

The Entire Federal Judiciary is a Fraud

Today we prove it

All federal judges, magistrates and judicial officers are guilty of treason against the Constitution, bar none. Congress is responsible; aggravated treason. All federal decisions made since March 1, 1991 are void. All actors participating and involved in executing orders are personally liable for damages.

The Lufkin Action at Law

United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas, Lufkin division civil action number 9:14 – CV – 138 (the “Lufkin action at law” to foreclose on federal tax liens against petitioner’s ranch in Tyler County Texas; judge rules against petitioner March 3, 2016.

On September 15, 2000 15th, demands for the provision of the Constitution that gives plaintiff United States of America to capacity to take jurisdiction and enter judgments, orders, and degrees in favor of the United States arising from a civil or criminal proceeding regarding a debt in the geographic area occupied by the body of Tyler County, Texas (where petitioner’s real property is located and petitioner is a resident), counsel for plaintiff United States of America go silent (see post of October 28, 2015 *infra*) and remain the duration of the case, March 3, 2016, 5 ½ months thereafter.

“The judicial power of the United States”

That certain Constitution ordained and established September 17 of 1787, and implemented March 4, 1789, Independence Hall, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania (the “Constitution”, at article 3 section 1.

The Constitution and article 6 clause 3 provides in pertinent part for the prevention of arbitrary exercise or abuse of “the judicial power of United States,” *id.*, by way of requirement that all justices and judges of the United States be bound by oath or affirmation to support the Constitution; two wit:

“The Senators and Representatives before mentioned, and the members of the several state legislatures, and all executive and judicial officers, both of the United States and of the several states, shall be bound by the oath or affirmation, to support this Constitution;...”

Justices and Judges Oath of Office

Section 8. And it be further enacted, that the justices of the Supreme Court and other district courts, before they proceed to execute the duties of their respective offices, shall take the following oath or affirmation, to wit;

“I, _____, Do solemnly swear or affirm, that I will administer justice without respect to persons, and to the poor and the rich, and that I will faithfully and impartially discharge and

perform all duties incumbent upon me as *District Judge*, according to the best of my abilities and understanding, agreeably to the Constitution and the laws of the United States, so help me God.”

Congress Materially Alters the Oath of Office

Congress on December 1, 1990, however, in Public law 101-640 thereof, 104 statute 5124 – effective 90 days later, March 1, 1991 (104 stat -5124 at §407) - alter materially by way of amendment, the oath at 28 USC §453 62 stat, 907, so as to relieve all justices and judges of the United States of any duty of fidelity in the Constitution, to wit:

“Section 404 amendment to the oath of office of justices and judges. “Section 453 of title 28, United States code, is amended by striking out “according to the best of my abilities and understanding, agreeably to and inserting “under”, pub 1,104-650, 104 stat 5089, 5124, December 1, 1990.

Upon amendment, 28 USC §453 oath of Justices and Judges of United States, 104 stat 5124; provides:

“Each justice or judge of the United States shall take the following oath or affirmation before performing the duties of his office: “I, _____, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will administer justice without respect to persons, and do equal right to the poor and to the rich, and that I will faithfully and impartially discharge and perform all the duties incumbent upon me as _____ **under** the Constitution and the laws of the United States. So help me God.”

Let’s Compare

I, _____, do solemnly swear or affirm, that I will administer justice without respect persons, and equal right to the poor and to the rich, and that I will faithfully and impartially discharge and perform all duties incumbent upon me as *District Judge*; ~~according to the best of my abilities and understanding, agreeably to~~ **under** the Constitution and laws of the United States. So help me God.”

But... The only duties incumbent upon justices and judges of United States to discharge or perform are provided in the statutes of Congress, i.e., the laws of the United States, the Constitution provides none.

The 1990 oath, 104 stat 5124, severs the connection between the federal judiciary and the Constitution; meaning: as of March 1, 1991, officers of the federal judiciary have no obligation to discharge or perform the duties of their respective offices “agreeably to the Constitution” (62 stat 907), and the former judicial-branch officers are now legislative branch officers under the close of control of Congress.

Plus peccat auctor quam actor

“The instigator of a crime is worse than he who perpetuates it” (John Bouvier, Bouvier’s law dictionary, 3rd revision (hereinafter “Bouvier’s”), page 215) -

...and the instigators of the takeover of the federal courts of limited jurisdiction by municipal judges masquerading as Article III judges and usurping exercise of general jurisdiction throughout the Union, are the Members of Congress.

Limited Jurisdiction

“As We Have Repeatedly Said: Federal Courts Are Courts of Limited Jurisdiction. They Possess Only That Power Authorized by Constitution and Statute...” “*Raul v Bush* 540 US 466, 489, (2004) (quoting *Kokkonen v. Guardian Life Ins. Co. of America*, 611 US, 375, 377 (1994) (citations omitted))

The above is why petitioner is so persistent: justices and judges ensconced (settled securely or snugly) in federal courts of limited jurisdiction are usurping exercise of the territorial jurisdiction (an aspect of the general jurisdiction) and entering judgment against, directing the disposition of, and committing theft under color of authority of, petitioners property in Montgomery and Tyler County, Texas - geographic area in which Texas possesses exclusive jurisdiction and sovereignty over property located there; to wit:

“The several states of the Union are not, it is true in every respect independent many of the right [sic] and powers which originally belonged to them being now vested in the government created by the Constitution. But, except and restrained and limited by that instrument, they possess and exercise the authority of Independent states, and the principles of public law to which we have referred our applicable to them. One of these principles is that every state possesses exclusive jurisdiction and sovereignty over the persons and property within its territory... “*Pennoyer v. Neff*, 95 US, 714, 722, (1878).”

“Those who framed the Constitution [sic] intended to establish a government complete for its own purposes, supreme within its sphere, and capable of acting by its own proper powers. They intended it consists of three coordinate branches, legislative, executive, and judicial, in the construction of such a government, it is an obvious maxim, “that the judicial power should be competent to give efficacy to the constitutional laws of the legislature. “*Cohens v Virginia*, 6 wheat, rep, 414]. The judicial authority, therefore, must be coextensive with the legislative power... [The Federalist, number 80, *Cohens v Virginia*, 6 Wheat. rep 384] *Osborne v. Bank of United States*, 9 Wheat., 738, 808 (1824).

Because Congress enjoyed only limited legislative power (subject matter legislative power only) Throughout the Union, the federal courts and the Department of Justice are authorized to exercise only limited jurisdiction (subject matter jurisdiction only) throughout the Union; to wit:

“As we repeatedly said: Federal courts are courts of limited jurisdiction. They possess only that power authorized by Constitution and statute...” “*Raul v Bush* 540 US 466, 489, (2004) *Kokkonen v. Guardian Life Ins. Co. of America*, 611 US, 375, 377 (1994) Justices And Judges ensconced in in federal courts of limited jurisdiction are usurping exercise of territorial jurisdiction (an aspect of general jurisdiction) and entering judgment against, directing the deposition of, and committing theft under **color of authority** of, Petitioners property in

Montgomery and Tyler County Texas-- geographic area in which Texas possesses exclusive jurisdiction and sovereignty over property located there; to wit:

The several states of the Union are not, the true, in every respect independent, many of the right [sic] and powers which originally belong to them being now invested in the government created by the Constitution. But except as restrained and limited by that instrument, they possess and exercise the authority of Independent States, and the principles of public law to which we have referred our applicable to them. One of these principles is that **every state possesses exclusive jurisdiction and sovereignty over persons and property within the territory**... *Pennoyer v. Neff*, 95 US, 714, 722, (1878).”

Notwithstanding that the federal courts are courts of limited jurisdiction, “*Raul v Bush* 540 US 466, 489, (2004), they are populated by municipal judges of the so-called “United States” 28 USC section 3002 (15), “a federal Corporation,” ID., by the name of district of Columbia municipal corporations, where usurping exercise of general jurisdiction in Montgomery and Tyler County, Texas and elsewhere throughout the Union.

Treason

“The Congress as the instrumentality of sovereignty is endowed with certain powers to be exerted on behalf of the people in the manner used with the effect the Constitution ordained. The Congress cannot invoke the sovereign power of the people to override their will as.” *Perry versus United States*, 294 US 330, 353 (1935).

United States is a federal Corporation, 28 USC section 3002 (15)) and, United States of America (a sovereign Republic, Constitution)

Notwithstanding that the federal courts are courts of limited jurisdiction *Raul supra*, they are populated by municipal judges of the so-called “United States” 28 USC section 3002 (15), “a federal Corporation,” *id*. By the name of District of Columbia Municipal Corporation, who are usurping exercise of general jurisdiction in Montgomery and Tyler County, Texas and elsewhere throughout the Union.

Justices and judges of the United States had used their position of trust to betray their creators, the American people, by overwriting there will has declared an article 6, clause 3 of the Constitution, that all judicial officers of the United States shall be bound by oath or affirmation to support the Constitution, and thereby legislating the Constitution out of the legal process, to wit:

“The Congress is instrumentality of sovereignty is in doubt with powers to be exerted on behalf of the people in the manner and with the effect the Constitution ordains the Congress cannot invoke the sovereign power of the people to override their will as thus declared. “*Perry v United States*, 294 US 330, 353 (1935)

18 US code section 2381- Treason

Whoever, owing allegiance to the United States levies war against them or adheres to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort within the United States or elsewhere, is guilty of treason and shall suffer death, or shall be imprisoned not less than five years and fined under this title but not less than \$10,000; and shall be incapable of holding any office under the United States.

Due Process of Law and Void Judgments

The essence of due process of law is constitutional authority; two wit:

“The process of law is process according to the law of the land... “... Due process of law in the latter[the fifth article of amendment of the Constitution] refers to the law of the land which derives its authority from the legislative powers conferred upon Congress by the Constitution of United States, exercised within the limits therein described and interpreted according to the principles of the common law...” *Hurtado v. California*, 110 U.S. 516 (1884).

Any justice or judge of the United States enters a decision or judgment in a federal case without the authority to exercise “the judicial power of United States,” Constitution, article 3 section 1- and this includes every Supreme Court decision and United States District Court judgment since March 1, 1991 - does so without the authority of the Constitution thereby denies the litigants due process of law and manufactures a void judgment.

Void Judgments

A void judgment is an utter nullity, of no legal force or effect, and anyone who was concerned with the execution of a valid judgment is considered in law as a trespasser; two wit:

(A void judgment which includes judgment entered by the court which... Lacks inherent power to enter the particular judgment. Can be attacked at any time, in any court, either directly or collaterally...” *Long v Sureshank Development Corporation* 180 3d 548 (C.A.111 1999)

“Where the court has jurisdiction, it has a right to decide any question which occurs in the course, and whether this decision be correct or otherwise, its judgments, until reversed, are regarded as binding in every other court. **But** if it acts without authority, its judgments and orders are regarded as nullities. They are not voidable, but simply void, and for no bar to a remedy sought in opposition to them, even prior to a reversal. They constitute no justification, and all persons concerned in executing such judgments are considered in law as trespassers.” *Elliott v Petrsol*, 26 US (1 Pet.) 328, 329 (1828).

“A judgment is void if the court that rendered it... acted in a manner inconsistent with due process. *Margolis v Johns*, 660 F 291 (7th Cir. on 1981).

--The courts are not the government and have no authority lawfully over you. Why? Because they are For-Profit Corporations and must have a corporate charter that must comply with the Constitution. see: <http://noauthoritycourts.com>