**Understanding Jurisdiction, Equity, and Lawful Adjudication Across All Courts**

`To all concerned parties—whether in **probate, civil, criminal, administrative, or claims court**—this notice is provided for clarity, equity, and lawful orientation.

All courts operating within the United States or its political subdivisions (municipal, county, state, or federal) now function under a **fusion of law and equity**, meaning **common law** principles (rooted in property, contracts, and injury) have been blended with **equitable doctrines** (based on fairness, remedies, and fiduciary duties). This fusion is codified and enforced across judicial, executive, and legislative tribunals, including **Article I (legislative), Article III (judicial), and administrative bodies**.

Additionally, **cash and credit are not on par**. This distinction is vital: **Federal Reserve Notes (FRNs)** are obligations of the United States under **Title 31 U.S.C. § 5103** and **Title 18 U.S.C. § 8**. Any court or agency that adjudicates or demands compensation, restitution, or performance in FRNs or similar securities is engaging in a **financial transaction**. Therefore, **jurisdiction over money and finance must be traceable to delegated authority from the Secretary of the Treasury**, as the Treasury governs the lawful issuance and discharge of obligations, including FRNs, bonds, and other financial instruments.

Whether civil, criminal, or probate in nature, all proceedings must meet constitutional minimums:

* **Injury-in-fact** (a legally cognizable harm);
* **Causation** (a direct connection between the accused and the injury);
* **Redressability** (a remedy the court can lawfully offer);
* and a **real claimant or injured party** with standing to sue or complain.
(See Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife, 504 U.S. 555 (1992)).

In the absence of any of the above, the proceeding may fall under the definition of a **manifest injustice**—a scenario where adjudication occurs without a valid cause of action, lawful jurisdiction, or injured party, resulting in harm, prejudice, or abuse of process.

Thus, any **court, agency, or institution** that presumes authority to compel performance, impose penalties, or issue judgments tied to financial value—without proving scope of jurisdiction under **money and finance law** and without a verified claim—**may be exceeding its lawful boundaries**. In such cases, the accused or respondent has the right to challenge the court’s jurisdiction, demand proof of authority, and seek remedy or dismissal under both **common law and equity principles**.

This explanation stands as a notice of law and equity to all courts, officers, agents, or legal actors, public or private.