

credibility of the information which the complaining officer adduces as probable cause. If there is no victim, there is no crime. This case makes it clear there shall be NO anonymous complaints, and it is the court's duty to interpose a neutral and detached judicial officer between the complaining parties to determine if a PUBLIC offense has been committed. In California, a warrant can only be issued on a FELONY.

CITIES AND COUNTIES CANNOT TELL YOU WHAT YOU CAN AND CANNOT DO AND OWN

California Penal Code § 1548(d): Laws of the United States means (1) those laws of the United States passed by Congress pursuant to authority given to Congress by the Constitution of the United States where the laws of the United States are controlling, and (2) those laws of the United States not controlling the several states of the United States but which are not in conflict with the provisions of this chapter. CONGRESS makes laws, NOT counties, cities, code enforcement, or dog-catchers.

Schad v. Ephraim, 452 U.S. 61, 68 L.Ed.2d 671, 101 S.Ct. 2176: Convictions, pursuant to zoning ordinance prohibiting live entertainment live nude dancing, held invalid under First and Fourteenth Amendments. A town or county may not legislatively prevent its citizens from engaging in or having access to forms of protective expression that are incompatible with its majority's conception of a decent life solely because these activities are sufficiently available in other locales. If the Supreme Court said that the city and county cannot dictate against live, nude dancing, they certainly cannot dictate raising small or large animals or owning old cars either. Property ownership, and especially farming, are forms of expression. Farmers, like painters, actors, musicians, writers, dancers, etc., use their experience, imagination, and skill to produce something from nothing. The Supreme Court said this is PROTECTED.

West Virginia State Board of Education et al. v. Barnett et al., 319 U.S. 624, 63 S.Ct. 1178 The United States Government was set up by the consent of the governed, and the Bill of Rights denies those in power any legal opportunity

to coerce that consent. The Fourteenth Amendment as applied to the states protects the citizen against the state itself and all of its creatures. One's right to life, liberty and property and other fundamental rights may not be submitted to vote, and they depend on the outcome of no election. The Supreme Court said that if the STATE cannot take away any inalienable right, the CITY or COUNTY cannot, either!

DUE PROCESS AND EMINENT DOMAIN

U.S. CONSTITUTION Amendment 5. Self-Incrimination; Double Jeopardy; Due process. No person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation. If any city or county wants to regulate, restrict or eliminate ANY private property, or restrict any right, it must PAY for it out of its General Fund. Regulations and restrictions are TAKINGS, and must be compensated. So POST your property No Trespassing to show that it belongs to YOU.

Protection; California Constitution Article 1, section 9 Due Process; Equal Privileges and Immunities: (a) A person may not be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law or denied equal protection of the laws. Due process means that anybody wishing to restrain property or file a protest against property of another, be it land, livestock, etc. must first put up a Bond to indemnify the lawful owner(s) for the takings, THEN go through the process of having the matter decided by a jury. THAT is Due Process.

Monterey v. Del Monte Dunes, 526 U.S.____, 143 L Ed 2d 882, 119 S.Ct.____ (1999): [T]he District Court's jury instructions directed the jury that (1) it should find for the landowner if the jury found that (a) the landowner had been denied all economically viable use of its property, or (b) the city's decision did not substantially advance a legitimate public purpose (the jury awarded the landowner \$8 million for the takings and \$1.45 million for the city's unlawful acts – no just compensation or providing an adequate post deprivation remedy for the loss). The County is liable for any city employee

violating the takings clause of the Fifth Amendment. The property owner owns all bundle of rights that come with his Deed, as he bought it as is and nobody can convert, alter, change or amend his deed except him. The law forbids the City or County to amend any deed, steal any deed, restrict its use, or to use deceit, extortion, fear, and threats to get the owner to amend it by restricting his ownership and use of livestock, property, or his land. Post-deprivation loss also attaches to the sale of any agriculture or other commodity in interstate OR intrastate commerce, which sales were diminished by the takings/restriction. This includes anything the landowner would buy for his use and enjoyment of his property ñ building materials, landscaping/gardening supplies, animal feed, livestock, pets, vehicles, etc. Damages for the takings without just compensation and for the extortion will be decided by a jury pursuant to the Seventh Amendment.

California Constitution Article 1, section 19 Eminent Domain: Private property may be taken or damaged for public use only when just compensation, ascertained by a jury unless waived, has first been paid to, or into court for, the owner. In an unpublished court order in the Daily Appellate, the Sierra Club was ordered to post a Bond of \$250,000 for a takings because it didn't want some logger to cut down his own trees. If private corporations or individuals such as the Humane Society wish to get rid of all roosters and restrict ownership of other pets and livestock in the County, they must likewise pay for it by putting up a Bond.

California Civil Code Title 1 Nature of Property, section 654 Ownership defined: The ownership of a thing is the right of one or more persons to possess and use it to the exclusion of others. In this code, the thing of which there may [be] ownership is called property. You own all your property to the exclusion of all others. Nobody can tell you how to care for your own property, and nobody can rescue property from you unless they BUY it, first.

California Civil Code Title 1 Nature of Property, Section 655 Things Subject to ownership: There may be ownership of all inanimate things [there may be ownership] of all domestic animals. Animals, land, junk cars, etc., are PROPERTY.

Lucas v. South Carolina Coastal Council, 505 U.S. 1003, 120 L.Ed.2d 798: There are a number of non-economic interests in land, such as interest in excluding strangers from one's land, the impairment of which will invite exceedingly close scrutiny under takings clause (5th Amend.) if the protection against physical appropriations of private property was to be meaningfully enforced, the government's power to redefine the range of interests included in the ownership of property was necessarily constrained by constitutional limits. If, instead, the uses of private property were subject to unbridled, uncompensated qualification under the police power, the natural tendency of human nature [would be] to extend the qualification more and more until at last private property disappeared. These considerations gave birth to the oft cited maxim that, while property may be regulated to a certain extent, if regulation goes too far it will be recognized as a taking. Where permanent physical occupation of land is concerned, we have refused to allow the government to decree it anew without compensation no matter how weighty the asserted public interests involved. Unless just compensation is offered, the city or county is committing fraud, theft, racketeering and terrorism if it wants to exert acts of ownership or control over private property and livestock ownership rights. It is illegal to impose public policy upon private land; to do so constitute a taking for which the City and County are liable for compensating the owner for his loss, no matter how small the intrusion.

Palazzolo v. Rhode Island, 533 U.S. ___, 150 L.Ed.2d 592, 121 S.Ct. ___ (2001) (quoting both Monterey v. Del Monte Dunes and Lucas v. South Carolina Coastal Council): "Petitioners' acquisition of title after the regulations' effective date did not bar his takings claims. This Court rejects the State Supreme Courts' sweeping rule that a purchaser or a successive title holder like petitioner is deemed to have notice of an earlier-enacted restriction and is barred from claiming that it effects a taking. Were the Court to accept that rule, the post-enactment transfer of title would absolve the State of its obligation to defend any action restricting land use, no matter how extreme or unreasonable. A State would be allowed, in effect, to put an expiration

date on the Takings Clause. This ought not to be the rule. Future generations, too, have a right to challenge unreasonable limitations on the use and value of land.

The Takings Clause of the Fifth Amendment, applicable to the States through the Fourteenth Amendment, *Chicago, B.&Q. R.Co. v. Chicago*, 166 U.S. 226 (1897), prohibits the government from taking private property for public use without just compensation. In *Pennsylvania Coal Co. v. Mahon*, 260 U.S. 393 (1922), Justice Holmes well-known formulation, while property may be regulated to a certain extent, if a regulation goes too far it will be recognized as a taking. (To quote Justice Stevens) It is wrong for the government to take property, even for public use, without tendering just compensation The Supreme Court ruled over 100 years ago that it is wrong for government to steal. If the restriction is not listed in the Deed, the city or county cannot come in AFTER the fact and say it's restricted, even if the restriction occurred before the property was purchased. If the city did not reimburse the FORMER owner for the regulatory taking, it cannot get away with failing to reimburse the PRESENT owner. That is FRAUD. If it isn't listed in the Deed, IT IS NOT RESTRICTED. And if the city or county still wants to impose any restriction, they have to lawfully acquire the property by justly compensating the owner/buying the land.

CITIES AND COUNTIES CANNOT DO ILLEGAL SEARCH AND SEIZURE

Steagald v. United States, 68 L.Ed.2d 38 Held: 2. The search in question violated the Fourth Amendment, where it took place in the absence of consent or exigent circumstances. (a) Absent exigent circumstances or consent, a home may not be searched without a warrant (c) A search warrant requirement will not significantly impede effective law enforcement efforts no warrant is required to apprehend a suspected felon in a public place. Moreover, the exigent-circumstances doctrine significantly limits the situations in which a search warrant is needed. And in those situations in which a search warrant is necessary, the inconvenience incurred by the police is generally insignificant. In any event, whatever practical problems

there are in requiring a search warrant they cannot outweigh the constitutional interest at stake in protecting the right of presumptively innocent people to be secure in their homes from unjustified, forcible intrusions by the government. The purpose of a warrant is to allow a neutral judicial officer to assess whether the police have probable cause to make an arrest or conduct a search. As we have often explained, the placement of this checkpoint between the Government and the citizen implicitly acknowledges that an officer engaged in the often competitive enterprise of ferreting out crime, *Johnson v. United States*, 333 U.S. 10, 13-15 (1948), at 14, may lack sufficient objectivity to weigh correctly the strength of the evidence supporting the contemplated action against the individual's interests in protecting his own liberty and the privacy of his home.

Warrantless search or arrest can ONLY occur IN A PUBLIC PLACE during a hot pursuit. In all other cases, a fair, neutral and detached judicial officer determines FROM THE COMPLAINT that a warrant should issue based upon the commission OF A FELONY. This is where the public's ignorance is used by robbers posing as code enforcement, etc.,

THERE ARE NO FISHING EXPEDITIONS TO SEIZE PROPERTY THAT IS NOT REPORTED AS STOLEN!!!

Carrera v. Bertaini, 63 C.A. 3d 721; 134 Cal.Rptr. 14: [I]mpoundment of an owner's farm animals without prior notice or hearing, and without a hearing in the superior court was unlawful and the owner was entitled either to have animals returned or their reasonable value. The due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment requires some form of notice and hearing; the hearing must take place before the property is taken. Cities try to wriggle around this one, by holding public hearings. These hearings, however, are NOT proper hearings with the property owner or his counsel present in superior court with the value of all property and bundle of rights tallied and presented for just compensation by the city or county out of the General Fund. The County is liable for the city using fraud and deceit to try to con the public into believing that public hearings take the place of a notice and hearing in superior court.

CITIES AND COUNTIES CANNOT VIOLATE THE FOURTH AMENDMENT

U.S. CONSTITUTION Amendment 4. Search and Seizure. The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no Warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by Oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized. We have forgotten that this was drafted to correct the evils of swarms of the King's officers barging in, and arbitrarily confiscating seditious material, which was determined by them to be seditious, without benefit of a judge or a public trial. Today, we see the same set of circumstances ñ invasion and terrorism because somebody else invaded our privacy and did a bench trial because they determined that our lifestyle was seditious.

People v. Camacho, 23 Cal.4th 824; 98 Cal.Rptr.2d 232; 3 P.3d 878 (2000): Police observation from non-public area constitutes unlawful search. The County is liable for Fourth Amendment violations, and has no immunity when its employees trespass upon areas that members of the public cannot be said to have been implicitly invited. No such implicit public invitation exists in a side yard, back yard, or neighbor's yard for county employees or anybody else to conduct invasion of privacy and/or pretextual search without probable cause to inventory livestock or other property by peeking over or through fences, even chain-link fences, which are there to exclude the eyes of strangers and trespassers.

U.S. v. Hotal, 143 F.3d 1223 (9th Cir. 1998). To comply with Fourth Amendment, anticipatory search warrant must either on its face or on the face of the accompanying affidavit clearly, expressly, and narrowly specify the triggering event Consent to search that is given after illegal entry is tainted and invalid under the Fourth Amendment. Plain-view doctrine did not apply to seizure of evidence from defendant's residence after officers conducted initial search based on invalid anticipatory search warrant Plain-view doctrine does not apply unless the initial entry is lawful pursuant to a valid warrant The county is liable for its agents/employees stealing

anything without probable cause on a tainted warrant that fails to narrowly list things with particularity that are connected with a crime, and that fails to have an attached affidavit from a victim injured in his or her business or property. State and federal law protects the unalienable right to own property / livestock, so the county is liable for its employees fabricated charges and pretextual search without probable cause.

See *v. City of Seattle*, 387 US 541, 18 L.Ed.2d 943, 87 S.Ct. 1737: [I]t was held that the Fourth Amendment forbids warrantless inspections of commercial structures as well as of private residences. The search of private commercial property, as well as the search of private houses, is presumptively unreasonable if conducted without a warrant. Again, if there is no victim, there is no crime. The county would be liable for violating the Fourth Amendment in allowing any of its agents or employees to conduct i[warrantless inspections] to search for livestock and other property on residences.

U.S. v. U.S. District Court, 407 U.S. 297 (1972): The Government's duty to safeguard domestic security must be weighed against the potential danger that unreasonable surveillances pose to individual privacy and free expression [t]he freedoms of the Fourth Amendment cannot properly be guaranteed if domestic surveillances are conducted [violates] the citizens right to be secure in his privacy against unreasonable Government intrusion. The city and county is liable for conducting illegal surveillance on private citizens to see who might be keeping or raising livestock. Violation of the Fourth Amendment strips public employees of all immunity. NOTE: *U.S. v. U.S. District Court* was about protecting the rights of persons who actually blew up federal property and conspired to blow up some more. It appears that terrorist bombers have more constitutional protections than a livestock owners today.

Camara v. Municipal Court, 387 US 523, 18 L.Ed.2d 930, 87 S.Ct. 1727: The basic purpose of the Fourth Amendment is to safeguard the privacy and security of individuals against arbitrary invasions by governmental officials; the Amendment thus gives concrete expression to a right of the people

which is basic to a free society. The guaranty against unreasonable searches and seizures contained in the Fourth Amendment is applicable to the states by reason of the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. The protection of the Fourth Amendment against unreasonable searches and seizures is not limited to a situation in which an individual is suspected of criminal behavior. The County is liable for violations of the Fourth, Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments by their agents / employees for suspecting that a citizen is a criminal because he or she happens to own and raise livestock for their own use. The County needs to remember the hundreds of innocent citizens who were released in the Rampart scandal, because corrupt city and county employees fabricated charges and committed perjury.

Hanlon v. Berger, 526 U.S._____, 143 L.Ed 2d 978, 119 S. Ct.____: It is a violation of the Fourth Amendment for media to be present during the execution of a search warrant. The County is liable and has no immunity for using the local media to invade the privacy of, and slander fowl and livestock owners while falsely representing the County's racketeering enterprise is lawful to facilitate raids on other livestock owners for the proceeds of the specified unlawful activity prohibited under Title 18 § 1962 Racketeering Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act.

CITES AND COUNTIES CANNOT VIOLATE CIVIL RIGHTS

Title 42 Section 1983: Every person who, under color of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage, of any State or Territory or the District of Columbia, subjects, or causes to be subjected, any citizen of the United States or other person within the jurisdiction thereof to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws, shall be liable to the party injured in an action at law, suit in equity, or other proper proceeding for redress The County would be liable for discrimination against livestock owners, 4-H, FFA, feed stores, and feed mills.

Title 28 United States Code § Section 1343 Civil rights and elective franchise.

(a) The district courts shall have original jurisdiction of any civil action

authorized by law to be commenced by any person:

(1) To recover damages for injury to his person or property, or because of the deprivation of any right or privilege of a citizen of the United States, by any act done in furtherance of any conspiracy mentioned in section 1985 of Title 42;

(2) To recover damages from any person who fails to prevent or to aid in preventing any wrongs mentioned in section 1985 of Title 42 which he had knowledge were about to occur and power to prevent;

(3) To redress the deprivation, under color of any State law, statute, ordinance, regulation, custom or usage, of any right, privilege or immunity secured by the Constitution of the United States or by any Act of Congress providing for equal rights of citizens or of all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States;

(4) To recover damages or to secure equitable or other relief under any Act of Congress providing for the protection of civil rights, including the right to vote.¹ The County is liable to reimburse disenfranchised livestock owners for property loss without just compensation and deprivation of the right to own all livestock both large and small for personal use, food, or profit. Cities and counties cannot set themselves up as heads of vigilante organizations. The County is liable to provide redress for the deprivation, under color, of the rights secured by the Constitution of the United States and Acts of Congress providing for equal rights of citizens to have just compensation for any County takings; and is liable to pay damages or to secure equitable or other relief providing for the protection of civil rights, including the right to own and raise pigeons, cats, dogs, large or small livestock, chickens whether they be hens or roosters, and to buy and sell livestock feed.

Estate of Macias v. Lopez, 42 F.Supp.2d 957 (N.D.Cal. 1999): Other district court began its analysis by setting forth the elements of a § 1983 claim against an individual state actor as follows:

[the plaintiff(s)] possessed a constitutional right of which [they were] deprived;

the acts or omissions of the defendant were intentional;

the defendant acted under color of law; and
the acts or omissions of the defendant caused the constitutional deprivation.
The court also stated that, to establish municipal liability, a plaintiff must show that:

[the plaintiff] possessed a constitutional right of which [he/she] was deprived;

the municipality had a policy or custom;

this policy or custom amounts to deliberate indifference to [the plaintiff's] constitutional right; and

the policy or custom caused the constitutional deprivation.

The district court then stated, however, that [b]efore there can be any liability under section 1983, there must be a direct causal link between the personal conduct of Deputy Lopez or the municipal conduct of Sonoma County and the alleged constitutional deprivation, in this case the murder of Maria Teresa Macias. In each of these cases, the Supreme Court and this court treated the deprivation of a constitutional right as the alleged injury. See *Monell v. Dep't. of Social Services*, 435 U.S. 658, 690 (1978), 436 U.S. at 692 (holding that a § 1983 plainly imposes liability on a government that, under color of some official policy, causes an employee to violate another's constitutional rights); *City of Canton v. Harris*, 489 U.S. 378 (1989) at 385 (stating that our first inquiry in any case alleging municipal liability under § 1983 is the question whether there is a direct causal link between a municipal policy or custom and the alleged constitutional deprivation); *City of Springfield v. Kibbe*, 480 U.S. 378 (1987) at 267 (stating that the Court repeatedly has stressed the need to find a direct causal connection between municipal conduct and the constitutional deprivation); *Harris v. City of Roseburg*, 664 F.2d 1121 (9th Cir. 1981) at 1125 (liability under § 1983 can be established by showing that the defendants either personally participated in a deprivation of the plaintiff's rights, or caused such a deprivation to occur). There is a constitutional right, however, to have police services administered in a nondiscriminatory manner – a right that is violated when a state actor denies such protection to disfavored persons. See *Navarro v.*

Block, 72 F.3d 712, 715-17 (9th Cir. 1996) (recognizing a cause of action under § 1983 based upon the discriminatory denial of police services); *Balistreri v. Pacifica Police Dept.*, 901 F.2d 696, 701 (9th Cir. 1990) (same); see also *Penrod v. Zavaras*, 94 F.3d 1399, 1406 (10th Cir. 1996) (stating that [a]n equal protection violation occurs when the government treats someone differently [from] another who is similarly situated). The alleged constitutional deprivation in this matter was the alleged denial of equal police protection to Mrs. Macias. There became a direct causal link between the city and the constitutional deprivation of its citizens under equal protection when the city, through its agents and employees, showed indifference to the rights of its residents and businessmen (feed mills) and adopted a custom or policy to discriminate against disfavored individuals, who were disenfranchised because they owned or raised livestock or were keeping any property the city doesn't like; this policy or custom amounts to deliberate indifference to injured citizens constitutional rights. Any hearings done in conspiracy with other private individuals to restrict commerce and deprive citizens of equal protection constitutes the cause/point of threat to citizens' unalienable rights of property ownership, equal protection, and benefit of honest government services before the citizen gets robbed.

CITIES AND COUNTIES CANNOT ENGAGE IN EXTORTIONATE CREDIT TRANSACTIONS

Title 18 USC sections 891-896. Section 891 Definition and rules of construction: (7) An extortionate means is any means which involves the use, or an express or implicit threat of use, of violence or other criminal means to cause harm to the person, reputation, or property. This applies to bogus utility liens or attorney's fees, which sanctions are only for licensed attorneys, and only for DEFENDANTS for causing undue delay and needlessly increasing the cost of litigation. Private attorneys conspiring with private corporations / Humane Societies to bribe federal or state judges, etc. to get rulings/judgments favorable to the robbers fits these rules of construction, as only Hitler punished those who sued and confiscated their

property. The county is not immune for cities criminal profiteering within the county, when they are paid to protect and serve, NOT to rob and do these white-collar con games.

CITIES AND COUNTIES CANNOT IMPERSONATE

FEDERAL AUTHORITY

Under Title 7 section 2159, Congress restrains all states subject to Public Law regarding animals and livestock. All investigations for alleged animal neglect fall under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture, NOT the County. The United States Department of Agriculture Secretary, sends a request to the United States Attorney General, now John Ashcroft, to request of a United States District Court Judge to issue a restraining order or injunction pursuant to section 2159 of Title 7 United States Code, whenever the Secretary has reason to believe the health of any animal [is] in serious danger. The County employees and agents are not the United States Department of Agriculture Secretary, and The County Board of Supervisors are not United States District Court judges, therefore, they conspired to intentionally and willfully impersonate federal authority, restricted since 1966 under the following explicit statute:

Title 7, Section 2159. Authority to Apply for Injunctions.- (a) Request. Whenever the Secretary has reason to believe that any dealer, carrier, exhibitor, or intermediate handler is dealing in stolen animals, or is placing the health of any animal in serious danger in violation of this Act or the regulations or standards promulgated thereunder, the Secretary shall notify the Attorney General who may apply to the United States district court in which such dealer, carrier, exhibitor, or intermediate handler resides or conducts business for a temporary restraining order or injunction to prevent any such person from operating in violation of this Act or the regulations and standards prescribed under this Act. The County is not immune from city's criminal conduct, and impersonating federal authority in order to commit terrorism and theft under color.

TERRORISM IS AGAINST THE LAW FEDERAL CRIMINAL CODES:

Title 18 USC CHAPTER 113B TERRORISM, Section 2331. Definitions. As used in this chapter ñ (1) the term ñinternational terrorismî means activities that (A) involve violent acts; (B) appear to be intended (i) to intimidate or coerce a civilian population; (ii) to influence the policy of a government by intimidation or coercion; or (iii) to affect the conduct of a government by assassination or kidnapping. The end results of all terrorist acts are to restrict the victimsí freedoms and put them out of business. That is what cities and counties do if they come to your door (trespass, impersonate an officer), and tell you that you cannot own over x number of dogs, roosters, or junk cars (regulatory takings in violation of due process). If they issue a citation, it's filing a false complaint,î because 1) they are not a victim of a public offense and 2) they cannot enforce city and county codes on PRIVATELY owned land ñ even if it is in the MIDDLE of the city, and even though you are RENTING! THEN it also becomes ñinterference with contract. City and County Codes and Ordinances are ONLY for city and county-owned property! The punishment for terrorism is imprisonment for 25 years. If they come to my door, I ask them where is the copy of the cancelled check, where they BOUGHT my property FIRST. Because my place is PRIVATE, and, just like Disneyland which is ALSO private, and which has its own rules and regulations, MY rule is, if the city or county want to LOOK at my property, they must PAY me first. That's the law, and my admission fee to them is \$5 million.

Title 18 CHAPTER 105 ñ SABOTAGE, Section 2152 Definitions As used in this chapter: The words war material include arms, armament, ammunition, livestock, forage, forest products and standing timber, stores of clothing, air, water, food. The words war premises include all buildings, grounds, mines, or other places wherein such war material is being produced The words national-defense material include arms, armament, ammunition, livestock, forage, forest products and standing timber, stores of clothing, air, water, food. The words national-defense premises include all buildings, grounds, mines, or other places wherein such war material is being

produced Livestock are second in importance as war materials and defense materials only to guns and ammo, and the places where chickens are raised are war premises and national defense premises. All those men on aircraft carriers eat eggs every morning. Anybody who interferes with the raising of livestock is sabotaging national defense materials. And anybody who restricts or prevents one American citizen from spending one dollar on one dog, cat, chicken, or pigeon is committing domestic terrorism, as nobody has the power to regulate these Title 7 sec. 2 agricultural commodities except Congress.

The President has declared WAR on terrorism. After September 11, 2001, ANYBODY who conspires to interfere with lands for growing livestock gets 30 years in jail and a fine for committing SABOTAGE against the United States. Anonymous complaints were abolished over 200 years ago.

Title 18 CHAPTER 113 STOLEN PROPERTY, Section 2311 Definitions: As used in this chapter: aircraft means any contrivance now known or hereafter invented, used, or designed for navigation of or for flight in the air; cattle means one or more bulls, steers, oxen, cows, heifers, or calves, or the carcass or carcasses thereof; 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; money means the legal tender; motor vehicles includes an automobile truck wagon, motorcycle, or any other self-propelled vehicle; securities includes any note, stock certificate, bond check, draft, warrant, traveler's check, letter of credit, warehouse receipt bill of lading valid or blank motor vehicle title; certificate of interest in property, tangible or intangible; tax stamp includes any tax stamp, tax token, tax meter imprint; value means the face, par, or market value, whichever is the greatest, and the aggregate value of all goods, wares, and merchandise, securities, and money referred to in a single indictment shall constitute the value thereof. The first capital offense prosecuted in this nation was for stealing chickens and eggs. Chickens and eggs were used as currency during the Depression, and are still on the books