to Continue with our "Quiet & Peaceable Possession" of this Real-Property; at least until such time as some person or persons, un-known, might show a superior "Right of Possession", & there-by also show their "Superior Title".

While our familiarity with Texas Statutes & Case-Law governing this issue is presently a bit limited; the Same Fundamental Principles Apply in Texas as other States, including Oregon; & the Oregon Statutes & Case-Law, properly interpreted, recognize precisely the conclusion which we Counter-Plaintiffs are here-in arguing; as follows:

"... a deed given as a mere security for an existing debt is not effective to transfer the legal title or right of possession of the mortgaged property from the grantor to the grantee, … ."
C.C.A. Or 1910. Sheradin v. Southern Pac. Co. 179 F. 81, 102 C.C.A. 375

The gist of the action of forcible detainer … is the force, either in the entry or detainer, or both; the object of the statute being to prevent and punish the use of forcible & violent means …, irrespective of question of actual title, and where these do not exist the action can not be maintained. Forcible entry & detainer cannot be maintained where there is nothing to show that defendant detained the premises by force, or by threats of personal violence. The action can not be made a substitute for ejectment.
Or. 1883: Taylor v. Scott, 10 Or. 483

This clearly related Oregon case-law; all clearly indicates, in broader context, that, as related to this case; the only interest that Counter-Defendants have in this Real-Property, is that of a "Security Interest", and as Collateral, for propping-up their financial balance-sheet, for their legal-fiction corporation. These Oregon case-law texts clearly place in proper & fuller perspective how the ORS

164.105 Statute is Intended to be Construed by those honorable Judges looking for lawful guidance & direction on this point.

Further here-under; these Counter-Plaintiffs are here-in Recognizable as having Stated Sufficient Facts to establish our Claim of having a "Title Superior" to that of the Counter-Defendants.

If & when this case might be moved before the conscience of a lawful "Jury"; under proper interpretation of these Fundamental Principles of Texas Real-Property Law, all as Rooted in Common-Law Tradition, then, this Real-Property will surely there-by be Lawfully Adjudicated to be Ours, at least as between the parties entangled in this case.

The Counter-Defendants named here-in, have maliciously twisted & perverted the basic purpose & intent of the Texas Statute governing "Forcible Entry & Detainer Complaints". They have malisiously engaged in Efforts to Circumvent constitutionally-guaranteed "Due Course of Law", & those very same "Rights of Possession Superior" which these Plaintiffs are so "En-Titled" to demand from these Courts. This is the clear general "Intent" of the Law, which the Defendants are here-in other-wise so dis-honorably attempting to pervert & twist.

67: Building on these conclusions; these Plaintiffs here-by present even broader & more anciently sourced Citations, quoted from a single & reputably sourced text-book, where-in what may be reasonably construed as some forms of "Maxims of Law" are presented, as follows:

"… It is sufficient to allege a Title of Possession only,
a Naked Allegation of Possession being Sufficient."
"... in the final analysis, No Title could be Tried Without Also Trying Possession."
"Every Title to Land has its Root in Seisin;
the Title which has its Root in the Oldest Seisin is the Best Title."
"Trespass, being an interference with the possession, …
does Not Require a Legal Title to support it.
Under the early Common Law, …
the so-called Title ... Was Only an Older Possession, … ."
"… the Possession Gives the Defendant a Right Against
Every One who Can-Not *Show* ... a Prior Possession, … .
The Defendant May Hold the Land With-Out any Title thereto,
as his Mere Possession Gives him a Right to Resist ..."

For purposes of emphasis; this Co-Plaintiff Stewart has taken the liberty of Capitalizing some letters in the above text. The fuller context, with more precise capitalization, & with source citation; is here presented more fully, as follows:

"For reasons of public policy, the Common Law protected a person in peaceable possession of land, irrespective of the method of acquisition. Actual seisin or possession, however acquired and however wrongful, created a presumptive right of possession, ... In case of being dispossessed, the disseisee could vindicate his right of possession by resort to some Possessory Proceeding, basing his action on his actual seisin and the wrongful act of the disseisor in ousting him. … when ownership in land is resolved into its essential elements, … the fundamental one is the right of possession. … the right of property enforced in the Proprietary Actions is nothing more than an older and *superior right of possession*." Page 50.

"As Pollock and Maitland so truly observed, "every Title to Land has its root in Seisin; the Title which has its root in the Oldest Seisin is the Best Title." Page 51.

"When an action is founded on possession only, and not on Title or Ownership, it is sufficient to allege a Title of Possession only, a naked allegation of possession being sufficient.

Alleging Title of Possession: It is often sufficient to allege a Title of Possession only." Page 116.

A Mere Naked Possession as Sufficient Title … Since the days of Ancient Real Possessory Actions … one forcibly ousted from his possession could be summarily restored to his possession. The law protected one in possession of real property in order to prevent breaches of the peace. ... Trespass, being an interference with the possession, … does not require a legal Title to support it. Under the early Common Law, … the so-called Title ... was only an older possession, ..." Pages 161-163.

"It is a general rule, that no right of entry, or reentry, can be reserved, or given to any other person, than the feoffer, donor or lessor, &c. and their heirs ; and such right of entry cannot be assigned or transferred to another (Litt. F. 347). This principle had its origin in the policy of the Ancient Law, to guard by all possible means against *maintenance*, the subversion of justice, and the oppression of the poor, by the rich and powerful. For if men were allowed to grant before they obtain possession, as Lord Coked remarks, pretended titles might be granted to great men, whereby right might be trodden down, and the weak oppressed." (Stearns, Summary Law & Practice Real Actions, Intro …) (Pgs 228-229, fnote 10)

"... in the final analysis, no title could be tried without also trying possession. …" Pg 229.

"The plaintiff, in all Cases, must recover on the strength of his own Title. He cannot found his claim upon the insufficiency of the defendant's title, for the possession gives the defendant a right against every one who cannot *show* ... a prior possession, … The defendant may hold the land without any Title thereto, as his mere possession gives him a right to resist ..." Page 233.

"... the rules & principles which for centuries were applicable to & developed by the old Common Law Action of Ejectment are, for most part, equally applicable to its Modem Statutory Counterpart." Pg-243.

"Common Law Pleading"; Hornbook, West Publishing Co., 1969;
Koffler & Reppy; … New York Law School;
http://legal-textbooks.com/law-civil/handbookofcommon-law-pleading.html

Another ten pages could easily be written here, in drawing out these powerful & deeper arguments in-to the support of the position of these Counter-Plaintiffs. While these Plaintiffs will be happy to engage in verbal or interned-based discussions of the legitimate interpretations of these citations; we are not inclined here to further elaborate or explain them. This document is already ab-normally lengthy; & fashionable modes of "civil-procedure", where-in litigants routinely attempt to type in lex-scripta based written-arguments concerning every possible detail of every possible issue which might arise; seem to us to be quite counter-productive.

68: The phrase "Legal Title", is of some significant interest; & a quote from "Black's Law Dictionary" is helpful here, as follows:

"Legal Title: ... one which is complete and perfect so far as regards the apparent right of ownership and possession, … . It may also mean appearance of title as distinguished from complete title."

Here-under, is shown, the inherently confusing, dysfunctional, & obstructive nature, of the codes, statutes, & regulations, of the Roman Empire Model of Civil/Municipal Government & Jurisdiction, not only in Texas;, but also through-out the entire USA. This is all just as the previously-referenced 1871 Citation from Samuel Tyler so effectively frames & clarifies, & as also referenced & explained more fully in the previously linked "Notice ofTreason" document.

The above quote clearly indicates "Two Differing Definitions" of the phrase "Legal Title". One Definition indicates "Complete Title", & includes "Rights of Possession"; where-as the other Definition clearly does Not Include "Complete Title". The former definition is a pure "Common-Law Definition",

because of its inherent clarity & grounding in natural-law; while the latter is a definition derived from Roman Civil/Municipal Codes, because it focuses more on "appearance" than on meaningful substance, & because it leaves those reliant there-on, in an equally lost & confused mental state as before they observed that later definition.

These Plaintiffs here-in allege, again, that: "In the light most favorable to the Defendants, they have only a "Security Interest" in the property in question in this case; & they have no lawful basis or claim up-on which to "state a cause of action" for having these Plaintiffs forcibly removed from this property in question in this case. These realities of true "Law" are codified in this same Oregon Statute, which, to quote it again, reads as follows:

ORS: 164.105: Right of possession. … (3) … a person in lawful possession of property shall be deemed to have a right of possession superior to that of a person having only a security interest in the property, even if legal title to the property lies with the holder of the security interest pursuant to ... security agreement.

Texas surely possesses similarly powerful statutes, or at least similarly powerful case-law. These words quite obviously translate into our claim of a "Superior Title", in & for we non-professional Counter-Plaintiffs; & we believe any conscience-bound & reasonably Jury will conclude similarly.

The Counter-Defendants presently claiming ownership rights in this real-property, can Not Prove they have any such of a "Complete Title" to the property in question in this case, as would Lawfully Entitle them to obtain a Lawful Order from any Court directing Sheriffs Deputies or Constables to use Force to Evict/Eject these Ex-Rel Plaintiffs from the quiet & peaceable possession of our home.

"Any such Complete Title as afore-mentioned would require those Counter-Defendants to show that some natural person from their corporate organization, has, at some time in the past, actually entered in-to some sort of a Physical "Possession" or "Seisin" of this real-property.

Those Counter-Defendants are Not Capable of showing that any such natural person from their corporate organization, has, at any time in the past, actually entered in-to any sort of a physical "Possession" or "Seisin" of this real-property."

These statements, in context, clearly show that we Plaintiffs are claiming a "Title" to this real-property, which is "Superior" to that of the Defendants.

69: Of significance here-under; is that, before those powerful Counter-Defendants can lawfully gain Possession of this property, in this case; those Counter-Defendants Must First Show Evidence that They have Had some sort of an Actual Physical "Possession" or "Seisin" of this real-property, at some time in the past. They can Not Do That. Those Defendants are Likely to Admit that they have never had any actual physical "Possession" of this property; & we co-plaintiffs solemnly affirm this to be the true fact of the matter.

This property is also recorded in Midland County under a specific Tax-ID #: ????????.

We Counter-Plaintiffs have strong evidence, prompting us to believe, that, that recording is fashionably & routinely mis-construed by compromized or bamboozled Judicial-Officers, as Granting Legitimacy to the military-police-state municipal/civil/statutory Courts, to Summarily Adjudicate that we Counter-Plaintiffs have "Consented to be Governed" by the Summary/Military Judicial Proceedings which are routinely invoked there-in.

But, such Presumptions are "Not Legitimate"; because, the people of Texas & Midland County, (including we Counter-Plaintiffs), have Not been Given the Full Disclosure that such Tax ID-Recordings are likely being Construed to Negatively Infringe Against our Constitutionally-Guaranteed Rights.

70: From the beginning; a "Peaceable Entry" was made on-to this land, by we Counter-Complaint Co-Plaintiffs "Christine & Michael Moore"; & we have peaceably occupied & maintained this home since that date; at least up until when we were terrorized in-to non-voluntarily vacating that property, on a later date; by & through the Criminally Un-Lawful invocation of the Un-Lawful Detauner Proceeding which the Counter-Defendants named here-in had shortly before that invoked against us, in the JoP-Court of Precinct-2.

In our own names, & in the names of the People of Texas, Midland-County, & Precinct-2 there-under; we Plaintiffs were & are Clearly Claiming this same "Title of Possession"; which derives its authority from this Court's more General Jurisdiction, & more "Public Law" authority, all of which is designed to follow the more ancient, traditional & Constitutionally Prioritized & Protected "Common-Law", or "Law of the Land", or "Due Course of Law".

"Various Sections of our "Texas Constitution" clearly Guarantees to we common People of Texas & Midland County, our "Rights" to this very sort of"Remedy by Due Course of Law", precisely as we Plaintiffs are here-in claiming; & this all with-out any necessity for us to rely at all on any "Title by Contract", or any other Lex-Scripta based social-engineering & Private Jurisdictional arguments.

71: An especially deep concern, is that, the entire line of argument of the Defendants, seems myopically focused on "Contract Rights", as recognizable only in a "Court of Equity".

72: The Judges of the Courts involved previously with this case, do seem in the habit of presuming that all complaints which non-professional members of the public bring before them, are legitimately resolvable under private-jurisdictional "Contract-Law".

Applicable Case-Law, as clearly articulated in various collective horn-book summaries there-of; clearly indicate that "Actions At Law" are to be Given "Preference" with-in the constitutional civil/municipal Jurisdiction of this State's Courts; & this is especially true when a case before them includes "Issues of Public Interest". A very large "Public Interest Issue" here is our efforts to "Maintain the Integrity of the Judiciary", at every level of Government. This is all defined by the classical "Rule of Law"; which, when fully researched, is shown to equate to constitutional, "Due Process of Law", aka: "Due Course of Law". The case here-in is also moving to so strengthen these honorable ideals in our local Judiciary.

We ex-rel Plaintiffs wish to more forcefully emphasize these Pivotal Issues of civil/municipal "Procedure" here, as previously & now again quoted from the federal case-law of "Beacon Theaters vs Westover"; as follows:

"**Since in the federal courts equity has always acted only when legal remedies were inadequate, the expansion of adequate legal remedies ... necessarily affects the scope of equity. Thus, the justification for equity's deciding legal issues ... must be re-evaluated in the light of the liberal joinder provisions of the Federal Rules ... Similarly the need for, and therefore, the availability of such equitable remedies ... must be reconsidered ... . This is not only in accord with the spirit of the Rules and the Act but is required by the provision in the Rules that '(t)he right of trial by jury as declared by the Seventh Amendment to the Constitution ... shall be preserved * * * inviolate.'**

… **Since the right to jury trial is a constitutional one, however, while no similar requirement protects trials by the court, that discretion is very narrowly limited and must, wherever possible, be exercised to preserve jury trial. ... 'In the Federal courts this (jury) right cannot be dispensed with ... nor can it be impaired by any blending with a claim, properly cognizable at law, of a demand for equitable relief ... . This long-standing principle of equity dictates that only under the most imperative circumstances, circumstances which in view of the flexible procedures of the Federal Rules we cannot now anticipate, can the right to a**

jury trial of legal issues be lost through prior determination of equitable claims."

Beacon Theatres, V. Westover, US Supreme Court (1959); 359 U.S. 500, 79 S,Ct. 948, 3 L.Ed. 988.

While this above citation nicely out-lines these important concepts; these Plaintiffs believe further citations related to this same case-law is good to present at this juncture, as follows:

"Given the fact that we can no longer distinguish what is law and what is equity - because of merger - the adequacy test seems almost meaningless. On the other hand, the analogical tests are geared to English experience under an outmoded system and are quite difficult to apply.

One possible solution seems …. A declaratory judgement, where authorized is always legal, and if it is adequate to protect the rights of the party, the claim will be treated as one for declaratory judgement and jury granted if demanded. ... However, if there are any legal issues in the case, these must be tried first ... . The result is that the judge can grant final equitable remedies only to the extent that these may be consistent with the jury's decision on the facts of the legal issues..

Beacon took a quite different approach by simply issuing its own declaratory judgement that all declaratory judgements were "legal". This made it possible to insist upon jury trial for virtually all cases with such supplementary equitable relief as may be consistent with the jury's findings.

Handbook on the Law of Remedies; Damages, Equity, Restitution. Pages 74 – 76. Dan B. Dobbs; Professor of Law, University of North Carolina, Hornbook Series; West Publishing Co.; 1973.

These Plaintiffs believe that these "More Enlightened Judicial Ideals" are Harmonious with Case-Law from Texas. We will remain "open for correction", from opposing council, & from any people acting as judicial public-servants, if they wish to present arguments that our belief here is "in error".

73: Further here-under; there is reputable scholarly text in existence, which clearly declares, that, "No Title can be Tried with-out also trying the Rights of Possession". The fuller text of this profoundly enlightening passage, reads as follows:

"This rapid change in procedure, which began in the reign of Henry VIII (1509 - 1547) ultimately resulted in the obsolescence of the Real Actions, once it was realized that Ejectment was an efficient instrument for trying the right of possession, and that, in the final analysis, no title could be tried without also trying possession. … Ejectment being a Personal Action, … . … , the pleading in Ejectment was general, … ."

"Common Law Pleading"; Koffler & Reppy; New York Law School; West Pub. Co., 1969.
http://legal-textbooks.com/law-civil/handbookofcommon-law-pleading.html

The main point to be gleaned here-from, is that, "No Title can be Tried with-out also trying the Rights of Possession". This same citation & argument is presented more fully, on page-2 of both of these Counter-Plaintiffs "Affidavit of Title of Possession" documents; as should be presented in accompaniment here-with; & which is available in Our Case's On-Line Web-Page, here:

http://ConstitutionalGov.us/sub/PoliticalSubdivisions-Local/09-TexasSS/1-Cases/Moores/QT-Complaint-&-RelatedDocuments-Notes&Research/AffidavitOfTitleOfPossession-ChristineHMoore-2022December.pdf

https://ConstitutionalGov.us/sub/PoliticalSubdivisions-Local/09-TexasSS/1-Cases/Moores/QT-Complaint-&-RelatedDocuments-Notes&Research/AffidavitOfTitleOfPossession-MichaelMoore-2022December.pdf

Further here-under; these ex-rel Plaintiffs draw-out & emphasize previous arguments, more narrowly focusing on the "Basis in Law", for, how we Plaintiffs to show legitimate "Standing" for us to Complain that we are "En-Titled" to the Protections of the Courts of this State, for our Lawful Rights to

the “Quiet & Peaceable Possession” of this Real-Property, which we presently hold.

~~~~~~

Specific Factual & Lawful Basis for this Trespass/Quiet-Title/Remove-Cloud, Public-Nuisance, Racketeering, Conspiracy, & other Complaints, here-in:

74: **OverView:** The averments of the preceding paragraphs are restated here by reference. These Counter-Plaintiffs are in the actual “Physical-Possession” of the real-property referred to herein. The here-in named Counter-Defendants Claim an Adverse Interest in this same real-property. This action is bought, in major part, for the purpose of adjudicating the merits of our allegation, that, that claim by those Counter-Defendants is fraudulant, illigitamate, & criminal.

75: Here-under; the claim of the Counter-Defendants to this Property is “Invalid” & “Un-Lawful”, because, at least in part, it is based upon a Deed of Trust document which is presently “Void” as a matter of law, because, at least in part, the “Promissory Note” that it was issued to secure was entered into with “Un-Clean-Hands”, & under Unconscionable, Fraudulent, & Usurious Circumstances, all of which makes the “Deed of Trust” document Un-Lawful & Invalid.

76: **Failure of Consideration:** The averments of the proceeding paragraphs are restated by reference herein. As a result of the practices described in the Factual Historical section above, the original lender did fail to lend any valuable consideration. The original lender only Lent a “Promise to Pay” the substance of value which is known as “Legal Tender” by issuing their “Promise to Pay” that said Legal Tender, through their issuing of their Negotiable Instruments and/or Electronic Credits.

Any Legal Tender which that Lender did actually part with, as a result of the Negotiable Instruments later being presented to them, was a secondary and lawfully unrelated transaction.

These same realities apply to the present holder of that resulting security-interest in this property. Here-under, the Trust's Interest in this property is unlawful.

Further here-under; “Law” Requires that Title be Quieted in these Plaintiffs, & that the Defendants be barred from bringing any sort of action for the “Ejectment” of these Plaintiffs from this property, including any sort of an “Unlawful Detainer” Action.

77: **Breach of Contract, First Count.** The U.S. Congress, in deciding what was to be “Legal Tender” in “Payment of Debts” for this country, by act on April 2nd, of 1792, defined the term "Dollar" to mean specifically a coin issued by the U.S. Government containing 371 4/16 grains of pure Silver. There is no Constitutionally Lawful Authority for referring to any form of paper currency or electronic credits as “Legal Tender Dollars".

As the Original Lender Failed to lend to the original borrower, the Moores, any “Legal Tender Dollars”, within the “Constitutional Definition” of this term, the Contractual Agreement between these parties was there-Breached, & the resultant Promissory Note & the Deed of Trust upon which it is founded are lawfully “Invalid”.

Here-under; the here-in named Counter-Defendants, knew or should have known of this Un-Lawful origin of the Beneficial Interest in the Trust Deed and the accompanying Promissory Note of which it was assigned. How-ever; they did Not Care about these Requirements of the Law for Respect of the Rights of the Common People of this County, State, & Nation; because they were only concerned about maximizing short-term profits while avoiding imprisonment.

Here-under; Defendants Interest in this property is Invalid & Un-Lawful; because the Promissory Note & the Beneficial Interest to the Deed of Trust up-on which they now rely is Invalid & Un-Lawful.

Further here-under; “Law” Requires that Title be Quieted in these Plaintiffs, & that the Defendants
~~~~~~

be barred from bringing any sort of action for the “Ejectment” of these Plaintiffs from this property, including their most recently & maliciously filed & prosecuted “Unlawful Detainer” Complaint.

78: **Breech of Contract, Second Count:** The averments of the proceeding paragraphs are restated herein by reference. By “Common Acceptance”, & by the decrees of the Federal Reserve Bank, & perhaps even the U.S. Congress, “Federal Reserve Notes” and other US Currency have come to be known as “Legal Tender Dollars". Original Lenders entered into a contract to lend these “Legal Tender Dollars" to the Moores, & the Moores there-under also agreed to repay in these “Legal Tender Dollars".

The contracting parties did Not enter into a Contract to be Lent or to repay in Negotiable Instruments or Electronic Credits, which were “Created out of Thin Air” by any of the Defendants.

Yet that is precisely what the Original Lender Did Lend to the Moores. The Original Lender did Not Loan any of these Federal Reserve Note based “Legal Tender Dollars", as this phrase has commonly come to be known & used, when they gained their purported interest in the real-property in question in this case.

Here-under; both the Original Lender & the here-in named Defendants knew or should have known of this Un-Lawful Origin of the Beneficial Interest in the Trust Deed and the accompanying Promissory Note of which it was assigned. How-ever; they did Not Care about these Requirements of the Law for Respect of the Rights of the Common People of this County, State, & Nation; because they were only concerned about maximizing short-term profits while avoiding imprisonment. Here-under; Counter-Defendant’s Interest in this property is Invalid & Un-Lawful; because the Promissory Note & the Beneficial Interest to the Deed of Trust are Invalid & Un-Lawful. Further here-under; “Law” Requires that Title be Quieted in these Plaintiffs, & that the Defendants be barred from bringing any sort of action for the “Ejectment” of these Plaintiffs from this property, including their most recently & maliciously filed “Unlawful Detainer” Complaint.

79: **Ultra Varies, Count One.** The proceeding paragraphs are restated by reference herein. The Original Lender exceeded the express provisions of it's Corporate Charter, in that, it engaged in the activity of Loaning a substance Other Than “Legal-Tender Dollars" of the United States. The Negotiable Instruments which it issued in granting the loan here in question are Not “Legal-Tender Dollars" of the United States, in either the Constitutional Gold and Silver Definition, or by the Commonly Accepted & so-called “Federal Reserve Note” Definition.

By all reasonable modes of construction, Original Lender was authorized by it's charter to loan Only “Legal-Tender Dollars" of the United States. As the terms of the corporate charter were exceeded by the Original Lender’s Corporate Officers in making this loan, it is a lawfully invalid loan.

Here-under; all here-in named Defendants knew or should have known of this Un-Lawful origin of the Beneficial Interest in the Trust Deed and the accompanying Promissory Note of which it was assigned. How-ever; they did Not Care about these Requirements of the Law for Respect of the Rights of the Common People of this County, State, & Nation; because they were only concerned about maximizing short-term profits while avoiding imprisonment. Here-under; all Defendant's Interest in this property is Invalid & Un-Lawful; because the Promissory Note & the Beneficial Interest to the Deed of Trust held by them is Invalid & Un-Lawful. Further here-under; “Law” Requires that Title be Quieted in these Plaintiffs, & that the Defendants be barred from bringing any sort of action for the “Ejectment” of these Plaintiffs from this property, including their most recently & maliciously filed “Unlawful Detainer” Complaint.

80: **Indefiniteness:** The averments of the preceding paragraphs are restated here by reference. As a result of the failure of the Original Lender to Specify the Essential Term of whether they would Loan

in either Federal Reserve Note "Dollars", or Gold and Silver "Dollars", or their own "Created out of Thin Air" Negotiable-Instruments or Electronic-Credit "Dollars", and weather or not they would demand payment in the same form or in a different form; the Defendants Created a Contract which was "Indefinite" to the point that a Court of Law will not be able to determine Which Type of Funds was either Agreed to be Loaned or Agreed to be Repaid.

As a result the Contract is "Indefinite" with-in the legal-definition of this term; & it is there-under Un-Lawful & Invalid.

Here-under; the here-in named Defendants knew or should have known of this Un-Lawful origin of the Beneficial Interest in the Trust Deed and the accompanying Promissory Note of which it was assigned. How-ever; they did Not Care about these Requirements of the Law for Respect of the Rights of the Common People of this County, State, & Nation; because they were only concerned about maximizing short-term profits while avoiding imprisonment. Here-under; all Defendant's Interest in this property is Invalid & Un-Lawful; because the Promissory Note & the Beneficial Interest to the Deed of Trust held by them is Invalid & Un-Lawful. Further here-under; "Law" Requires that Title be Quieted in these Plaintiffs, & that the Defendants be barred from bringing any sort of action for the "Ejectment" of these Plaintiffs from this property, including their most recently & maliciously filed "Unlawful Detainer" Complaint.

81: **Unconscionability:** The averments of the preceding paragraphs are restated here by reference. As a result of the Fractional Reserve Banking Practices and the loan of the Negotiable Instruments &/or Electronic Credits which were Created Directly by the Original Lender, & their corporate officers; the actual amount of Federal Reserve Notes which were eventually Actually Parted With, was only approximately 1/10th, or 10%, of that which were actually contracted to be delivered to the original borrower, the Moores. Here-by; the "Interest Rate" upon the "Legal-Tender Dollars" which were actually parted with was at least 10 times greater than the amount agreed to in the original Trust Deed Contract. This is a violation of State and Federal provisions against "Unconscionable" actions and contracts, as set forth in U.C.C. sections 2-302, and others.

82: Further, the parties to the contract occupied substantially "Un-Equal Bargaining Positions" in that the Original Lenders had access to the ability to Circulate it's Own Self-Created Negotiable Instruments and Electronic Credits as "Money" with-in this State and Nation. By this activity, the here-in named Defendants have an Un-Fair Advantage in their Ability to Circulate as Money the Negotiable Instruments & Electronic Credits which they issue. This gave the Original Lenders the ability to circulate approximately Ten-Times the amount of money in comparison to the amount that the Common People of this Nation can circulate. As the Negotiable Instruments and Electronic Credits of the Moores & the Common People of our Nation were not capable of being competitively circulated as money, the Moores were in a substantially "Un-Equal Bargaining Position" with the Original Lenders; & thus, the Moores were Un-Fairly Coerced to enter in-to the Promissory-Note & Trust-Deed Contracts. As a result, these are "Un-Conconscionable Contracts", because of the "Un-Equal Bargaining Positions" of the parties there-to.

83: **Usury:** The averments of the preceding paragraphs are restated here by reference. In the Alternative that the Promissory Note which the present Deed of Trust is designed to secure might be viewed as lawfully requiring a Repayment in "Legal-Tender Dollars", as commonly defined to be "Federal Reserve Note Dollars"; then any good faith estimate accounting for that actual amount of Federal Reserve Note Dollars which were actually parted with, will reveal, that, the here-in named Defendants have actually gained a "Usurious" Amount of Interest on this loan. Through the use of their "Fractional Reserve Banking System", these Defendants likely only parted with a sum of Federal Reserve

Notes amounting to less than 1/10th of the face value of the Negotiable Instruments and/or Electronic Credits which they actually issued in their efforts to secure their interest in the property in question in this case. This means that the actual "Interest Rate" upon the accurate amount of Federal Reserve Note denominated Dollars which were Actually Parted With by these corporate entities, as the direct result of this loan, was a minimum of Ten-Times Greater than the amount actually agreed to by the Moores in the original Promissory Note and Trust Deed Contracts which we entered into.

This is a violation of both Common Law & Statutory Law Prohibitions against "Usury" as they presently exist under the vast majority of the laws of this State & Nation. As a result of this Usury, the obligations true, & much Smaller but hidden "Principal" has been "Paid Off" by the Moores, and all economic "Interest" on the true Principal that the here-in named Defendants have in the property in question has also been repaid. As a result, the interest that Defendants continue to claim through the Deed of Trust & Promissory Note no longer exists.

Here-under; the here-in named Defendants knew or should have known of this Un-Lawful origin of the Beneficial Interest in the Trust Deed and the accompanying Promissory Note of which it was assigned. How-ever; they did Not Care about these Requirements of the Law for Respect of the Rights of the Common People of this County, State, & Nation; because they were only concerned about maximizing short-term profits while avoiding imprisonment. Here-under; the Defendant's Interest in this property is Invalid & Un-Lawful; because the Promissory Note & the Beneficial Interest to the Deed of Trust held by those Defendants is Invalid & Un-Lawful. Further here-under; "Law" Requires that Title be Quieted in these Plaintiffs, & that the Defendants be barred from bringing any sort of action for the "Ejectment" of these Plaintiffs from this property, including their most recently & maliciously filed "Unlawful Detainer" Complaint.

84: Extortion: The averments of the preceding paragraphs are restated here by reference. Defendants Conspired to "Extort" a "specific form of money" from these Counter-Plaintiffs, all after these Counter-Plaintiffs had Already Offered to Pay-Off all Debts that the Counter-Defendants Claim that we owe to them, under their claimed-interest in this real-property. More notes, documents, & Evidence in support of this "Allegation of Fact", is, or soon should be, available, in an Amended Version of thisComplaint, & on our web-page related to this case, as web-linked else-where here-in.

This "Extortion" charge is further reasonably "Justified", because, even though they are entitled to nothing more than a "Security Interest" in this real-property; these same Counter-Defendants have invoked Extortionist Threats to file what amounts to an "Unlawful-Detainer Complaint" against we Plaintiffs; this latter act, of which, inherently, by its very nature, is nothing less than their malicious & lawless efforts to extort money from us, through threatening to get us Ejected/Evicted from our property. We Counter-Defendants are sure much Similar Texas Case-Law Exists, as that found in the Oregon citations relating here-to, the latter of which reads as follows:

"... a deed given as a mere security for an existing debt is not effective to transfer the legal title or right of possession of the mortgaged property from the grantor to the grantee, … ."

C.C.A. Or 1910. Sheradin v. Southern Pac. Co. 179 F. 81, 102 C.C.A. 375

The gist of the action of forcible detainer … is the force, either in the entry or detainer, or both; the object of the statute being to prevent and punish the use of forcible & violent means …, irrespective of question of actual title, and where these do not exist the action can not be maintained. Forcible entry & detainer cannot be maintained where there is nothing to show that defendant detained the premises by force, or by threats of personal violence. The action can not be made a substitute for ejectment.

Or. 1883: Taylor v. Scott, 10 Or. 483

85: Attempted Collection of an Unlawful Debt in Violation of Principles of Law enshrined within 18 USC 1961, 1962, and 1964. The averments of the proceeding paragraphs are restated herein by reference. The here-in named corporate Defendants, have received income from collection of the un-lawful debt which presently is encumbering these Plaintiff's property. These Defendants have participated in and/or used the proceeds of such income in the operation of an enterprise which engages in activities which affect interstate and foreign commerce, all of which violates of general & public principles of Common-Law, as enshrined with-in 18 U.S.C. 1961, 1962, and 1964.

Here-under; the here-in named Defendants knew or should have known of this Un-Lawful origin of the Beneficial Interest in the Trust Deed and the accompanying Promissory Note of which it was assigned. How-ever; they did Not Care about these Requirements of the Law for Respect of the Rights of the Common People of this County, State, & Nation; because they were only concerned about maximizing short-term profits while avoiding imprisonment. Here-under; Defendant's Interest in this property is Invalid & Un-Lawful; because the Promissory Note & the Beneficial Interest to the Deed of Trust held by those Defendants is Invalid & Un-Lawful. Further here-under; "Law" Requires that Title be Quieted in these Plaintiffs, & that the Defendants be barred from bringing any sort of action for the "Ejectment" of these Plaintiffs from this property, including their most recently & maliciously filed "Unlawful Detainer" Complaint.

86: Fraud: The averments of the preceding paragraphs are restated here by reference. Those previous paragraphs clearly show the Fraudulent Nature under which the promissory-note & trust-deed associated with this real-property were composed by the Defendants named here-in. As shown earlier here-in; the Original Lender Purposefully "Deceived" the Moores concerning the actual Amount of Money which they were both loaning out, & actually making off of, their loan to the Moores. Here-by; those Original Lenders committed a "Fraud" upon the Moores; which, in turn, allowed the here-in named Defendants to take Fraudulent Advantage of the Moores, as well as of multitudes of other simple and honest working Texans & Americans; including we Ex-Rel Plaintiffs. All of the here-in named Defendants have been knowingly & willfully participating in the Same "Fraud". Here-under; the here-in named Defendants knew or should have known of this Un-Lawful origin of the Beneficial Interest in the Trust Deed & the accompanying Promissory Note.

87: Conspiracy to Commit Robbery and Theft: The averments of the preceding paragraphs are restated here by reference. The here-in named corporate Defendants have all Conspired to Fraudulently Engineer Color-of-Law Authority, so that they may enter into the of the Courts of Justice of this State & Nation, & by way of their presentment of "Unlawful Detainer" Complaints, obtain Orders to Sheriffs or other Executive Officers to Mis-Use the Force of their Offices, all so-as-to "Breach the Peace" of the Common People of this Nation. This is all in Bold Violation of our Constitutionally Guaranteed Rights to have such matters as these settled by "Due Course of Law", aka: "Due Process of Law", all as set forth in Article 1 Sections ?? & ?? of Texas's Constitution. Here-by; these here-in named Defendants have Conspired to commit Theft and Robbery of the Homes of the Common People of this County, State, & Nation, including these Plaintiffs, all as Theft & Robbery are defined through general & public Common–Law, as well as by their definition under our State & National Statutory-Law.

88: Public Nuisance: The averments of the preceding paragraphs are restated here by reference. In addition to the Equitable nature of the Texas "Tresspass to Try Title" procedure, or similarly under Oregon "Quiet Title" portion of our Complaint, the Common-Law Authority of this complaint is also invoked, not only to "Remove Cloud", but also regarding "Nuisance", as preserved in Texas Statutes, & in Oregon's Statutes under ORS 105.505 - 105.600 . The evils complained of here-in, clearly amount

to a "Nuisance"; as defined in these Statutes, & as defined under general American, Texan, & Oregon Property Law, & as defined through general deeper American, Texan, & Oregon Constitutional Common-Law. This "Public Nuisance" Complaint is Justified & Legitimate, because of the general large-scale "Pattern" in which these Un-Conscionable & Fraudulent Banking & Foreclosure Practices are Routinely being Committed by the Defendants & their powerfully-influential Cohorts, as against the Rights of Texans & Americans every-where. These general & public interests of Common-Law & Statutory "Justice" Require that the very real Dangers of the Evils produced through these sorts of wide-spread & Socially Disastrous "Nuisance" activities be quickly & firmly Abated.

Here-under; the here-in named Defendants knew or should have known that their lending practices were In Violation of these Fundamental Principles of General American & Texas Public Law; & there-under of the Un-Lawful Origin of the Beneficial Interest in the Trust Deed & the accompanying Promissory Note. How-ever; they did Not Care about these Requirements of Law; because they were only concerned about maximizing profits. Here-under; Defendant's Interest in this property is Invalid & Un-Lawful; because the Promissory Note & the Beneficial Interest to the Deed of Trust held by the Defendants is Invalid & Un-Lawful; & Title should be Quieted in these Plaintiffs.

89: **Illegality by Monopoly, Conspiracy, and Racketeering.** The averments of the preceding paragraphs are restated here by reference. All of the here-in-named Corporate Legal-Fiction Defendants, and their officers, and other Banking, Financial, Political, and/or Real Estate Institutions (unknown or unnamed at this time) have all knowingly or unknowingly "Conspired" Against the Working Class Population of the good County of Midland, Precinct-2 there-under; & this Constitutional State & Nation; all so-as to submerge us all a mountain of perpetual & unpayable Debt.

The Federal Reserve Banking corporation, which the defendants are franchise/agents of, have historically demonstrated a track record of purposefully expanding & contracting the money supply at timed intervals so as to purposefully dispossess economically vulnerable Texans and Americans from our property. The videos web-linked in the supportive document alleging "Treason", clearly document these historical "Facts", all in manners which are idiot-proof. All who contest these Truths are either complete idiots; or else they are actively supporting this larger despotic racketeering conspiracy.

These Plaintiffs, & all of the good people of Midland County, the State of Texas, & the United States of America, are all the pointed "Targets" of a Conspiracy by the Defendants, & others, to reduce us to a class of obedient & broken "Slaves", who are there-under schemed to exist in a society with substantially less constitutional rights than the working-classes of common people in Nazi Germany or the previous Soviet Union. As defined in Texas Statutes, the here-in named Defendants have engaged "in at least two incidents ... that have the same or similar intents, results, accomplices, victims or methods of commission, or otherwise are interrelated by distinguishing characteristics, including a nexus to the same enterprise". The acts complained of here-in are clearly within these broad "Racketeering" parameters.

~~~~~~

Expanding on the Conspiracy, Monopoly, & & Racketeering Allegations in the Complaint of these Plaintiffs:

90: The Corporate Legal-Fiction Defendants and their Officers are active Causes of, & Participants in, the present Increase in the "Foreclosure Rate" in this State & County. The individual officers of these corporate legal-fictions are, or should be, knowledgeable of their complicity in this criminality despotic scheme. Those Corporate Officers have caused detriment & "Damage" to these Plaintiffs, & to every homeowner in this State, by way of the manner in which they have been entering into this & the majority of their other lending & foreclosure & eviction practices.
~~~~~~

All of the Defendants named in this case may reasonably be presumed to be fully aware of the factual realities related to the source of their superior economic-status in our modern society, & over & above that disenfranchised status of we Plaintiffs. This is the direct-result of their being at the higher-levels of the lawless "trickle-down economics" policies, all of which flow to each of them directly through the working-relationships which they have developed with those criminally privileged, "too big to fail", & private/corporate banking institutions.

As clearly explained in the here-in &/or supportive-document linked videos; those powerfully-influential private banking institutions have "Targeted" the poorer & middle-class people of our American nation; & there-in those Conspirators do maliciously seek to have the constitutionally-guaranteed Rights of our American People reduced to something similar to what was allowed to exist during "World-War Two" among the working-class people, of all races, who barely survived the cross-cultural conflicts of Nazi Germany & the Soviet Union. As these linked videos clearly explain; that evil agenda is still being carried-out, even now, by way of those fewer but more powerful entities, "Conspiring", with multitudes of lower-level "Franchisees" of their massive pyramid-scheme, such as the here-in named Defendants.

Here-under; & whether they consciously realize it or not; the here-in named Defendants are working in an active "Racketeering Conspiracy" with those powerful & corrupted private/corporate interests, to reduce our American People to a class of obedient and broken "Slaves". This scheme has been referred to by prominent proponents there-of as a "New World Order".

Two videos which explain all of this in much greater detail, are web-linked, here:
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QBSJvtkPICM
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=r5If2YaLtX4

91: These last linked videos; more directly explain the corrupted nature of the economic system under which our American People are presently laboring, & they clearly provide comprehensive "Evidence" that the specific provisions of Texas Statutes which are designed to Prohibit these sorts of "Racketeering Activities", are routinely being violated. Those violations are routinely being committed by those powerfully influential natural-persons who are involved, directly &/or indirectly, with those immensely powerful corporate/legal-fiction organizations.

The Texas Statutes governing Racketeering, directly relate to these concerns, & they read substantially similarily as the Oregion Statute, which reads as follows:

166.715 Definitions (6) "Racketeering activity" ... means ... to conspire to commit, or to solicit, coerce or intimidate another person to commit: … (B) bribery and perjury; (C) obstructing governmental administration; (D) abuse of public office; (K) ... theft, burglary, criminal trespass and related offenses; (P) ... forgery and related offenses; (Q) ... business and commercial offenses; (RR) ... intimidation; (SS) … relating to real estate & escrow; … .

166.720 Racketeering activity unlawful; penalties.

(4) It is unlawful for any person to conspire … to violate ... subsections (1), (2) or (3) … .

(1) It is unlawful for any person who has knowingly received any proceeds derived, directly or indirectly, from a pattern of racketeering activity or through the collection of an unlawful debt to use or invest, whether directly or indirectly, any part of such proceeds, or the proceeds derived from the investment or use thereof, in the acquisition of any title to, or any right, interest or equity in, real property or in the establishment or operation of any enterprise.

(2) It is unlawful for any person, through a pattern of racketeering activity or through the collection of an unlawful debt, to acquire or maintain, directly or indirectly, any interest in or control of any real property or enterprise.

(3) It is unlawful for any person employed by, or associated with, any enterprise to conduct or participate, directly or indirectly, in such enterprise through a pattern of racketeering activity or

the collection of an unlawful debt. ...

(6) An allegation of a pattern of racketeering activity is sufficient if it contains … the following: (a) A statement of the acts constituting each incident of racketeering activity in ordinary and concise language, and in a manner that enables a person of common understanding to know what is intended; (b) A statement of the relation to each incident of racketeering activity that the conduct was committed on or about a designated date, or during a designated period of time; (c) A statement, in the language of ORS 166.715 (4) or other ordinary and concise language, designating which distinguishing characteristic or characteristics interrelate the incidents of racketeering activity; and (d) A statement that the incidents alleged were not isolated.

166.720 Racketeering activity unlawful; penalties. (6) An allegation of a pattern of racketeering activity is sufficient if it contains substantially the following: (a) A statement of the acts constituting each incident of racketeering activity in ordinary and concise language, and in a manner that enables a person of common understanding to know what is intended; (b) A statement of the relation to each incident of racketeering activity that the conduct was committed on or about a designated date, or during a designated period of time; (c) A statement, in the language of ORS 166.715 (4) or other ordinary and concise language, designating which distinguishing characteristic or characteristics interrelate the incidents of racketeering activity; and (d) A statement that the incidents alleged were not isolated.

As defined in the Texas Version of these Racketeering Statutes, the here-in named & powerfully influential Defendants may reasonably be presumed to have have engaged "in at least two incidents ... that have the same or similar intents, results, accomplices, victims or methods of commission, or otherwise are interrelated by distinguishing characteristics, including a nexus to the same enterprise". The acts complained of here-in are clearly within these broad "Racketeering" parameters.

Any conscience-bound & fair-minded Jury will surely find these accusations to be "True Facts".

~~~~~~

Presumed Points of Dispute Between the Parties: Plaintiffs contend the following:

92: None of the here-in named Defendants can Prove that have any such of a "Complete Title" to the property in question in this case, as would Lawfully Entitle them to obtain a Lawful Order from any Court directing Sheriffs Deputies or Constables to use Force to Evict/Eject these Ex-Rel Plaintiffs from the quiet & peaceable possession of our home.

93: Any such "Complete Title" as afore-mentioned would require Defendants to show that some natural person from their corporate organization, has, at some time in the past, actually entered in-to some sort of a physical "Possession" or "Seisin" of this real-property.

94: Those Defendants are Not Capable of showing that any natural person from their corporate organization, has, at any time in the past, actually entered in-to any sort of a physical "Possession" or "Seisin" of this real-property.

95: The "Trustee's Deed" document which has colorably been issued in this case, which might, on its surface, seem to evidence Defendant's claim of ownership of this property, was secured by them through "Un-Clean-Hands", and/or by way of Fraudulent, Usurious, &/or other Unconscionable & Class-Warfare based Circumstances, all of which makes any such Title document un-lawful & invalid.

96: The Defendants can Not show that they actually Parted With any constitutionally-recognizable "Valuable Consideration" when they obtained their interest in the property in question in this case.
~~~~~~

97: The above is true, at least in-part, because, when the U.S. Congress decided what was to be "Legal Tender" for the Currency of this nation, by act on April 2nd, of 1792; they defined the term "Dollar" to mean specifically a coin issued by the U.S. Government containing 371 4/16 grains of pure silver. That would be True & Constitutionally-Lawful "Valuable Consideration"

There is "no lawful authority", in constitutional terms, for referring to any form of paper or electronic-credit forms of currency as either Legal Tender "Dollars", or as "Valuable Consideration". Through fiat of economic manipulations & "boom & bust" cycles, & also by way of provisions in the "Uniform Commercial Code"; "Federal Reserve Notes", and Negotiable-Instruments issued by other Americans, have all become to be known as "Currency of Account". Defendants named here-in are all direct beneficiaries & franchisees of that private/corporate & extra-constitutional banking system.

The Defendants named here-in have gained their economic advantage in purchasing their interest in this real-property through these very same sorts of grossly un-fair, un-conscionable, & class-warfare based advantages. Here-under; their past & possible future use of unlawful-detainer claims to possession-rights for this property, over & above the rights of we co-plaintiffs, is un-conscionable, un-just, & lawless.

The "Modus Operandi" of those Counter-Defendants named here-in, seems very similar to that which is described in the videos linked here-in; all of which clearly shows how the people in control of those mega-wealthy Banking institutions have established a "Pattern of Behavior", which "Evidences a Design" by them, to Claim Rights to Administer Force so-as-to Evict Any Person on this Planet from their home. Evidence here-under clearly indicates that none of the mega-wealthy natural-persons who hide behind the corporate-veils of these legal-fictions, have any real concern for the general welfare for America's common-people.

98: Because the corporate Defendants named here-in are all direct Recipients of the basic Lawless Monopoly which those powerful banking institutions control over the economy of our entire nation; here-under, the Defendant's interest in this property is Invalid, Lawless, & Void.

99: Further here-under; those Counter-Defendant's Cloud over the "Prior Peaceable Possession" based Title of these Plaintiffs, should be Removed, & Title should be Quieted in these Plaintiffs.

100: The averments of the preceding paragraphs are restated here by reference. Through the criminally reckless negligence and greed of the Defendants named in this case, these Plaintiffs have suffered "Damage" in the form of emotional stress, trauma, and incredible burdens in legal-research and social pressures.

This Damaged caused by these Defendants amounts in approximation to $230,000.00 in Federal Reserve Note denominated dollars.

If & when this Counter-Complaint proceeds so far as to have a Jury adjudicating it's merits; those Jurors should be advised to use their natural/organic consciences & reasoning capabilities, so-as-to arrive at what they deem to be a just & fair amount of economic damages, both actual damages, & sufficient punitive damages to cause each & all of those class-warfare rich fat-cats to suffer as nastily as the Moores have suffered; & perhaps even a bit more, just to make sure those evil conspirators learn their lesson.

~~~~~~

Building further on the Conspiracy & Racketeering Issues related to this Case:

101: The "Economic Issues" involved in this larger "Criminal Conspiracy", are explained clearly in numerous popular and well-researched videos. One of these is called "Century of Enslavement: ...", & another is called "The Money Masters"; both of which are listed in the two web-links following, here:
~~~~~~

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5IJeemTQ7Vk
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=B4wU9ZnAKAw

It is our position that the Defendants listed here-in, are all direct-recipients of the economic franchise & privilege which emanates, ultimately, from the same larger & immensely wealthy & powerful criminal racketeering conspiracy, all as is clearly explained in these videos. These videos also explain, that, this larger organization is massively criminally-syndicated, & it has historically evidenced its clearly malicious-intent to subvert our American constitutional monetary, political, & judicial systems.

The Defendants named here-in; are in the habit of routinely mis-using applicable "Law", so-as to continue with their ability to pay their monthly extortion payments to the larger racketeering schemers which are described in these videos. These here-in named counter-defendants are here-by gathering "Un-Lawful Benefits", all in direct-proportion to how many innocent & poor people that they can lawlessly pillage & plunder, especially by coercing &/or intimidating them in-to abandoning their real-property, as is the case here-in. If those sorts of reptilian-brained, survival-of-the-fittest, & greed-is-good/gordon-gekko strategies might not produce the full results that they seek, then they frequently move to evict such honest people from their homes by way of bamboozling, bribing, or threatening Judges into authorizing the lawless use of the force of the local sheriff's office.

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VCC1H7MSIsg
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=r1YjwFty7-I

All of the arguments contained in all of these sources are included in this complaint by way of this reference to them. We have not named the so-called "Federal Reserve Bank", or any of its regional "Federal Reserve" franchises, as Co-Conspirators in this action; even though they do seem to be the ultimate source of the evil-mind-set which has permeated our American and Texas Social Bodies-Politic, and about which we here-in generally complain.

Here-under; the same aristocratic pillage-and-plunder mind-set towards lawless abuses of the constitutionally protected rights of the common people of Texas and the U.S.A., has all been franchised down to the more local practitioners of this much larger criminal racketeering scheme, as complained of against the here-in named Defendants. We here-by complain that these here-in named Defendants have committed basically the same criminally-lawless-acts as those of which are so very well complained of in the above linked videos and related documents. Here-by, our Complaints of "Racketeering", "Conspiracy", "Fraud", & numerous other "Crimes", all find Legitimacy & "Justification", in the minds & the consciences of the Common People of Texas.

Knowledge about how "Due Process of Law", aka: "Law of the Land", actually works, has been Purposefully Obscured; because, if it were to become "Common-Knowledge", then, our entire Court System would be granting Judgements which would promptly Stop the Un-Lawful Flow of Economic-Resources from the masses of the 99% of the body-politic, to the Kleptocratic & Plutocratic "One Per-cent". That aristocratic "One Per-cent" are the immediate Beneficiaries of the intellectually & morally bankrupt policies of "Trickle Down Economics" & "Too Big to Fail" Banking Policies. Here-under; the natural-persons behind these Mega-Wealthy Racketeering Criminal-Syndicates, place Immense Pressure on honorable Judges & Attorneys in our constitutional Judicial System, to "Obstruct Justice" & "Hinder Prosecution" of the Multitudes of their Crimes & "Offenses Against the State & Public Justice".

~~~~~~

"Alternative Dispute Resolution" Efforts:

102: The issue of "Alternative Dispute Resolution", is of under-rated importance in all cases; because, it is an "Issue of Procedure", or of "Procedural Law"; as opposed to that which is fashionable to
~~~~~~

construe separately, & to refer-to, as, issues of "Substantive Law". Massive texts have been written, all purportedly in efforts to increase Clarity & Efficiency in the Administration of Justice, such as Texas "Rules of Civil Procedure" & "Uniform Trial Court Rules". Also; the entire modern procedural tool of "Discovery" has become an organic part of all of these generally praise-worthy developments. And, even more importantly; all of this is harmonious with Texas Civil-Government's Constitutional Guarantee to All Texas People, redundantly, at Article 1, Sections 1s & 19; that "Remedy" by "Due Course of Law" (aka: "Due Process of Law"), Must Be Made Available to All Texas People.

A good example of this socially justified & natural/organic harmony, can be found in Oregon's "Uniform Trial Court Rule" of "5.010"; where it clearly declares that moving-parties should make "Good-Faith Efforts to Confer with the other parties concerning the Issues in Dispute" before they are to be granted any "Motion to Dismiss" against their opposing-party. This rule clearly establishes a Course & Process where-in Requirements of Discovery-like "Investigation & Inquiry" in-to the Merits of the Issues in Controversy between the Parties are Imposed up-on Moving-Parties, all well "Before" any party to the action can successfully move the court to grant them any favorable decisions. The essential "Principle of Procedure" here; is, that, litigants who are Refusing to Contribute to the Showing of Evidence Necessary to bring the case to a complete & Just Resolution, and especially when their opposing-party is providing significant open efforts at communicating towards the resolution of the dispute; then that Singular-Party who is actively or passively Obstructing the efficient Resolution of the Dispute, should Not be allowed to Benefit from his/her/their obstructive efforts.

These are all very well-settled & valuable general-policies of All Courts in our USA, including our Texas Courts. And even more so; these are also the general policies of our Texas"Legislative-Assembly". There-in are advocated these same forms of "Alternative Dispute Resolution".

~~~~~~

Pressures on Honorable Judges to Capitulate to Powerful & Evil Men:

103: There is much evidence, that honest Judges in our Judiciary, are routinely Threatened with Violence, or other sorts of Lawlessly Coercive Pressures, unless they compromize their principles & capitulate to that well-financed & seriously militarized group of reptilian-brained & cold-blooded international out-laws, as is else-where described here-in.

Example 1: Evidence indicates that President Johnson "Coerced" Earl Warren, in-to lending his credibility as Chief-Justice of the US-Supreme-Court, so-as-to give "color of legitimacy" to the white-wash of the involvement of powerfully wealthy Americans in the Murder of President John Kennedy.

"In a telephone conversation with Richard B. Russell Johnson claimed: 'Warren told me he wouldn't do it under any circumstances... I called him and ordered him down here and told me no twice and I just pulled out what Hoover told me about a little incident in Mexico City... And he started crying and said, well I won't turn you down... I'll do whatever you say.'"

http://spartacus-educational.com/JFKwarren.htm

Example 2: is of the more modern Assassination of "Federal District Judge John Roll":

"... the top US Federal Judge for the State of Arizona was assassinated barely 72-hours after he made a critical ruling against the Obama administrations plan to begin the confiscation of their citizen's private retirement and banking accounts … . … Federal Judge John McCarthy Roll was the Chief Judge for the United States District Court for the District of Arizona who this past Friday issued what is called a "preliminary ruling" in a case titled "United States of America v. $333,520.00 in United States Currency et al" [Case Number: 4:2010cv00703 Filed: November 30, 2010] wherein
~~~~~~

he stated he was preparing to rule against Obama's power to seize American citizens money without clear and convincing evidence of a crime being committed. The case being ruled on by Judge Roll, this report continues, was about bulk cash smuggling into or out of the United States that the Obama administration claimed was their right to seize under what are called Presidential Executive Orders, instead of using existing laws."

http://www.eutimes.net/2011/01/top-us-federal-judge-assassinated-after-threat-to-obama-agenda/

http://politicalvelcraft.org/2012/08/22/u-s-federal-judge-john-roll-murdered-the-sheriffs-judge-who-upheld-the-constitution-and-reversed-congress/

We Ex-Rel Co-Plaintiffs are under the impression that there are "Professional Codes of Ethics" which place positive "peer pressure" on the legal-fiction Defendants to behave more honorably & responsibly than they have behaved in this case. We are under the impression that these officers have "Fiduciary Duties" to make reasonable efforts to allow record owners of real-property, to use these clear provisions of law, to resolve disputes associated with real-property.

http://definitions.uslegal.com/f/fiduciary-duty/

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fiduciary

104: Common-law/due-process is also known as "lex-non-scripta"; because, it requires the decision-makers to look at the "Fundamental Fairness" of the "Process", as opposed to whether or not some hapless non-professional litigant might have stepped-on-to a lex-scripta based procedural booby-trap. A few citations in support of the position of we Plaintiffs here, read as follows:

Texas Rules of Civil Procedure:
The proper objective of rules of civil procedure is to obtain a just, fair, equitable and impartial adjudication of the rights of litigants under established principles of substantive law.
To the end that this objective may be attained with as great expedition and dispatch and at the least expense both to the litigants and to the state as may be practicable, these rules shall be given a liberal construction.

". . . the allegations of the pro se complaint, . . . we hold to less stringent standards than formal pleadings drafted by lawyers, . . ."
Haines v. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519, 30 L. Ed. 2nd 652 ; US Supreme Court: 1972.

~~~~~~

Shielding Texas Sovereign People From Dismissals of their Due-Process/Course of Law Rights:

105: There seems to be a common mis-conception amongst professional bar-member attorneys, that, "Law", Flows, in a top/down, authoritarian, & essentially despotic manner. We Plaintiffs theorize that this is "true", because, the very nature of the "bar association" under which professional attorneys operate, is similarly top/down, authoritarian, & despotic. We have seen how honest bar-member attorneys are frequently terrorized away from insisting on the rights of litigants in courts, simply because they are threatened with the loss of their "license to practice law", if they might be so bold as to insist on constitutionally-guaranteed & natural/organic "Rights". Dis-honest attorneys seem to thrive in these sorts of top/down authoritarian & despotic environments. All that they have to do is to continue selling-out our common people, & to there-by enable the devils at the top of that power-pyramid to continue to run their slave-trading disneyland empire. This course gives those corrupted attorneys a feeling of assurance that
~~~~~~

they will continue to be able to maintain their very comfortable upper-class-warfare based standard of living.

But this is not harmonious with the “Original Intent” of those who fought & died to make Texas America, England, & Israel, “Free”. America reverted back, in 1776, to a very pure & ancient form of Common-Law, that was in-place in England, prior to the “Norman Conquest” of 1066-ad; & which was actually based on the even more ancient “Torah Laws” of Israel. America's average founders had a fresher “genetic memory” flowing through their veins, of the realities of those more noble time-periods; in stark contrast to the institutionalized propaganda that now saturates the blood which flows through the veins of the brains of our average modern American. America's founders, as with Texas founders, thirsted for these very forms of ancient due-process-of-law related freedoms; & that is precisely what they did their level best to codify in our written “Constitution” documents.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Norman_conquest_of_England

Yet most modern bar-member attorneys seem to have been programmed by despotic new-world-order conspirators, to function like robots, in coldly mechanical manners, as they process hapless litigants through gauntlet-like tortures, all in purposefully & needlessly complicated court proceedings. We live in a new information-age, where-in people all over the planet are becoming aware of these realities; & they are self-organizing to take steps to put an end to this ability of this aristocratic & babylonian-whore-like parasite-class to pillage & plunder our planet's common-people.

It seems clear to we Plaintiffs, that, the Courts of our nation & state are the only really possible theaters in which these sorts of evils have any sort of a chance for being settled in non-violent manners. This is the precise reason why common-law/due-process fixates on the core-issue of Preventing “Breach of the Peace”. This is the modern equivalent of “International Law”. In those ancient protestant/christian times; Preventing “Breach of the Peace” was the Singular Concern for the entirety of society. Here-under; the monarchs there-in governing had “zero tolerance” for those with legal skills who purposefully deceived commoners, in their efforts to pervert these supreme & international “laws of nature”.

Civil Procedure; West Publishing Company, Friedenthal, Kane & Miller, West Hornbook Series on Civil Procedure, 1985: Page 476 & 477:

“In America ... (t)he right of juries to decide questions of law was widely accepted in the colonies, especially in criminal cases. Prior to 1850, the judge and jury were viewed as partners ... . The jury could decide questions of both law and fact, ... Legal theory and political philosophy emphasized the importance of the Jury in divining natural law, which was thought to be a better source for decision than the "authority of black letter maxim." Since natural law was accessible to lay people, it was held to be the duty of each juror to determine for himself whether a particular rule of law embodied the principles of the higher natural law.”

“Fair Trial: A proceeding before an impartial and disinterested tribunal; a proceeding which hears before it condemns, which proceeds upon inquiry and renders judgement only after trail consideration of evidence and facts as a whole. A basic constitutional guarantee ... . A legal trial or one conducted in all material things in substantial conformity to law. A trial which insures substantial justice. A trial without prejudice to the accused. An orderly trail before an impartial jury and judge whose neutrality is indifferent to every factor in trial but that of administering justice. One conducted according to due course of law. A trail before an impartial judge, and an impartial jury, and an atmosphere of judicial calm. In such trial, the judge may not extend his activities so far as to become, in effect, either an assistant prosecutor, or a thirteenth juror.” ...

Black's Law Dictionary; 5th Ed.

"The Lawfinding Power of Colonial American Juries". Ohio State Law Journal. http://moritzlaw.osu.edu/students/groups/oslj/files/2012/03/71.5.nelson.pdf

The economic condition of our nation's common-people continues to suffer pillage & plunder by that same powerful & conspiratorially franchised & privileged "One-Percent" that the "Occupy-Wall-Street" People were protesting against. Bar-member attorneys & judges who are in the habit of actively Obstructing that specific & well-settled "Course of Justice" which is "Due" to each & all of Texas common people, through capitulating to the demands of that "One Percent", are going to have to seriously adjust their attitudes.

These words are True; because, before our nation's common people can find the Peace & Justice that they are constitutionally entitled to, they may have to use lawful-force to achieve it; & here-under, the ability of that plutocratic "One Percent" must be surgically separated from their present monstrous ability to negatively-influence the decision-makers in our national & Texas State Court-Systems.

****

~~~~ Concluding Notes Concerning the Status of these Ex-Rel Plaintiffs ~~~~

106: Further here-under; these Plaintiffs are proceeding in Propria-Persona and Sui-Juris; which means that we are in possession of the full spectrum of our natural, God-given, & constitutionally-guaranteed "Rights" of "Sovereignty"; & we are entitled to proceed in the Public Courts of this State by asserting these natural "Rights of Sovereignty". Here-under; we are Entitled to Demand that a "Jury" resolve this action, upon all issues in this case which are both cognizable as Common-Law Issues; and which are alleged by these Counter-Plaintiffs, & not admitted by the Counter-Defendants.

We Plaintiffs further Demanded our Right to Proceed by way of that traditional "Process" & "Course of Law" which is "Due" to each and Every Constituent/Member of the Public Bodies-Politic of Midland County, Texas, & the U.S.A.; aka: "Due Process of Law", aka: "Due Course of Law"; as specifically guaranteed to All Texans, in Article 1 Sections 13 & 19, in our State Constitution. These "Powers of Sovereignty" in our common People, are also affirmed in Article 1 Section 2 of our Texas Constitution, which contains the clear phrase, that: "All Political Power is Inherent in the People".

In significant Contrast there-with; Bar-Member "Attorneys" are the recipients of "Franchises", which are distributed through a process of "Licensing"; & where-under those superior "Rights of Sovereignty" of our common people, are "No Longer Available" to be accessed. Here-under; case-law recognizes that we Propria-Persona/Sui-Juris Litigants are entitled to have "Less Stringent Standards" of procedure applied to us, in our efforts to prosecute complaints such as this, than are those more constrained standards under which licensed/franchised/privileged "Bar Member Attorneys" are routinely presumed to have agreed to limit their efforts at seeking "Justice". And their Clients, such as the Defendants named here-in, are all there-under even further constrained in their abilities to assert their "Rights of Sovereignty" in the Public Courts of this State; because, they have all Agreed to be "Represented" by a Bar-Member Attorney, who, as a "matter of law" is not even capable of asserting that full-spectrum of constitutionally-guaranteed "Rights".

Available "Evidence", including case-law, clearly supports these conclusions. These powerful under-currents of what is really happening in the Courts of this State & Nation are generally quite

obscured from public-knowledge. But the Courts of this State & Nation still espouse & affirm that "Law" Requires that Common-People be "Not Constrained" by the myriad of technical procedural requirements that have been maliciously placed in-to "Rules of Civil Procedure", & all of which are routinely presumed by corrupted judicial-officers to be applicable to those licensed/franchised/privileged "Bar Member Attorneys". These realities are guardedly Recognized by such case-law as has manifested through the U.S. Supreme Court case of Haines v. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519, 30 L. Ed. 2D 652 (1972); which reads, as:

"* * * the allegations of the pro se complaint, * * * we hold to less stringent standards than formal pleadings drafted by lawyers, * * * ".

Further; prohibitive costs related to court filings have caused we Plaintiffs to eliminate various John and Jane Doe Defendants from this complaint; and for the same reason we have been forced to reduce the names of the corporate defendants down to just these bare essentials.

~~~~~~

Relief Requested:

107: Wherefore; Because of the validity of the previously complained-of Injustice and Lawlessness of the here-in named Counter-Defendants, these Counter-Plaintiff's respectfully Demand that the public-servants in positions of "Public Trust" in this Court, Order that:

108: The Counter-Defendants Answer this Counter-Complaint, & there-in specifically Admitting or Denying with particularity all allegations of reasonable significance contained herein;

109: That "Alternative Dispute Resolution" process be exhaustively explored & promoted; & with this especially prioritizing the Constitutionally Prioritized Concerns of "Due Course of Law", & of the issue of "Proper Venue" from whence a Jury should be selected;

110: That All Issues Raised in This Complaint, be Adjudicated First in the "Justice of the Peace Court" for Precinct-2 of Midland County; there-by exercising its "Original & Exclusive Jurisdiction", as recognizable under Traditional Anglo-American Organic/Constitutional Common-Law;

111: In the Event that the Presiding Judicial-Officer in the Justice of the Peace Court might Fail to Administer Justice in hisConstitutionally-Mandated Manner; then,

That all issues that might continue in dispute in this case, be Tried by a full Jury, as required under the "Rules of the Common-Law"; and with the verdict to be binding upon All Courts Exercising All Municipally-Franchised sorts of Nisi-Prius & Limited-Jurisdictions; & this all as is Required under well-settled interpretations of Constitutional "Due Process of Law", aka "Due Course of Law"; & as is Required under Article 1 Sections 13 & 19, in our Texas Constitution;

112: That all issues of Both Fact & Law be subjected to the Jury, which is to deliberate until their "Unanimous Verdict" is spontaneously forth-coming, and where-under Justice, Good Conscience, & the "Rule of Law" are the targeted end-result.

113: That "Economic Damages" to these Counter-Plaintiffs, Be Judicially Ordered as Awarded, in the Amounts Deemed "Reasonably Justified", at the Time of the Issuance of the Judgement; & this with due consideration then being given to the Cost-Estimate of these Economic-Damages, as estimated by the Moores, on the date of 2024-January-15; as follows:

Hard Costs:

Costs of Hiring Attorney, to Help trying to save the home: $3,270.00.

Cost of Three Bankruptcy-Proceedings, in Desperate & Reasonably Justified Efforts
~~~~~~

to Obstruct the Criminally-Lawless & Peace-Breaching Eviction; (including expenses for
4 hour drives traveling to file the court documents): $1,205.00
Hotel for 168 days @ $209.00 per night: $35,112.00
Meals for that 168 days since we had no Kitchen (That's for 5 of us): $21,574.00
Deposit for House we could finally Rent: $12,500.00
Rent on the Rent House, for 17 months, @ $6,000 per month: $102,000.00
Second Trip Back to a Hotel, for 191 days, @ $124 a day: $23,684.00
Meals for 5, for 191 days: $23,875.00
Rental on 2 Fema 1-bedroom Trailers, for 42 Months @ $1,500/Month: $63,000.00
3- Moving Expenses: $15,300.00
Storage for 6 months when evicted: $5,875.00
Storage for last 43 months, @ $550.00 monthly: $23,650.00
6 Flights back to Midland dealing with this case: $3,685.00
25 days of lost work to try to save house, & Moving Three Times,
@ average cost per day of $4,500.00: $112,500.00
Us Maintaining the Property, including:
mowing, weed-eating, & hauling weeds: for 5 & ½ years: $14,200.00
Total Hard Costs: **$461,430.00**

~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~

Additional Costs:
Christine's Jewelry being Stolen during the First Move; her Wedding-Ring,
& All Jewelry Described in the Police-Report which we filed on this event: $57,062.00
Furniture Broken & Ruined, because of desperate conditions during moving: $38,757.00
Mattresses Ruined because of rushed efforts at Storage: $ 7,819.00
Three Plasma TV's Broken during the moves: $ 8,470.00
Clothing & Shoes Ruined because of rushed efforts at Storage: $12,750.00
Total Additional Costs: **$118,782.00**

Total Hard Costs & Additional Costs: **$580,212.00**

****

Now Visible Repair-Costs Needed for the Out-Side & In-Side of the Home:
Roof Repair Or Replacement: $42,000.00
Cost to Replace Sod in the Yards, which was totally Ruined: $22,715.00
Estimated Costs of Replacing Three GeoThermal Air-Conditioning Units
because they have been sitting idle with no maintenance for 5 & ½ Years: $29,763.00
Three Hot-Water-Heaters similarily need Replacement: $ 8,750.00
Repair to the Back Aluminum-Gate the opposing parties Broke: $ 695.00
Estimated Costs for Repair & Replacement of
the Grout in the Tubs & Showers of the House Bathrooms: $19,173.00
Inspect & Replace the Faucets, in the kitchen, baths & laundry room of the home,
which have deteriorated, because of lack of maintenance & non-use: $ 5,896.00
Costs of Sheet-rock Replacement & Repairs, because of Roof-Leaks: $ 38,159.00
Estimated Costs of Electrical Repairs, due to sitting, & mice: $ 11,149.00
Inspection for Black-Mold, due to Leaks: $ 5,550.00
Pre-Inspection High-Cost Estimate for Repairs for Black-Mold Damage is: $125,000.00
~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~

Estimated Un-Seen Repair-Costs:	$ 92,332.00
Estimated Total Visible Repair Costs:	**$401,182.00**

~~~

Newly Discovered Repair Costs, Upon Taking Possession of the Home:

Carpet and tile replacement due to non care	$48,000.00
Cookware & dishes broken or ruined due to temperature changes in storage:	$3,256.00
Plumbers to reseal toilets:	$2,987.00
Electrician to replace light fixtures, wiring, wall-plugs, switches, etc.:	$3,975.00
Contractor to repair back door:	$675.00
Total Newly Discovered Repair Costs:	**$58,893.00**

~~~

Total: Visible Repair Costs, + Newly Discovered Repair Costs: **$460,075.00**

~~~~~~

Total Cost For All Damages, Repairs, & Replacements: $580,212 + $460,075: **$1,040,287.00**

****

Daily Cost of Not Having Access To Our Home, due to Being Lawlessly & Criminally Forced-Out At Gun-point: 2,020 Days; @ $5,000.00 per day; = **$10,100,000.00**

****

Total Repairs, Replacements, & Damages Costs & Bill: **$11,140,287.00**

~~~~~~

Also we Counter-Plaintiffs Request Reasonable "Punative-Damages" Costs-Award, because of: Deceptive Trade Practices & Mental Anguish For Our Entire Family, & Including Especially for Our Special-Needs Daughter: $750,000,000.00

This is "Justified", from the rich corporate fat-cats here-in named, because: according to Texas Penal Code, Section 22.04; anyone that injures or harms a "Special Needs Child", Mentally or Physically; is Guilty of a "First-Degree-Felony"; & putting our 10-year-old Special-Needs Daughter Out of Her Home, Is Causing Her "Mental-Harm"; because she was there-by Brutally Displaced Out of Her Environment, all of which Brutally Interrupted the Life which She Was Accustomed To.

$11,140,287.00 + $750,000,000.00 = $761,140,287.00.

****

114: This written complaint is presently intended to Later be Re-Filed in an "Amended Version". Multitudes of issues are involved here; & our time/energy/personnell/monetary resources are extremely limited; & we are under pressures from the Counter-Defendants named here-in, to move forward with this complaint, in its present form, now, even though it is not perfected.

Keep in mind here please, that, it is only under the Roman-Empire Model of Municipal/Civil Governing & Court-Process, where-in these sorts of elaborate "Written Complaints" were/are required, before "Justice" might be secured. That purposefully despotic system of so-called "Law" was also known as "Lex Scripta", or "Statutory Law", or "Written Law".

No such Obstructions or Impediments to the Presenting of the Dispute to the Jury Existed, under the more pure form of Common-Law Governing & Jurisprudence, where-under "Lex Non Scripta", aka the "Un-Written Law" was the governing norm. Here-under, parties to the action were given instant access to present before the Jury their "lucid exposition of broad legal principles, or the conduct of a finely reasoned argument, on their application to a disputed point."; as quoted from text available in the web-link here:

https://ConstitutionalGov.us/Citations-Short/CommonLawIs-LivingTempleOfJustice-FredrickPollock-OxfordLectures.pdf

We have posted copies of this document, & other related files, in a web-page located intuitively under the web-link here:

https://ConstitutionalGov.us/sub/PoliticalSubdivisions-Local/09-TexasSS/1-Cases/Moores/

115: All words presented here-in and which can reasonably be construed as being solemnly sworn to or affirmed by any of us, are actually done so by those of us signatory here-in below. Each of us also witness the validity of the others signatures on this document.

Here-under; & as reasonably interpreted, under the full context of this document; all three of us, Christine Huddleston Moore, Michael Moore, & Charles Stewart, have all signed this document; & similarly as established under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure, Rule 13, each of us do here-by solemnly Swear, that, to the best of our knowledge, information, & beliefs, formed after reasonable inquiry, All Declarations presented here-in, are here-by presented in Good-Faith, & they are Well Grounded in the Situational-Facts which are Declared in this Complaint; & they are also Well Grounded, Justified, & Warranted, by Good Faith Arguments for the un-tainted Application, Extension, Modification, or Reversal of what is fashionable for the Judicial Officers of the Municipal Government of this State of Texas to consider as being true & existing "Law"; & No Declarations in this Complaint are 'Fictitious', Nor are any of these Declarations Intended for any Bad Purpose, such as for that of Harassment.

All words presented here-in, and which can reasonably be construed as being solemnly sworn to or affirmed by these primary 'Co-Plaintiffs with the State', are actually done so, by each of us.

Before the Almighty God of America, England, & Israel; each of us do bear Witness to the fact, that, each of the others of us did actually Sign & Swear to the Truth of all of the words which are contained in this document, as reasonably interpreted.

God's kingdom come, & God's will be done; on this earth, as in the heavens.

Revelation 18:

1: And after these things I saw another angel come down from heaven, having great power; and the earth was lightened with his glory. 2: And he cried mightily with a strong voice, saying, Babylon the great is fallen, is fallen, and is become the habitation of devils, and the hold of every foul spirit, and a cage of every unclean and hateful bird. 3: For all nations have drunk of the wine of the wrath of her fornication, and the kings of the earth have committed fornication with her, and the merchants of the earth are waxed rich through the abundance of her delicacies. ...

11: And the merchants of the earth shall weep and mourn over her; for no man buyeth their merchandise any more: 12: The merchandise of gold, and silver, and precious stones, and of pearls, and fine linen, and purple, and silk, and scarlet, and all thyine wood, and all manner vessels of

ivory, and all manner vessels of most precious wood, and of brass, and iron, and marble, 13 And cinnamon, and odours, and ointments, and frankincense, and wine, and oil, and fine flour, and wheat, and beasts, and sheep, and horses, and chariots, and slaves, and souls of men. ...

15: The merchants of these things, which were made rich by her, shall stand afar off for the fear of her torment, weeping and wailing, … 17: For in one hour so great riches is come to nought. … 19: And they cast dust on their heads, and cried, weeping and wailing, saying, Alas, alas that great city, wherein were made rich all that had ships in the sea by reason of her costliness! for in one hour is she made desolate. … 20: Rejoice over her, thou heaven, and ye holy apostles and prophets; for God hath avenged you on her. 21: … for thy merchants were the great men of the earth; for by thy sorceries were all nations deceived. 24: And in her was found the blood of prophets, and of saints, and of all that were slain upon the earth."

Solemnly Sworn & Subscribed, before All-Mighty God,
& in the Name of our Lord & Savior: Christ Jesus;
& as Ex-Rel Co-Plaintiffs with our Constitutional 'State of Texas':

_____

Christine Huddleston Moore, In Propria-Persona, & Sui-Juris;
1001 South County Road 1060, Midland City & County, & in Texas State Republic [79706].
christine.moore1028@gmail.com / 432-889-6362.

_____

Michael Moore, In Propria-Persona, & Sui-Juris;
1001 South County Road 1060, Midland City & County, & in Texas State Republic [79706].
mike.moore1028@gmail.com / 432-889-6361.

_____

Charles Bruce, Stewart; In Propria-Persona, & Sui-Juris; (Signature By Accommodation);
1117 North Neches Street, Coleman City & County, & in Texas State Republic.
charles@constitutionalgov.us / 325-603-0334.