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**Exempt Status Declaration**

**Traveler in the Private**

**Revocation of Registration**

“Affidavits are often the only supporting evidence….

Affidavits alone should therefore certainly be sufficient to prove a *prima facie* case.”

*United States v. Kis*, 658 F.2d 526, 536 N.28 (7th Cir. 1981)

Notice to agent is notice to principal, notice to principal is notice to all.

**UCC 1 § -308**, & **UCC 3 § -202**, & **UCC 9 § -109, 1**

**Yassmin Gramian**, PE

Secretary of Transportation

PA Department of Transportation

Keystone Building

400 North St., Fifth Floor

Harrisburg, PA 17120 Registered Mail \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

 Return Receipt # **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Affidavit of Truth and Fact**

**Be it known by all;** I am I, and therefore, as I am a creation of nature and nature’s God, with DNA intact 1 and not altered to be cDNA by the mRNA (EMU) Emergency Use Authorization concoction, it is my will and desire to correct the errors of my past and do as my creator has commanded me.

1 See… ASSOCIATION FOR MOLECULAR PATHOLOGY v. MYRIAD GENETICS, INC. 569 U. S. 576 (2013) No. 12–398. Argued April 15, 2013—Decided June 13, 2013 *“(c) cDNA is not a “product of nature,” so it is patent eligible under §101. cDNA does not present the same obstacles to patentability as naturally occurring, isolated DNA segments.”….”in light of Mayo Collaborative Services v. Prometheus Laboratories, Inc., 566 U. S. 66, the Circuit found both isolated DNA and cDNA patent eligible.” … Held: “A naturally occurring DNA segment is a product of nature and not patent eligible merely because it has been isolated, but cDNA is patent eligible because it is not naturally occurring.”*

**Whereas:** LAW (is) the **Land**Juris, being common law, of superior titles and private property rights. The **Air**Juris being Trusts and Wills, for the benefit of another, Canons of Trust and Duty of Care. The **Water**Juris being commercial contracts, code of commerce and statute, commercial intercourse, the admiralty form and in-land marine contracts.

As Bobby, as a man, as one people, no-longer being ignorant of the LAW, it is my free will to take dominion over the Land, Air and Water. The Water Juris being one main subject matter of this writing.

**By my hand and free-will,** I create this Affidavit of Truth and Fact for the Estate of \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ as listed on the BIRTH CERTIFICATE issued by \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ COUNTY in the STATE OF \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. All rights are and will be reclaimed, reserved and retained by me Robert-Lee; .Lawrence-Jr, as executor, transmitting utility / signatory, and co-beneficiary of the PCT-CQ estate, held in-trust.

**The Origin of LAW**

**1611 KJV Genesis Chapter 1, 26;** And God said, “Let us make man in our Image, after our likeness: and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea [**Water**], and over the foul of the **Air,** and over the chattel, and over all the earth [**Land**], and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth.” As a creation of nature and Natures God- I came from the water of the womb to take my first breath of air then learned to walk on the land. Man attorned God’s order from Water, Air and Land and made Land, Air and Water as we now know as LAW. Commanded by my creator to take dominion… and so I will.

I am commanded by my creator to take dominion over the Land, the Air and the Water. Expressing my free-will as a creation-of-nature and nature’s God, a People, and a Man, commonly known by my family, friends and neighbors as Bobby Lawrence. I will do as commanded by my creator. So here I stand and stand of my free-will.

**“A Republic, if you can keep it”**

**Who has the power in America?**

Has America become and Oligarchy or are we to be the Republic ordained by the People?

**OLIGARCHY:** “This name is given to designate the **power** which a few citizens of a state have usurped, **which ought by the constitution to reside in the people**. Among the Romans the government degenerated several times into an oligarchy” ... **Bouvier's Law Dictionary, adopted by the Supreme Court of the United States.**

**ORDAIN:** of the United States, the preamble, declares that the **people** "do ordain and establish this constitution for the United States of America." [A]nd the state constitutions of the several states] **Bouvier’s Law Dictionary, adopted by the Supreme Court of the United States**

**SOURCES OF THE LAW;** By this expression is [be it] understood the authority from which the laws derive their force. “The power of making all laws is in the people or - their representatives, and none can have any force whatever, which is derived from any other source… The Constitution is an act of the People themselves, made by their representatives elected for that purpose. It is the supreme law of the land, and binding on all future legislative bodies, until it shall be altered by the authority of the People, in the manner, provided for in the instrument itself, and if an act be passed contrary to the provisions of the constitution, it is, ipso facto, void.”

**2 Pet. 522; 12 Wheat. 270; 2 Dall. 309; 3 Dall. 386; 4 Dall. 18; 6 Cranch, 128**

**Bouvier's Law Dictionary, adopted by the Supreme Court of the United States.**

**Notice of Automobile Superior Title Claim**

**Whereas:** The Juris of Water being known as commercial, contract law form and pertaining to the **Legal** and **Equitable** titles of “fixture(s)” Automobiles as commonly known. I as executor/agent, have in my keep and held in-trust, the legal title **MCO** (Manufacturer Certificate of Origin) and the equitable title **COT** (Certificate of Title) for the household ‘private conveyance(s)’ known as; Title Number \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, VIN # \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, (a) 1999 model year, Mercedes Benz, S500 Sedan being silver in color and Title Number: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, VIN #: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, (a) The Ford F250, 2017 model year pickup, being white in color and listing the REGISTERED OWNER(S) in the proper style for legal fiction (per the GPO Styles Manual / Chicago Manual of Styles ) as ROBERT LEE LAWRENCE JR, [a] VESSEL.

**Political Status**

**Whereas:** I have corrected my VESSEL’S political and/or civil status to that of an American state National per **USC 8 (1101), (a), (21), (23),** the non-corporate U.S. CITIZEN remedy provided by the United States Congress and recognized by international treaties as a “non-resident alien”, also known by the IRS as “non-resident individual” and more commonly known as American National, a non-enemy, non-combatant and being at-peace with the corporations. I am by my actions of deeds, in-reality per Canons’ 2056 and 2057 moving to “establish my status” and “demonstrate my competency” ‘in’ the law’ and ‘at’ law.

**Whereas:** **Non-resident aliens / non-resident individuals** (American Nationals,) have properly and lawfully removed themselves in their living capacity, in-reality from the status of a corporate U.S. PERSON / U.S. CITIZEN Surety. As to the all-capital name PERSON not being me, I the man, claimed by deed of re-conveyance of the Birth Certificate, the thing, placing it, the PERSON in-trust and me as the beneficial owner. The PCT-CQ no longer being a construed Public Trust of the PERSON, I the man, no-longer being property of the CORPORATION, [n]or a legal construct to any and all of its CORPORATION subsidiaries. The VESSEL is no longer of the FEDERAL corporation; the PERSON is of the state of the Republic and my inheritance, and of my mother that created it as informant with her signature. The VESSEL / PERSON have been placed in its proper status and I being the beneficial owner claim it. I the man will conduct the VESSEL / PERSON in-trust of private interest and being non-commercial as relation to the aforementioned fixture(s) and the use thereof.

**All Government is a Foreign Corporation**

**19 Corpus Juris Secundum § 883, & 884** “[t]he United States government is a FOREIGN CORPORATION with respect to a state.” **All "public servants,"** officials, Congressmen, politicians, judges, attorneys, law enforcement officers, States and their various agencies, actors etc. [subdivisions and subsidiaries], are the express agents of these foreign principals [being foreign to the people of the Dejure states, non-corporate] - **see Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938; 22 USC 286 et seq, 263A, 185G, 267J, 611(C) (ii) & (iii); Treasury Delegation Order #91, BAR Treaty of 1947**. [Emphasis added]

**Whereas:** Government chose to incorporate itself, it is foreign to the people, (as foreign agents to the people) of the several states and the Republic form of government that “We the People” ordained in our Constitutions, both federal [supreme law of the land] and state. I am I, a non-resident of the corporations named PENNSYLVANIA, STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA and the COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA… or any other STATE OF STATE. I live **on** the land of the People’s commonwealth of Pennsylvania, (not **in** the STATE OF [n]or the COMMONWEALTH OF) being properly styled and being non-legal fiction, the people 1st ordained the Pennsylvania State Constitution (non-corporate). The Constitution PENNSYLVANIA operates under now is a CORPORATE Constitution and of the UNITED NATIONS through various treaties, and listed on Dunn & Bradstreet, DUNS Numbers redacted for all.

**Constitutional Status**

**Whereas:** The man commonly known as Bobby Lawrence, properly styled in-reality a man named by my father Robert-Lee; ,Lawrence-Jr. (a) Junior as my father still walks on the land before me, has claimed my status as **one** of **We the People.** My DNA bloodline of ancient Nobility, was on the land known as Pennsylvania before there ever was a STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA or the COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA or the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, or any political subdivision thereof, being corporations and legal fiction by definition in Black’s Law and many other legal definitive publications over time. *Maxim of Law: what comes first in law is strongest in law*, *the “chiefest” event* has maximum standing, and *Maxim of Law: that which one creates, one controls*. Deeds in-reality evinced over time demonstrates my intent; my intent evinces free-will. I, the man having no will or desire to be neither chattel nor a “thing” to a CORPORATION acting as Dejure government and not being ordained by the People. I claim my Right-to-Travel as a man.

**Whereas:** My family being of Noble Sovereign blood and having a Coat of Arms, sailed the ocean and walked on the land in Philadelphia on or about the spring of 1732, see…. Moretz Lorentz, who landed in Pennsylvania in 1732, Filby, P. William, Meyer, Mary K., Passenger and immigration lists index: a guide to published arrival records of about 500,000 passengers who came to the United States and Canada in the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries. 1982-1985 Cumulated Supplements in Four Volumes Detroit, Mich.: Gale Research Co., 1985, Print (ISBN 0-8103-1795-8). Evinced as a settled matter of fact by “recording things that have been done in-reality … written down”, see Black’s Law 4th edition, Definition of Deed(s), Per my Patent of Nativity of DNA Bloodline Right as one of We the People, being publicly published on the land juris-diction in Franklin County and evincing my family Coat-of-Arms, Inst. # 202109907. I am one of We the People and a party to the founding of our Nation and State, accepting the ‘deeds’ of the founding generation as inheritance bequeathed to me…. Robert-Lee / Bobby...

**Whereas:** I as a creation of nature and nature’s God, the man, as one people, have claimed my Constitutional bloodline status as one of We the People lawfully and legally, thereby becoming a party to our nation’s four founding parchments listed as; **Declaration of Independence**, **Articles of Confederation, Northwest Ordinance, The Constitution for The United States Of America with the 1st -12th amendments**  in the U.S.C., under the Front Matter, Organic Laws Chapter and the Pennsylvania original Constitution ordained by the People, the three constitutions that followed notwithstanding.

 Status corrections and claims of this nature are performed to/by and acknowledged by the Secretary of State for the United States of America in form by means of affidavits and declarations of status, followed by issuance of a United States Passport that, when scanned, should reflects one’s status. When the Passport is scanned by level three Lexus Nexus or NCIC, NCIS subscription, the program reflects one’s political status and/or other limited information.

The State Department has up to 180 days to update one’s status. For me, this time period has long passed with no issues presented.

**Unified Commercial Code - UCC**

**UCC § 9-102 (70)** **"Record",** “except as used in "for record", "of record", "record or legal title", and "record owner", means information that is inscribed on a tangible medium or which is stored in an electronic or other medium and is retrievable in perceivable form”. The legal **and** equitable title bond papers are **merged**, with the Equitable Title listing the estate VESSEL owner legal name and the MSO describing the property manufactured and by what entity. Together they have become “the Superior Title” in common law and are held in-trust for the beneficial owner.

The property listed on the merged Superior Titles is now and forevermore held in-trust, I being the beneficial.

**UCC § 9-109 (d) (11) (B)** **fixtures in Section 9-334;** **9-102** **(41) "Fixtures"** “means goods that have become so related to particular real property that an interest in them arises under real property law.”

**Whereas:** The private conveyance(s) known to me and being aforementioned, is now and in-future declared a “Fixture” of my life and is real and private to me having no liens, claims or encumbrances upon it. They are fixture(s) of my life.

**Right to Liberty and Freedom of Locomotion**

**The Constitution for the United States of America (1789)** is positive law, a trust indenture and “the supreme law of the land”. All States of the United States of America must honor Judicial Proceedings of every other State. The higher Courts opinions and rulings of every state must be re-cognized by the other states of the Union in order to insure domestic tranquility and continuity of justice as to insure confidence and trust in our judicial system as best may be achieved.

**Constitution for the United States of America (1789); Article V, Section 1;** “Full Faith and Credit shall be given in each State to the public Acts, Records [including deeds], and Judicial Proceedings of every other State” ….

People’s right to travel is *obvious*:per the Declaration of Independence ‘Liberty’ as a Right and a First Amendment Right of the 4th freedom retained by the people. In the first amendment of the Bill of Rights there are five freedoms listed and in proper lawful order, Freedom of Religion, Freedom of Speech, Freedom of the Press, Peaceful Assembly and Petition for Redress of Grievance. Under the Right to Assemble, it is *obvious* that one must travel in-order to assemble. Without the “right to travel”, the people (c)would effectively be denied their right to assemble for any lawful purposes the government deemed illegal. This would effectively give government the unconstitutional power to license a Liberty and the Freedom of the People thereof to pursue their Happiness by denying the free traveling from place-to-place for any lawful purpose[s].

**Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness**

**Personal Liberty in Black’s Law 4th** Edition: The right or power of locomotion; of changing situation, or moving one's person to whatsoever place one's own inclination may direct, without imprisonment or restraint, unless by due course of **law** [not code]. 1 Bl. Comm. 134. Civil Rights Cases, 3 S.Ct. 42, 109 U.S. 3, 27 L.Ed. 835; Pinkerton v. Verberg, 78 Mich. 573, 44 N.W. 579, 7 L.R.A. 507, 18 Am.St.Rep. 473.

Towing one’s Auto while not engaged in commercial intercourse, before any due process of Law is performed, is a violation of “due course of law”. **Why can I claim this…? Because the Supreme Court of the United States says so…**

The right of locomotion has also been held to be a part of the liberty guaranteed by the due process clauses. **See… Hearings before the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, on the Right to Travel, 85th Cong., 1st Sess., part 2 (1957), p. 86; see also id., at 62.**

"The right to travel is a part of the `liberty' of which the citizen cannot be deprived without due process of law.” **Kent v. Dulles, 357 U. S., at 125. See Aptheker v. Secretary of State, 378 U.S. 500, 517 (1964); Zemel v. Rusk, 381 U.S. 1 (1965).**

“[I]t would be an impermissible delegation of power; and that, in any event, the exercise of the power to restrict travel denied to petitioner his rights under the First and Fifth Amendments”.

**United Sates v. Laub et al. 385 U.S. 475 (1967)**

**The United States Supreme Court** has Held (multiple times) that; "the right of locomotion - the right to remove from one place to another according to inclination, is an attribute of personal liberty." **Williams v. Fears 179 U.S. 270, 21 S. Ct.128; see Papachristou v. Jacksonville, 405 U.S. 156, 164, 92 S. Ct. 839; Kent v. Dulles, 357 U.S. 116, 126, 78 S. Ct. 1113; See also Johnson v. City of Cincinnati 310 F.3d 484, 6th Cir. (2002)**

“The men who wrote the Bill of Rights were not concerned that government might do too little for the people but that it might do too much to them.”

**Jackson v. City of Joliet, 715 F.2d 1200, 1203 (7th Cir. 1983)** I had an Orwellian feeling when reading this case.

**SHAPIRO, COMMISSIONER OF WELFARE OF CONNECTICUT v. THOMPSON, 394 U. S. 630, 631**.” ... [A]s members of the same community must have the right to pass and repass through every part of it without interruption, as freely as in our own States…" “We have no occasion to ascribe the source of this right to travel interstate to a particular Constitutional provision. It suffices that, as JUSTICE STEWART said for the Court in **United States v. Guest, 383 U. S. 745, 757-758 (1966):** "The Constitutional Right to travel from one State to another . . . occupies a position fundamental to the concept of our Federal Union. It is a right that has been firmly established and repeatedly recognized. "... [T]he right finds no explicit mention in the Constitution. The reason, it has been suggested is that a right so elementary was conceived from the beginning to be a necessary concomitant [component] of the stronger Union the Constitution created. In any event, freedom to travel throughout the United States has long been recognized as a basic right under the Constitution." In **Corfield v. Coryell, 6 F. Cas. 546, 552 (No. 3230) (C. C. E. D. Pa. 1825), Paul v. Virginia, Wall 168, 180 (1869), and Ward v. Maryland, 12 Wall. 418, 430 (1871),** the right to travel interstate was grounded upon the Privileges and Immunities Clause **of Art. IV, § 2**. See also S**laughter-House Cases, 16 Wall. 36, 79 (1873); Twining v. New Jersey, 211 U. S. 78, 97 (1908) In Edwards v. California, 314 U. S. 160, 181, 183-185 (1941) (DOUGLAS and Jackson, JJ., concurring), and Twining v. New Jersey,** reliance was placed on the Privileges and Immunities Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.

See also **Crandall v. Nevada, 6 Wall. 35 (1868) In Edwards v. California, supra**, and the **Passenger Cases, 7 How. 283 (1849)**, a Commerce Clause approach was employed.

See also **Kent v. Dulles, 357 U. S. 116, 125 (1958); Aptheker v. Secretary of State, 378 U. S. 500, 505-506 (1964); Zemel v. Rusk, 381 U. S. 1, 14 (1965)**,

I claim my Right-to-Travel, Motor Vehicle Code notwithstanding, while not in commercial intercourse. Furthermore, I claim ‘lack of Subject Matter Jurisdiction’ pertaining to law enforcement and the courts while traveling non-commercially and harming none and damaging [n]ot, the property of others.

“Without jurisdiction the court cannot proceed at all in any cause. Jurisdiction is power to declare [judge] the law, and when it ceases to exist, the only function remaining to the court is that of announcing the fact and dismissing the cause.” **Bova v. U.S. Bank, N.A., 446 F. Supp. 2d 926, 941 (S.D. Ill. 2006)**

“The makers of the Constitution conferred, as against the government, the Right to be let alone; the most comprehensive of Rights, and the Right most valued by civilized men… with the rule of liberal construction that always has been applied to provisions of the Constitution safeguarding personal Right” … **citing (Byars v. United States, 273 U.S. 28, 32)**

**U. S. Supreme Court Justice Brandeis in Olmstead v. United States 277 US 438, 48 S.Ct. 564, 575; 72 L ED 944 (1928)** “A sufficient answer is found in **Boyd v. United States, 116 U.S. 616, 627-630**, a case that will be remembered as long as civil liberty lives in the United States. This Court there reviewed the history that lay behind the Fourth and Fifth Amendments. We said with reference to Lord Camden's judgment in **Entick v. Carrington, 19 Howell's State Trials, 1030**: "The principles laid down in this opinion affect the very essence of constitutional liberty and security. They reach farther than the concrete form of the case there before the court, with its adventitious circumstances; they apply to all invasions on the part of the Government and its employees of the sanctities of a man's home and the privacies of life. It is not the breaking of his doors, and the rummaging of his drawers, that constitutes the essence of the offence; but it is the invasion of his indefeasible right of personal security, the protection guaranteed by the Amendments is much broader in scope. The makers of our Constitution undertook to secure conditions favorable to the pursuit of happiness. They recognized the significance of man's spiritual nature, of his feelings and of his intellect. They knew that only a part of the pain, pleasure and satisfactions of life are to be found in material things. They sought to protect Americans in their beliefs, their thoughts, their emotions and their sensations. **They conferred, as against the Government, the right to be let alone the most comprehensive of rights and the right most valued by civilized men.** To protect that right, every unjustifiable intrusion by the Government upon the privacy of the individual, whatever the means employed, must be deemed a violation of the Fourth Amendment. And the use, as evidence in a criminal proceeding, of facts ascertained by such intrusion must be deemed a violation of the Fifth. **Justice Bradley** in the **Boyd case**, and **Justice Clark** **in the Gouled** case, said that “the Fifth Amendment and the Fourth Amendment were to be liberally construed to effect the purpose of the framers of the Constitution in the interest of liberty.”

“Napoleon at his coronation took the imperial crown out of the hands of the Pope and crowned himself. Federal judges do not have a similar prerogative. A court that does not have jurisdiction cannot assume it, however worthy the cause.” **In re Brand Name Prescription Drugs Antitrust Litig., 248 F.3d 668, 670 (7th Cir.2001)**

**The false argument of public safety as a right……**

**Reckless Endangerment is not a cause of action….**

….”the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment is “to protect the people from the State, not to ensure that the State protect[s] them from each other.”

**J.O. v. Alton Cmty. Unit Sch. Dist. 11, 909 F.2d 267, 272-73 (7th Cir.1990)**

In general, of course, the United States Constitution confers on citizens no right to be free from injury by their fellow citizens. Thus, for example, “there is no constitutional right to be protected by the state against being murdered by criminals or madmen.” **Bowers v. DeVito, 686 F.2d 616, 618 (7th Cir. 1982)**

“[t]he Constitution is a charter of negative liberties; it tells the state to let people alone; it does not require the federal government or the state to provide services, even so elementary a service as maintaining law and order.” **Id. Cf.** **Olmstead v. United States, 277 U.S. 438, 478 (1928)**

**Use determines Jurisdiction**

"Under UCC 9-109 there is a real distinction between goods purchased for personal [private] use and those purchased for business [public] use. The two are mutually exclusive and the principal use to which the property is put should be considered as determinative."

**James Talcott, Inc. v Gee, 5 UCC Rep Serv 1028; 266 Cal.App.2d 384, 72 Cal.Rptr. 168 (1968)**

"A vehicle not used for commercial activity is a "consumer goods” ... it is NOT a type of vehicle required to be registered and “use tax” paid of which the tab is evidence of receipt of the tax.”

**Bank of Boston vs Jones, 4 UCC Rep. Serv. 1021, 236 A2d 484, UCC PP 9-109.14** (Emphasis added)

**Title 18 U.S. Code, Part 1, Chapter 2 § 31** [U.S. Code trumps local and state code. Acceptance of federal funding places the state code as subordinate to Federal interests.]

**(6) Motor vehicle**. - The term “motor vehicle” means every description of carriage or other contrivance propelled or drawn by mechanical power and “used for commercial purposes” on the highways in the transportation of passengers, passengers and property, or property or cargo.

**(10) Used for commercial purposes**. - The term “used for commercial purposes” means the carriage of persons or property for any fare, fee, rate, charge or other consideration, or directly or indirectly in connection with any business, or other undertaking intended for profit.

The private fixtures(s) aforementioned will not and are not “used for commercial purposes” and they are for private use in all circumstances and instances when on the public roadways, byways and highways of any state or presumed jurisdiction.

**U.S. Supreme Court and other high court citations** proving that no license, registration of motor vehicle tag is necessary for normal use while traveling upon public roadways, byways and highways while **not** engaged in commercial activities. The Supreme Court of the United States is the highest court in our nation, higher authority than any state code.

“It is contended that the absence of a driver’s license was evidential of the operator’s unfitness to drive a car. We think such evidence was irrelevant and that the rejection was proper. Non observance of the statute, by the [driver], is not evidence of his ability to drive a car. He may have possessed more skill than may persons that held a license...” **Ross v Penn. R. Company (N.J.L.) 148 A 741; Huddy, Automobiles; 9th Ed. §249 footnote 63**

**Murdock v. Pennsylvania, 319 U.S. 105, 113 (1943)** “A state may not impose a charge [or perform a taking of property] for the enjoyment of a right granted by the Federal Constitution…” “…the ultimate question in determining the constitutionality of (this) license tax is whether the state has **given something for which it can ask a return. That principle has wide applicability. State Tax Commission v. Aldrich, 316 U.S. 174**, and cases cited. **But it is quite irrelevant here.** This tax is not a charge for the enjoyment of a privilege or benefit bestowed by the state. The privilege in question exists apart from state authority. It is guaranteed the people by the Federal Constitution.” This case has progeny citations in the hundreds.

**Thompson v. Smith, 155 Va. 367, 370 (1930)** “Whether a right to use the public highways for the ordinary and usual purposes of life be a property right or not, it is a very valuable right, not a mere privilege. A court of equity has not jurisdiction to enjoin acts only because they are attempted or **threatened under color of an unconstitutional or void statute or ordinance**.” Thompson v Smith, 154 SE 579 (1930) is the Supreme Court of Appeals of Virginia and says this “The right of a citizen so to do is that which he has under his right to enjoy life and liberty, to acquire and possess property, and to pursue happiness and safety.”

“The right of a Citizen to travel upon the public highways and to transport his/her 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**. Under this constitutional guaranty one may, therefore, under normal conditions, [non-commercial use] travel at his inclination along the public highways or in public places, and while conducting himself in an orderly and decent manner, neither interfering with nor disturbing another’s rights, he will be protected, not only in his person, but in his safe conduct.” **Thompson v. Smith, 155 Va. 367, 154 S.E. 579, 581, 584, 71 A.L.R. 604 (1930)**

**Thompson v. Smith, 155 Va. 367, 368 (1930)** “The doctrine that when the State or city has the power to prohibit the doing of an act altogether, it has the power to permit the doing of the act under any condition, or subject to any regulation, however arbitrary, **has no application** to a permit issued for the purpose of regulating the exercise of the common right to operate a **private automobile** on the streets of a city.”

The Thompson v. Smith case of 1930 made such an impact on the ‘right-to-travel it has even made its way into AmJur. 2nd Edition and cited as follows:

“The right of the Citizen to travel upon the public highways and to transport his property thereon, in the ordinary course of life and business, is a common right which he has under the right to enjoy life and liberty, to acquire and possess property, and to pursue happiness and safety. It includes the right, in so doing, to use the ordinary and usual conveyances of the day, and under the existing modes of travel, includes the right to drive a horse drawn carriage or wagon thereon or to operate an automobile thereon, for the usual and ordinary purpose of life and business.” – **11 American Jurisprudence, Constitutional Law, section 329, page 1135**

Complete freedom of the highways is so old and well established a blessing that we have forgotten the days of the Robber Barons and toll roads, and yet, under an act like this, arbitrarily administered, the highways may be completely monopolized, if, through lack of interest, the people submit, then they may look to see the most sacred of their liberties taken from them one by one, by more or less rapid encroachment.

**Robertson v Department of Public Works 180 Wash 133, 39 P.2d 596**

"Most sacred of liberties" of which Justice Tolman spoke is personal liberty. The definition of personal liberty is to be defined by common law definitions; ‘Personal liberty’, or the Right to enjoyment of life and liberty, is one of the fundamental or natural Rights, which has been protected by its inclusion as a guarantee in the various constitutions, which is not derived from, or dependent on/upon, the U.S. Constitution, which may not be submitted to a vote and may not depend on the outcome of an election. It is one of the most sacred and valuable Rights, as sacred as the Right to private property ... and is regarded as unalienable.”

See… **16 Corpus Juris Secundum, Constitutional Law, §202 page 897**

 “In view of this rule, a statutory provision that the supervising officials “may” exempt such persons when the transportation is not (i)on a commercial basis means that they “must” exempt them.”

**State v. Johnson, 243 P. 1073; 60 Corpus Juris Secundum, section 94 page 343**

"Automobile purchased for the purpose of transporting buyer to and from his place of employment was ``consumer goods'' as defined in UCC 9-109." [Exempt from DMV Corporation taxation and fees]

 **Mallicoat v Volunteer Finance & Loan Corp., 3 UCC Rep Serv 1035; 415 S.W.2d 347 (Tenn. App., 1966)**

The term "Motor Vehicle" may be so used as to include only those self-propelled vehicles which are used on highways primarily for purposes of "transporting" [in-the-private, non-commercial use] persons and property from place to place. (Emphasis added).

**60 Corpus Juris Secundum § 1, Page 148;**

**Ferrante Equipment Co. v. Foley Machinery Co., N.J., 231 A.2d 208, 211, 49 N.J. 432.**

**The Supreme Court of the United States**

I have in my keep a driver’s license issued to my VESSEL all-capital name PERSON. It is for when I choose to engage in commerce for my VESSEL on the roadways as the Agent for the VESSEL. An example of this would be when renting an automobile; this action is legally defined as commercial intercourse and of my choosing and no more. Why can I claim this? Because the Supreme Court of the United States says so…

Here is a juicy little quote from the Supreme Court of the United States; “People have an almost unlimited right to contract or not to contract and by government choosing to incorporate itself, it must act within the confines of a corporation”. **See Shepherd’s Citations** Clearfield Trust

**19 Corpus Juris Secundum (C.J.S.), Corporations § 883 & 884 (2003)**

A Corporation has the exact constitutional restrictions upon it, as the state that created it. If there is a violation of Law in [by] the defective creator, the creature is also defective. There is no corporation authorized by the People to act as government. The true definition of a sovereign is one that is answerable to The Supreme Divinity alone, and no other. The U.S. Federal Corporation or any municipal subdivision thereof i.e., STATE OF or COUNTY OF whichever [a corporation] is not sovereign.

Moreover, while traveling in my private conveyance, even though I have a license, the mere fact that I have one **does not** automatically convey consent to the Motor Vehicle Code of any state while traveling for non-commercial purposes. Why can one claim this? Because the Supreme Court of the United States says so …. And they have said so quite often……

**"The acceptance of a license**... **will not impose** upon the licensee **an obligation to respect or to comply with any provision of the statute or with the regulations** prescribed that are repugnant to the Constitution of the United States." **Collier v. Wallis 180 US 452 (1901) 333 US 426, 606 CL (1936) 56 P2d 602…** This case has Progeny in multitudes.

“[J]udges must be aware today that there are currents of ferment in the legal world that seek to revise or even overthrow traditional notions of judicial interpretation.” **—William H. Rehnquist**

**“The Nature of Judicial Interpretation,” Politics and the Constitution: The Nature and Extent of Interpretation 3, 3 (1990)**

"Where rights secured by the Constitution are involved, there can be no rule making or legislation which would abrogate them" – **Miranda v. Arizona, 384 U.S. 436, 491**

"[I]t has always been common ground that the Privileges or Immunities Clause protects the third component of the right to travel" **Saenz v. Roe, 526 U.S. 473, 503, 502 (1999)**

"A state may not impose a charge for the enjoyment of a right granted by the Federal Constitution and that a flat license tax here involves restraints in advance of the constitutional right secured by the first amendment” …. **Murdock v. Penn. 319 US 105: (1943)**

Majority opinion on the licensing of a Constitutional Right

"If the state does convert your right into a privilege and issue a license and a fee for it, you can ignore the license and a fee and engage the right with impunity." –

**Shuttlesworth v. Birmingham AI. 373 US 262: (1962)**

Any Constitutional provision intended to confer a benefit should be liberally construed in favor of the clearly intended and expressly designated beneficiary. “Then a Constitution should receive a literal interpretation in favor of the Citizen, is especially true, with respect to those provisions which were designed to safeguard the liberty and security of the Citizen in regard to person and property." – **16Am Jur 2d: 16Am Jur 2d., Sec. 97; Bary v. United States - 273 US 128**

"The Claim and exercise of a Constitutional Right cannot be converted into a crime."

 **Miller v. U.S., 230 F 2d 486, 489** This case not withstanding when there is property damage and/or a corpus delicti. I will remain in honor and settle any valid claims made against me for such actions or consequences of my travel on the public and private roadways. The state cannot be a victim as it has no arms and legs and no DNA as a creation of nature and Nature’s God.

“There should be no arbitrary deprivation of life or liberty, or arbitrary spoilation of property”.

**(Police power, Due Process) Barber v. Connolly, 113 U.S. 27, 31; Yick Yo v. Hopkins, 118 U.S. 356.**

“… Thus, the particular phraseology of the Constitution of the United States confirms and strengthens the principle, supposed to be essential to all written constitutions that a law repugnant to the Constitution is void, and courts, as well as other departments, are bound by that instrument.” **Marbury v. Madison 5 U.S. 137 (1803)** after more than 200 years this decision still stands.

" Whatever springes the State may set for those who are endeavoring to assert Rights [constitutional] that the State confers, the assertion of federal Rights, [Bill of Rights] when plainly and reasonably made, is not to be defeated under the name of local practice…The principle is general and necessary. **Ward v. Love County, 253 U. S. 17, 22, 40 Sup. Ct. 419, 64 L. Ed. 751** If the Constitution and laws of the United States are to be enforced, this Court cannot accept as final the decision of the state tribunal as to what are the facts alleged to give rise to the Right or to bar the assertion of it [constitutional rights] even upon local grounds. **Creswill v. Grand Lodge Knights of Pythias, 225 U. S. 246, 32 Sup. Ct. 822, 56 L. Ed. 1074** “This is familiar as to the substantive law and for the same reasons it is necessary to see that local practice shall not be allowed to put unreasonable obstacles ‘in the way’ of one exercising their rights.” See **American Ry. Express Co. v. Levee, 263 U. S. 19, 44 Sup. Ct. 11, 68 L. Ed..".** – **DAVIS v. WECHSLER. 263 U.S. 22, 44 S.Ct. 13 68 L.Ed. 143 (1923)**

"There can be no sanction or penalty imposed upon one because of this exercise of constitutional rights". – **Sherer v. Cullen, 481 F 946.**

…every man is independent of all laws, except those prescribed by nature. He is not bound by any institutions formed by his fellowman without his consent." *–* **Cruden v. Neale, 2 N.C. 338 May Term 1796**.

"Since the Constitution is intended for the observance of the judiciary **as well as other departments of government** and the judges are sworn to support its provisions, the courts are not at liberty to overlook or disregard its commands or counteract by evasions thereof, it is their duty in authorized proceedings to give full effect to the existing Constitution and to obey all constitutional provisions irrespective of their opinion as to the wisdom or the desirability of such provisions and irrespective of the consequences, thus it is said that the courts should be in our alert to enforce the provisions of the United States Constitution and guard against their infringement by legislative fiat or otherwise in accordance with these basic principles, the rule is fixed that the duty in the proper case to declare a law unconstitutional cannot be declined and must be performed in accordance with the delivered judgment of the tribunal before which the validity of the enactment it is directly drawn into question. If the Constitution prescribes one rule and the statute another in a different rule, it is the duty of the courts to declare that the Constitution and not the statute [or code] governs in cases before them for judgment.” -- **16Am Jur 2d., Sec. 155:,**

**The Constitution for the United States of America (1789)**

“This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, **shall be the supreme law of the land**; and the judges in every state shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.” See also Article I, Section 9, clause 3: “No Bill of Attainder or **ex post facto Law** shall be passed”.

“But whenever the operation and effect of any general regulation [code] is to extinguish or destroy that which **by law of the land** is the property of any person, so far as it has that effect, it is unconstitutional and void. Thus, a law is considered as being a deprivation of property within the meaning of this constitutional guaranty if it deprives an owner of one of its essential attributes, destroys its value, restricts or interrupts its common, necessary, or profitable use, hampers the owner in the application of it to the purposes of trade, or imposes conditions upon the Right to hold or use it and thereby seriously impairs its value” [or use thereof].

**(Statute, Code) 167 Am. Jur. 2d, Constitutional Law, Section 369**

**Qualified Immunity; Potential Loss of Assumed Protections**

"A court evaluating a claim of ‘qualified immunity’ must first determine whether the plaintiff has alleged the deprivation of an actual Constitutional Right at all, and if so, proceed to determine whether that Right was clearly established at the time of the alleged violation.” [People lose their rights if they do not claim them and enforce them. When public agents have been noticed to the claim of a right, they (the claimed rights) stand and must be respected.]

**Wilson v. Layne, 526 U.S. 603, 609 (1999) (quoting Conn v. Gabbert, 526 U.S. 286, 290 (1999)**

I, Robert-Lee; ,Lawrence-Jr claim my Constitutional right-to-travel the highways, byways, roadways and any other surface worked for the purpose of transportation by automobile while in non-commercial intercourse.

**U.S. v. Lee, 106 U.S. 196, 220 1 S. Ct. 240, 261, 27 L. Ed 171**

"No man in this country is so high that he is above the law. No officer of the law may set that law at defiance with impunity. All the officers of the government, from the highest to the lowest, are creatures of the law and are bound to obey it.” ... "It is the only supreme power in our system of government, and every man who, by accepting office participates in its functions, is only the more strongly bound to submit to that supremacy, and to observe the limitations which it imposes on the exercise of the authority which it gives." – Ultra Vires actions notwithstanding.

 "Government officials performing discretionary functions generally are granted a qualified immunity and are shielded from liability for civil damages insofar as their conduct does not violate clearly established statutory or Constitutional Rights of which a reasonable person would have known.”

**Wilson v. Layne, 526 U.S. 603, 609 (1999) (quoting Harlow v. Fitzgerald, 457 U.S. 800, 818 (1982)** You are a reasonable person… Now you know…. And have been noticed.

“Clearly established for purposes of qualified immunity means that the contours of the right must be sufficiently clear that a reasonable official would understand that what he is doing violates that right. This is not to say that an official action is protected by qualified immunity unless the very action in question has previously been held unlawful, but it is to say that in the light of pre-existing law the unlawfulness must be apparent.” **Wilson v. Layne, 526 U.S. 603, 614-615 (1999) (**Quoting **Anderson v. Creighton, 483 U.S. 635, 640 (1987)**

**You have been noticed;** it is now apparent…. Now you know…

**Ultra Vires actions by public employees notwithstanding**, when a piece of delegated legislation is declared to be without standing by the courts, as the right-to-travel being un-a-lien-able and so well established by the high courts of our nation while in a non-commercial capacity, the delegated legislation is voidable and becomes unenforceable except by consent.

The delegated legislation or code cannot [e]affect the rights of any one claiming them. A void rule, by claim-of-right cannot be the basis of any administrative action. No one can be prosecuted under a void-able rule and the Ultra Vires actor has no immunity from being held personally liable for their actions. Once informed of their Ultra Vires actions, and if they continue with the unlawful enforcement of the void-able legal code, the public actor, agent or employee assume full liability for their actions beyond the point of once being notified of the Ultra Vires enforcement. *Maxim of law; a right not declared, claimed and acted upon does not exist*. Once clearly stated rights are presented and claimed, any enforcement of voidable contract code is notwithstanding.

 Subordinate or delegated legislation is without-standing against Constitutional rights. Sometimes it is found that the Enabling or Parent Act [regulation of commerce] is not violative of the Constitution, but the subordinate or delegated legislation [motor vehicle code] made under it may violate the provisions of the Constitution. Such subordinate or delegated legislation will be unconstitutional and voidable, though the Enabling or Parent Act is perfectly valid. Consent must be given for Code to apply to a PERSON in non-commercial intercourse. This consent can be obtained by ‘silence as consent’ and a ‘tacit agreement’, *Maxim of law; if one be fooled then let them be a fool…. Maxim of law; a right not declared, claimed and acted upon does not exist.* Thus, the subordinate or delegated legislation, (e.g., rules, regulations, by- laws, etc.) made under the Enabling or Parent Act may be unconstitutional while the Enabling or Parent Act is constitutional and by consent, the subordinate legislation is enforceable although it may be unconstitutional. Getting one’s consent before enforcement of the subordinate legislation is paramount.

**Federal Civil causes of action:**

**USC 42 §1983;** CIVIL ACTION FOR DEPRIVATION OF RIGHTS: Every person who, under color of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage, of any State subjects, or causes to be subjected, any person within the jurisdiction thereof to the deprivation of **any rights**, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws, shall be liable to the party injured in an action at law.

**USC 42 1985;** CONSPIRACY TO INTERFERE WITH CIVIL RIGHTS: If two or more persons in any State or Territory conspire for the purpose of depriving, either directly or indirectly **any person’s rights**, the party so injured or deprived may have an action for the recovery of damages against any one or more of the conspirators.

**USC 42 §1986;** ACTION FOR NEGLECT TO PREVENT: **Every person** who, **having knowledge** that **any** of the **wrongs conspired** to be done **or are about to be committed**, and **having power to prevent or aid in preventing** the commission of the same, neglects or refuses so to do, if such wrongful act be committed, **shall be liable** to the party injured

**Federal Criminal cause of action:**

**18 USC; 245 In Part Reads: [Prohibited actions by law enforcement]**

**2)** Prohibits [the acts] of willful injury, **intimidation,** or **interference or attempt to do so, by force or** threat of force of any person because of race, color, religion, or ***national origin*** [American National] and because of his/her **activity as**:

**2, e)** "**a traveler"** **or** user of any facility of interstate commerce or common carrier [‘traveler’ is non-commercial]

**3)** **Prohibits interference by force or threat of force** against any person because he/she is or has been, or in order to intimidate such person or any other person or "**class of persons**" [American National] from participating or affording others the opportunity or protection to so participate, or lawfully aiding or encouraging other persons to participate in any of the benefits or activities listed in items (1) and (2), above without discrimination as to race, color, religion, or ***national origin***. [American National]

"Various facts of circumstances extrinsic to the Constitution are often resorted to, by the courts, to aid them in determining its meaning, as previously noted however, such extrinsic aids may not be resorted to where the provision in the question is clear and unambiguous in such a case the courts must apply the terms of the Constitution as written and they are not at liberty to search for meanings beyond the instrument." – **16 Am Jur 2d, § 117:**

“Any judge [or magistrate] who does not comply with his/her oath to the Constitution of the United States wars against that Constitution and engages in acts in violation of the supreme law of the land. The judge is engaged in acts of treason.” **Cooper v. Aaron, 358 U.S. 1, 78 S. Ct. 1401 (1958)**

**How old is the established Right-To-Travel?**

**“**The Right to travel is a part of the "liberty" of which the citizen cannot be deprived without due process of law under the Fifth Amendment. So much is conceded by the solicitor general. In Anglo Saxon law that Right to travel was emerging at least as early as the **Magna Carta” (1215 AD) Kent v. Dulles, 357 U.S. 116, 125 (1958)**

“The constitutional Right of individuals, in the exercise of their liberty interests, by claiming their Right to travel, in this writing, is a one-hundred-year-old concept, as it relates to the introduction and evolution of the automobile industry, and an individual’s necessarily impetuous need to travel the common highways. As indicated herein, the highways were established for the use of the general public. Streets and highways are established and maintained primarily for purposes of travel by the public and incidental uses.” **16 Am Jur 2d, § 227**

**Robertson vs. Department of Public Works, 180 Wash 133,147**

"Complete freedom of the highways is so old and well established a blessing that we have forgotten the days of the Robber Barons and toll roads, and yet, under an act like this, arbitrarily administered, the highways may be completely monopolized, if, through lack of interest, the people submit, then they may look to see the most sacred of their liberties taken from them one by one, by more or less rapid encroachment.".

**Progeny of; Robertson vs. Department of Public Works:**

1. Taylor v Smith, 140 Va. 217, 235

2. Thompson v. Smith, 154 SE 579

3. Wool v Larner, 26 A 2nd 89, 92, 112 Vt. 431

4. Kent v. Dulles, 357 U.S. 116 (1958)

5. Aptheker v. Secretary of State, 378 U.S. 500 (1964)

6. Zemel v. Rusk, 381 U.S. 1 (1965)

7. United States v. Guest, 383 U.S. 745 (1966)

8. Oregon v. Mitchell, 400 U.S. 112 (1970)

9. Grayham v. Dept. of Pub. Welfare, 403 U.S. 365 (1971)

**Williams v. Fears, 179 U.S. 270, 274, 21 S.Ct. 128, 45 L.Ed. 186.** "Iron curtains have no place in a free world. …undoubtedly the right of locomotion, the right to remove from one place to another according to inclination, is an attribute of personal liberty, and the right, ordinarily, of free transit from or through the territory of any state is a right secured by the U.S. Constitution."

I**n the U.S. Supreme Court, Shuttlesworth v. Birmingham 394 U.S. 147 (1969)** "With regard particularly to the U.S. Constitution, it is elementary that a Right secured or protected by that document cannot be overthrown or impaired by any state police authority."

“The Right of the 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 the common Right which he has under his Right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Under this Constitutional guarantee one may, therefore, under normal conditions, travel at his inclination along the public highways or in public places, and while conducting himself in an orderly and decent manner, neither interfering with nor disturbing another's Rights, he will be protected, not only in his person, but in his safe conduct."

**American Jurisprudence 1st. Constitutional Law, Sect.329, p 1135.**

There must be a corpus delicti or property damaged in order for cause of action to exist. The state cannot be the victim.

The "most sacred of liberties" of which Justice Tolman spoke often of, was Personal Liberty.

"Personal liberty, or the Right to enjoyment of life and liberty, is one of the fundamental or natural Rights, which has been protected by its inclusion as a guarantee in the various constitutions, which is not derived from, or dependent on, the U.S. Constitution, which may not be submitted to a vote and may not depend on the outcome of an election. It is one of the most sacred and valuable Rights, as sacred as the Right to private property ... and is regarded as unalienable." **16 Corpus Juris Secundum, Constitutional Law, Sect.202, p.987**

Justice Bandeis eloquently affirmed his condemnation of abuses practiced by Government officials, who were defendants *ultra vires* actions as Government officials.

**Olmstead vs. U.S. 277 US 438, 48 S.Ct. 564, 575; 72 L ED 944 (1928)** **Justice Bandeis** **declared:**

"Decency, security, and liberty a-like demand that Government officials shall be subjected to the same rules of conduct that are commands to the Citizen. In a government of laws, existence of the Government will be imperiled if it fails to observe the law scrupulously. Our government is the potent, the omnipresent teacher. For good or for ill, it teaches the whole people by its example. Crime is contagious. If the Government becomes a law-breaker, it breeds contempt for law; it invites every man to become a law unto him-self, it invites anarchy. To declare that, in the administration of the law, the end justifies the means would bring a terrible retribution. Against that pernicious doctrine, this Court should resolutely set its face."

“It is this intentional want of language, missing from the statute policy, which creates discretion. It is necessary to **turn the clock back forty years** and **in some instances over one hundred years** to establish that the 'incidental use of the highways' language which is the historical legislative authority in regulating commerce, does not transcend [to] the private, until that private is intended to be used commercially”. **Niemotko v. Maryland 340 U.S. 268**

**Use determines the juris-diction**. **Use determines classification**

**United States Supreme Court;** ...” It is now universally recognized that a state does possess such power to impose such burdens and limitations upon private carriers when using the public highways for the transaction of their public business with respect to common carriers using the public highways for the transaction of their [commercial] business in the transportation of persons or property for hire”. That ruling is further clarified as follows by the Supreme Court of the United States: “A citizen may have, under the fourteenth amendment, the right to travel and transport his private property upon them (the public highways) by auto vehicle, but he has no right to make the highways his place of business by using them as a common carrier for hire. Such use is a privilege which may be granted or withheld by the state in its discretion, without violating either the due process clause or the equal protection clause.”

**Buck v. Kuykendall, 267 U. S. 307 [38 A. L. R. 286, 69 L. Ed. 623, 45 Sup. Ct. Rep. 324]**

Majority opinion of the court continues……"The right of a citizen to travel upon the highway and transport his property thereon in the ordinary course of life and private business differs radically and obviously from that of one who makes the highway his place of public business for hire.”

The 5th Circuit defines automobile for non-commercial use and motor vehicle for commercial use, the judge continues that the decision is ultimately up to the jury in this particular case. "It is a jury question whether ... an automobile ... is a motor vehicle…" **United States v Johnson, 718 F.2d 1317, 1324 (5th Cir. 1983)**

"The use to which an item is put, rather than its physical characteristics, determine whether it should be classified as ``consumer goods'' under UCC 9 – 109 (1) or ``equipment'' under UCC 9-109(2)."

**Grimes v Massey Ferguson, Inc., 23 UCC Rep Serv 655; 355 So.2d 338 (Ala., 1978)**

"The classifications of goods in UCC 9-109 are mutually exclusive."

**McFadden v Mercantile-Safe Deposit & Trust Co., 8 UCC Rep Serv 766; 260 Md. 601, 273 A.2d 198 (1971)**

"The classification of ``goods'' under [UCC] 9-109 is a question of fact."

**Morgan County Feeders, Inc. v McCormick, 18 UCC Rep Serv 2d 632; 836 P.2d 1051 (Colo. App., 1992)**

"The definition of ‘consumer goods’ includes an automobile." [Non-commercial]

**Henson v Government Employees Finance & Industrial Loan Corp., 15 UCC Rep Serv 1137; 257 Ark. 273,**

"No state government entity has the power to allow or deny byways, [n]or waterways…while transporting his vehicles and personal property… [When not engaged in commercial activities] … Travel is not a privilege requiring, licensing, vehicle registration, or forced insurances."

 **Chicago Coach Co. v. City of Chicago, 337 Ill. 200, 169 N.E. 22**

“The existence of a public highway creates a public easement of travel which permits the general traveling public to use the highway at will. All persons have an equal right to use highways for a purpose of travel by proper means, and with due regard for the corresponding rights of others.” **Am Jur 2d Highways Streets and Bridges §228, Citing Town of Ridgefield v Eppoliti Realty Co, Inc. 71 Conn. App 321, 801 A 2d 902; State v Mayo 106 Me 62, 75 A 295;** see also **Williamson v Garrigus 228 Ark 705, 310 SW 2d 8.**

“Hence a traveler, as such, may occupy and use any part of the highway he or she desires when not needed by another whose rights thereto are superior to his own.” **Am Jur 2d Automobiles §10.**

**All Code is a Constructive Contract**

“Revised Code of Washington…. is not the law...”

**Self v. Rhay, 61 Wn. 2d 261, 264-65 (Wash. 1963)**

"A constructive contract is where duty defines it instead of the contract defining the duty to be performed. Constructive contracts are fictions of law adopted to enforce the legal duties by actions of Contract where no proper contract exists, express or Implied." **Graham v. Cummings, 57 Atl. 943, 208 Pa. 616 (citing Hertzog v. Hertzog, 29 Pa. [5 Casey] 465**

When traveling in non-commercial intercourse, there is no enforceable contract with the state of state, without one’s consent. One’s consent is given by silence, by compliance without claim of Right, and complying when asked for the Driver’s License and handing it out the window thereby giving tacit agreement of engaging in commercial intercourse.

**Be it known by all:** Any presumed, assumed, or implied Constructive Contract of the Motor Vehicle Code is rebutted and any and all power(s) of Attorney are hereby revoked for forever, by reason of nondisclosure, and other Lawful measures, and by expressing my will to do so, by: Robert-Lee; ,Lawrence-Jr - Executor

**Res Judicata and Stare Decisis**

Americans have the un-a-lien-able right to use roadways for non-commercial use, as long as, they are not damaging property or violating Rights of others, is a well-established truth and fact evinced by and not limited to the contents of this writing.

I claim **Res Judicata** and **Stare Decisis** as ‘Duty of Care’ by all public actors, employees, and agents for the now settled matter of my Right-to-Travel in non-commercial intercourse.

**Res Judicata** (RJ), also known as claim preclusion, is the Latin term for "a matter decided" and refers to a case or question of a matter in which there has been a final judgment on the subject matter jurisdiction (right-to-travel) and that the question is no longer subject to appeal or questionable.

**Stare Decisis** is the doctrine that courts will adhere to precedent in making their decisions. Stare decisis means “to stand by things decided” in Latin.

 When a court faces a legal argument, if a previous court has ruled on the same or a closely related issue, then the court will make their decision in alignment with the previous court’s decision. The previous deciding-court must have binding authority over the court; otherwise, the previous decision is merely persuasive authority. In **Kimble v. Marvel Enterprises**, **the U.S. Supreme Court described the rationale behind stare decisis as “promot[ing] the evenhanded, predictable, and consistent development of legal principles, foster[ing] reliance on judicial decisions, and contribut[ing] to the actual and perceived integrity of the judicial process.”**

 The doctrine operates both ‘horizontally’ and ‘vertically’. A horizontal stare decisis refers to a court adhering to its own precedent. For example, if the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals adhered to the ruling of a previous Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals case, that would be horizontal stare decisis. A court engages in **vertical stare decisis when it applies precedent from a higher court**.

**Peaceful Process**

**19 Corpus Juris Secundum § 883, & 884** “[t]he United States government is a FOREIGN CORPORATION with respect to a state.” [state vs. State] **All "public servants,"** officials, Congressmen, politicians, judges, attorneys, law enforcement officers, States and their various agencies, actors etc… [subdivisions and subsidiaries]., are the express agents of these foreign principals [being foreign to the people of the dejure states, non-corporate] - **see Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938; 22 USC 286 et seq, 263A, 185G, 267J, 611(C) (ii) & (iii); Treasury Delegation Order #91, BAR Treaty of 1947, Trading with the Enemies Act, Clearfield Doctrine…**

Have the public roads been monopolized by a foreign military? Why are public employees, the state police, named TROOPERS, are they at war? - and with whom? See….19 Corpus Juris Secundum § 883, 884, also… the Liber Codes, also… Hobbs Act, Trading with the Enemy Act, the Clearfield Doctrine…. And the list goes on…

**Black’s Law 4th**

**LIBERTY.** Freedom; exemption from extraneous control;

The term is used in the expression, rights, liberties, and franchises, as a word of the same general class and meaning with those words and privileges. This use of the term is said to have been strictly conformable to its sense as used in Magna Charta and in English declarations of rights, statutes, grants, etc.; Corn. v. Alger, 7 Cush. (Mass.) 70.

**LICENSE,** International Law; Permission granted by a belligerent state to its own subjects, or to the subjects of the enemy, to carry on a trade interdicted by war. Wheat. Int. Law, 447.

**Bouvier's Law Dictionary;** adopted by the Supreme Court of the United States as their legal dictionary.

**LICENSE,** International law; An authority given by one of two belligerent parties, to the citizens or subjects of the other, to carry on a specified trade.

**2.** The effects of the license are to suspend or relax **the rules of war** to the extent of the authority given. It is the assumption of a state of peace to the extent of the license. In the country which grants them, licenses to carry on a specific commerce are **stricti juris**, as being exceptions to the general rule; though they are not to be construed with pedantic accuracy, nor will every small deviation be held to vitiate the fair effect of them.

4 Rob. Rep. 8; Chitty, Law of Nat. 1 to 5, and 260; 1 Kent, Com. 164, 85.

**Stricti juris** is a Latin term which means according to strict right of law. It is a legal rule of interpretation. The rule of stricti juris requires the strict, narrow and close interpretation to regulate commerce. When the law requires application of stricti juris to a particular Right protected by the Constitution, then such regulation of commerce will be applied only in the context in which the authority to regulate applies. **This term is often applied to servitudes and monopolies**. As noncommercial the extension of the right-to-travel cannot be of servitude or monopoly and cannot be granted by License, because Licenses are in themselves a restriction on the free exercise of the rights to property and traveling while of non-commercial intercourse.

I am not at war with anyone or anything. A peaceful life I seek.

**18 USC; 245** In Part Reads: [Prohibited actions by law enforcement]

**2)** Prohibits [the acts] of willful injury, intimidation, or interference or attempt to do so, by force or threat of force of any person because of race, color, religion, or **national origin** [American National,] **and** because of his/her activity as:

**2, e) "a traveler"** or user of any facility of interstate commerce or common carrier [‘traveler’ is non-commercial]

**Motor Vehicle Code;** every state I checked so far has this exemption in their MVA code; **Pennsylvania Title 75 § 1303** nonresident owners; Non-commercial use is exempt from registration in the Commonwealth…. [COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA]

“In view of this rule, a statutory provision that the supervising officials “may” exempt such persons when the transportation is not (i)on a commercial basis means that they “must” exempt them.” **State v. Johnson, 243 P. 1073; 60 Corpus Juris Secundum, section 94 page 343**

 From the desk of and by the hand of the man, a creation of nature and nature’s God, commonly known by my family, friends and neighbors as Bobby Lawrence, claim the right of travel as a man and for the estate of ROBERT LEE LAWRENCE JR as listed on the BIRTH CERTIFICATE issued by \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ COUNTY in the STATE OF \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. All rights are and will be reclaimed, reserved and retained by: Robert-lee; ,Lawrence-Jr as executor, transmitting utility / signatory, and co-beneficiary of the PCT-CQ estate held in-trust.

 It is my intention and freewill, as a creation of nature and nature’s God, to exercise my God given right to travel in the private property, held in-trust for the beneficial owner being me, as one of the people of the several American states, defined as USC 8 section 1101, (a) 21, 23, “as one who owes allegiance to a state” [non-corporate], to terminate the former sub silentio “voluntary registration” of;

The Mercedes Benz, Title Number: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, VIN #: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, (a) 1999 model year, Mercedes Benz, S500 Sedan, silver in color. MCO # **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (red) Auto #1**

And The Ford F250, Title Number: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_, VIN #: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, (a) 2017 model year pickup, white in color. MCO # \_\_**\_\_\_\_\_\_ (red) Auto #2**

As one of We the People (American National) a traveler in private non-commercial intercourse and not ‘operating’ a ‘motor vehicle’, hereby give notice to public agents all, of the MCO and the Certificate of Title in hand and to be recorded as merged, thereby becoming and being (the) Superior Title, consisting of two parts; the legal title (MCO) and the equitable title (Certificate of title). Both (together as one) to be acknowledged as the Superior Title held in-trust, once done, I have an undisputed-able private Automobile and retaining my interest in it as a ‘fixture’ and of my ‘private property’ estate held in-trust. All government actors, agents and employees are the trustee(s) and having a duty to perform for the beneficiary being me.





I being Robert-Lee am a nonresident of the corporation(s) UNITED STATES, PENNSYLVANIA, COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA and STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA properly styled as ‘LANGUAGES OTHER THAN ENGLISH’ in the Chicago Manual of Styles, see page 666; 11.130 Fingerspelling, see also 10.27, page 583; Geographical Terms, PA. Is not the same as Pa. and is different than Penn. or Pennsylvania. PA refers to the UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE STATE and the ‘Zone Improvement Parcel’ (aka ZIP CODE) of the DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA. Furthermore, PA denotes a possession of the UNITED STATES Corporation located in the DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA and not of the Constitutional Republic form ordained by the People, it, the thing, is legal fiction, a corporation per U.S. Code, not having arms and legs, and is foreign to me as one of We the People. Why (?), because the courts have said so and are settled matters of fact, see… 19 C.J.S, § 884 & 884, *supra*.

See the Government Printing Office, GPO Styles Manual, page 95 for the designation of “Nationalities, etc” as inhabitant of the dejure Nation States of the Constitutional Union, I am a non-corporate Pennsylvanian and am owed a Constitutional Republic form of Government.

**Nationalities, etc**

**5.23. In designating the natives of the States, the following forms will be used.**

Alabamian

Alaskan

Arizonan

Arkansan

Californian

Coloradan

Connecticuter

Delawarean

Floridian

Georgian

Hawaii resident

Hoosier (Indiana)

Idahoan

Illinoisan

Iowan

Kansan

Kentuckian

Louisianian

Mainer

Marylander

Massachusettsan

Michiganian

Minnesotan

Mississippian

Missourian

Montanan

Nebraskan

Nevadan

New Hampshirite

New Jerseyan

New Mexican

New Yorker

North Carolinian

North Dakotan

Ohioan

Oklahoman

Oregonian

Pennsylvanian

Rhode Islander

South Carolinian

South Dakotan

Tennessean

Texan

Utahn

Vermonter

Virginian

Washingtonian

West Virginian

Wisconsinite



gpostyle@gpo.gov

Wyomingite

ROBERT LEE LAWRENCE JR derives no income and conducts no public business from (or) for (or) of any source that is "commercial use of the public roadways" while traveling in the aforementioned Auto(s).

I am I, and therefore I am expressing my freewill for now and in the future, to set right (any that may or may not exist) presumptions, assumptions, assumed power(s)-of-attorney, any construed contracts of time past, and notice all parties concerned with the matter-at-hand that I reclaim and have reclaimed all my natural and God-given Rights as one of We the People.

Notice to agent is notice to principal, notice to principal is notice.

And now this: invoking the ten commercial maxims of law;

1. An Affidavit of my truths and facts as I have researched them to be so. Any rebuttal must be per each case cited and per each authority cited, item by item. Any item left unrebutted, stands as truth and fact and a settled matter.
2. This is now notice of Superior Title for the aforementioned Autos and Trust property for use by the beneficial owner being me.
3. This is now notice of exempt status for the ‘fixture(s)’ listed and being of my household property held in-trust.
4. This is now notice of my status as a Traveler in non-commercial intercourse upon the public ways.
5. This is notice of ‘fixture’ revocation of registration of Title Number \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, VIN #: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ *supra*
6. This is notice of ‘fixture’ revocation of registration of Title Number \_\_\_\_\_\_, VIN #: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, *supra*

It is with a firm reliance and full faith in the Honor of all parties involved that they will update the records of the Motor Vehicle Department to reflect such information for Law Enforcement and Police Departments in-order to facilitate and aid in the adherence by public agents, actors, employees and officials to the ‘Duty of Care’ required for these matters.

Thank you for your cooperation and attention to these matters.

A certified recorded copy of this writing will be placed in each fixture listed herein and serve as notice of Right-to-Travel, a settled matter of fact before a court of record.

Date: By:

**Supporting documentation**

Actions taken by me are not of light and fickle concerns. They are of a most serious nature and are intended to establish my status and demonstrate my competency of the LAW per canons 2056 and 2057 in the claim of the PCT-CQ estate. Many others before me have done the same.



MCO goes here

MCO goes here

UNDER THE LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, THE CONSTITUTIONAL REPUBLIC, WHICH IS WITHOUT THE STATUTORY UNITED STATES [THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA] AND IN ACCORDANCE WITH 28 USC 1746(1) IN ORDER TO BE AS PRECISE AS POSSIBLE, DO HEREBY STATE THE FOLLOWING:

I, Robert-Lee; ,Lawrence-Jr , DECLARE OR AFFIRM BY PENALTY OF PERJURY WITHOUT THE STATUTORY UNITED STATES THAT THE ABOVE AND FOREGOING PRESENTATIONS, FEDERAL LAWS, AUTHORITIES AND CITATIONS ARE TRUE AND CORRECT TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE, COMPREHENSION, ABILITY TO RESEARCH, INTERPRETATIONS AND BELIEF.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ By: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Date Executor UCC 1-308

Mailing Address: c/o \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Registered Mail #** **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Notary:**

STATE, \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ COUNTY \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

On this \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, 2023, before me, the undersigned Notary Public, personally appeared \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ and proven to me through satisfactory evidence of identification, which was a \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, to be the man who signed the preceding or attached document in my presence, and who swore or affirmed to me that the contents of the document are truthful and accurate to the best of his knowledge and belief.

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

(seal of Notary)

My commission expires: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_.

NOTICE: Use of the notary public is for verification of signature and identity confirmation only. It implies no consent to federal jurisdiction under the Buck Act as one is 'without the jurisdiction of the District of Columbia'.

NOTICE: Use of the notary public is for verification of autograph or seal of individual biological ‘character’ confirmation only implying no presumption to federal jurisdiction whatsoever.