

****STATUTES ARE NOT LAW.****

This NOTICE is a just and modest self defense for any people and well below the precedent set by ****James C. Trezevant v City of Tampa**** wherein the damages established were at \$25,000 for 23 minutes of unlawful detainment. That remedy calculates to more than \$1.5 million per day.

****US. SUPREME COURT DECISION**** - The common law is the real law, the Supreme Law of the land, the code, rules, regulations, policy and statutes are "not the law", ****[Self v. Rhay, 61 Wn (2d) 261]****

****People v. Ortiz****, (1995) 32 Cal.App.4th 286. "A statute does not trump the Constitution."

****Bennett v. Boggs****, 1 Baldw 60, "Statutes that violate the plain and obvious principles of common right and common reason are null and void."

****Dunn v. Blumstein****, 405 U.S. 330, 92 S Ct 995, 31 L Ed 2d 274. [5 U.S. Dig, Constitutional Law, and 101.5: "The RIGHT TO TRAVEL is an unconditional personal right whose exercise may NOT be conditioned."

****People v. Battle****: "Persons faced with an unconstitutional licensing law which purports to require a license as a prerequisite to exercise of right... may ignore the law and engage with impunity in exercise of such right."

****Miller vs. U.S., 230 F. 486, 489****: "The claim and exercise of a constitutional Right cannot be converted into a crime."

****Shuttlesworth v. City of Birmingham, Alabama, 373 U.S. 262 (1963)****: "If the State converts a right (liberty) into a privilege, the citizen can ignore the license and fee and engage in the right (liberty) with impunity."

****19 Cal.Jur. 54, § 407****: "The streets of a city belong to the people of the state, and the use thereof is an inalienable right of every citizen..."

****Hertado v. California, 110 US 516****: The U.S Supreme Court states very plainly: "The state cannot diminish rights of the people."

****Bouvier's Law Dictionary, 1914, p. 2961****: "Those who have the right to do something cannot be licensed for what they already have right to do as such license would be meaningless."

****Caneisha Mills v. D.C. 2009****: "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. . ."

****SHAPIRO vs. THOMSON, 394 U. S. 618 April 21, 1969****: Further, the Right to TRAVEL by private conveyance for private purposes upon the Common way can NOT BE INFRINGED. No license or permission is required for TRAVEL when such TRAVEL IS NOT for the purpose of [COMMERCIAL] PROFIT OR GAIN on the open highways operating under license IN COMMERCE. "The rights of the individuals are restricted only to the extent that they have been voluntarily surrendered by the citizenship to the agencies of government."

****US. SUPREME COURT DECISION**** - "All codes, rules, and regulations are for government authorities only, not human/Creators in accordance with God's laws. All codes, rules, and regulations are unconstitutional and lacking due process..." ****Rodriques v. Ray Donovan (U.S. Department of Labor) 769 F. 2d 1344, 1348 (1985)****.

TO BE CONVICTED UNDER A STATUTE YOU MUST GIVE YOUR CONSENT,
AND I DO NOT GIVE MY CONSENT.

****Poindexter v. Greenhow, 114 U.S. 270, 303 (1885)****. ****Brady v. U.S., 397 U.S 742, 748, (1970)**** "Waivers of Constitutional Rights, not only must they be voluntary, they must be knowingly intelligent acts done with sufficient awareness."

****US. SUPREME COURT DECISION**** - "...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 (1796) 2 S.E.****

****US. SUPREME COURT DECISION**** - "Under our system of government upon the individuality and intelligence of the citizen, the state does not claim to control him/her, except as his/her conduct to others, leaving him/her the sole judge as to all that affects himself/herself." ****Mugler v. Kansas 123 U.S. 623, 659-60.****

****US. SUPREME COURT DECISION**** - "The assertion of federal rights, when plainly and reasonably made, are not to be defeated under the name of local practice." ****Davis v. Wechsler, 263 US 22, 24.****

****US. SUPREME COURT DECISION**** - "A State may not impose a charge for the enjoyment of a right granted by the Federal Constitution." ****Murdock v. Com. of Pennsylvania, 319 U.S. 105, at 113.****

****US. SUPREME COURT DECISION**** - "No State shall convert a liberty into a license, and charge a fee therefore." ****Murdock v. Pennsylvania, 319 U.S. 105.****

****US. SUPREME COURT DECISION**** - "If the State converts a right (liberty) into a privilege, the citizen can ignore the license and fee and engage in the right (liberty) with impunity." ****Shuttlesworth v. Birmingham, 373 U.S. 262.****

****US. SUPREME COURT DECISION**** - "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.****

****US. SUPREME COURT DECISION**** - "There can be no sanction or penalty imposed upon one because of this exercise of constitutional Rights." ****Sherar v. Cullen, 481 F. 946.****

****US. SUPREME COURT DECISION**** - "The claim and exercise of a constitutional right cannot be converted into a crime." ****Miller v. U.S., 230 F. 2d 486, 489.****

****US. SUPREME COURT DECISION**** - "For a crime to exist, there must be an injured party (Corpus Delicti). There can be no sanction or penalty imposed upon one because of this exercise of constitutional rights." ****Sherar v. Cullen, 481 F. 946.****

CONSIDER THIS LEGAL NOTICE TO BE GIVEN UNDER THE LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE STATE OF WASHINGTON!