

**Notice by Affidavit**  
**Lawful Notice of Ownership and Right to Travel**

By: Nicholas Kenrick Hill sui juris  
in care of / rural route 1953 s Wallrade ln. Gilbert, Arizona Zip exempt

To: Jennifer Toth  
Director Arizona Department of Transportation  
1655 West Jackson Street  
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

To: Wayde Webb  
Motor Vehicle Department and Compliance  
1655 West Jackson Street  
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

To: Stacy Guillen  
Director of Law and Policy  
1655 West Jackson Street  
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

**Notice to Agent is Notice to Principal and Notice to Principal is Notice to Agent**

**Comes now Affiant; A Living Soul**, So called by my Father and Mother since born, Nicholas Kenreck Hill; of the genealogy of Hill, was born 28th of February, 1978, in the Sovereign Republic Washington State. I am not a Resident, Employee or Citizen of the UNITED STATES Government (Corporation), whose situs is Washington, the District of Columbia. My relationship to that Federal entity as far as jurisdiction is that of a non-resident alien to the Corporate United States Government Also known as an American State National, or Lawful Bloodline American. I am one of the people (as seen in 50 State Constitutions), Sui Juris, in this court of record. You, being trustees of the People must provide due care and remember your oath which binds you. I, the Affiant, make the following statements and claims:

**1. RIGHT TO TRAVEL: STATUTES, CODES & REGULATIONS ARE NOT LAW**

Any Color of Law “Law,” Statute, Code or Regulation that violates my fundamental and Constitutionally-protected rights is null and void as defined in countless Supreme Court cases, Arizona Statutes, Transportation Codes, and the Revised Code of Arizona itself.

Consider yourself duly notified. Ignore this information at your and the “state’s” detriment.

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]

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

RIGHTS TRUMP STATUTES—FORCED LICENSING AND REGISTRATION OF A NON-COMMERCIAL VEHICLE USED FOR TRAVEL IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL:

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."

Supreme Court Ruling [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..."

In 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. . ."

The proof that my activity of travel is, by law, a common right and not at all a privilege, is overwhelming in the eyes of all but the morally bankrupt, criminally insane and irretrievably corrupt. The law, state and municipal, foreign and domestic, is virtually replete with this framework which recognizes outright, and therefore duly protects, my right to engage in travel and to not be subjected to any privilege code.

I will not be licensing my automobiles in the UNITED STATES or the STATE OF ARIZONA. I may allow a special plate installed for the police officers to see. I will not contract otherwise.

## 2. OWNERSHIP DOCUMENTATION: PAID INVOICE & ARIZONA TITLE REASSIGNMENT

Listed & attached:

- Automobile Year: \_\_\_\_\_ Make: \_\_\_\_\_ Model: \_\_\_\_\_

Vehicle Identification Number:

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

identify the automobile that I OWN. They, in Fact describe the automobile in great detail. These documents provide proof of Ownership. They are Lawful proof of Ownership. When the Manufactures Certificate Of Origin was given away in trade for a Certificate of Title the owners then held inferior title of their property and the Motor Vehicle Department has possession of the superior title. Yet no one may Ever acquire it from the MVD even as the owner we may not acquire it. This seems a sort of Theft of the people. I will not be using a Certificate of Title for ownership.

### MORE CASE LAW

In House v. Hodges, 227 Ark. 458, 299 S.W.2d 201 (1957)

Supreme Court of Arkansas Mar 4, 1957 299 S.W.2d 201 (Ark. 1957)

Stating “certificate of title is not title itself but only evidence of title”

*American States Insurance Co.v.Gawlicki & Hussey, Inc.*, 231 Ill. App. 3d 199, 201 (1992) (noting, the word, "own," has a plain, dictionary definition which can reasonably be given to it in this contract). Illinois defines a vehicle "owner" as "a person who holds legal document of ownership of a vehicle," *including* a certificate of title.

“Including a certificate of title”, does not mean “only a certificate of title”

625 ILCS 5/3-100 (West 2014); *Nudi Auto RV & Boat Sales, Inc.*, 328 Ill. App. 3d at 535. A certificate of title to an automobile is evidence of legal title. *Id.* A *prima facie* presumption of ownership arises from a certificate of title, and this presumption may be rebutted by competent evidence of actual ownership.

Potter v. State Farm Mut. Auto

Section 42-6-107(2), C.R.S. 1999. A certificate of title evidences a rebuttable presumption of ownership....

State Farm Mutual v. Secrist

While a certificate of title to a vehicle creates a rebuttable presumption of ownership in the person named...

Crowley v. State Farm

Supreme Court of Alabama

Nov 27, 1991

591 So. 2d 53 (Ala. 1991)

Explaining that "the absence of ownership indicated by the absence of a certificate of title...can be rebutted by other evidence of ownership. For example, ownership or a transfer of ownership can be established by evidence of a party's taking possession of the vehicle; by evidence of a bill of sale that manifests an intent to sell and transfer the vehicle and to grant dominion and control over it; and by evidence of a transfer of money for the vehicle."

**Any man or woman** who denies these claims are true must rebut them under penalty of perjury in the form of an affidavit. In case of dispute, all parties agree to have these matters heard before an Arbitrator of the Affiant's choice at the expense of the public official or private actor. Any man or woman denying these claims are true must rebut these claims point by point within (3) days (72 hours). Failure to respond means that, by acquiescence, you agree that all claims are true.

Any man or woman who commits an offense upon my Right to travel while Traveling in my OWNED personal automobile as indicated in this affidavit agrees, to pay a minimum of \$25,000 **per controversy**.

## Verification

I hereby declare, certify and state, pursuant to the penalties of perjury under the laws of the United States of America, and by the provisions of 28 USC § 1746 that all of the above and foregoing representations are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief. Executed in Maricopa County, Arizona on this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ in the year of Our Lord Two Thousand Twenty-Four.

Autograph of Affiant

Notary as JURANT CERTIFICATE

JURAT \*\*\*\*\*

Arizona State }
Maricopa County }

Subscribed and sworn to (or affirmed) before me, On this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2024 (date) before me,
A Notary Public personally appeared, \_\_\_\_\_ Name of Affiant, who
proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the woman whose name is subscribed to the within
instruments and acknowledged to me that she executed the same in her authorized capacity and that by her
autograph(s) on the instrument, the woman executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the lawful laws of Massachusetts State and that the foregoing
paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal. \_\_\_\_\_

Signature of Notary /Jurat Seal \_\_\_\_\_