

THE UNITED STATES FEDERAL COURT

Petition:1:24 cv 01626

In re: Eeon, a sole proprietor, et..., al...

THE DISENFRANCHISED DEFRAUDED
AMERICAN CIVILIANS, ex rel.
The EEON FOUNDATION SOLE PROPRIETORSHIP,
Defrauded Clients, et al (primary list affixed hereto), et al

v.

THE UNITED STATES, in its commercial capacity, et al,
THE FEDERAL RESERVE AND ITS MEMBER BANKS, Et Al, THE 470
FEDERAL STATUTES THAT AFFECT THE LIVES OF AMERICANS IN
A HOST OF ALL-ENCOMPASSING AREAS THEY GAVE
EXTRAORDINARY POWERS NORMALLY EXERCISED BY
CONGRESS, TO THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE UNITED STATES,
ET AL, and DOE 1-UNLIMITED, et al

COMMON LAW LAWSUIT PURSUANT TO THE SEVENTH
AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES OF
AMERICA the petitioner's are not legal constructs:

The petitioner's are neither legal constructs, legal entities, juristic persons and/or any other unnatural fictional characters.

The petitioner and their constitutional capacity as the "Posterity" of "The People", they are ordainers of that sacred instrument known as "the Constitution of the United States of America!"

We have already rebutted the presumption that presumptions of law, a laughable concept, is viable in any court ordained by the Constitution! The law requires due process, fairness, and equal protection, presumptions are based on neither of the 3 which makes them unconstitutional as a matter of facts and conclusions of law.

Presumptions are not fair, for it requires a party who doesn't have the obligation to prove something which is not their responsibility. The burden of proof is on the claimer, not on the accused, this is long been a tradition since the founding of the Constitution and is secured by The First, the Fourth and the Fifth Amendment's to the Constitution for the United States of America, unless anyone can produce evidence to the contrary which would in essence be, "unconstitutional" because there doesn't exist anything in law supported by Maxim that would support such a conclusion!

So, until such time as someone can provide some type of proof that the court gets to change the capacity of any of the posterity of the people or, that the petitioner's are not members of the "posterity of the people", the matter is settled as a matter of established law.

We do not object to the clerk of the court and the tradition of the court, we challenge their jurisdiction under these so-called style manuals and procedural processes is unconstitutional. The court has no jurisdiction for converting the capacity of any of the posterity of the people to "**legal constructs**", and/or utilizing legal terminology as the foundation for communicating with the people and/or their posterity. Legal terminology is a foreign language, it has its own dictionary, whereas the people of the United States has historically been known to speak "English". Other languages such as Spanish, Mandarin, Vietnamese, Latin, Portuguese, Creole, Italian and so forth are spoken by the people who migrated to this country, but let's face it, the Constitution was written English and although legal terminology was utilized, the people express their wishes to Congress but never authorize Congress to write such continuously and legal terminology, why? Because it abridges the height of the people to communicate, to petition for redress of grievance, for which the First Amendment prohibits Congress by saying "Congress shall make no law". Legal terminology abridges the right of the people to communicate effectively, to receive news, to speech, to practice their religion, and to redress their grievances, surely this is not lost upon officers who've taken an oath to uphold the Constitution?

So, no we reject the offer, and which to proceed with our right to petition for redress of grievances unimpeded, unless there is an objection? Any objection must evidence and demonstrate standing!

CERTIFICATION:

We do hereby certify, validate, and verified that the aforementioned is wholly accurate, witness by and before God on this the 20 second day of July 2024 as written, attested and described, as I will word is our bond operating as a self-authenticated proclamation, to be admitted into evidence as such with the accompanying attachments from the onset of this matter!