



**1: '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, "Ginger Walker", "David Walker", & "Charles Bruce, Stewart". David Walker has formerly been known as "David Prichard".

Here-under; & as reasonably interpreted, under the full context of this document; all three of us, Ginger Walker, David Walker, & 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.

**2: The Status & Names of these 'Co-Plaintiffs', & 'Complaining Parties', Is:** among our 'Natural-People' entities, most prominently is the direct blood-line grand-mother of the Children who are the central issue of concern in this Complaint; one "Ginger Walker". Additionally; our natural-persons names include "David Walker", "Charles Stewart", & the above referenced Children of Laiella Walker, Trever Brooks, Emma Horn, & Aiden Walker. "David Walker" has been previously known as "David Prichard".

Further; & because this unique Complaint is "In the Public-Interest", for our Larger Communities of the "State of Texas", "Coleman County", & "Precinct 1, of Coleman 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>

'Ginger Walker' & 'David Prichard' were the names of the people who were originally targeted in the original Complaint, under which acting Coleman County Texas State District Court Judge James Edison saw fit to issue his Order, there-by directing local & blindly-obedient executive-officers to use displays of deadly & lethal force, in their acts of Forcible Removal of Four Children from our loving care & custody. The original complaint which lent color-of-legitimacy to that act originally presumed to name these Children as 'Laiella Walker', 'Trever Brooks', 'Emma Horn', as allegedly in need of being protected from us through their forcible removal from our care & custody. Although 'Aiden Walker' was not directly named in that original complaint against us, Aiden was also then forcibly removed from our care & custody, under the same color-of-legitimacy of the same order which was issued by acting District Court Judge James Edison.

Here-under, & through similar process of representation & relation to this case; All Four of these Children are here-in Named as Co-Plaintiffs; along side of we three adult Co-Plaintiffs, & along with our Ex-Rel Relations to various other Communities of People, including (but not limited to) our 'State of Texas', 'Coleman County', & 'Precinct 1 of Coleman County'. These Four Children are here-in Named as Co-Plaintiffs, because of, the Damage which They have Suffered as the result of the Crimes which have been perpetrated against all of us, under the color-of-legitimacy which was lent there-to by & through James Edison issuing his corrupted &/or recklessly-negligent Order, as more fully described & complained of later here-in. The corrupted & fraudulent complaint documents which resulted in the Crimes complained of here-in, only gained their first color-of-legitimacy through their naming of three of these Children in that

corrupted complaint against us. By similar token, in this Criminal Counter-Complaint, we feel 'Justified' in using the Names of these same three Children, plus Aiden, in our efforts at finally securing that naturally conscionable, objective, & Godly "Justice"; & we here-under are doing precisely that.

All Three Individual Adult Complaining-Parties here-in Are: "Ginger Walker"; David Walker", formerly known as "David Prichard"; & "Charles Bruce, Stewart". "Ginger Walker" is the Biological Grand-Mother of all four of the Children referenced here-in; & has suffered the most trauma & damage of all of the individual adult Co-Plaintiffs who are named in this Complaint. "David Walker" is now the step-grand-father of the four children referenced here-in; &, under his previous name of "David Prichard", (as set forth in the original complaint against us), David has suffered Slander & Liable of his good character & reputation, all in direct & malicious efforts to discredit Ginger in her capacity to provide responsible care for the Four Children here-in named.

"Charles Bruce, Stewart" has much less directly suffered any trauma or damage as the result of the criminal activities generally complained of here-in. How-ever, & in support of the original complaint against us, & on page-3 of Ms Ratliff's supportive Affidavit, clear reference is made to a man named as 'Charley'. Further, & on page-4 of that same Affidavit, Ms Ratliff references an "older and frail looking man sitting on one couch"; & again in that same page as "I inquired about the man that was inside the home and seated on the couch". All three of these passages from the Original Complaint against us are referencing this Co-Plaintiff, "Charles Bruce, Stewart". The larger context of those passages is clearly designed to imply that Ginger Walker was some-how being irresponsible in how she selected the people whom she allowed to associate with the Children; & the latter two of these three referenced passages seem clearly designed & intended to support that larger & general accusation that Ginger Walker was behaving in that sort of an "Irresponsible" manner, all of which was causing an allegedly legitimate "Danger" to the Children.

Here-under, this Co-Plaintiff 'Charles Stewart', has suffered a portion of the collective Slander & Liable that has been publicly brought collectively against Ginger & David; & here-under, I am also a legitimate Counter-Co-Plaintiff in this case. "Charles Stewart" is a close family friend of Ginger & David Walker, & he is a fellow member with them in the 'Brazos Street Community Church' here in Coleman.

Charles also possesses specialized skills in the technical formalities of Composing, Filing, & Prosecuting Criminal-Complaints against Corrupted Public-Servants, such as is here-in being presented. David & Ginger Walker have waited patiently in their efforts to achieve some sort of a reasonable compromise with the people acting as Public Servants, & who are here-in Accused of Criminal-behavior; but their patient efforts at compliance have been dis-respected, & their Constitutionally Guaranteed & Natural Rights have continued to suffer brutally insensitive abuses.

Here-under, Ginger & David Walker have become so exasperated at this brutally insensitive mode of established court procedures, that, they have asked Charles Stewart to Assist them in Composing, Filing, & Prosecuting, this Criminal Counter-Complaint, all for the non-commercialized Purposes of Promoting God's Holy "Justice" in Coleman County, in our State of Texas, the U.S.A., & on all of God's Earth.

Charles Stewart has here-under promised to Ginger & David, that, he will do his best to use this Complaint as a Tool in our joint effort at Securing perfectly Objective, Public, & Godly "Justice"; where-under we all expect the net result to be the Judicial Ordering of the Return of these four Kidnapped Children to Ginger & David Walker. Ginger & David have both fully reviewed this composed document, & we have contributed significantly to its finalized version. Many of the technicalities of the 'Law", as set forth here-in, we are not capable of swearing to be 'True'; & here-under, we do not do so. How-ever; we categorically do swear as being True all of the non-legalistic claims declared here-in, & which relate to the Situational/Facts surrounding the Kidnapping of our Children, & the other Crimes such as Racketeering, which are directly related there-to.

With-in the numerous Courts before which this Complaint is being presented & filed for prosecution, & in the event that No Judicial Officers Can be Found who are Capable of Responsibly & Reasonably

exercising the “Judicial Power” there-in, by following Constitutionally Guaranteed “Due Process of Law”, aka “Due Course of Law”; then, this Co-Plaintiff, ‘Charles Stewart’, does here-by Reserve the Right to Vacate my position as Co-Plaintiff in this Complaint; & I here-under Reserve my Constitutional Right to begin exercising that same “Judicial Power”, on behalf of Ginger & David Walker, & the Children, & the People of Texas & Coleman County; all in such manners as actually respect Constitutionally Guaranteed “Due Process of Law”, aka “Due Course of Law”.

Under the larger context, that, 1: acting District Court Judge James Edison has here-in been formally Accused of Criminally Mis-Using his Judicial-Power for Corrupted Purposes; & 2: a clear majority of the People of Coleman County are too terrorized by the powers-that-be here-in, to stand-up and assume the leadership role of directly exercising that “Judicial Power”; here-under, it is “In the Interests of Justice” that Charles Stewart make it clear, that, if indeed this is the only path-way through which Constitutionally-Guaranteed “Due Process of Law” might be brought to bear in response to this Criminal Counter-Complaint, then, Charles Stewart does intend to exercise this same “Judicial Power”.

Under the Non-Religious & Statutory Codes based Municipal-Laws of the Roman-Empire Model-of-Government, as presently dominate in both Coleman County & our State of Texas; we are here-by seeking what might be perceived as a Specialized or Religious form of “Justice”; because it only flows through Anglo/American Constitutional “Due Process of Law”, which includes the Right of “Trial by Jury”; & all as has been traditionally practiced with-in those Christian Communities who voluntary consent to & comply with these traditional “Rules of the Common Law”. We here-under believe that we are reasonably pursuing a “Public Interest”, for All of the People of our ‘State of Texas’; & that, quite possibly, the further ‘Public Interest’ may best be served by our bringing these Religious Principles to bear from Our Own Venue of Our Own Religious-Community, known as the “Brazos Street Community Church”, or as the “Natural Law Church”; both of which carry with them Our Own Public-Policies of Peace-Keeping, & all of which we sincerely & humbly believe were firmly solidified under the more ancient Holy Kingdom of Christ/Messiah Jesus/Yeshuah.

Additional explanation of the Status of these Co-Plaintiffs, is presented near the end of this document, in Section 26, & on pages 28 - 29.

### **3: Opening Formalities; All Parties Take Note; Jurisdictional Concerns:**

All Parties Take Notice, that, we Co-Plaintiffs do here-by commence & proclaim this “Complaint In 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”; 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 relinquish 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”. 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”.

In response to this specific case, & as a ‘Matter of Law’; there is ‘No Other’.

Please note further, that, we Counter-Plaintiffs Respect the Natural-Rights of Every Socially Responsible Person, as these Natural-Rights have been Enshrined with-in our traditional Anglo/American concept of “Due Process of Law”, & the “Rules of the Common-Law”; both of which include our Right to have Accusations (such as this one) settled by the Unanimous-Judgements of a Conscience-Bound & Reasonably-Minded Twelve-Member “Jury”. All Americans, (including we Counter-Plaintiffs), have Never ‘Contracted Away’ any of our “Un-Alienable Rights”. That is what the phrase “Un-Alienable” Means, as in that these ‘Rights’ are of such a ‘Fundamental Nature’ to our Human Existence that they can Never be legitimately ‘Alienated’ from any of us.

Here-under; we have Not established any form of “Legal Nexus” or “Minimal Contacts” with any sort of “Private Jurisdiction”, which might include any sort of a “De-Facto Governmental Jurisdiction”; all where-under a secondary Presumption might other-wise seem to be justified, to the effect, that, we have some-how agreed to Submit our Constitutional, Public, & Natural Rights to any such a fundamentally constitutionally-repugnant jurisdiction. Those precise forms of ‘Presumptions’ seem to us to be epidemic in America’s & Texas’s modernly available Civil/Municipal Courts. This ugly reality seems to exist mostly because of Influences of ‘Private Corporations’, which are mere franchisees of our various jurisdictions of Civil/Municipal Government; & which includes the entire mis-named “Federal Reserve Banking System”, & Defacto State Attorney’s “Bar Associations”.

In these same dysfunctional but only available Civil/Municipal Courts, & routinely, multitudes of un-knowing litigants seem to secretively be “Presumed” to have established entanglements with these sorts of “Private Jurisdictions”. Here-under; these innocent people seem secretively & routinely Presumed to have “Contracted” to be treated “Slaves”; all under a ‘Fiction of Law’ Scheme , routinely invoked by Corrupted Attorneys & Judicial Officers, all where-under has become established what has been referred to as “Fourteenth-Amendment Citizens”. Here-under; literal multitudes of hapless litigants are Routinely Obstructed from their good-faith efforts to protect Any of their Natural, God-Given, & Constitutionally-Guaranteed “Rights”. This is the very sort of a jurisdictional-entanglement which the powerfully influential Defendants named here-in are routinely using to advance the Criminal & Peace-Breaching Racketeering-Scheme of which they are else-where here-in more fully accused.

**4: Jurisdiction; Brief Introductory Note:** Jurisdiction is invoked at this time in Multiple Jurisdictions of Multiple Courts, at the same time, & in parallel; in vigilant efforts of these Plaintiffs 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 Court Procedures under the epidemic of Roman Empire based Municipal Codes & Statutes all generally set forth issues of ‘Jurisdictional Concern’ near the start of the Complaint, in a section like this. How-ever; because we here are so un-fashionably invoking the Jurisdiction of ‘Multiple Courts’, at the same time, & in parallel; here-under, this section of our Complaint has grown to become quite lengthy. Further; because most common American readers will find this “Jurisdiction” part of our Complaint to be of a dry & boring nature, & because our greater concern here is to make this Criminal Counter-Complaint easily comprehensible & digestible for our common People; here-under, we have moved the remainder of this “Jurisdiction” explanation section towards the End of this (now quite lengthy) Complaint. Please see section here-in numbered as “25”, & entitled as “Jurisdiction, More Fully Explained”, in order to review that more complete textual explanation.

**5: The Defendants:** in this action, are both Natural-Persons & Corporate Legal-Fictions. The natural persons involved here are frequently using their Legal-Fiction 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 Legal-Fiction Entity thus-far here-in named as a Defendant, is a Community of People who exist under a Private Municipal Corporate Franchise from the larger Municipal Government of our community of people who are known as the ‘State of Texas’. The smaller municipal corporate franchisee here-under is more specifically described as the “Department of Family and Protective Services”, aka “DFPS”; & all of these private municipal corporate community members collectively maintain their more localized mailing-address at ‘2400 Crockett Drive, Ste 100; in Brownwood Texas’.

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 Both their Capacity as Private-

Persons, & in their Capacity as “Public Servants”.

The First Natural Person is here-in named & Accused as “Janet Ratliff”, who functions as an Employee of the above-referenced “DFPS”; & whose mailing-address is the same as that given above, of 2400 Crockett Drive, Ste 100; in Brownwood Texas. Ms Ratliff Falsely & Maliciously Swore that Co-Plaintiff here-in “Ginger Walker” was “Endangering the Children”, when Ms Ratliff Knew that there was “No Reasonable Cause” or Evidence to Support such an Accusation.

The second Natural Person named & Accused here-in as a Criminal Counter-Defendant is “Tiffany N. Helms”, a ‘Bar Member Attorney’, operating under bar-number ‘24046053’; & who possesses sufficient skill in ‘law’ to know that she is maliciously prosecuting Ms Ratliff’s constitutionally-repugnant & malum-prohibitum based social-engineering Complaint against we Counter-Plaintiffs. Ms Helms maintains a mailing-address with the “Department of Family & Protective Services”, at 3610 Vine Street, in Abilene Texas.

The third Natural Person here-in named & Accused as a Criminal Counter-Defendant is “James Edison”, who routinely occupies the public office of a Judge for the Texas State District Court for Coleman County, & who possesses sufficient skill in ‘law’ to know that he is maliciously conspiring with Ms Ratliff & Ms Helms in their constitutionally-repugnant & malum-prohibitum based social-engineering complaint against we Counter-Plaintiffs. Mr Edison maintains a mailing-address with the “Coleman County District Court”, at 300 Oak Street, in Abilene, Texas [79602-1521].

The fourth Natural Person named here-in as a Criminal Counter-Complaint Counter-Defendant is “Lee Hamilton”, who routinely occupies the public office of a Judge for the Texas State District Court for Taylor County, & who possesses sufficient skill in ‘law’ to know that he is maliciously conspiring with Ms Ratliff & Ms Helms in their constitutionally-repugnant & malum-prohibitum based social-engineering complaint against we Counter-Plaintiffs. Mr Edison maintains a mailing-address with the “Taylor County District Court”, at 300 Oak St., Suite 402, in Abilene Texas.

A Fifth Natural-Person accused here-in, is Coleman Elementary Independent School District Principal “Joy Thompson”. Ms Thompson is the person who filed the first Complaint against David Prichard, who is now known as one of the Co-Plaintiffs named here-in as “David Walker”. This woman had no reasonable grounds to suspect that David Walker/Prichard was then causing any legitimate Danger to any of the Children in that School facility. Further; she knew, or should have known, of the lawless & peace-breaching modus-operandi, history, & nature, of the CPS-Community; but she did Not Care about those mitigating factors, because she became enraged when David Walker/Prichard dared to question her despotic authority over that entire School facility. There-under; she went ahead & filed the Complaint that prompted CPS-Employee Janet Ratliff to invoke the process which resulted in the Order issued by Judge Edison, & which there-under resulted in the Criminal Acts of forcibly removing the Children from their loving home, aka “Kidnapping” them. Ms Thompson maintains a mailing-address at her place of employment, at: the Coleman Elementary Independent School District, 303 West 15th Street, Coleman, Texas [76834].

A Sixth Natural Person named here-in, is the Coleman Independent School District Police Chief “Jeromy Watson”. Mr Watson presented False Testimony against David Walker/Prichard, all of which lent color-of-credibility to Janet Ratliff’s Complaint against these Co-Plaintiffs David & Ginger Walker; & all of which resulted in the gross miscarriage of Justice which was perpetrated through Judge Edison’s criminally reckless Order to direct armed & blindly-obedient executive-officers to forcibly remove the Children from our care & custody. Mr Watson maintains a mailing-address at his place of employment, at: the Coleman Independent School District, 303 West 15th Street, Coleman, Texas [76834].

A Seventh Natural Person named & accused here-in as a Criminal Counter-Defendant, is an unknown & here-in still un-named Coleman City Police Officer, who lawlessly displayed deadly force when he furthered the criminal racketeering & kidnapping conspiracy of the previously here-in listed Counter-Defendants; all similar to how the Nazis in the Nuremberg Trials gave the bankrupt excuse of “Just Following Orders” when they brutally murdered multitudes of Common People during World-War-2. We expect to soon issue an amendment to this complaint where-in this unknown Coleman City Police Officer is

more specifically named; but we are presuming that his mailing address is good at the Coleman City Police Department, at P. O. Box 592, in Coleman Texas.

Other yet unknown Defendants may be added to this Criminal Counter-Complaint, as they are discovered and identified, in amendments here-to.

~~~~

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 Answer & Counter-Complaint:  
Preliminary Procedural Concerns:**

6: Preliminary Note: On the date of the 17<sup>th</sup> of October, 2019, & in the District Court-room where-in was scheduled a hearing for this case; was present both Ginger Walker & Lacie Liebhaber, along with well over a dozen of our friends & supporters, all of whom were prepared to testify as-to the complete “Lack of Justification” for the lawless Seizure & Kidnapping in this case, of the three Children previously under our safe care & custody. After we had all waited there-in for hours, for our opportunity to be heard in response to this evil scheme to kidnap our Children; I Ginger Walker, was asked to step out-side of the court-room by women associated with “DFPS”. At their direction, I found my-self in the company of my opposing-counsel & DFPS attorney “Tiffany N. Helms”, along with the main complaining party against me, & DFPS employee & “Investigator”, one “Janet Ratliff”; along also with another woman, of un-known name, but who seemed to be an Officer of the District Court. That un-known official-looking woman formally informed me, with the affirmative support of both Ms Helms & Ms Ratliff, that, the Court Proceeding then scheduled for hearing my objections to my Children being lawlessly kidnapped from me, had been “Postponed”, by presiding Judge Edison; until the ‘adversarial’ hearing’, then scheduled for 31-October-2019.

The excuse then given by these three women, there-for, was that, Judge Edison had summarily ordered ‘Additional Time’ for some un-known Attorney that he had appointed for the Children, so that that Attorney could have more opportunity to ‘Speak with the Children’ about the merits of their baseless & malicious complaint which has resulted in these three Children being lawlessly kidnapped from our safe care & custody.

\*\*\*\*\*

**The Situational/Historical “Facts” which Lawfully “Justify” this Answer & Counter-Complaint:  
& Point by Point “Answer” to the Allegations Presented in the Affidavit of Janet Ratliff:**

7: With reference to the Allegations presented in the “Affidavit in Support of Removal” of the

Children in issue here-in, from their safe care & custody of this Co-Counter-Plaintiff Ginger-Walker; all as there-in Sworn to be True by DFPS employee & 'investigator', one "Janet Ratliff"; & in consecutive order, is this Counter-Plaintiff Ginger Walker's Sworn Counter-Affirmation, as follows:

**8:** On "Page 3", & the second paragraph of "Section 4" of Ms Ratliff's original Affidavit, she there-in renders her own judgements & alleges, that, "Mr Prichard will shout odd things in the children's face and they are afraid of Mr Prichard.". Ms Ratliff continues on there-in to volunteer her own judgement that Mr Prichard "is talking crazy" in his Facebook postings & in front of children.

Ms Ratliff has presented "No Evidence" in support of her allegation that "the Children ... are Afraid of Mr Prichard". Ginger Walker does here-by solemnly affirm my sincere belief that Ms Ratliff is here "False Swearing" as to Truth, that which should more objectively & properly be adjudicated as a "Lie"; all of which results in Evidence that she has there-in committed the Crime of "Perjury".

**9:** Ms Ratliff continues on in that same paragraph, to infer, that "the children's mother, Lacie Liebhaber", is a bad influence on her own children, just for being in the company of her children. Ms Ratliff there-in ambiguously presents only what amounts to un-named "Here-Say Evidence", through only her ambiguous allegation that "there are concerns".

**10:** On "Page 3", & the first paragraph of "Section 5" of Ms Ratliff's original Affidavit, she there-in renders her own judgements, & alleges, that, "The children stated that Mr Prichard ... sometimes gets out of hand.". I Ginger Walker, do solemnly affirm my belief, that, none of these children have ever made any such statement as this; at least not with-out being heavily coerced to do so by over-zealous & misguided people who are bullying & pressuring these Children to make such false statements. In fact, on our recent weekly visit with the Children, on the 9<sup>th</sup> of February, 2020; Laiella has clearly expressed her sincere desire to come back home again; & that she feel's completely safe in David's company.

**11:** Continuing on under "Section 5", but now on "Page 4", & the 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph there-in, Ms Ratliff declares, that: "I contacted Officer Watson on October 4, 2019 and he stated Mr Prichard was arrested on October 3, 2019 after law enforcement learned he had stolen a vehicle in Coleman." This hear-say statement infers, that, formerly "Mr Prichard", (now "Mr Walker"), has committed the crime of "Auto Theft". This Counter-Co-Plaintiff Ginger Walker has firmly come to know, that, this hear-say evidence from Ms Ratliff is "False". The woman who owns the automobile in question is a good friend of Mr Walker/Prichard; & she has refused to file any complaint against him when he borrowed her car due to circumstances where he was under intense pressure to immediately leave a local business. Coleman city police promptly released Mr Walker/Prichard from his confinement under their authority; & they have abandoned attempting to prosecute Mr Walker for this crime which Ms Ratliff is here-in falsely inferring that Mr Prichard/Walker is guilty.

**12:** In the single full-paragraph on "Page 5" of her Affidavit, Ms Ratliff alleges that: "Ms Walker stated that would be fine if CPS took the children.". This Co-Counter-Plaintiff, Ginger Walker, here-by solemnly affirms this statement to be 'False', at least with-in its larger-context. I was then frustrated with the gestapo-like tactics which were then being used against me & my children; & I may have said something similarly worded as this; but, in proper interpretation of the full context, I then positively did Not affirm my own approval or consent to have these precious children taken from my safe & comfortable home & care-taking.

**13:** On the last 'Page 8' of her Affidavit, in the first paragraph there-in; Ms Ratliff states her "Conclusion", about what ambiguously "the Department believes ...". "The Department", there-in referenced, is obviously the Texas "Department of Family and Protective Services", with probably well over



a hundred employees, the vast majority of whom are quite likely entirely ignorant concerning this specific case. Properly interpreted, in its most favorable light, this is what "Ms Ratliff Believes". Ms Ratliff is here Presuming to Proceed in the Name of, & Speak on behalf of, the entire community of DFPS. But it is merely her own singular & personal testimony presented by her in this Affidavit; & all statements by her as to what "the Department believes" should be stricken from the record as being quite un-substantiated by the available Evidence.

In this same paragraph; Ms Ratliff builds on her afore-referenced but un-substantiated & shaky sworn testimony, to conclude, that, the entire population of employees of this "Department", aka DFPS, has collectively concluded, after some un-known sort of responsible & collective community decision-making process, that, "allowing the children to remain in the home of Ms Walker is detrimental to their health.". Ms Ratliff continues on with her un-substantiated but sworn allegations, to declare:

"... Ms Walker cannot provide a safe environment for the children, due to her allowing Mr Prichard to be in the home. Mr Prichard untreated mental health and erratic behavior places the children at risk of harm. ..."

This is all merely 'Subjective Conclusions' from Ms Ratliff. Ms Ratliff is here-in clearly attempting to fabricate some color-of-legitimacy for the gestapo & military-police-state like tactics which she & her morally & ethically compromised associates are here employing. All of this is in bold-faced Conflict with the "Higher Principles of Law" which are articulated in the 'Bill of Rights' of our 'Texas State Constitution'. As a Public-Servant of Texas, Ms Ratliff is required to take an Oath that she will support our Texas Constitution's Mandate, at 'Article 1 Section 5', that, her oath will be "binding upon the conscience" of her own self. By her Sworn Affidavit here, Ms Ratliff is in bold-faced Violation of her Oath to respect this & the "Rights of Conscience" of our common people, as referenced in 'Article 1 Section 6' there-in.

Ms Ratliff is here in further bold-faced Violation of 'Article 1 Section 9', where-in is mandated, that, "The people shall be secure in their persons, houses, papers and possessions, from all unreasonable seizures or searches, and no warrant to search any place, or to seize any person or thing, shall issue ... without probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation."

This phrase of "Probable Cause" is a phrase derived from "Common Law", where-under use of force by executive-officers against the common-people, as was here-in done in the seizure of the children, must be Justified based on some sort of "Breach-of-the-Peace Crime", aka "Common Law Crime", aka "Malum-In-Se Crime".

Here-under; the color-of-legitimacy & presumption-of-validity which was issued (similarly as a credit), as based up-on Ms Ratliff's Sworn Affidavit, is Not issued based on any Constitutional form of Traditional & Organic Anglo/American "Probable Cause"; but, rather, it was Re-Defined, based on a Private & Corporate 'Social-Engineering Agenda', where-under all local Municipal/Civil Governmental Policies & Procedures are following that specifically historically universally recognized, as the Roman-Empire Model of Government & Governing; which is programmed like a computer to use a 'Malum-Prohibitum' based form of Social-Engineering, all based on brutality & coercion, & all of which results in a 'Military-Police-State' form of Government for all people being subjugated there-to.

**14:** In the second & last paragraph of her sworn Affidavit, Ms Ratliff declares, that:

"All reasonable efforts have been made by the Texas Department of Family and Protective Services to prevent or eliminate the need for removal of the Child from the Child's home."

This statement from Ms Ratliff is just another one of her malicious & bold-faced "Lies"; it is emphatically "Denied" by these Counter-Plaintiffs; & if Ms Ratliff's Complaint continues to be used to lend color-of-legitimacy to this malicious & bad-faith prosecution; then we will prove that these words by Ms Ratliff are "Lies", all before the legitimate Jury which will ultimately decide the True Merits, (or lack thereof), concerning Ms Ratliff's accusations against us.

\*\*\*\*\*

**The Situational/Historical “Facts” which Lawfully “Justify” this Answer & Counter-Complaint:  
Point by Point “Answer” to the Allegations Presented in  
the Complaint Composed, Filed, & Prosecuted by Bar-Member Attorney Tiffany N. Helms:**

**15:** This section of our Answer is quite Brief, & it may be expanded through Amendment, or through oral-argument during trial.

In the first-page of her “Original Petition ... in Suit Affecting Parent-Child Relationship”, Bar-Member Attorney Tiffani N. Helms makes numerous bold declarations, about the Jurisdiction of the District Court, & about the alleged “Standing” of her legal-fiction “Department” (DFPS) to “Bring this Suit under ... Texas Family Code”.

That entire “Texas Family Code” only authorizes prosecutions under a “Municipal Jurisdiction”, aka a “Civil Jurisdiction”; all of which is based on the Laws of the Roman-Empire, which was a ‘Slave-Trading Jurisdiction’; & all of which is Not Applicable to Christians & other responsibly self-governing communities in Texas. In support of this un-fashionable claim; a citation from Websters New International Dictionary, of 1950, defines a “Municipal District” as “A subdivision of a region inhabited chiefly by Non-Christians”; & photo-copies of this actual text can be provided to all concerned parties at up-coming Court hearings.

This entire Seizure of these Children, by executive officers wearing deadly-force weaponry; is all in bold-faced Violation of the Rights of “Due Process of Law”, aka “Due Course of Law”, as guaranteed to our Common-People of Texas, in our State Constitution. It is all based on that form of “Malum Prohibitum” Legislation as existed under & emanated from that evil “Roman Empire” form of government; & which both Old & New Testament sections of the Bible has soundly condemned.

Here-under; Ms Helms claim that her DFPS community-of-interest has “Standing” to bring this suit against we Christian Counter-Plaintiffs, & before this Administrative/Municipal ‘District Court’, is a “False Statement”; & here-under, the Officers of the District Court have Duties to Dismiss this entire complaint from Ms Helms & Ms Ratliff, & to Order them to Promptly Return our Children.

**16:** Near the bottom of her first page, Ms Helms declares, that: “This Court has emergency and/or home state jurisdiction under the Uniform Child Custody Jurisdiction and Enforcement Act.”. This mention of “Emergency”, implies, that, the nature of the Jurisdiction which is being brought to bear in this case, is Out-Side of the Parameters of the Constitution for our Republican Texas State Government; & that it is operating under the Roman-Empire Model of Despotic & Slave-Trading Military-Government.

Later in this document are presented reputedly sourced Citations, which show the Constitutionally Lawless nature of the private municipal-jurisdiction, where-under Ms Helms has based her argument, that, some sort of a Legitimate “Public Interest” is actually being Served through this brutal, bold-faced, & un-conscionable kidnapping of these innocent Children from their comfortable & safe home.

**17:** Ms Helms has only submitted a single Sworn Affidavit in support of her prosecution of her & Ms Ratliff’s complaint against we Counter-Plaintiffs, even though some additional support did seem to appear verbally in the most recent District Court proceeding before then presiding Judge Hamilton. Ms Walker presently has the Sworn Testimony of at least Two Witnesses who are solemnly affirming that these same Children are completely Safe & Secure under her vigilant care & custody. Ms Walker is quite capable of securing many more such supportive Sworn Statements, if she might continue to suffer the results of this malicious & despotic prosecution.

**18:** Ms Helms there-in also declares, her belief, that, “no other Court has continuing, exclusive jurisdiction over the children”.

If that truly is Ms Helms true belief, then, Ms Helms is “In Error”. Our “Brazos Street Community Church” has this very same “continuing, exclusive jurisdiction over the children”; along with the “County-

Wide Justice-Court of Coleman County”, & the “Coleman County Court”; & a number of other common-law respecting tribunals which these Counter-Plaintiffs might see fit to invoke.

**19:** On the final page of her complaint against us; Ms Helms signature does not even appear to be accurately written above her typed-name there-on. We Counter-Plaintiffs demand that Ms Helms swear before this Court that to be her true signature, or else that she actually places her true signature there-on.

**20:** We believe we have presented in this document, sufficient citations to applicable law, & sufficient discussion of the evidence, facts, & merits of this case, in order for all conscience-bound judicial-officers & concerned public-servants & common-people to recognize the merits of our position.

If the presiding judicial-officers in this case might be so tainted by the nature of their municipal-franchise, as to refuse to apply either good-conscience, or reason & logic, to the arguments laboriously typed & presented here-in; then, these co-counter-plaintiffs would rather spend our remaining but limited time/energy resources in educating sufficient numbers of our common-people, as to exercise “their right to alter, reform or abolish their government”, as is described in ‘Article 1 Section 2;’ of our ‘Texas State Constitution’, & this especially including our court system.

We would much prefer, that, the presiding Judicial Officers of this District Court, or the other Courts who’s Jurisdiction is here-by being invoked, to just respect the ‘Rule of Law’, & return our Children to us; & grant the relief necessary to restore us to our previous standing before these evils were perpetrated against us.

~~~~~

**21:** Numerous other & similarly powerful arguments are available from these constituents who have been accused by Ms Ratliff & Ms Helms; but our time & energy is limited; & the more important concern here is whether or not the Judicial Officers before whom this case is being presented are willing to be “Reasonable”, & “Bound by Conscience”, as is Constitutionally Mandated. As the common-law maxim of “Justice Delayed is Justice Denied” so mandates; We need to move promptly in this specific case, so that the ‘Public-Interest issues’ involved here-in, for our Common People of Texas, might quickly confront what we might here actually be confronting as an ‘Even Deeper Problem’, of a ‘Seriously Corrupted Judiciary’; & where-under we have Public Interest Concerns for insuring that these same Evil & Criminal Acts are Not Again Committed Against Other Innocent Texans.

Here-under; typing even the most exhaustive arguments possible, & which clearly prove our case to more conscience-bound & common-people, may not be capable of convincing those corrupted judicial-officers, who would then likely be more concerned about supporting their evil municipal Roman-empire model-of-government, than with bringing conscience-bound & well-reasoned “Justice” to our Common-People of Texas, including these Co-Plaintiffs.

~~~~~

**Broader Issues Concerning:  
Fundamental Principles of Lawful Procedure & Jurisdiction, Vs:  
Purposefully Municipally Institutionalized Judicial Procedural Confusion:**

**22:** 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. These citations point out well that 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", 5<sup>th</sup> 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 Civilis*, - 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.**

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".

**23:** 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" 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". Here-under; these Plaintiffs have come to believe, that, with-in the "Rules of Civil Procedure", what fashionably now passes in the Courts of our Constitutional State as modern "Law", has been maliciously mis-used by the Defendants & their cohorts to shift the Court's focus away from its "Primary Constitutional Duties", under "Public Law"; & over to its more fashionable & convenient focus in the realm of Commercial & Contract Law, under "Private Law". Further here-under; the same "Mass of Procedural Confusion" is routinely used with military efficiency, in maximizing opportunities for the Powerful Private Interest Groups to lawlessly Pillage & Plunder our State's Common People. It is easy to here-under be lead to the conclusion, that, those Powerful "Private Interest Groups", do routinely view these same "Fundamental Principles of Law", with "Contempt". "Law", properly defined; is the worst enemy of those Powerful Private Interest Group Conspirators; & here-under, they naturally Conspire to develop Mechanisms to Evade being Held to Account under the "Public Laws" of this Constitutional State.

These same sorts of Diversions From the more Honorable-Standards of Judicial-Procedure have become routine under the "Civil Jurisdiction" of our nation's modern Courts, with purposefully imposed "Confusion" reigning there-in; because, that is the Only Way that such obscured but well-documented Evils can continue to exist in our Nation & States, 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 - unforeseen, 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](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Senate_Report_93-549)

[http://www.ncrepublic.org/images/lib/SenateReport93\\_549.pdf](http://www.ncrepublic.org/images/lib/SenateReport93_549.pdf)

[http://barefootworld.net/war\\_ep1.html](http://barefootworld.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](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 wit, 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 Lieber’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, 8<sup>th</sup> 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 their Public-Interest Mandate to preserve constitutional "Due Process of Law" for the 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:**

**24:** 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.

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Norman\\_conquest\\_of\\_England](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Norman_conquest_of_England)  
<https://constitutionalgov.us/Citations-Short/CommonLaw-BeforeNormanConquest-FreePeopleWereFountainheadOfJustice-LawyersCoOp-GClark1947.pdf>  
<https://constitutionalgov.us/Citations-Short/CommonLaw-PreconquestChristianKings-AvoidedDirectAdministration-EncyclopediaAmericana.pdf>

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; 5<sup>th</sup> Edition.**

**Also see: "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>**

~~~~~

**25: 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:

The First Court with-in which this Criminal Counter-Complaint does seek to invoke Jurisdiction, is

that of the "Texas District Court, for Coleman County". That 'District Court' is the Court in which first originated the Malicious Prosecution against we Counter-Plaintiffs; all through a Conspiracy among the main Counter-Defendants who are listed & so accused here-in. One Copy of this 'Answer & Criminal Counter Complaint' is 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 first present Opportunity to the presiding Judge of that District Court, one 'James Edison', with an Opportunity to Correct what we are (at least temporarily) willing to presume as merely being his honest 'Errors'. We are here-under invoking this Court's "At Law" 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 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", of 'common-law juris-diction', which is technically 'foreign' to the original municipal District Court's limited juris-diction.

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; & all where-under this entire Criminal Complaint's original 'Cause of Action' against municipally franchised Judge Edison & the others accused has arisen. 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 further, that, various Other Courts than that 'District Court' 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 Returns the Children to their loving Families, & to also order some modest but reasonable additional protections & compensations for the damages which these Counter-Plaintiffs have suffered as the direct result of their collective incompetence &/or corruption; then, this entire Counter-Complaint will promptly be de-escalated & abandoned, & James Edison & all other here-in Accused Counter-Defendants will have no further reasons to be concerned about this entire counter-complaint.

How-ever; that 'Window of Opportunity' for the Judicial Officers presiding in that District Court to 'Reverse the Error' of its incompetent &/or corrupted Judicial Officers, will 'Come to a Close', 'Rapidly', after this Counter Complaint first begins being filed & distributed. We consider that "Ten Days" is a reasonable time-frame to allow here for some sort of Response from some Judicial Officer legitimately representing the authority of that District Court; & if no such Response is forth-coming there-from, & no other considerations merit divergence from this general agenda; then, we Counter-Plaintiffs do plan on promptly beginning prosecuting this Criminal Counter-Complaint in one of the above-named 'Alternative Courts' directly after that 'Ten Days' has expired. (Another ten-day extension of time may be allowed if a plausibly legitimate reason is included in a judge signed document formally requesting such extension.)

If in-deed the evil results of this morally bankrupt & criminally lawless Kidnapping & Racketeering scheme continues under the 'color of legitimacy' which has been lent there-to by that 'District Court'; then,

it is under the Jurisdiction of one of these perhaps more conscience-bound & lawfully-proceeding Courts that we Counter-Plaintiffs shall begin prosecuting this Criminal-Counter-Complaint.

~~~

The Second Court's Jurisdiction here-by being invoked is again of the similarly limited municipal nature of the municipally franchised "Supreme Court of the State of Texas"; again, in similar efforts to provide the Judicial Officers of that municipal Supreme Court with Opportunity to 'Correct the Errors' of their Lower-Level & similarly Municipally Franchised for Coleman County "District Court". The Judicial-Officers in that 'Texas Supreme Court' have Duties to promptly 'Correct the Errors' of their Lower Courts, including the here-in referenced 'District Court for Coleman County', when-ever they are made aware of such errors & injustices being perpetrated there-in. 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.

Due to our economically disenfranchised status & limited budget, only One Copy of this larger Criminal Counter-Complaint is being mailed to that 'Supreme Court', & that one copy is intended to be filed permanently in that Court's Clerk's Records. How-ever; multiple Cover-Letters are being included in our mailing to that Court, each of which is marked for being distributed to each of the Judges who constitute that Court's governing body. Each such Cover Letter has Web-Links printed in it, similarly as given at the end of this document; & where-under each such Supreme Court Judge is being directed to retrieve, print-out, & review, not only a complete copy of this Criminal Counter-Complaint, but also other files related to this case.

We Counter-Plaintiffs would be delighted if the Judges of that Supreme Court would become inspired to become concerned about actual "Justice" for the People of Texas, as the result of their being so notified of this Criminal Counter-Complaint. Yet, while we here-by do openly & publicly invite that same "Justice" there-from; the Roman municipal legalistic nature of that 'Supreme Court', & the self-evident Track-Record of the Judicial-Officers there-in, & the seeming serious Lack of functionality of either Conscience or Reason there-from; here-under causes us to find cause for holding serious reservations about the likelihood of any actual 'Justice' forth-coming there-from.

You Judicial-Officers there-in have now been Notified of the existence of this unique Criminal Counter-Complaint; & we consider that it has far-reaching potential; all of which might eventually come circling back around to your municipally franchised 'Texas Supreme Court'. Here-under, & at this early stage of making publicly known our Criminal Counter-Complaint, we are desirous of Laying a Solid Foundation for when this Complaint might eventually become more seriously joindered with-in the Jurisdiction of your municipally franchised 'Texas Supreme Court'.

~~~

The Third Court & Jurisdiction here-by being invoked is that of the "County-Wide Justice Court for Coleman County": as presently governed by the man acting as the legitimate "Justice of the Peace" there-in, & named as one "Robert J. Nash"; all as represented by the web-page for this Public Office, here:  
<http://www.co.coleman.tx.us/page/coleman.Justice>

With just two exceptions/reservations; Traditional/Organic/Constitutional Common-Law provides very deep Roots for this "Justice Court"; which is known under various other names, including "Courts of Justice", "Courts of Justices of the Peace", & "Justice of the Peace Courts". We Co-Plaintiffs have consensus in support of Co-Plaintiff Stewart's proposition here, that, this is the Only Court that presently exists in Coleman County that has True 'Original Jurisdiction' to try serious Criminal Charges such as are presented in this Criminal-Counter-Complaint. It is useful here to reference a few citations which point-out the power of this 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 where-under We Follow Constitutionally Guaranteed "Due Process of Law", aka "Due Course of Law", through obtaining of Unanimous Verdicts from Twelve Responsibly Qualified & Reputable Members of our Local County or Precinct Communities; & 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 s 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 "County-Wide Justice Court for Coleman 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 this Co-Plaintiff Stewart.

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 Coleman County.

Exception/Reservation 2: This Exception/Reservation to our general support for the “County-Wide Justice Court for Coleman County”, is due to the “County-Wide” nature of this Court. We hold Reservation, because, this Only Existing ‘Justice Court’ in Coleman County, is of this “County-Wide” Nature. The Original & Traditional Structure of these Courts Only Authorized their Creation & Operation at the Level of Each “Precinct”, in the legitimate Counties.

We are well aware that our legitimate & organic body-politic of common People, which is legally known as the “State of Texas”, has colorably adopted the Municipal-Law based Roman Empire Model of Government, for the Governing of our common People; & that is that Same “Municipal Model of Government” which has Established the Procedures which are looked to by the Judicial-Officers who preside in the Courts of Coleman County & all of Texas. Yet the very Source of that Municipal body-of-law, is “Un-Natural”, & there-under it is a “Perversion” of the Higher “Laws of Nature”; as the immediately-following web-links clearly show. By reviewing reputable definition of the phrase “Civil Law”, as provided in the first immediately following web-link; serious readers will learn that this body of so-called “Law” is “More Properly Called Municipal Law”; & that both of these phrases denote a ‘Body of Law’ concerning which it is quite Proper to “Distinguish It From the Law of Nature”. Please review the Citations & Arguments presented in section 22, on pages 11 – 14 of this same document, in order to re-affirm clearly the validity of these well-settled ideas.

Likely the main Reason Why this same Roman-Empire sourced form of “Municipal Government” consistently evidences tendencies to so Pervert the superior “Laws of Nature”, is because the Collective Consciousness of the Selected-Few of People who have been Granted colorable Authority to Preside as the Decision-Makers there-in, have Consistently Evidenced their Criminal Lust to Un-Naturally “Centralize Power”, Away from the Counties, & up-wards to the Municipal Government of the State, & Away from our local Townships & Precincts , & up-wards to the Municipal Governments of our Counties.

Here-under; we Co-Plaintiffs are apprehensive, that, this “County-Wide” Nature of this “County-Wide Justice Court for Coleman County”, might some-how Interfere with its Full Empowerment under the previously referenced Constitutional provisions. By placing this Court at the “County Level”, we now have Needless Redundancy with the “County Court”; both of which were Originally Intended to Work Together, rather than to Compete with each other, as is naturally inherent through making this Precinct-Level Court of this “County Wide” nature.

Further; Texas Statutes seem to imply, that, making these Courts of this 'County Wide' nature, is justified & legitimized when Counties have only 'Small Populations', as is the case here in Coleman County. And, it is worth noting here, that, Neighboring Brown County & numerous other larger-population Counties in Texas have one of these "Justice of the Peace Courts" in Each Precinct in their County.

But here-under; review of the previously-referenced "Anglo/Saxon Model of County Government", (as well as the "Bible-Torah-Law Model of Government", on which it is based); reveals, that, the Geographic Boundary-Lines of those more ancient & perfected Counties & Precincts were Frequently 'Re-Drawn', in accord with 'Population Changes' for each of these Common-Law Communities. The very word "Count", up-on which the word "County" is clearly based, implies a specific "Numerical Value", most logically centered around "Population Counts"; all of which the more ancient Models of County Government vigilantly maintained. Here-under; the Solution to this Problem is to 'Re-Draw County & Precinct Boundary-Lines'; rather than to Take-Away the Right of our Local Communities to Operate Our Own "Courts of Justice". For purposes of this case, presently; we do not need to prioritize further discussions of re-drawing of geographical boundary-lines.

We may now conclude this section by merely referencing the desperate & legitimate needs of our common People of Coleman County & Texas for legitimate "Justice". In support of this proposition, we point-out that the present municipal-law based Judicial Systems of Texas & Coleman County are Not functioning in any manner that reasonably serves this "Need for Public Justice", just as their Perverted & Un-Natural Mode of Municipal-Governing so strongly inclines them, & as the very existence this Criminal Counter-Complaint so bears witness.

Here-under; we consider that we are both "Justified", & that we have the Constitutional Right & Duty to Press JoP/Judge Nash to Defy Normal Corrupted Municipal Peer-Pressures, & to actually Respect his Oath to Support our Texas & American-National Constitutions, by Assembling a Jury & Following Constitutional "Due Process of Law", all so-as-to Produce a "Jury Verdict" & "Final Judgement"; all of which accurately reflects the "Conscience" of the well-informed & reasonable members of Coleman County. If incompetence or corruption might perhaps influence this present holder of that Public-Office to so obstruct the complete & legitimate following of Constitutional "Due Process of Law" in response to this Complaint from we Co-Plaintiffs; then, we Counter-Plaintiffs expect that we will merely shift our efforts at prosecuting this Complaint to Another of the numerous Courts which are or might soon be made available to us.

~~~~

The Fourth Court & Jurisdiction here-by being invoked is that of the "Coleman County Commissioners Court", as provided by the Municipal Government of the State for the Franchised/Municipal Local-Governing of the People of Coleman County. This "Commissioners Court" is composed of Commissioners: Mark Williams, David Tucker, Scotty Lawrence, & Alan Davis; as the Municipally Franchised & Elected Representatives of Precincts 1, 2, 3, & 4, respectively.

This 'County Commissioners Court' has clearly been established as the result of another 'Municipal Corporate Franchise', from our State's Municipal 'Legislative-Assembly'. That "Municipal Corporate Franchise" is of a 'Top/Down', 'Authoritarian' Nature; all of which makes for a quite 'Un-Natural' Mode of 'Governing' for our Coleman County People. 'As a Matter of Law', (aka 'Common Law', 'County Law', & traditional organic 'Constitutional Law'); this 'Commissioners Court' has much Less Constitutional Legitimacy, & Integrity, than either the previously referenced "County-Wide Justice Court", as presently presided over in Coleman County by Robert Nash; or, the immediately following referenced "Coleman County Court", as presently presided over by "Billy D. Bledsoe".

An important note here should be made, that, this 'Commissioners Court' is specifically mandated to be Governed & Presided Over by our 'Coleman County Judge', who presently is "Billy D. Bledsoe"; all as mandated in the "Rules & Procedures of the Coleman County Commissioners' Court" document, as made publicly available through the web-page web-linked here:



[http://www.co.coleman.tx.us/upload/page/6059/docs/Comm.Court/Rules\\_and\\_Procedures\\_of\\_Coleman\\_County\\_Commissioners\\_Court.pdf](http://www.co.coleman.tx.us/upload/page/6059/docs/Comm.Court/Rules_and_Procedures_of_Coleman_County_Commissioners_Court.pdf)

Here please note where the above-linked document clearly declares, on page 2, paragraph V, that: “The County Judge is the Presiding Officer of the Coleman Commissioners Court and is a fully participating member there-of”. This is a fundamentally legitimate mandate, over the other-wise very dysfunctional & municipal-law based “Commissioners Court”; largely because, (as our studies of these ‘Common-Law Jurisdictions’ indicate), the Office of the “County Judge”, is merely that of a “First Among Equals”, as composed of the individual Constituents, aka: Representatives, aka: Delegates, from each of the Precincts with-in each County. Under traditional organic constitutional ‘Common-Law Jurisdiction’, the County Court Governing Body is Nothing More than an Assembly of the Constituents, aka: Representatives, aka: Delegates, of each of the Precincts of that County.

Because this ‘Commissioners Court’ consists of what may reasonably be presumed to be the Legitimate Representatives of the People in each of the Precincts of Coleman County; here-under, by reasonable implication, this ‘Commissioners Court’ actually carries with it the “Highest Authority of the County”. The separate Office of the “County Judge” is actually ‘Inferior’ to the collective authority of this ‘Constituent Assembly’ of the Representatives of these Precincts, as also the Office of the “County Sheriff”, as also the Offices of the ‘Justice of the Peace’, as also the Office of the “Constable”.

<https://constitutionalgov.us/Citations-Short/ConstituentAssemblies.pdf>

In the alternative that the previously referenced Courts have refused to invoke legitimate “Due Process of Law”, in response to this complaint; then, here-under, we Co-Plaintiffs here-by place our Demands before these four County Commissioners, that these Commissioners respond to this Criminal-Complaint by De-Prioritizing the Municipally-Perverted Version of the Jurisdiction & Authority which they have been franchised to possess; & rather promptly Begin Exercising their Duties & Rights to Provide Constitutionally Recognizable “Due Process of Law” based & Natural/Organic “Justice” for the People of their Precincts in Coleman County. Eventually, this would likely amount to these Commissioners Abandoning their entire “Commissioners Court” Charter of authority, & rather begin acting as the Constituents who Legitimately Constitute Coleman County’s Traditional Organic Common-Law Governing-Body, which is presently known as our ‘Coleman County Court’.

With-in Every American County’s Geographical Boundaries; our Federal & State Constitutions Guarantee the Common People of the Right to Assemble & Organize ‘Responsibly Self-Governing Common-Law Monarchies’; each of which would be Composed levels of a ‘Thousand Able-Bodied Men’, & also where-under a ‘Thousand Qualified-Electors’ Stand fully Accountable for their Posse-Comitatus Thousand-Man Army of Peace-Officers which is Obligated to Respect with Military Discipline the American organic Constitutional ‘Rules of the Common-Law’.

Here-under; & in direct pursuit of that “More Perfect Union” that this entire field of research clearly implies; (& presuming that presently presiding “Coleman County Judge Billy D. Bledsoe” is the First Choice of the Constituents of which-ever Precinct he actually resides in; & presuming also that the presently sitting ‘Commissioner’ from that same Precinct does Not Challenge Judge Bledsoe’s ‘first-in-line status’ as the most competent Judicial Officer from their Precinct); here-under, the Two Coleman Court Judicial Offices, of the ‘County Commissioner’s Court’, & the ‘Constitutional County Court’, (over which Judge Bledsoe presently Presides), will be Motioned to be “Merged”. This action is sought because the older & more simplified model of County Government had No Use for a Top/Down Authoritarian Court, such as the ‘Commissioners Court’; all because the legitimate ‘County Court’, properly constituted & functioning, consists of nothing more than the Assembly of the legitimate Representatives of the Precincts.

Further; under the ancient Anglo/Saxon version of this entire Common-Law Rooted Governmental Structure, the french word ‘County’ was not in use; but rather that same ‘County Jurisdiction’ was referred

to as the 'Shire'; & the 'Reve' of the 'Shire' was the 'Common-Law Monarch' of that entire County/Shire level of Jurisdiction. That 'Shire-Reve' held both the "Judicial Power", & the "Executive Power". Because he was consistently under immense peer-pressure to comply with their long string of 'Judicial Precedents', there was No Need for any separated (municipal authoritarian legal-fiction) "Legislative Power".

This 'Shire-Reve' was also subject to 'Immediate Recall', from the Assembly of the Captains of each of the Precincts, aka the 'Shire Court', aka the 'County Court'; all to be invoked only if one of these Precinct Captains facilitated the bringing of a Formal Complaint against him, there-in presenting a 'prima-facie case' that he had stepped out-side of the well-settled Boundaries of that long string of 'Judicial Precedents', as referred to in the Seventh-Amendment as the 'Rules of the Common-Law'.

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Shire\\_court](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Shire_court)

Here-under; we Co-Plaintiffs propose that it is Reasonable to Presume, that, the 'Best Interests of the People of Coleman County' will most efficiently be served by our motion here & now to also Add to our previous Motion to Merge the Offices of the "County Commissioners Court" & the "County Court", with the Third County Office of the "Coleman County Sheriff", as presently occupied by 'Les Cogdil'. By this action, much "Needless Redundancy" will be Eliminated from the present dysfunctional Over-Lap between Offices of the 'County Court', the 'Commissioners Court', & the 'County Sheriff'. Here-by; much County Expense will be similarly be Eliminated; & most importantly, "Justice", under Constitutional "Due Process of Law", will very much More Efficiently be Made Available for our Common People.

Because the Criminal Acts which are here-in Complained of, have taken place in "Precinct 1" of Coleman County; & in the event that JoP-Nash might Refuse his Constitutional-Duties to facilitate the lawful resolution of this Criminal Complaint under the "County Wide Justice Court" over which he presides; then, here-under, we Co-Plaintiffs intend first to Press the municipal Representative of 'Precinct 1' of Coleman County, one 'Commissioner Williams', to assume the other-wise "Vacant Office" of the "Justice of the Peace" for Precinct 1. We intend to press him further to there-under provide for that same 'Due Process of Law' based "Justice", in response to this Criminal Complaint, as that which JoP-Nash has the Constitutional Duties to perform, but then might have Refused to do so.

In the event that Commissioner Williams of Precinct-1 also Refuses his Constitutional Duties to so provide Due-Process based Justice for these Co-Plaintiffs; then, we Co-Plaintiffs will proceed under our Lawful Presumption that Commissioner Williams has Abandoned his Lawful Office; & the next motion we expect to make will be to place our Complaint's Demand for Justice before the entire "Commissioners Court"; including presiding Judge Billy D. Bledsoe.

We Co-Plaintiffs will be delighted if the different individual Commissioners being presented with these Demands, all individually Recognize how these Demands are both Constitutionally 'Legitimate', & 'In the Best Interests of the People of Coleman County', & Comply there-with. How-ever; we also recognize that at least some among them might Refuse to so Comply. This later scenario might possibly result in a "Split County Court"; where-under these Co-Plaintiffs will merely move in support of those Commissioners who have the Integrity & Courage to stand-up for the Local Self-Governing Rights of the People of Coleman County. Perhaps all of the Commissioners will present such integrity & courage; & perhaps this might also include supervising County Judge Bledsoe. We Co-Plaintiffs will be quite happy if this is how these events develop; & we are not here-in going to describe the multitude of possible scenarios that might present themselves to us if our hoped-for expectations here do not actually materialize.

~~~~

The Fifth Court & Jurisdiction here-by being invoked is that of the "Coleman County Constitutional Court", as presently presided over by County Judge Billy D. Bledsoe. But since Judge Bledsoe is the Presiding Judge in the 'Commissioners Court'; & we have already presented this Complaint before him &

the representatives of the individual Precincts which constitute that Commissioners Court; & since we have previously Motioned for the Merger of these two Courts; here-under, this section is more of a formality than of any practical significance.

~~~

The Sixth Court & Jurisdiction here-by being invoked is that of the “Brazos Street Church Ecclesiastical Court”. This Court is Located in ‘Precinct-1 of Coleman County’; &, in the event that all of the previous Courts fail to produce the Due-Process based ‘Justice’ which we Co-Plaintiffs are here-in seeking, then, this Court is expected to become the grass-roots organizing Court from whence we launch our less fashionable efforts at securing this same Due-Process based “Justice”.

~~~

Here-under; the Seventh Court, acting as a ‘Court of Last-Resort’, may have it’s Jurisdiction invoked, under our larger American Patriotic Grass-roots Organic Constitutional Juris-diction, & named as the “Supreme Court of Law for the United States of America”. The presiding Judicial-Officer of this larger jurisdictional Court, is also a Co-Plaintiff with the Counter-Plaintiffs named here-in, & who is more fully & properly named as ‘Charles Bruce, Stewart’. This court maintains two mailing-addresses, with the more mature one being at ‘39854 Proctor Boulevard, # 347; in Sandy Oregon, [97055]’; & the other one being more appropriate for this specific case, being at ‘1117 North Neches Street’, in Coleman, Texas [76834]. This larger jurisdictional Court maintains a web-page, presently, here:

<https://ConstitutionalGov.US/SupremeCourtOfLaw/>

Here-under; we ex-rel Co-Plaintiffs find “Justification”, in “Invoking in Parallel” with the above-referenced Roman-law based “Courts”; to move to Also to Invoke, in parallel, the Jurisdiction of our “United States Supreme Court of Law”, (as slightly differently entitled above). Here-under; we National, County, Precinct, & State ‘Ex-Rel Plaintiffs’, expect to find Greater Opportunity for Escaping the afore-mentioned “Coercive Pressures” which saturate those Roman-law based Courts, & which routinely Obstruct the Cause of Justice for the People of our State & Nation. This will allow our Common People here-in not only to follow “Due Process of Law” in much more quick & un-adulterated manners, but it will there-by also much more quickly & efficiently bring true Justice & Peace to these same Common People.

This is all as was “Originally Constitutionally Intended” by the Framers of our State & National Constitutions; because it all allows for our Common People to “Responsibly Self-Govern” under our own more localized & organic/constitutional “County Law”; with similar localized self-governing dynamics manifesting from each of our County's politically sub-divided “Precinct Jurisdictions”. This is all admittedly un-fashionable; but it's potential represents vast “Improvement” for escaping the lawlessly “Coercive Pressures” which are so rampant in the more fashionable Roman-law based Courts. We Common People of our State & Nation, who are so articulating these Criminal Complaints in this manner, emphatically claim to be completely “Justified” in our efforts to secure “Justice” by invoking this “Parallel Jurisdictional Process”.

~~~

In Conclusion of this section on “Jurisdiction”, please note further, that, these Ex-Rel Counter-Plaintiffs are Fully Aware that the Judges & other good officers in the modernly fashionable State & Federal Courts, are modernly suffering under “Coercive Pressures” from those same “Powerful Private Interests” which are generally complained of here-in. These “Coercive Pressures” on the Judges in those Courts seem to emanate from our National & State Government's “Civil”, aka “Municipal” Jurisdictions; as is the unnatural & perverted 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; & where-under these

Counter-Plaintiff's ultimate Remedy will likely lie.

The very Nature of that Roman-Empire based Model of "Civil/Municipal" Government & Judicial Administration is inherently designed to establish a parasitical working-relationship with Powerful "Private-Interest-Groups", all of which routinely engage in Criminal Coercion of our Common People, & also of any honorable Judges which might be found in these Courts. That was how the Roman Empire was run; & this legacy of essentially "Criminal Despotism" through their "Civil/Municipal Jurisdiction" has infiltrated in-to even our National & State Constitution documents, all by the evil schemes of the very same but more ancient Powerful 'Private-Interest-Groups' which are generally complained of here-in.

However, & as a bright ray of sunshine, providing hope that truly conscionable "Justice" might actually become commonly available for our Common People; our research has indicated that we Common People have the Constitutionally-Guaranteed Right to Convene various Less Adulterated & More Honorably Controlled 'Courts',

Also, as provided in the General Texas & US Common-Law, Constitutional-Law, Statutory-Law, & Commercial-Law; the following jurisdictional rule is invoked:

**"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.**

\*\*\*\*\*

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

**26:** 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 Plaintiffs, & not admitted by the 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 Coleman County, Texas, & the U.S.A.; aka: "Due Process of Law", aka: "Due Course of Law"; as specifically guaranteed in our State & National Constitutions. These "Powers of Sovereignty" in our common People, are also affirmed in various common references to the clear phrase, that: "All Political Power is Inherent in the People", as is solemnly affirmed in 'Article 1 Section 2' of our Texas Constitution.

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". Here-under; case-law recognizes that we Propria-Persona & Sui-Juris Litigants are entitled to have "Less Stringent Standards" of procedure applied to us, than are those more constrained standards under which licensed/franchised/privileged "Bar Member Attorneys" 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 the full-spectrum of their 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 placed in-to “Rules of Civil Procedure”, & all of which are applicable to 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, in part, as:

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

~~~~~  
**Relief Requested:**

**27:** 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” Order, that:

**28:** The Counter-Defendants Immediately Return the Children who have been Seized in this case to the Safe Care & Custody of Ginger Walker;

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

**30:** 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;

**31:** That all issues in 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 the Nisi-Prius, Limited-Jurisdiction & Municipally-Franchised ‘District-Court’; all as is Required under well-settled interpretations of Constitutional “Due Process of Law”, aka “Due Course of Law”;

**32:** That all issues of 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.

This written complaint may be re-filed in an “Amended Version”. Keep in mind 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/9-TexasSS/WTxSC/ColemanCounty/Cases/Walkers&Stewart-TxExRel-Vs-TxDFPS&CPS/>**

**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.”

Here-under; & as reasonably interpreted, under the full context of this document; all three of us, Ginger Walker, David Walker, & 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’, ‘Ginger Walker’, ‘David Walker’, & ‘Charles Stewart’; are actually done so, by each of us, so help us God.

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.

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’:

---

Ginger Walker; In Propria-Persona & Sui-Juris;  
115 Miami Avenue,  
Coleman City & County, & in Texas State Republic.

---

David Walker; In Propria-Persona & Sui-Juris;  
115 Miami Avenue,  
Coleman City & County, & in Texas State Republic.

---

Charles Bruce, Stewart; In Propria-Persona, & Sui-Juris;  
1117 North Neches Street, Coleman City & County, & in Texas State Republic.  
charles@constitutionalgov.us / 325-232-0241