D. I. Y. Habeas Corpus

by Sovereignty International (a trust)
C/O 6340 Lake Worth Blvd., #437
Fort Worth, Texas
ZIP CODE EXEMPT
engineerwin@yahoo.com
Administrating-Your-Public-Servants@GoogleGroups.com
Administrating-Your-Public-Servants@YahooGroups.com
www.sovereigntyinternational.fyi
https://sovereigntyinternational.wordpress.com
Kangaroo Courts are Everywhere!

“Kangaroo court. Term descriptive of a sham legal proceeding in which a person's rights are totally disregarded and in which the result is a foregone conclusion because of the bias of the court or other tribunal.”

Clerks masquerading as Judges

“"When acting to enforce a statute and its subsequent amendments to the present date, the judge of the municipal court is acting as an administrative officer and not in a judicial capacity; courts administering or enforcing statutes do not act judicially, but merely ministerially....but merely act as an extension as an agent for the involved agency -- but only in a “ministerial” and not a “discretionary capacity...”” Thompson v. Smith, 154 S.E. 579, 583; Keller v. P.E., 261 US 428; F.R.C. v. G.E., 281, U.S. 464 [emphasis added]
Clerks Masquerading as Judges

• "It is the accepted rule, not only in state courts, but, of the federal courts as well, that when a judge is enforcing administrative law they are described as mere 'extensions of the administrative agency for superior reviewing purposes' as a ministerial clerk for an agency..."
  30 Cal 596; 167 Cal 762

• "...judges who become involved in enforcement of mere statutes (civil or criminal in nature and otherwise), act as mere "clerks" of the involved agency..." K.C. Davis, ADMIN. LAW, Ch. 1 (CTP. West's 1965 Ed.)
Clerks Masquerading as Judges

• A Clerk Masquerading as a Judge is not competent to do anything judicial like issue orders, or warrants

• A Clerk Masquerading as a Judge is operating in his private capacity, and has no immunity

• "Ministerial officers are incompetent to receive grants of judicial power from the legislature, their acts in attempting to exercise such powers are necessarily nullities" Burns v. Sup., Ct., SF, 140 Cal. 1
Kangaroo Courts are Everywhere!

- They are ALWAYS dealing with a Statute
- All Codes are derived from Statutes
- A Code is a liar’s (lawyer’s) opinion of what the statutes say
- All filing fees are based on statutes
- All Courts are governed by Statutes
- All officers of the Court are governed by Statutes
Oaths

“OATH....All oaths must be lawful, allowed by the common law, or some statute; if they are administered by persons in a private capacity, or not duly authorized, they are *coram non judice*, and void; and those administering them are guilty of a high contempt, for doing it without warrant of law, and punishable by fine and imprisonment. 3 *Inst.* 165; 4 *Inst.* 278; 2 *Roll. Abr.* 277.” Tomlin’s Law Dictionary, 1835 Edition, Volume 2 [emphasis added],
“IN PROPRIA PERSONA. In one's own proper person. It is a rule in pleading that pleas to the jurisdiction of the court must be plead in propria persona, because if pleaded by attorney they admit the jurisdiction, as an attorney is an officer of the court, and he is presumed to plead after having obtained leave, which admits the jurisdiction. Lawes, Pl. 91.” Black’s Law Dictionary, 4th Edition, page 899-900
Satanists and their Satanic Contracts

- "It is impossible to prove jurisdiction exists absent a substantial nexus with the state, such as voluntary subscription to license. All jurisdictional facts supporting claim that supposed jurisdiction exists must appear on the record of the court." Pipe Line v Marathon. 102 S. Ct. 3858 quoting Crowell v Benson 883 US 22
State Citizens

• "State citizens are the only ones living under free government, whose rights are incapable of impairment by legislation or judicial decision." Twining v. New Jersey, 211 U.S. 97, 1908

• "State Citizenship is a vested substantial property right, and the State has no power to divest or impair these rights." Favot v. Kingsbury, (1929) 98 Cal. App. 284, 276 P. 1083,

• "The State cannot diminish rights of the people." Hertado v. California, 110 U.S. 516
“Bill of Attainder” means Legislative acts, no matter what their form, that apply either to named individuals or to easily ascertainable members of a group in such a way as to inflict punishment on them without a judicial trial. United States v. Brown, 381 U.S. 437, 448-49, 85 S. Ct. 1707, 1715, 14 L.Ed. 484, 492; United States v. Lovett, 328 U.S. 303, 315, 66 S.Ct. 1073, 1079, 90 L.Ed. 1252.
All Statutes and Codes are Bills of Attainder

• “bill of attainder. 2. A special legislative act prescribing punishment, without a trial, for a specific person or group. • Bills of attainder are prohibited by the U.S. Constitution (art. I, § 9, cl. 3; art. I, § 10, cl. 1). — Also termed act of attainder. See ATTAINDER; BILL OF PAINS AND PENALTIES. [Cases: Constitutional Law 82.5. C.J.S. Constitutional Law §§ 429–431.]” Black’s Law Dictionary, 8th Edition, page 496

• “BILL OF PAINS AND PENALTIES bill of pains and penalties. A legislative act that, though similar to a bill of attainder, prescribes punishment less severe than capital punishment. • Bills of pains and penalties are included within the U.S. Constitution's ban on bills of attainder. U.S. Const. art I, § 9. [Cases: Constitutional Law 82.5. C.J.S. Constitutional Law §§ 429–431.]” Black’s Law Dictionary, 8th Edition, page 499
Warrant for Arrest

“CAPIAS. A writ or process formerly of two sorts; one whereof in the court of C. P. is called *capias ad respondendum*, before judgment, where an original is sued out, etc. to take the defendant and make him answer the plaintiff: and the other a writ of execution, after judgment, being of divers kinds, as *capias ad satisfaciendum, capitu ultiagatum*, &c.”

Tomlin’s Law Dictionary 1835 Edition
Warrant for Arrest

“CAPIAS AD SATISFACIENDUM (shortly termed a CA. SA.) A judicial writ of execution which issues out on the record of a Judgment, where there is a recovery in the courts at Westminster, of debt, damages, &c. And by this writ the sheriff is commanded to take the body of the defendant in execution, and him safely to keep, so that he have his body in court at the return of the writ, to satisfy the plaintiff his debt and damages. Vide 1 Litt Abr. 249.” Tomlin’s Law Dictionary 1835 Edition

Capias

“In this chapter: (1) "Capias" means a writ that is: (A) issued by a court having jurisdiction of a case after judgment and sentence; and (B) directed "To any peace officer of the State of Texas" and commanding the officer to arrest a person convicted of an offense and bring the arrested person before that court immediately or on a day or at a term stated in the writ.

(2) "Capias pro fine" means a writ that is:

(A) issued by a court having jurisdiction of a case after judgment and sentence for unpaid fines and costs; and

(B) directed "To any peace officer of the State of Texas" and commanding the officer to arrest a person convicted of an offense and bring the arrested person before that court immediately.” Texas Code of Criminal Procedure Article 43.015 Definitions
Warrant of Arrest

• There are no lawful warrants
• It is ALWAYS a capias
Satanists

- They drag you into their kangaroo court and the Clerk masquerading as a Judge forges your signature onto their satanic contract to fabricate evidence of a debt, then they issue a capias to their satanist order followers to further assault you, kidnap you, and falsely imprison you.
Clerks Masquerading as a Judge

• “No one is bound to obey an unconstitutional law and no courts are bound to enforce it." 16th American Jurisprudence 2d, Section 177 late 2nd, Section 256

• “An unconstitutional act is not law; it confers no rights; it imposes no duties; affords no protection; it creates no office; it is in legal contemplation, as inoperative as though it had never been passed.” Norton vs Shelby County, 118 U.S. 425, p. 442

• "An unconstitutional law is void, and is as no law. An offence created by it is not a crime." Ex parte Siebold, 100 U.S. 371, 376 (1880), quoted with approval in Fay v. Noia, 372 U.S. 391, 408 (1963)

• "it never became a law and was as much a nullity as if it had been the act or declaration of an unauthorized assemblage of individuals." (Ryan v. Lynch, 68 Ill. 160)
Deny due Process = Void Judgment

"Not every action by any judge is in exercise of his judicial function. It is not a judicial function for a Judge to commit an intentional tort even though the tort occurs in the Courthouse, when a judge acts as a Trespasser of the Law, when a judge does not follow the law, the judge loses subject matter jurisdiction and The Judge's orders are void, of no legal force or effect"! Yates Vs. Village of Hoffman Estates, Illinois, 209 F.Supp. 757 (N.D. Ill. 1962)

"Where a court failed to observe safeguards, it amounts to denial of due process of law, court is deprived of juris." Merritt v. Hunter, C.A. Kansas 170 F2d 739
Clerks Masquerading as a Judge

• "Where there is no jurisdiction there is no judge; the proceeding is as nothing. Such has been the law from the days of the Marshalsea, 10 Coke 68; also Bradley v. Fisher, 13 Wall 335,351." Manning v. Ketcham, 58 F.2d 948.
Clerks Masquerading as a Judge


• “Void judgment is one which has no legal force or effect whatever, it is an absolute nullity, its invalidity may be asserted by any person whose rights are affected at any time and at any place and it need not be attacked directly but may be attacked collaterally whenever and wherever it is interposed.” City of Lufkin v. McVicker, 510 S.W. 2d 141 (Tex. Civ. App. – Beaumont 1973).
Void Judgment

• The Courts have decreed, that Want of Jurisdiction makes;
  • “...all acts of judges, magistrates, U.S. Marshals, sheriffs, local police, all void and not just voidable.” Nestor v. Hershey, 425 F2d 504.

• Watch the Void Judgments video
Void Judgment

- “And a remedy may be had by a writ of prohibition”; 3 Bla. Com. 12.
- The judgment of conviction pronounced by court without jurisdiction is void, and one imprisoned thereunder may obtain release by habeas corpus. Johnson v. Lewis, 144 U.S. 653.
The Holy Bible

• “The end justifies the means” is satanic

• “Wo unto them that call evil good and good evil, and put darkness for light, and light for darkness...” Isaiah 5:20
Making Merchandise of you

• “If a man be found stealing any of his brethren of the children of Israel, and maketh merchandise of him, or selleth him ; then that thief shall die; and thou shalt put evil away from among you.” Deuteronomy 24:7

• “And through covetousness shall they with feigned words make merchandise of you: whose judgment now of a long time lingereth not, and their damnation slumbereth not.” 2 Peter 2:3
History

• “Give me liberty or give me death” Patrick Henry,
• after he witnessed a man flogged to death for refusing to take a license
Satanists

• Everything their so-called Court does is a fraud
• They spell your name in all block capital letters – a fraud
• They spell your address in all block capital letters – a fraud, they use a ZIP Code – another Fraud
• They present themselves as neutral and unbiased, when in reality they are bought and paid for
• All so-called Judges (state or federal) are actually federal whores selling their justus
• There is no such thing as an Article 3 Judge, because they are all territorial
Satanist PIGs

• These Satanists CANNOT speak the truth
• That is one of the hallmarks of satanism, lies, half truths, fraud, deception
• They criminally convert your appellation (name)
• They criminally convert your postal address
• They present the judge as neutral and unbiased, when the so-called judge is actually a bought and paid for clerk – see LEOs in Azle, Texas videos 1, 2, 3, & 4
• Everything they do is a fraud (lie)
• “Colour, color. Signifies a probable plea, but which is in fact false…” Tomlin’s Law Dictionary 1835, Volume 1
Satanist PIGs

• They lie in wait for you to say the wrong thing so they can justify selling you into slavery

• “give color, vb. Hist. To admit, either expressly or impliedly by silence, that an opponent's allegations appear to be meritorious. • In common-law pleading, a defendant's plea of confession and avoidance had to give color to the plaintiff's allegations in the complaint or the plea would be fatally defective.” Black’s Law Dictionary 8th Edition, page 2031
Satanists

• They assault you with their criminal corporation

• “My opinion is and long has been that the mayor and aldermen of a city corporation, or the president and directors of a bank, or the president and directors of a railroad company and of other similar corporations, are the true parties that sue and are sued as trustees and representatives of the constantly changing stockholders.... A corporation, therefore, being not a natural person, but a mere creature of the mind, invisible and intangible, cannot be a citizen of a state, or of the United States, and cannot fall within the terms or the power of the above mentioned article, and can therefore neither plead nor be impleaded in the courts of the United States.” Rundle v Delaware & Raritan Canal Company 55 U.S. 80 (1852) [emphasis added]
Satanists

• “Once a fraud, always a fraud.” 13 Vin. Abr. 539.
• “Things invalid from the beginning cannot be made valid by subsequent act.” Trayner, Max. 482. Maxims of Law, Black’s Law Dictionary 9th Edition, page 1862
• Time cannot render valid an act void in its origin. Dig. 50, 17, 29; Broom, Max. 178, Maxims of Law, Black’s Law Dictionary 9th Edition, page 1862
Satanists

• “Ex dolo malo non oritur action. Out of fraud no action arises. Cowper, 343; Broom’s Max. 349.” Bouvier’s Maxims of Law, 1856,

• and any act by any government official to conceal the fraud becomes an act of fraud;

• “fraus est celare fraudem. It is a fraud to conceal a fraud. 1 Vern. 270.” Bouvier’s Maxims of Law 1856

• and fraud is inexcusable and unpardonable;

• “Fraus et dolus nemini patrocinari debent. Fraud and deceit should excuse no man. 3 Co. 78.” Bouvier’s Maxims of Law 1856
Satanists

• and any fraud amounts to injustice;


• “Quod alias bonum et justum est, si per vim vei fraudem petatur, malum et injustum efficitur. What is otherwise good and just, if sought by force or fraud, becomes bad and unjust. 3 Co. 78.” Bouvier’s Maxims of Law, 1856
Fraud = Lies = Satanism

• “Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar, and the father of it.” John 8:44

• “But the fearful, and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers [pharmaceutical drug pushers], and idolaters, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone: which is the second death.” Revelation 21:8
Satanists

- They send out their US citizen PIGs to assault you, and kidnap you and falsely imprison you as a revenue officer under the Federal Tax Lien Act of 1966
- Then they hold a show-trial in their kangaroo court that has a US citizen prosecutor, and a US citizen clerk masquerading as a Judge – Article 1 Military tribunal
- Then they make merchandise of you and sell you into slavery.
Habeas Corpus

• You can do it
• A “Best Friend” can do it
• Hand written is better if you are in their jail
• The arguments are in the first part of this presentation
• All you really need is 1 good point of law
Habeas Corpus

1. Show that you were denied due process
2. When you are denied due process, the court loses subject matter jurisdiction
3. When they lose jurisdiction, it becomes a void Judgment
4. If you are in their jail because of a void Judgment, the remedy is Habeas corpus
It is NON discretionary
Habeas Corpus

• A person affected by both a void or voidable order has the right – ex debito justitiae – to have the order set aside (which means that the Court does not have discretion to refuse to set aside the order or to go into the merits of the case) (Lord Greene in Craig v Kanssen [1943] KB 256).
Resources

• National Liberty Alliance has a Habeas Corpus Class
• www.nationallibertyalliance.org
NLA Weekly Newsletter #43
August 19, 2016

Calendar of Events

- **Monday night**, 9 PM EDT weekly NLA teleconference. Click "Weekly Call" on NLA website and click the Green phone or call 605-562-3140 and enter access code 385698#. All people filing a Habeas Corpus need to attend.
IN THE COUNTY CRIMINAL COURT NO. __
COUNTY OF TARRANT, STATE OF TEXAS

THE PEOPLE OF THE Republic of Texas, ON THE RELATION OF Black (Incarcerated)
Petitioner

vs.

Cause No: ______________

CHIEF OF POLICE ______________
CITY OF_____________
COUNTY OF TARRANT,
STATE OF TEXAS et al De Facto Respondent

PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS (NON-STATUTORY)

The Petition of the people of the Republic of Texas on the relation of Black, Petitioner, against the Respondent, CHIEF OF POLICE, CITY OF COUNTY OF TARRANT, STATE OF TEXAS, et al De facto, shows:

1. Petitioner is restrained of his liberty and unlawfully imprisoned by the Respondent in the KENNEDALE CITY JAIL, in the COUNTY OF TARRANT, STATE OF TEXAS, et al De facto.

2. Petitioner is unable to pay the fine or the bail imposed, nor does the Petitioner have friends or relatives who are able or willing to pay the imposed fine or post such EXCESSIVE BAIL bond. See Article 1 Sec.13 (Bill Of Rights) Constitution for the state of Texas Republic, also Article VIII (Bill Of Rights) Constitution for the united States of America Republic.

3. The cause of the restraint, according to the best knowledge and belief of Petitioner, is set forth as follows:

Petitioner’s restraint in the City Jail is by order of a MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE, who, if properly sitting, is so sitting under his own SWORN OATH TO SUPPORT, PROTECT, AND DEFEND THE CONSTITUTIONS OF THE Republic of Texas and the united States of America. Who is now imposing imprisonment on Petitioner for traffic infractions which are Color of law class C Misdemeanors that ARE NOT JAILABLE OFFENSES. AND WARRANTS THAT ARE NOT
IN THE COUNTY CRIMINAL COURT NO. ___
COUNTY OF TARRANT, STATE OF TEXAS

THE PEOPLE OF THE Republic of Texas, ON THE RELATION OF
  Black (Incarcerated)
  Petitioner

vs.

CHIEF OF POLICE
CITY OF,
COUNTY OF TARRANT,
STATE OF TEXAS et al De Facto
  Respondent

Cause No: __________

PETITION FOR WRIT
OF HABEAS CORPUS
(NON-STATUTORY)

The Petition of the people of the Republic of Texas on the relation of Black, Petitioner, against the Respondent, CHIEF OF POLICE, CITY OF COUNTY OF TARRANT, STATE OF TEXAS, et al De facto, shows:

1. Petitioner is restrained of his liberty and unlawfully imprisoned by the Respondent in the COUNTY OF TARRANT, CITY OF FORRESTER, STATE OF TEXAS.
The Petition of the people of the Republic of Texas on the relation of Black, Petitioner, against the Respondent, CHIEF OF POLICE, CITY OF COUNTY OF TARRANT, STATE OF TEXAS, et al De facto, shows:

1. Petitioner is restrained of his liberty and unlawfully imprisoned by the Respondent in the KENNEDEALE CITY JAIL, in the COUNTY OF TARRANT, STATE OF TEXAS. et al De facto.

2. Petitioner is unable to pay the fine or the bail imposed, nor does the Petitioner have friends or relatives who are able or willing to pay the imposed fine or post such EXCESSIVE BAIL bond. See Article 1 Sec.13 (Bill Of Rights) Constitution for the state of Texas Republic. also Article VIII (Bill Of Rights) Constitution for the united States of America Republic.

3. The cause of the restraint, according to the best knowledge and belief of Petitioner, is set forth as follows:

Petitioner’s restraint in the City Jail is by order of a MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE, who, if properly sitting, is so sitting under his own SWORN OATH TO SUPPORT, PROTECT, AND DEFEND THE CONSTITUTIONS OF THE Republic of Texas and the united States of America. Who is now imposing imprisonment on Petitioner for traffic infractions which are Color of law class C Misdemeanors that ARE NOT JAILABLE OFFENSES, AND WARRANTS THAT ARE NOT
LAWFUL FOURTH (4th) AMENDMENT WARRANTS. They are computer originated and are not SIGNED BY A JUDGE.

ATTORNEY GENERAL JIM MATTOX, in 1985 wrote in his opinion that it is unconstitutional to impose a cash bond on a person in a simple Misdemeanor case or on a simple traffic infraction. Petitioner's restraint is not because he has been adjudged guilty of the infraction charged but only because he was/is unable to pay the fine or post the bail.

4. Petitioner has been held in the_________ CITY JAIL well in excess of 24 hrs. and has not been brought before a magistrate or judge to determine the lawfulness of this incarceration.

5. Petitioner is being restrained of his liberty unlawfully in that Petitioner has not been afforded counsel prior to imprisonment, contrary to the Sixth (6' th) Amendment to the United States Constitution, binding on all the states via the Fourteenth (14' th) Amendment to the United States Constitution.

According to the United States Supreme Court in the case of Argersinger v. Hamlin, 407 U.S. 25, 92 S.Ct, 2006, 32 L.Ed. 2d 530, the court set forth the Argersinger Doctrine which states, at page 2014 to wit:

"Under the law we announce today, every judge will know when the trial of a misdemeanor starts that 'no imprisonment may be imposed, even if local law permits it, unless the accused is represented by counsel.'"

See also: Walker v. McLain, 768 F.2d 1181 (10'th Cir 1985), and Ridgeway v. Baker, 720 F.2d 1409 (5'th Cir. 1083).

6. The imprisonment is unlawful, because to hold a person in arrest of his/her liberty, simply because he/she does not have the resources to post bond on a traffic ticket, is illegal. The Equal Protection clause prohibits imprisonment where such imprisonment converts an inability to pay into a jail term.


7. The United States Constitution, at Article Five of the Bill of Rights, is a guarantee to each Citizen that he/she will not be deprived of his liberty without due process of law. Petitioner is a natural-born Citizen and inhabitant of the Republic state of Texas and is entitled to due process of law.

8. Petitioner is entitled to present and to represent his/her right afforded by due process
LAWFUL FOURTH (4th) AMENDMENT WARRANTS. They are computer originaterated and are not SIGNED BY A JUDGE.

ATTORNEY GENERAL JIM MATTOX, in 1985 wrote in his opinion that it is un-Constitutional to impose a cash bond on a person in a simple Misdemeanor case or on a simple traffic infraction. Petitioner’s restraint is not because he has been adjudged guilty of the infraction charged but only because he was/is unable to pay the fine or post the bail.

4. Petitioner has been held in the __________ CITY JAIL well in excess of 24 hrs. and has not been brought before a magistrate or judge to determine the lawfulness of this incarceration.

5. Petitioner is being restrained of his liberty unlawfully in that Petitioner has not been afforded counsel prior to imprisonment, contrary to the Sixth (6'th) Amendment to the United States Constitution, binding on all the states via the Fourteenth (14'th) Amendment to the United States Constitution.

According to the United States Supreme Court in the case of Argersinger v. Hamlin, 407 U.S. 25, 92 S.Ct, 2006, 32 L.Ed. 2d 530, the court set forth the Argersinger Doctrine which states, at page 2014 to wit:

"Under the law we announce today, every judge will know when the trial of a misdemeanor starts that 'no imprisonment may be imposed, even if local law permits it, unless the accused is represented by counsel.'"

See also: Walker v. Mclain, 768 F.2d 1181(10'th Cir 1985), and Ridgeway v. Baker.
According to the United States Supreme Court in the case of Argersinger v. Hamlin, 407 U.S. 25, 92 S.Ct, 2006, 32 L.Ed. 2d 530, the court set forth the Argersinger Doctrine which states, at page 2014 to wit:

“Under the law we announce today, every judge will know when the trial of a misdemeanor starts that "no imprisonment may be imposed," even if local law permits it, unless the accused is "represented by counsel."

See also: Walker v. Mcclain, 768 F.2d 1181(10th Cir 1985), and Ridgeway v. Baker, 720 F.2d 1409 (5th Cir. 1083).

6. The imprisonment is unlawful, because to hold a person in arrest of his/her liberty, simply because he/she does not have the resources to post bond on a traffic ticket, is illegal. The Equal Protection clause prohibits imprisonment where such imprisonment converts an inability to pay into a jail term.


7. The United States Constitution, at Article Five of the Bill of Rights, is a guarantee to each Citizen that he/she will not be deprived of his liberty without due process of law. Petitioner is a natural-born Citizen and inhabitant of the Republic state of Texas and is entitled to due process of law.

8. Petitioner is entitled to present and to represent his/her right afforded by due process
under the law. Moreover, it is the fundamental right of every Citizen to petition and redress government for grievances, and never to fear imprisonment for objecting to proceedings of government. In the instant case, Petitioner's desire to contest the traffic violation charge has been met with further punishment, in which he has been deprived of his prescription glasses and denied pencil and paper, thus disabling him from preparing his defense while imprisoned.

Petitioner should never be met by such arrogant abuse of executive and judicial authority for a minor traffic infraction. Imprisonment is clearly out of the question in such instances, and punishment amounts to a cruel and unusual punishment in violation of Petitioner's rights under the federal and state Constitutions.

9. The imprisonment is unlawful in that your Petitioner has stated and demonstrated to the County Criminal Court his ability, willingness, and duty to appear in court as required, and to answer the charges against him. A bail bond is typically and historically a guarantee against "the risk of flight." Petitioner is not a flight risk and should be released on his own recognizance. "Justice is not for sale" in the Republic state of Texas.

10. The U.S. Supreme Court ruled and upheld a lower court ruling that made a Virginia judge liable for attorney's fees and court costs for jailing a misdemeanor prisoner who could not post bail. The Virginia Supreme Court decision itself dealt with the issue of judicial immunity, not the question of whether the suspect should have been detained. Pulliam v. Allen. Also, in a 1971 Houston, Texas case the court established "a person cannot be ordered held in jail to work out a fine if his crime is not punishable by jail time." Tate v. Short, 1971 TX.

CONCLUSION

11. The imprisonment with the additional deprivations, coupled with the Petitioner's inability to pay the cost of the bond, are egregious violations of the law.

12. The punishments, especially taken together, constitute cruel and unusual punishment, to imprison a person at a time in which he is struggling to make ends meet, for inability to post a bond, is cruel and unusual punishment.

13. The legality of the imprisonment has not already been adjudged upon a prior proceeding.

14. The next court date has not been scheduled or docketed, and Petitioner has not been informed of a future court date.

15. The prisoner is not a threat or danger to the public or himself, and further incarceration would be regarded as a crime against the people of the Republic state of Texas, and a
under the law. Moreover, it is the fundamental right of every Citizen to petition and redress government for grievances, and never to fear imprisonment for objecting to proceedings of government. In the instant case, Petitioner's desire to contest the traffic violation charge has been met with further punishment, in which he has been deprived of his prescription glasses and denied pencil and paper, thus disabling him from preparing his defense while imprisoned.

Petitioner should never be met by such arrogant abuse of executive and judicial authority for a minor traffic infraction. Imprisonment is clearly out of the question in such instances, and punishment amounts to a cruel and unusual punishment, in violation of Petitioner's rights under the federal and state Constitutions.

9. The imprisonment is unlawful in that your Petitioner has stated and demonstrated to the County Criminal Court his ability, willingness, and duty to appear in court as required, and to answer the charges against him. A bail bond is typically and historically a guarantee against "the risk of flight". Petitioner is not a flight risk and should be released on his own recognizance. 'Justice is not for sale' in the Republic state of Texas.

10. The U.S. Supreme Court ruled and upheld a lower court ruling that made a Virginia judge liable for attorney's fees and court costs for jailing a misdemeanor prisoner who could not post bail. The Virginia Supreme Court decision itself dealt with the issue of judiciary immunity, not the question of whether the suspect should have been detained. Pulliam v. Allen. Also, in a 1971 Houston, Texas case the court established "a person cannot be ordered held in jail to work out a fine if his crime is not punishable by jail time." Tate v. Short, 1971 TX.
10. The U.S. Supreme Court ruled and upheld a lower court ruling that made a Virginia judge liable for attorney’s fees and court costs for jailing a misdemeanor prisoner who could not post bail. The Virginia Supreme Court decision itself dealt with the issue of judiciary immunity, not the question of whether the suspect should have been detained. Pulliam v. Allen. Also, in a 1971 Houston, Texas case the court established “a person cannot be ordered held in jail to work out a fine if his crime is not punishable by jail time.” Tate v. Short, 1971 TX.

CONCLUSION

11. The imprisonment with the additional deprivations, coupled with the Petitioner’s inability to pay the cost of the bond, are egregious violations of the law.

12. The punishments, especially taken together, constitute cruel and unusual punishment. To imprison a person at a time in which he is struggling to make ends meet, for inability to post a bond, is cruel and unusual punishment.

13. The legality of the imprisonment has not already been adjudged upon a prior proceeding.

14. The next court date has not been scheduled or docketed, and Petitioner has not been informed of a future court date.

15. The prisoner is not a threat or danger to the public or himself, and further incarceration would be regarded as a crime against the people of the Republic state of Texas, and a
dire threat to their freedom.

WHEREFORE, your Petitioner suggests that this Honorable Court grant the Writ of HABEAS Corpus, and that he be immediately discharged from this imprisonment. Respectfully submitted on behalf of the Petitioner this 14th day of July, 1996.

AFFIRMATION OF PETITION BY PETITIONER’S NEXT OF FRIEND

I, [Redacted] Black, paternal aunt, on behalf of the Petitioner, in and for the above and foregoing Petition For Writ of HABEAS CORPUS, because Petitioner is imprisoned in the KENNEDALE CITY JAIL by the Respondent, do hereby attest and affirm under the pains and penalty of perjury per 28 U.S.C. 1746, that the above and foregoing statements are true and correct as I verily believe, to the best of my ability.

[Redacted] Black, paternal aunt
as next of friend of the Petitioner

C/O [Redacted], Lancaster
Republic of Texas  TPZ 75146
IN THE COUNTY COURT OF ___________ COUNTY, ___________ COUNTY, STATE OF TEXAS.

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF TEXAS
ON THE RELATION

__________________________, Clan of Black
Petitioner

against

____________________________________

Chief of Police, City ___________
___________ County, Texas

Respondent

The State of Texas to the Chief of Police City of ___________ Texas:

WHEREAS, information by affidavit has been laid before the Honorable

______________________________________________, Judge of the Texas County Court, Tarrant County,
State of Texas, that you ______________________ the said Chief of Police, have illegally in your
custody the body of one ___________ Clan Of Black, pursuant to an order issued by a
judge of this Court on ___________.

This is therefore to command you, all excuse and delays set aside, to have the body
of the said ___________ Clan of Black before the Honorable

______________________________________________, by __ o’clock am on the __ th day of ___________ at
______________________________________________ in the ____________________________ Court, then
and there to do and receive what shall be ordered concerning the said ___________ Clan
of Black; to then and there have this Writ and make return of same. Hereof fail not under
penalties of the law.

WITNESS my hand and the Seal of this Court this __ day of ___________.

CLERK OF THE COUNTY COURT, ___________ COUNTY
IN THE COUNTY COURT OF _________ COUNTY,
___________ COUNTY, STATE OF TEXAS.

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF TEXAS
ON THE RELATION

________________ Clan of Black
Petitioner

against

________________
Chief of Police, City ___________
___________ County, Texas
Respondent

Cause No: ___________

RETURN OF WRIT OF
HABEAS CORPUS

Common Law

COMES NOW ____________ Chief of Police of City of ___________ County,
TEXAS, and for his return to the Writ of HABEAS Corpus issued herein, states: That
________________ Clan of Black was placed in the custody of the _______ Municipal Jail on the
of________________ by Magistrate ______________ Municipal Court Judge, and was jailed
on class C misdemeanor(s) being non-liable infractions Civil code and is being held for
on the person of _________ plus towing and storage charges placed on ___________, vehicle,
when arrested upon issuing Citations.

In obedience to the Writ of Habeas Corpus issued herein, I now produce the body of said
Clan of Black before the Judge of the __________________ Court, to
be dealt with according to law, together with the original of my authority for said imprisonment.

________________ Chief of Police, ____________ Texas

I, _______________________, being duly sworn upon oath, state that the set forth in
the above return are true.

Subscribed and sworn to me this ___ day of ________.
Signed ____________
Notary Public
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I do hereby certify that on the _____ day of ______ a true and correct copy of the foregoing Writ of Habeas Corpus was hand delivered the Chief of Police of_____.

County, and to the_______ County District Attorney, State of Texas.

CC

______________________________
Chief of Police

______________________________
Texas

______________________________
County District Attorney
County Court Building
Texas

DELIVERED BY ____________________________
Satanists

“By which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison;” 1 Peter 3:19

“And it shall come to pass in that day, that the LORD shall punish the host of the high ones that are on high, and the kings of the earth upon the earth. And they shall be gathered together, as prisoners are gathered in the pit, and shall be shut up in the prison, and after many days shall they be visited.” Isaiah 24: 21-22
Conclusion

"It behooves every man who values liberty of conscience for himself, to resist invasions of it in the case of others: or their case may, by change of circumstances, become his own” Thomas Jefferson
Conclusion

"If Ye love wealth better than liberty, the tranquility of servitude, better than the animating contest of freedom, go home from us in peace. We ask not your counsel or arms. Crouch down and lick the hands which feed you. May your chains set lightly upon you, and may our posterity forget that you were ever our countrymen." Samuel Adams, "the father of the American revolution", member of "The sons of Liberty (the group that did the Boston Tea Party)" Quoted from the debates of 1776
Conclusion

"When shall it be said in any country of the world, my poor are happy, neither ignorance or distress is to be found among them; my jails are empty of prisoners, my streets of beggars; the aged are not in want, the taxes not oppressive; the rational world is my friend because I am friend of its happiness. When these things can be said, then may that country boast of its constitution and government."

- Thomas Paine
The Watchman

• “But if the watchman see the sword come, and blow not the trumpet, and the people be not warned; if the sword come, and take any person from among them, he is taken away in his iniquity; but his blood will I require at the watchman's hand.” Ezekiel 33:6

• Either you are part of the problem, or you are part of the solution

• You are now a watchman!

• Circulate this video far and wide!!
Other Videos

- Bankster Thieves 1, 2, & 3
- Churchianity series
- Bankrupt Corporate (so-called) Governments
- BAR Members 1 & 2
- UNIDROIT
- Martial Law is here!
- Quasi Contracts and Roman Civil Law
- De Facto Courts
- All Courts are Ecclesiastical Courts
- DC Courts in Texas
- Jurisdiction
Summary

• Copies of these documents can be found at My private group at Yahoo called Administrating-Your-Public-Servants

• I have Youtube videos that are videos of Private Information Shares that show these and other court citations that are available for a donation

• Donations to support this work are appreciated. I prefer gold or silver coin, but as an extremely less desireable alternative I can accept IOUs (Federal Reserve Notes, Paypal gifts, checks, money orders, etc) send me an email for particulars
Summary

• If you find this useful, then you need to pay it forward
• If you don’t know what Pay it Forward means, then watch the movie
Contact Information

• My Blog is;
  • http://sovereigntyinternational.wordpress.com

• Website - www.sovereigntyinternational.fyi

• Email - engineerwin@yahoo.com

• Youtube profile - sovereignliving

• Facebook
  • Community Page - Sovereignty International
  • Private Group – Sovereignty International

• Yahoo Private Group – Administrating-Your-Public-Servants

• Google Private Group – Administrating-Your-Public-Servants