

To: Merrick Garland

To: (United States Senate)

To: (United States House of Rep.)

Notice to Merrick Garland and Federal Congress by the People of the American Republican States

I, _____, one of the People (of the 50 American States, in Form, Republican), am giving you and your agents notice, that you may give the People due care;

I, one of the People, present the following evidence that you swore to provide a Republican Form of Government to the People in the 50 States:

**United States Constitution Article 4
Section 4 - Republican Government**

The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a Republican Form of Government, and shall protect each of them against Invasion; and on Application of the Legislature, or of the Executive (when the Legislature cannot be convened) against domestic Violence.

Please take notice that Title 42 programs and partnerships, that give financial incentives in order to provoke government workers (County or School Board) to attack the Liberty interest of parents in their children's health and medical procedures, are in no way in accordance with the People's rights with which you swore to never interfere;

It is therefore the My demand, as one of the People, that you deliver to me, by mail, all financial interest, COVID related funds or any other funds that may be given in any Federal Program, State or County Partnership that may be given to any school.

Please take further notice that Administrative Tribunals, run by administrative agencies, in order to present force against the People, where the State has already sworn in every State Constitution that the People shall have the right to Trial by Jury, in a Court that is Impartial (Court of Record), moving under the course of Common Law, with a Magistrate that is completely independent of the Tribunal, is not the same as and will be considered as a trespass against the People and a willful Attack on the American States with Republican forms of government.

Please take further notice, that the People of each State, who create frames of government, have the power to bar their government personnel from taking part in any Federal Action, Cooperative Program, or system that is not in favor of the People. (Please see evidence from Arizona Constitution, Article 2 Section 3):

Arizona Constitution Article 2 Section 3 C:

C. If the **people** or their representatives **exercise their authority** pursuant to this section, this **state and all political subdivisions of this state are prohibited from using any personnel or financial resources to enforce, administer or cooperate with the designated federal action or program.**

Please take further notice that as one of the People, I wish to not have you or your agents, interfere with the rights of the People, especially when you have conflicts of interest in several programs that generate wealth that are not broadly known to the People. This can cause attacks on the rights of the People which are unlawful, for no government has the power to make rules or legislation abrogating any rights of the People (See Authority below):

**Miranda v. Arizona, 384 U.S. 436 (1966)
Pg. 491**

Where rights secured by the Constitution are involved, there can be no rulemaking or legislation which would abrogate them.

Please take notice that law comes before judgement, therefore, using your agents to interfere with the People's rights is done without jurisdiction and is unlawful. Furthermore, are you able to produce a Charter that shows that the Federal Bureau of Investigation has Inquisitorial Power, declared by the Legislature in creation of this entity, to have Power over the People inhabiting the 50 Republican States?

Please deliver this provision for the creation and powers the Federal Congress gave to the FBI within 5 days, if you have it.

Please also take notice that United States Supreme Court has already shown the importance of government ensuring they understand the difference between Judicial and Administrative actions and processes. I as one of the People, am not ignorant to the attempts by overzealous Federal workers, using process that is administrative while at the same time trying to trample the rights, liberty, property or lives of the People. I am now giving you notice and an excerpt from the case *Minker v United States*, that you may not follow down the same types of transgressions as your predecessors. (Please see Excerpt below):

United States v. Minker, 350 U.S. 179 (1956)

Page 350 U.S. 187

... This extensive delegated authority reinforces the considerations inherent in the nature of the power sought to be exercised that make for a restrictive reading of the Janus-faced word "witness." The subpoena power

"is a power capable of oppressive use, especially when it may be indiscriminately delegated and the subpoena is not returnable before a judicial officer..... True, there can be no penalty incurred for contempt before there is a judicial order of enforcement. But the subpoena is in form an official command, and, even though improvidently issued, it has some coercive tendency, either because of ignorance of their rights on the part of those whom it purports to command or their natural respect for what appears to be an official command or because of their reluctance to test the subpoena's validity by litigation."

Cudahy Packing Co., Ltd. v. Holland, 315 U. S. 357, 315 U. S. 363-364.

These concerns, relevant to the construction of this ambiguously worded power, are emphatically pertinent to investigations that constitute the first step in proceedings calculated to bring about the denaturalization of citizens. See *Schneiderman v. United States*, 320 U. S. 118; *Baumgartner v. United States*, 322 U. S. 665. This may result in "loss of both property and life, or of all that makes life worth living." *Ng Fung Ho v. White*, 259 U. S. 276,

Page 350 U. S. 188

259 U. S. 284. In such a situation, where there is doubt, it must be resolved in the citizen's favor. Especially must we be sensitive to the citizen's rights where the proceeding is nonjudicial because of "[t]he difference in security of judicial over administrative action....." *Ng Fung Ho v. White*, supra, at 259 U. S. 285.

These considerations of policy, which determined the Court's decisions in requiring judicial as against administrative adjudication of the issue of citizenship in a deportation proceeding and those defining the heavy criterion of proof to be exacted by the lower courts from the Government before decreeing denaturalization, are important guides in reaching decision here. They give coherence to law, and are

fairly to be assumed as congressional presuppositions unless, by appropriate explicitness, the lawmakers make them inapplicable. Cf. *Bell v. United States*, 349 U. S. 81, 349 U. S. 83. It does not bespeak depreciation of official zeal, nor does it bring into question disinterestedness, to conclude that compulsory ex parte administrative examinations, untrammelled by the safeguards of a public adversary judicial proceeding, afford too ready opportunities for unhappy consequences to prospective defendants in denaturalization suits. [...Added at beginning of citing as there was text on page not added before quote]

Please take notice that I, as one of the People, realize that there have been many cases that deal with Title 42, a non-positive law, that handle many issues by which multiple parties build revenue, with many presumptions, and failure to honor the rights of the People. It is therefore my wish that you refrain from interfering in the People's business of instructing their servants, as you have conflicts of interest that do not allow for you to be a faithful judge as to whether the People are standing up for their rights, or if there is some form of actual threat. Lastly, it is my wish that you learn to correct the FBI for abusing FISA Courts, changing emails, and taking part in activities for which they do not have a Charter giving them authority. If you can show the Charter allowing the FBI to do all these things against the People's will and to give evidence of when and where the Federal Congress allowed them, please reveal this information within 5 days by mail. Failure to respond with this evidence means that you agree that you are using an agency against the People without right or Jurisdiction, and that you are doing this knowingly and with Malice.

Autograph: _____

Date: