

as valuable property, more important than stolen money or stolen car.

Owning and raising cats, dogs, livestock, pigeons, etc. is an unalienable right guaranteed by the Constitution, and anybody stealing or conspiring to steal small animals or livestock gets 10 years in jail.

Title 18 section 43. Animal enterprise terrorism. Whoever (2) intentionally causes physical disruption to the functioning of an animal enterprise by intentionally stealing or causing the loss of, any property (including animals or records) or conspires to do so; shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than one year, or both (d) Definitions the term animal enterprise means – (A) a commercial or academic enterprise that uses animals for food or fiber production, agriculture (B) a zoo, aquarium, circus, rodeo, or lawful competitive animal event; or (C) any fair or similar event intended to advance agriculture arts and sciences (b) Aggravated offense Whoever causes serious bodily injury shall be fined or imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both. **The County is liable for their or cities employees taking anonymous complaints and using threats, fear, and intimidation (animal terrorism) to restrict federally protected events intended to advance agriculture arts and sciences, namely, all 4H and FFA projects, all hobbyists who raise livestock and small animals and birds including pigeons for shows and competitions, and anybody who raises an animal for food. NOTE: The Humane Society is a private corporation, contracted with the County to get rid of unwanted pets and nuisance wildlife. They are NOT contracted to violate the Fourth Amendment in order to inventory and steal dogs, cats, chickens, horses, etc. under ANY pretext, or to conspire with corrupt judges, lawyers and court clerks to use the courts as a racketeering enterprise. The Humane Society was declared by the FBI to be an animal terrorist organization in 1993, and they use bribe/protection money to void judgments against them in court. See REPORT TO CONGRESS ON THE EXTENT OF DOMESTIC AND INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM ON ANIMAL ENTERPRISE online at Department of Justice Reports at findlaw.com or firstgov.gov.**

Title 18 section 3112. Repealed November 16, 1981. This federal law used to

provide for the issuance of search warrants for seizure of animals, birds, and eggs, but it was repealed, which means that it has been illegal since 1981 for anybody to issue a warrant to seize an animal, a bird, or an egg. The County is liable for any of its cities, agents or employees acting outside the law to restrict ownership of livestock, and using fear, threat, intimidation, and fraud to coerce citizens to give up their property rights.

THREAT TO DOMESTIC & NATIONAL SECURITY

Title 18, section 3592. Mitigating and aggravating factors to be considered in determining whether a sentence of death is justified: (b) Aggravating factors for espionage and treason. In determining whether a sentence of death is justified for an offense the court shall consider each of the following aggravating factors for which notice has been given and determine which, if any, exist: (2) Grave risk to national security. In the commission of the offense the defendant knowingly created a grave risk of danger to the national security. Our dwindling resource of farmers is being wiped out by vigilantes in government and private sectors committing terrorism, racketeering and theft under color of law. Farmers, by their own hard work, produce something out of nothing to feed our nation. The 3 million farmers left in the United States today are under threat of dwindling down to zero, because Title 18 sec. 43 Animal enterprise terrorism is adopted and perpetrated by county employees. The County is liable for any of its agents or employees taking anonymous complaints and illegally imposing limits or restrictions on livestock and property ownership without just compensation, and who threaten food supplies through regulation and control of all wealth with the aid of private vigilantes to enforce a no ownership policy upon citizens to the point where they can no longer keep and raise livestock, food or pets. The County would be liable for its agents threatening national security/food supply.

CITIES & COUNTIES CANNOT LEGISLATE EXCEPT AS TO LANDS THEY OWN.

UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION Article 6, Cl.2 Supremacy of Constitution.

This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof shall be the supreme Law of the Land; and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or Laws of any State to the Contrary notwithstanding. We have three separate branches of government, legislative, administrative, and judicial set up this way to ensure we would not become a dictatorship. Dictatorship means that one branch assumes all control, takes over the other branches, and becomes a legislator who makes its own laws, administrates to set up its own and country prosecutes its own laws. Under a dictatorship, citizens have no rights, and property ownership is eliminated, as the dictatorship assumes regulation and control over all private property. The penalty for conspiring to overthrow the government of the United States is death or life imprisonment.

Schulz v. Milne, 849 F.Supp. 708 (N.D.Cal. 1994: [D]efendants fail to apprehend basic constitutional tenets restricting the extent to which state power may be delegated to private parties. See also page 6694, footnotes 1 & 5: 1. It appears to the court that the City may have improperly contracted away its legislative and governmental functions to the Board and Milne, both of whom are private parties. The Ninth Circuit clearly held that a municipality may not surrender its control of a municipal function to a private party. Cities and Counties are private municipalities; they CANNOT assume legislative powers without the Governors signature, or without it going through the State Legislature. Only the Governor can sign laws against consumer goods. If any city or county does this, it's racketeering, fraud, embezzlement, extortion, and impersonating an officer; in this case, a State Legislator or the Governor.

In re Ellett, 254 F.3d 1135 (9th Cir. 2001): Under Ex Parte Young and its progeny, a suit seeking prospective equitable relief against a state official who has engaged in a continuing violation of federal law is not deemed to be a suit against the State for purposes of state sovereign immunity; Ex Parte Young, 209 U.S. at 159-160, 28 S.Ct. 441; Will v. Mich. Dep't of State Police, 491 U.S. 58, 71 n. 10, 109 S.Ct. 2304, 105 L.Ed.2d 45 (1989) (stating that

official-capacity actions for prospective relief are not treated as actions against the State.). Since the State cannot authorize its officers to violate federal law, such officers are stripped of [their] official or representative character and [are] subjected in [their] person to the consequences of [their] individual conduct. *Ex Parte Young*, 209 U.S. at 160, 28 S.Ct. 441. *Ex Parte Young* gives life to the Supremacy Clause, as remedies designed to end a continuing violation of federal law are necessary to vindicate the federal interest in assuring the supremacy of that law. Cities and Counties are private municipalities; they CANNOT assume legislative powers to regulate federally protected articles livestock (including dogs, cats and pigeons) and feeds in commerce. Cities and counties have NO IMMUNITY for legislating away ANY property rights and/or ownership rights without the Governor's signature, or without it going through the State Legislature. If they do, it's impersonating an officer and treason against the United States.

THE COUNTY CANNOT SHIRK ITS LIABILITY FOR THE CONDUCT OF ITS EMPLOYEES OR AGENTS, OR ANY CITY EMPLOYEES OR AGENTS

Allen v. City of Portland, 73 F.3d, 232 (9th Cir. 1995): By definition, probable cause to arrest can only exist in relation to criminal conduct; civil disputes cannot give rise to probable cause contract dispute cannot give rise to probable cause to arrest. Cities or counties CANNOT butt in on any civil dispute between neighbors, or presume there is any criminal activity related to ownership of livestock, fowl or other property. Civil disputes go through the DISTRICT ATTORNEY. If the city gets involved, it commits domestic terrorism.

Watkins v. City of Oakland, 145 F.3d 1087 (9th Cir. 1998) at 1088: 6. Civil Rights 214(4) Municipality is not entitled to the shield of qualified immunity from liability under 42 U.S.C.A. section 1983. Discrimination against disenfranchised citizens because they own fowl (roosters) and/or other livestock, and/or are Latinos, strips the County of immunity.

Burns v. Reed, 500 U.S. 478, 486, 111 S.Ct. 1934, 114 L.Ed.2d 547 (1991): [T]he law requires that the official seeking immunity to bear the burden of

demonstrating that immunity attaches to the particular function. County or city employees could not bear the burden of demonstrating that sabotage, terrorism, extortion, theft under color of law, discrimination, racketeering, violation of due process, and takings without compensation attaches to their particular function of upholding the Constitution and protecting the property and rights of tax-paying citizens and property owners; therefore, the County would not be immune, either for the conduct of criminals posing as city or county employees.

Brandon v. Holt, 105 S.Ct. 873 (1985) at pp. 873, 874: 12. Civil Rights 13.16 In cases arising under section 1983, judgment against a public servant in his official capacity imposes liability on the entity that he represents provided the public entity receives notice and an opportunity to respond. 42 U.S.C.A. section 1983. Held: 2. In cases under section 1983, a judgment against a public servant in his official capacity imposes liability on the entity that he represents. This rule was plainly implied in Monell, supra; Hutto v. Finney, 437 U.S. 678, 98 S.Ct. 2565, 57 L.Ed.2d 522; and Owen v. City of Independence, 455 U.S. 622, 100 S.Ct. 1398, 63 L.Ed.2d 673. Cities and counties cannot take anonymous complaints. The Supreme Court says that the County is the municipality upon which liability is imposed for civil rights claims against city employees within its jurisdiction. Any County Claim Form filed regarding these terrorist acts, frauds and swindles will be the County's Notice and Opportunity to be heard regarding city or county employees criminal conduct/conspiring to steal property.

Lalonde v. County of Riverside, 204 F.3d 947 (9th Cir. 2000): If, however, there is a material dispute as to the facts regarding what the officer or the plaintiff actually did, the case must proceed to trial, before a jury if requested¹⁰ even when immunity from suit was an issue. Issues of credibility belong to the trier of fact. The Seventh Amendment to the Constitution so requires See also Johnson v. Jones, 515 U.S. 304, 317-318 (1995) (holding that the existence of genuine issues of material facts render not appealable a pre-trial denial of summary judgment on the issue of qualified immunity) [O]nce the plaintiff established that material issues of

fact existed, the court was required to submit the factual dispute to a jury. Thomson v. Mahre, 110 F.3d 716, 719 (9th Cir. 1997) ([W]here there is a genuine issue of fact on a substantive issue of qualified immunity, ordinarily the controlling principles of summary judgment and, if there is a jury demand and a material issue of fact, the Seventh Amendment, require submission to a jury.). It would be impossible for the County to prove any immunity, when, after receiving a Claim or civil RICO suit with additional charges of terrorism and sabotage, it automatically rejects it in order to play the odds that the Claimant would be too ignorant to follow up where these issues would be taken to trial. The rejected Claim would become Exhibit A. Robinson v. Solano County, 2000 Daily Journal D.A.R. 7643: [T]he court awarded partial summary judgement after Robinson filed both state and federal claims in federal court. As to the county, the court found that Robinson had failed to provide evidence to support municipal liability under the rule set out in Monell v. Dept. of Social Services, 435 U.S. 658, 690 (1978). However, California has rejected the Monell rule, under which a county may be held liable in a § 1983 suit only if it has adopted an illegal or unconstitutional policy or custom. California holds counties liable for acts of their employees under the doctrine of respondeat superior, and grants immunity to counties only where the public employee would also be immune from liability. See C.G.C. § 815.2; see also Scott v. County of Los Angeles, 32 Cal. Rptr. 2d 643, 650 (Ct. App. 1994) (Under Government Code section 815.2, subdivision (a), the County is liable for acts and omissions of its employees under the doctrine of respondeat superior to the same extent as a private employer.

CITIES AND COUNTIES CANNOT VIOLATE RACKETEERING LAWS

Title 18 section 1951 Interference with Commerce: Whoever in any way or degree obstructs, delays or affects commerce or the movement of any article or commodity by robbery or extortion or attempts or conspires to do so shall be fined or imprisoned not more than twenty years (2) the term extortion means the obtaining of property from another, with his consent, induced by

wrongful use of actual or threatened force, violence, or fear, or under color of official right. Title 7, section 2 [Agricultural commodities] Definitions: The word person shall include individuals, associations, partnerships, corporations, and trusts. The word commodity shall mean wheat, cotton, rice, corn, oats, barley, rye, flaxseed, grain sorghums, mill feeds, butter, eggs, [Irish potatoes], wool, wool tops, fats and oils cottonseed meal, cottonseed, peanuts, soybeans, soybean meal, livestock, livestock products, and frozen concentrated orange juice, and all other goods and articles. Title 7 section 2131 The Congress finds that animals and activities which are regulated under this chapter are either in interstate or foreign commerce or substantially affect such commerce or the free flow thereof, and that regulation of animals and activities as provided in this chapter is necessary to prevent and eliminate burdens upon such commerce and to effectively regulate such commerce, in order. (3) to protect the owners of animals from theft of their animals by preventing the sale or use of animals which have been stolen. Title 18 section 1962. Prohibited activities: (b) It shall be unlawful for any person through a pattern of racketeering activity or through collection of an unlawful debt to acquire or maintain, directly or indirectly, any interest in or control of any enterprise which is engaged in, or the activities of which affect, interstate or foreign commerce (d) It shall be unlawful for any person to conspire to violate any of the provisions of subsection (a), (b), or (c) of this section. Title 18 Stolen Property, section 2311 Definitions: As used in this chapter livestock means any domestic animals raised for home use, consumption, or profit, such as horses, pigs, llamas, goats, fowl, sheep, buffalo, and cattle, or the carcasses thereof. Title 7 Agriculture section 601: No state can restrict the raising of any commodity (chicken hen or cock, other poultry, cattle, horse, goat, pig, sheep, parakeet, frog, fish, chinchilla, guinea pig, rabbit, etc.) for personal use. If the state is forbidden to restrict commodities, neither can the city or county. City or county employees get 20 years in prison for conspiring to restrict the free flow of commerce and agricultural commodities known as chickens (roosters and hens), birds and poultry, cattle, crowing fowl, pigeons, goats,

horses, pigs, sheep, other small farm animals (rabbits, fish, chinchillas, frogs, parakeets, guinea pigs, etc.), and animal/livestock feed consisting of mill feeds: rice, corn, oats, barley, rye, flaxseed, and grain sorghums. The penalty is 20 years imprisonment or \$250,000 fine.

Salinas v. United States, 118 S.Ct. 469 (1997): [I]nterpretive canon is not license for judiciary to rewrite language enacted by legislature Predominant elements in substantive Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act (RICO) violations are (1) conduct (2) of enterprise (3) through pattern of racketeering activity. 18 U.S.C. § 1962(c). Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act. 18 U.S.C. § 1962(d). (RICO) conspiracy conviction does not require overt or specific act. If conspirators have plan which calls for some conspirators to perpetrate crime and others to provide support, supporters are as guilty as perpetrators. Conspiracy may exist and be punished whether or not substantive crime ensues, for conspiracy is a distinct evil, dangerous to the public, and punishable in itself. Judges and cities are forbidden to rewrite language enacted by legislature. They are forbidden to even think about using the courts to uphold bogus, fabricated charges for hot pursuit of revenue. By their conduct of falsely representing the character, amount, or legal status of any debt, participants violate 15 U.S.C. sections 1681s-2 and 1692(e), and become principles in a pattern of racketeering by putting false liens or debts on court or credit records without verifying that the liens or debts were illegally valid as the result of having the matter determined by a jury prior to having an abstract of judgment entered. The fraud continues when these bogus judgments are used for collection of unlawful debt. The language of 15 U.S.C. section 1681s-2 is particularly clear: a person shall not furnish any information relating to a consumer to any consumer reporting agency if the person knows or consciously avoids knowing that the information is inaccurate. Amortization: The World Book Dictionary defines amortize as: 1. To set money aside regularly in a special fund for future wiping out of (a debt); 2. Law. To convey (property) to a body, especially an ecclesiastical body, which does not have the right to sell or give it away. Amortization is: 1. The act of

amortizing a debt; 2. The money set aside for this purpose. The County is liable for cities fraudulent misuse of the word amortization to mean an 18-month grace period before county agents crack down on all livestock and other small farm animal owners, 4-H, and FFA. The correct definition of amortization means that the county and cities need to set money aside right now for conveying property (deeds/bundle of rights chickens/chicken feed/livestock) to a body, (city or county agents), which does not have the right to sell or give it away. This is hard evidence of County's liability for fraud ñ they know they have no right to con citizens into amending their own Deeds by giving up their property, but count on the public being too ignorant to look up the real definition of amortize.

CIVIL RICO by DAVID B. SMITH and TERRANCE G. REED, 1999 Edition published by MATTHEW BENDER, publication update September 1999, front page: Injuries to Business or Property: Interpreting the scope of compensable business or property injuries under section 1964(c), THE Sixth Circuit recently held in Isaak v. Trumble Savings & Loan Co., 169 F.3d 390 (6th Cir. 1999), that the use and enjoyment of real estate constitutes property within the meaning of RICO so as to trigger the accrual of a RICO claim. The county and its cities are liable for racketeering conduct of its employees/agents use of fear, threats, and intimidation to interfere with the use and enjoyment of property by citizens who pay city and county employees to protect and serve their property rights.

U.S. v. Frega, 179 F.3d 793 (9th Cir. 1999) at 793: To establish conspiracy under Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act (RICO) does not require proof that individual defendant participated personally, or agreed to participate personally, in two predicate offenses; rather, the conspiracy must contemplate the commission of two predicate acts by one or more of its members. 18 U.S.C. section 1962(d). More than two predicate acts occur when private individuals conspire with public employees to violate state and federal law by restricting property ownership without just compensation in

furtherance of a racketeering scheme or artifice (denial of honest government services and theft under color of law); therefore, the County is the municipality upon which the liability is imposed for conduct constituting RICO conspiracy through fraud and deceit to effect takings without due process and without just compensation, which is theft under color. The county needs to remember the judicial officers who went to jail in this Frega case for operating the courts as a racketeering enterprise, the \$42 million that went back into Uncle Sam's Treasury as fruits of a racketeering enterprise, and needs to remember the 1,500 crooked employees who used to work for the DMV and who took bribes to do favors and manufacture fake licenses for their friends. In the Frega case, the feds only collected \$42 million, because it was pled improperly and a lot more big fish escaped the net.

Salinas v. United States, 118 S.Ct. 469 (1997): [C]onspiracy is a distinct evil, dangerous to the public, and punishable in itself. City and county employees are liable for conspiring to restrict property (including old cars) and agricultural commodities (Title 7, section 2) without just compensation, and conspiring to target disenfranchised livestock owners and feed mills in violation of Title 42 section 1983, when they admit to having met (conspired) with code enforcement and private persons in violation of the Brown Act in order to steal. The county is liable for its employee's intent (conspiracy) to conduct city and county business as a racketeering enterprise.

In Re Grand Jury Proceedings, 87 F.3d 377 (9th Cir. 1996) at 378: Attorney need know nothing about client's ongoing or planned illicit activity for crime-fraud exception to attorney-client privilege to apply. The County is liable for city employees planned illicit activity to turn property ownership into a crime, and any attorney representing the city or county agents in a lawsuit is liable under crime-fraud exception, and their malpractice insurance will not cover RICO allegations; nor can any of their clients recover ANY attorney fees (this notion was rejected by the full House in 1970 see CIVIL RICO, footnote 25)

Crowe v. Henry, 43 F.3d 198, 199 (5th Cir. 1995): A pre-answer Motion to Dismiss action for failure to state a claim admits facts alleged in complaint but challenges plaintiff's right to relief based upon those facts. The County would have no hope of using a 12(b)(6) motion to deny the fact that any of its citizens exists, and that one citizen was subjected to Animal Enterprise Terrorism, threats, fear, intimidation, trespass, and robbery by city employees.

Guerrero v. Gates, et al, CV 00-7165, WILLIAM J. REA, August 28, 2000, United States District Court for the Central District of California, quoting pertinent parts relating to nationwide news the LAPD CONDUCT SUBJECT TO CIVIL RICO: DISCUSSION: Legal Standard Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6): A party may bring a motion to dismiss a plaintiff's claims if the plaintiff's allegations fail to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6). Generally, [a] complaint should not be dismissed for failure to state a claim unless it appears beyond doubt that the plaintiff can prove no set of facts in support of his claim which would entitle him to relief. *Conley v. Gibson*, 355 U.S. 41, 45-46 (1957). Thus, dismissal is proper where the complaint lacks either a cognizable legal theory or insufficient facts to support a cognizable legal theory. See *Balistreri v. Pacifica Police Dep't.*, 901 F.2d 696, 699 (9th Cir. 1990). In reviewing a Rule 12(b)(6) motion, a court must construe all allegations contained in the complaint in the light most favorable to the plaintiff, and must accept as true all material allegations in the complaint, as well as any reasonable inferences to be drawn from them. See *Hospital Bldg. Co. v. Trustees of the Rex Hosp.*, 425 U.S. 738 (1976). Thus, no matter how improbable the alleged facts are, the court must accept them as true for the purposes of the action. See *Nietzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 326-27 (1989). The first amended complaint alleges planting evidence and extortion by Rampart police, which are both racketeering violations under Title 18. Attorneys for the defendant police made a motion to dismiss based on failure to state a claim. The court recommended that this motion be denied, and encouraged the plaintiff to pursue his racketeering claims. Likewise, it would be very easy to prove the

set of facts that the city and county employees aided and abetted racketeering activity by restricting property use, and by conspiring with private individuals and corporations to terrorize tax-paying citizens.

AR zoning: Existing animal keeping uses in the AR Agricultural-Residential District which become nonconforming by reason of development on an adjoining site which was vacant when the animal keeping use was established may be continued indefinitely; provided, however, if the animal keeping use is abandoned or discontinued for a period of eighteen (18) months, it shall not be resumed except in conformity with the provisions of Section 9-3.420 of this article. The County is liable for illegally proposing (extortion) that citizens be given 18 months to get rid of chickens or face charges in order to threaten and intimidate citizens to give up their property rights, which is a scheme or artifice to defraud under color of official right. The County is liable for any of its employees/agents using extortion, threats, fear and intimidation to coerce citizens to amend their Deeds and give up their property rights without just compensation or due process, and for falsely purporting that if the chickens or other livestock/small farm animals are gone for 18 months, the County can then fraudulently amend the owners deed, illegally convert the title, and get rid of the Prop 13 tax break.

Dewey J. Jones v. United States, 529 U.S. ___, 146 L.Ed.2d 902, 120 S.Ct. ___ (2000): Held: Because an owner-occupied residence not used for any commercial purpose does not qualify as property used in commerce or commerce-affecting activity, arson of such a dwelling is not subject to prosecution. The Supreme Court says that you cannot be prosecuted by anybody for damaging your own property. The county is liable for its employees/agents fraud, perjury, and extortion to steal property under the guise of rescuing it from its lawful owner.

PROPERTY OWNER IS STANDING TO SUE UNDER RICO

Rotella v. Wood, 528 US ___, 145 Led 2d 1047, 120 SCt. ___, at pg. 1047: The Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act (RICO) (18 USCS §§ 1961 et seq.) provides that (1) it is unlawful to conduct an enterprise's affairs through a pattern of racketeering activity (18 USCS § 1962(c), (2) a pattern

requires at least two acts of racketeering activity, the last of which occurs within 10 years after the commission of a prior act (18 USCS § 1962(c), (3) a person injured by a RICO violation can bring a civil RICO action (18 USCS 1964(c)). Any person injured by racketeering activity can file a civil RICO lawsuit. Racketeering activity is anything which interferes with land use and property rights ñ threats, fear, false process, false liens, etc.

CITIES AND COUNTIES ARE FORBIDDEN TO INTERFERE WITH FEDERALLY PROTECTED AND FUNDED PROGRAMS FFA and 4H

Title 18 section 666. Theft or bribery concerning programs receiving Federal funds. Whoever being an agent of a State, or local government, or any agency thereof—(A) embezzles, steals, obtains by fraud, or otherwise converts to the use of any person other than the rightful owner shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both. The circumstances referred to is that the organization, government, or agency receives, in any one year period, benefits in excess of \$10,000 under a Federal program involving a grant, contract, subsidy, loan, guarantee, insurance, or other form of Federal assistance As used in this section—(1) the term agent means a person authorized to act on behalf of another person or government and includes a servant or employee, and a partner, director, officer, manager, and representative; (2) the term government agency means a subdivision of the executive, legislative, judicial, or other branch of government, including a department, independent establishment, commission, administration, authority, board, and bureau, and a corporation or other legal entity established, and subject to control, by a governmental or intergovernmental program. The County is liable for its servants or employees, boards, etc. embezzlement of federal funds in excess of \$10,000 for restricting federally funded and protected animal enterprises including hobbyists, petting zoos, fairs, aquariums, 4H and FFA, pigeon shows, etc. by stealing, obtaining by fraud, or otherwise convert to the use of any person other than the rightful owner livestock and small animals lawfully owned within the County. The county does not get to receive federal funds for protected 4H and FFA programs, then turn around and restrict

them. Not only is this a crime against the tax-paying citizens in the County, it is a crime against the United States. Anything which interferes with land use is racketeering.

Authority AFFIDAVIT V. MOTION

Bench: I have considered the Defense Motions & they are all DENIED.

Real Man: I did not file any motions, I filed affidavits.

Bench: Well I am treating your documents as motions!!

Real Man: AGAIN, I did not file any motions, I filed affidavits; it is a criminal offense to file a false affidavit, I notice I am not under arrest for filing a false affidavit so it is clear that my affidavits are true, correct, and accurate; an affidavit is a statement of truth so my UNCONTESTED AFFIDAVITS are the TRUTH; I'm sure this court isn't deliberately DENYING THE TRUTH in order to FALSIFY THE RECORD!!! I'm certain it isn't this court's intent to FALSIFY THE RECORD AND CREATE DENIAL OF DUE PROCESS is it???

MORRIS V NATIONAL CASH REGISTER,
&
GROUP V FINLETTER

Defendant is likely to be the only individual, now or in the future, who is willing and able to place a sworn affidavit affirming the herein disclosed facts under penalties of perjury, into the record of this case and as such, in absence of sworn counter-affidavit signed under the penalties of perjury regarding these same facts, laws, caselaws and evidence, Defendant should be the only prevailing party. Morris v National Cash Register, 44 S.W. 2d 433, clearly states at point #4 that "uncontested allegations in affidavit must be accepted as true.", and the Federal case of Group v Finletter, 108 F. Supp. 327 states, "Allegations in affidavit in support of motion must be considered as true in absence of counter-affidavit."