

Dear Law Enforcement Officer:

With all due respect,

Demand for Trial By Jury to First decide the innocence or guilt of this individual upon the instant matter is hereby made on all proceedings arising from charges made by this Officer or Department of Government.

Demand that Nature and Cause be proven into the record of the Court for any charges arising from charges made by this Officer or Department of Government is hereby demanded.

Please attach this document in its entirety with any charge, summons, or information you may make regarding me as this Document constitutes a specific demand for Jury trial to FIRST decide my innocence or guilt and that the Nature and Cause for said charge be proven in this or any matter arising out of this matter and that it must be made a part of the record of any and all proceedings as my communication to the court and as these demands are fully supported by the 6th amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America (the law of the land, all others notwithstanding).

I am hereby informing you that I do not consent to talk to you, and that I must insist, unless you are placing me under arrest, or can state specific and articulable facts which warrant your detaining me that you immediately leave me alone to go about my business, as is my right as a United States Citizen.

I am engaged in the ownership and use of Property belonging to me as I see fit to use it, and as is my Constitutional Right to do. My responsibility to that act does not extend beyond any harm my decision does to another. If you (the officer or applicable Department of Government) are attempting to curtail my free use of my property you are hereby requested to identify the injured party and to instruct said injured party articulate the specific harm I or my use of my property has caused, in writing and provided to me and to the applicable court.

Should you choose to ignore this request and to detain me or cause me costly litigation knowing that no injured party exists as a result of my actions, be advised you are very likely acting outside the authority of your office and your Sovereign immunity.

I am not operating a motor vehicle pursuant to USC Title 18 Sec. 31, definitions.

Whereas I recognize it is your charge to protect the safety and welfare of the citizenry, you must also see that I have not harmed nor caused to be harmed anyone. I state here and now that I have exercised my unalienable rights in a fashion that is within the meaning and protection of the U. S. Constitution and beyond that I have no responsibility.

In addition, as it is my opinion, this detention is completely about converting my money to the use of this municipality, city, county and/or state, I inform you that my property is also protected by the Constitution just mentioned and that my money is my property. I do not choose to surrender it nor any other right protected for me by that Constitution, nor could I if I did so choose.

In addition, be advised that any act on your part to proceed under color of law against me knowing full well I am not party to a contract which enables you to enforce traffic and property laws (unless, there is a real/true injured party willing to testify that I have done them harm) will be met with an aggressive and protracted and time consuming Court battle before a Jury of my peers.

I am party to NO contract (visible or invisible) with corporate body politics in the City of Clinton, County of Clinton, State of Iowa, or any other city, county, state in the Union or the Federal Government. In clarification, I pay for the few services supplied by this government that I use with MONEY (the legal tender of this land i.e. Income tax, fuel tax, cigarette tax, sales tax, property tax, real estate tax ,,,,,, etc. etc. etc.). I DO NOT PAY WITH MY RIGHTS, as do most other Americans. Beyond that payment I am not indebted to this or any other government entity. As such, there can be no valid contract, (visible or invisible) which binds me to the laws by contract you are heretofore attempting to enforce.

I HAVE NO HISTORY OF PHYSICAL VIOLENCE AND AM THEREBY NO THREAT TO YOUR SAFETY AS THAT FACT WILL NOT CHANGE NOW.

IN ADDITION

Any assumed contracts this court or this city may be acting in accordance with have been rescinded from their inception per Affidavit currently published at <http://www.doprocess.net/>

I was acting within my Rights with respect to the use I made of my property as is defined in *Spann vs City of Dallas, Tx SC (1921)*

and/or

I was exercising my Constitutional Right to travel in an automobile as pointed out in *Chicago Motor Coach v Chicago* quoted #169NE221 which says: Use of a highway for purpose of travel and transportation is not a mere privilege but is a common and fundamental Right of which the Public and Individuals cannot be deprived.

"Highways are for the use of the traveling public, and all have the right to use them in a reasonable and proper manner; the use thereof is an inalienable right of every citizen." *Escobedo v. State 35 C2d 870 in 8 Cal Jur 3d p.27*

"Users of the highway for transportation of persons and property for hire may be subjected to special regulations not applicable to those using the highway for public purposes." *Richmond Baking Co. v. Department of Treasury 18 N.E. 2d 788.*

The use of the automobile as a necessary adjunct to the earning of a livelihood in modern life requires us in the interest of realism to conclude that the RIGHT to use an automobile on the public highways partakes of the nature of a liberty within the meaning of the Constitutional guarantees. . . ." *Berberian v. Lussier (1958) 139 A2d 869, 872*

"The RIGHT of the citizen to DRIVE on the public street with freedom from police interference, unless he is engaged in suspicious conduct associated in some manner with criminality is a FUNDAMENTAL CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT which must be protected by the courts." *People v. Horton 14 Cal. App. 3rd 667 (1971)*

"One who DRIVES an automobile is an operator within meaning of the Motor Vehicle Act." *Pontius v. McClean 113 CA 452*

"The word 'operator' shall not include any person who solely transports his own property and who transports no persons or property for hire or compensation." *Statutes at Large California Chapter 412 p.833*

"The right of a citizen to travel upon the public highways and to transport his property thereon, by horse-drawn carriage, wagon, or automobile is not a mere privilege which may be permitted or prohibited at will, but a common right which he has under his right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." *Slusher v. Safety Coach Transit Co., 229 Ky 731, 17 SW2d 1012, and affirmed by the Supreme Court in Thompson v. Smith 154 S.E. 579.*

Also See:

- EDWARDS VS. CALIFORNIA, 314 U.S. 160
 - TWINING VS NEW JERSEY, 211 U.S. 78
 - WILLIAMS VS. FEARS, 179 U.S. 270, AT 274
 - CRANDALL VS. NEVADA, 6 WALL. 35, AT 43-44
 - THE PASSENGER CASES, 7 HOWARD 287, AT 492
 - U.S. VS. GUEST, 383 U.S. 745, AT 757-758 (1966)
 - GRIFFIN VS. BRECKENRIDGE, 403 U.S. 88, AT 105-106 (1971)
 - CALIFANO VS. TORRES, 435 U.S. 1, AT 4, note 6
 - SHAPIRO VS. THOMPSON, 394 U.S. 618 (1969)
 - CALIFANO VS. AZNAVORIAN, 439 U.S. 170, AT 176 (1978)
- researched and furnished by George Mercier, Federal Judge (retired)

Further, If the Authority you are enforcing is assumed by you and your superiors to be an act of "Police Power" granted the State by the people pursuant to the State's Right to provide for the Health and Welfare of all the people, I am informing you that the action to which you are undertaking now is beyond the scope and limits of such power of the State and I therefore demand that you cease and desist the present intervention. see *Spann v City of Dallas*, get cite at <http://www.doprocess.net/>

And finally, *Davis v. Mississippi, 394 U.S. 721*, to make sure all are informed regarding the fact that my fingerprints are private property which cannot be taken over your objection without a valid court order.

Respectfully Submitted,