

## NOTICE-OF-CORPORATE-DENIAL-AND- NON-CORPORATE-STATUS

Let the Record Show:

With the knowledge of the fact that “Assumption” and “Presumption” may prevail unless rebutted, or explicitly denied, I: this Asseverant: do plainly state that Asseverant is in no way to be considered, termed as, or thought as, a person, legal entity, legal fiction, fictional character, or corporation of any form; with the knowledge that all such entities are not living, breathing, sentient men. Therefore, Asseverant hereby makes express and explicit claim and affirmation to the living, whose Creator is Asseverant’s Heavenly Father; and, express and explicit claim that Asseverant is not a “person” or any other form of corporation.

The word “person” is according to several references and 22 USC Sec. 1621: Definitions - For the purposes of this subchapter - (a) The term 'person' shall include an individual, partnership, corporation, or the Government of the United States.

**Point-001A.** The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Rule 52, applies in Civil and Criminal actions with equal force and effect because criminal is always civil in nature. No civil or criminal cause of action can arise lest there be a contract. See *Eads v. Marks*, 249 P. 2d 257, 260. There is always a presumption that a contract exists and that the responding party is a Corporation. Under Rule 52, which is the same in all states as in the Federal Rules, the Texas Court of appeals (5<sup>th</sup> Cir) has ruled of the finding of fact, by the Court, that “the failure of an adverse party to deny under oath the allegation that he is incorporated dispenses with the necessity of proof of the fact”. Thus, a presumption becomes a finding of fact by the court unless rebutted before trial.

**Point-001B.** *Dr. Pepper Co. v. Crow*, 621 S. W.2d 464, 465 (Tex App.-Waco 1981, no Writ) “Plaintiff plead defendant was a corporation. Defendant did not deny by verified pleading pursuant to Rules 52 and 93 Tennessee RCP ... that it was not a corporation; thus, such fact was established.

**Point-001C.** Louisiana Revised Statutes Art. 429 - Corporation existence is presumed unless affidavit of denial is filed before trial.

**Point-001D.** A presumption is a rule of Law, Statutory or judicial, by which the finding of a basic fact gives rise to the existence of presumed fact until presumption is rebutted. See *Van Wart v. Cook*, 557 P. 2d 1161. In the Commercial Law of all States, a presumption means that the trier (the Judge) of fact, must find the existence of the fact presumed per FRCP 52, unless and until the evidence is introduced which would support a finding of its non-existence. Arizona Revised Statutes: Title 47 Section 1201 (31) Presumption" or "presumed" means that the trier of fact must find the existence of the fact presumed unless and until evidence is introduced which would support a finding of its nonexistence. Thus, this Affidavit of Non-Corporate Status is for the purpose of rebutting any presumption that the Asseverant is the Corporation by whatever name or notation.

**Point-001E.** Federal Rules Evidence, R.301 Agreement by Acquiescence Rule 301 of the Federal Rules of Evidence states; “...a presumption imposes on the party against whom it is directed the burden of proof [see 556(d)] of going forward with evidence to rebut or meet the presumption.”



**Point-001F.** When the complaint is lodged by the Government for a fine, fee or a tax, all of which are revenue, they are imposed only on Corporations. See Colonial Pipe Line Co. v. Triangle, 421 US 100 (1975). This Asseverant rebuts any presumption presuming that Asseverant is a Corporation or General Partner to any Corporation.

**Point-001G.** Where an Asseverant is not a Corporation, he cannot appear and plead. See West Union Tel. Co. v Eyser, 2 Colo. 141; Greenwood v. Railroad Co., 123 Mass. 32; Foster v. white Cloud, 32 Mo. 505; Hobich v. Folger, 20 Wall. 1; Boyce v. M.E. Church, 43 Md. 359; Folsom v. Star Union Etc. Fright Line, 54 Iowa 490.

**Point-001H.** When a Person brought into Court by its Corporate name, its existence as a Corporation is admitted. See Mud Creek Drain Co. v State, 43 Ind. 157; Johnson v. Gibson, 73 Ind. 282; Ewing v. Robeson, 15 Ind. 26; Callender v. Railroad Co, 11 Ohio St. 516; Com. Ins. Etc. Co. v Taylor, 8 S.C. 107. Compare Ware v. St. Louis Bagging and Rope Co., 47 Ala. 667.

**Point-001I.** Stating conclusions, only, is insufficient. It has been held that where the representative of a railroad corporation is served with process, he may plead in abatement in his own name that the Corporation is extinct. See Kelly v. Railroad Co., 2 Flip C.C. 581; Callender v. Plainsville Co., 11 Ohio St. 516; Quarrier v. Peabody Co., 10 W. Va. 507; Evarts v. Killingworth Co., 20 Conn. 447; Stewart v. Dunn, 12 Mees. & W. 655; Stevenson v. Thorn, 13 Mees & W. 149. Where the person is so served with that he may, by plea, deny that he/she sustains any such relation to the Corporation that authorizes the service of process on him/her. See Kelly v. Railroad Co., 2 Flip C.C. 581. In 1886 the Supreme Court did not grant corporate-personhood to any State of the Union or Federal Government and that this doctrine derives from a mistaken interpretation of a Supreme Court reporter's notes. See Santa Clara County v Southern Pacific Railroad Company [118 U.S. 394 (1886)].

**Point-001J.** No laws have been passed by Congress granting that corporations, under the constitution, should be treated the same as members of the living, breathing Mankind. No court decisions, state or federal, held that corporations were "persons" instead of "artificial persons." In Santa Clara County v Southern Pacific Railroad Company [118 U.S. 394] (1886), The Supreme Court did not rule on the issue of corporate personhood. Railroad attorney Sanderson and his two colleagues watched as Chief Justice Morrison Remick Waite told Delmas, and his two colleagues the attorneys for the opposing party, that: "The court does not wish to hear argument on the question whether the provision in the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution, which forbids a state to deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws, applies to these corporations. We are of the opinion that it does. This written statement, that corporations were "persons" rather than "artificial persons", with an equal footing under the Bill of Rights as humans, was not a formal ruling of the court, but was reportedly a simple statement by its Chief Justice, recorded by the court recorder". See Vermont Supreme Court building. Volume 118 of United States Reports: Cases adjudged in the Supreme Court at October Term 1885 and October Terms 1886 published in New York in 1886 by Banks & Brothers Publishers, and written by J.C. Bancroft Davis, Supreme Court's Reporter.

**Point-001K.** Here is the often expressed understanding from the United States Supreme Court that "in common usage, statutes employing the terms person and corporation are ordinarily construed to exclude the Sovereign man or woman." Wilson v. Omaha Tribe, 442 U.S. 653, 667 (1979) (quoting





United States v. Cooper Corp., 312 U.S. 600, 604 (1941). See also United States v. Mine Workers, 330 U.S. 258, 275 (1947).

**ADDITIONAL-INFORMATION-TO-CLARIFY-MEANING-OF-"U.S. CITIZEN"**

The term "Citizen of the United States", as found in the Qualifications Clauses, is properly constructed to mean a Citizen of one of the States which are united by and under the U.S. Constitution.

This construction -- one of -- is reiterated in the following passage from Words and Phrases, to wit:

"Citizens of a state, within the removal act [18 Stat. 473, March 3, 1875] means citizens of one of the United States, and the suits contemplated are suits between citizens of one of the states of the Union on one side, and foreign states, or citizens or subjects on the other."

Roberts v. Pacific & A. Ry. & Navigation Co., 121 F. 785, 789, 58 C.C.A. 61. (9th Cir. 1903)

**Point-001K.** Here is the often expressed understanding from the United States Supreme Court that "in common usage, statutes employing the terms person and corporation are ordinarily construed to exclude the Sovereign man or woman."

Wilson v. Omaha Tribe, 442 U.S. 653, 667 (1979) (quoting United States v. Cooper Corp., 312 U.S. 600, 604 (1941). See also United States v. Mine Workers, 330 U.S. 258, 275 (1947).

**Point-001L.** US Supreme Court in Luther v Borden, 48 US1, 12 Led 581: "...The government are but trustees acting under derived authority and have no power to delegate what is not delegated to them. But the people, as the original fountain, might take away what they have delegated and in trust to whom they please. ... The sovereignty in every state resides in the people of the state and they may alter and change their form of government at their own pleasure." US Supreme Court in Wilson v Omaha India Tribe 442 US 653, 667 (1979): "In common usage, the term 'person' does not include the sovereign, and statutes employing the word are ordinarily construed to exclude it."

**Point-001M.** Asseverant is NOT a "United States Person", "United States Resident", "U.S. Citizen", "U.S. Individual", "U.S. Corporation" or "citizen subjected to its jurisdiction"; as such are "words of art" or "terms of art"; nor is Asseverant a corporation created under the laws of the United States or any state of the Union States, the District of Columbia, or any territory, commonwealth or possession of the United States or any terrestrial foreign state or country, public or private.

**Point-001N.** Asseverant is NOT a "resident of", "inhabitant of", a "franchisee of", "subject of", "ward of", "property of", "chattel of", or "subject to the jurisdiction of" this State of the Forum of any United States, corporate State, corporate County, or corporate City, or Municipal body politic created under the primary authority of Art. I, Sec. 8, Cl.17 and Art. IV, Sec. 3 Cl. 2 of the Constitution for the united States of America and thereby not subjected to any legislation created by or under the jurisdiction of any employees, officers, or agents deriving their authority thereof. Further, Asseverant is NOT a subject of the Administrative and Legislative Article I Courts nor bound by precedents of such courts created by the "United States", given "Legislation enacted by Congress applicable to the inferior courts in the exercise of the power under Article III of the Constitution cannot be affected by legislation enacted by Congress under Art. I, Sec. 8, Cl.17, of the Constitution, D.C. Code, Title 11 at p. 13 "an officer, agent, shareholder, franchise or fiduciary agent, surety, resident inhabitant or domiciled in any corporation."





**Point-001O.** Asseverant does rescind revoke and cancel all of every of each of Asseverant's signatures on any and all forms/instruments which may be construed as granting to the Federal Government, or any other agency or department of the United States Government created under the authority of Article I, Sec. 8, Cl. 17 and Article IV, Sec. 3, Cl. 2 of the Constitution for the United States, authority or jurisdiction over Asseverant. For on the grounds of constructive fraud, and non-disclosure of pertinent facts, Asseverant does also revoke, rescind and make void ab initio, all powers-of-attorney, conservatorships, guardianships, or receiverships whether in fact, by presumption, express or implied or otherwise, signed either by Asseverant or any Person or Individual, with or without Asseverant's consent, as such power-of-attorney may be presumed to pertain to Asseverant or Asseverant's Persons, by, but not limited to, as presumed by any and all quasi/colorable government entities or corporations.

**Point-001P.** Asseverant is NOT a vessel documented under Chapter 121 of Title 46, United States Code or a vessel numbered as provided in Chapter 123 of said Title.

**Point-001Q.** Asseverant does hereby cancel any presumed election made by the United States Government or any agency or department, thereof, presuming that Asseverant is, or ever has been, a citizen, alien citizen or resident of any territory, possession, instrumentality or enclave, under the sovereignty or exclusive jurisdiction of the United States, as defined in the Constitution for the United States of America in Art. I, Sec. 8 Cl. 17 and Art. IV, Sec. 3, Cl. 2.

**Point-001R.** Asseverant is neither an enemy nor enemy-ally against the: United States nor any corporation created under the either laws of the United States or any state of the Union States, the District of Columbia, territory, commonwealth or possession of the United States nor a foreign state or country, public or private.

**Point-001S.** Asseverant's name is a private possession of Asseverant, and is neither given nor granted to any other without fees assessed; nonetheless, Asseverant's Christian Appellation is; :John-Henry: of the House-of-Doe. styled Gary Forrest Edwards with location of temporal domicile being where the Living Man stands on the land in the land, and may be instantly NOTICED at non-domestic Carrier Route mail location "Cabbelier Drive East #1658 RR R031 San Tan Valley Arizona United States of America" foreign to the United States addressing the name particularly unique to Asseverant, and not affiliated with any "Corporate Body Politic" near the same location and is determined as complete, necessary and sufficient identification evidencing Asseverant's neutral standing.

**Point-001T.** These averments supported by Affidavit is NOT averred for the purpose of debating constitutionality or legality of the Communications Act of 1934; but rather, to raise the specter exposing the United States Government and government service units' lack of jurisdiction in these matters, for Asseverant is a neutral party and NOT a pirate nor affiliated with any enemy or enemy ally of either the United States or any public or private corporation whether domestic or foreign such that any past, present or future reference referencing Asseverant ex.rel. any agency or its officer(s) fiction is deemed "defamation of character" and/or false and misleading statements [15 USC 1692e, 78ff] which may expose offender[s] and all Libellee[s] to good faith immunity waiver with their volunteering to litigation and/or assessment in their jurisdiction under "Within the Admiralty" 28 USC 1333 or 1337, Bills of Lading Act, The Public Vessel Act, Foreign Sovereign Immunity Act, False Claims Act, Federal Arbitration Act, Declaratory Judgment Act given that any of the facts or



Laws presented herein are not contrary to the Communications Act of 1934 where all facts averred herein are to the best of Asseverant's research and belief; whereby, Asseverant has not seen any facts or evidence that any of these herein averred facts/averments have been determined to be "frivolous", when averred within their exact and proper context, as determined by a Court of competent jurisdiction. These averments are technical facts that, under Commercial Law, must be point-for-point expressly rebutted with respondents sworn first-hand personal knowledge via counter-affidavit with supporting facts and evidence in support thereof all sworn to be true correct complete and not misleading by misrepresentation of omission under respondents full unlimited commercial liability to avoid nihil decit tacit procurement acquiescence.

**Point-001U.** Any statements or claims averred herein must be properly rebutted by facts of law, or overriding Article III Supreme Court rulings, and shall not prejudice the lawful validity of other claims not properly rebutted or invalidated by facts of law. Therefore, an Affidavit of Truth, under Commercial Law, can only be satisfied: (i) through a rebuttal Affidavit of Truth, Point-for point, (ii) by payment, (iii) by agreement, (iv) by resolution by a jury under the rules of Common Law savings to suitors.

**Point-001V.** Further, Asseverant denies having, or ever having had, a "birthday"; but rather, Asseverant does have a "Nativity" upon the Soil of Alabama and the Republic thereof, and Asseverant does celebrate Asseverant's day of conception.

**Point-001W.** Asseverant expressly avers that Asseverant is an Adverse Party ex.rel. any presumption of Corporate existence, and Asseverant does deny any allegation that Asseverant is incorporated and the closing unrebutted averments underscored by Asseverant's wet-ink autograph and landmark imprints is Asseverant's express proof of the fact that Asseverant is the expression of the living God here on earth; as per: *"The failure of an adverse party to deny under oath the allegation that he is incorporated with the necessity of proof of the fact [it becomes part of the official record]."* Galleria Bank v. Southwest Properties, 498 Southwest 2<sup>nd</sup>

#### **USE-MISUSE-AND-ABUSE-OF-WORDS-TO-CHANGE-THE-MEANING.**

Webster's 1828 Dictionary says this under "BIRTH": BIRTH, n. berth.

"Birth", "berth" and "born" all come from the same root of "to bear". When you look up "berth" you find out that every definition has to do with ships. So our "berth-day" is the day we were given a place within the maritime/admiralty jurisdiction of the State.

*Webster's New World Dictionary of the English Language - Third College Edition*, copyright 1988, page 132,

berth *n.* ...4 a position, place, office, job, etc.

We perceive that this "berth" is the "office of person" aboard the SHIP OF STATE.

A Living-Soul has a date-of-Nativity with life beginnings at the moment of conception; while, on the other hand, a Corporation Sole has a date of Birth/Berth. There are only two birthday-parties in the Scripture, and in both cases a man lost his head. At Pharaoh's birthday-party in Genesis, the baker was hung; and, at Herod's birthday-party in the Gospels, John the Baptist was beheaded. So how did a "Christian" culture end up celebrating "Berth"-days as is customary? Somebody had a plan, and that



plan involved embedding a number (the number of the beast) into our consciousness at a very early age as possible, the third “birthday” was mentioned in the Holy Writ; note that the 666 talents of gold mentioned below did NOT include all that was brought by merchant means.

1 Kings 10:14 and 2 Chronicles 9:13, “*Now the weight of gold that came to Solomon in one year was six hundred threescore and six talents of gold;*”

Wherefore, I do inform the nice policeman, mobile revenue enforcement agents, peace officers, the bureaucrat, the “de facto” court system, and all other parties that may make inquiry, “I, as I Am, have no birthday,” even backing that with, “No man can be compelled to incriminate himself.”

### **MEMORANDUM-OF-LAW-AND-POINTS-OF-AUTHORITY-IN-SUPPORT-OF-NON-CORPORATE-STATUS-AVERMENTS**

1. The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Rule 52, applies in Civil and Criminal actions with equal force and effect because criminal is always civil in nature. No civil or criminal cause of action can arise lest there be a contract. See *Eads v. Marks*, 249 P. 2d 257, 260. There is always a presumption that a contract exists and that the responding party is a Corporation. Under Rule 52, which is the same in all states as in the Federal Rules, the Texas Court of appeals (5<sup>th</sup> Cir) has ruled on the finding of fact, by the Court, that “the failure of an adverse party to deny under oath the allegation that he is incorporated dispenses with the necessity of proof of the fact”. Thus, a presumption becomes a finding of fact by the court unless rebutted before trial.
2. *Dr. Pepper Co. v. Crow*, 621 S. W.2d 464, 465 (Tex App.-Waco 1981, no Writ) “Plaintiff plead defendant was a corporation. Defendant did not deny by verified pleading pursuant to [TRCP] 52 and 83 ... that it was not a corporation; thus, such fact was established.”
3. Louisiana Revised Statutes Art. 429  
Corporation existence presumed unless affidavit of denial filed before trial.
4. A presumption is a rule of Law, Statutory or judicial, by which the finding of a basic fact gives rise to the existence of presumed fact until presumption is rebutted. See *Van Wart v. Cook*, 557 P. 2d 1161. In the Commercial Law of all States, a presumption means that the trier of fact, must find the existence of the fact presumed per FRCP 52, unless and until the evidence is introduced which would support a finding of its non-existence. Arizona Revised Statutes: Title 47 Section 1201 (31) “Presumption” or “presumed” means that the trier of fact must find the existence of the fact presumed unless and until evidence is introduced which would support a finding of its nonexistence. Thus, these averments averring Asseverant’s Non-Corporate Status is averred for the special purpose of rebutting any presumption that Asseverant in name is a Corporation, without regard to how any idem sonans name is styled or annotated in any complaint or form.
5. Federal Rules Evidence, R.301 Agreement by Acquiescence Rule 301 of the Federal Rules of Evidence states: “... a presumption imposes on the party against whom it is directed the burden of proof [see 556(d) ] of going forward with evidence to rebut or meet the presumption.”
6. When the complaint is lodged by the Government for a fine, fee or a tax, all of which are revenue, they are imposed only on Corporations. See *Colonial Pipeline Co. v. Traigle*, 421 US 100 (1975). Thus, this instant complaint, for the collection of some form of tax, must have been lodged against





a Corporation whose name is similar to my name. This Respondent must rebut the presumption that this Respondent is the Corporation named in the alleged complaint.

7. If Respondent is not a Corporation he cannot appear and plead. See *West Union Tel. Co. v Eyser*, 2 Colo. 141; *Greenwood v. Railroad Co.*, 123 Mass. 32; *Foster v. White Cloud*, 32 Mo. 505; *Hobich v. Folger*, 20 Wall. 1; *Boyce v. M.E. Church*, 43 Md. 359; *Folsom v. Star Union Etc. Freight Line*, 54 Iowa 490.
8. When a party brought into Court by its Corporate name, its existence as a Corporation is admitted. See *Mud Creek Drain Co. v State*, 43 Ind. 157; *Johnson v. Gibson*, 73 Ind. 282; *Ewing v. Robeson*, 15 Ind. 26; *Callender v. Painesville & Hudson Railroad*, 11 Ohio St. 516 (1860). Compare *Ware v. St. Louis Bagging and Rope Co.*, 47 Ala. 667.
9. Stating not facts, but conclusions only, is insufficient. It has been held that where the representative of a railroad corporation is served with process, he may plead in abatement in his own name that the Corporation is extinct. See *Kelly v. Railroad Co.*, 2 Flip C.C. 581; *Callender v. Plainsville Co.*, 11 Ohio St. 516; *Quarrier v. Peabody Co.*, 10 W. Va. 507; *Evarts v. Killingworth Co.*, 20 Conn. 447; *Stewart v. Dunn*, 12 Mees. & W. 655; *Stevenson v. Thorn*, 13 Mees & W. 149. Where the person is so served with that, he may, by plea, deny that he/she sustains any such relation to the Corporation that authorizes the service of process on him/her. See *Kelly v. Railroad Co.*, 2 Flip C.C. 581. In 1886 the Supreme Court did not grant corporate-personhood to any State of the Union or Federal Government and that this doctrine derives from a mistaken interpretation of a Supreme Court reporter's notes. See *Santa Clara County v Southern Pacific R. Co.* [118 U.S. 394 (1886)].
10. No laws were passed by Congress granting that corporations should be treated the same under the constitution as living, breathing human beings, and none have been passed since then.

No court decisions, state or federal, hold that corporations were "persons" instead of "artificial persons." The Supreme Court did not rule in *Santa Clara County v Southern Pacific Railroad Company* [118 U.S. 394] (1886). (In this case, or in any other case, on the issue of corporate personhood.) As railroad attorney Sanderson and his two colleagues watched, Chief Justice Morrison Remick Waite told Delmas, and his two colleagues, the attorneys for the opposing party that: "The court does not wish to hear argument on the question whether the provision in the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution, which forbids a state to deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws, applies to these corporations. We are of the opinion that it does. This written statement, that corporations were "persons", rather than "artificial persons", with an equal footing under the Bill of Rights as humans, was not a formal ruling of the court, but was reportedly a simple statement by its Chief Justice recorded by the court recorder. See *Vermont Supreme Court Volume 118 of United States Reports: Cases adjudged in the Supreme Court at October Term 1885 and October Term 1886* published in New York in 1886 by Banks & Brothers Publishers, and written by J.C. Bancroft Davis, the Supreme Court's Reporter.

11. Here is the often expressed understanding from the United States Supreme Court that "in common usage, the term Sovereign, in statutes employing the terms person and corporation are ordinarily construed to exclude the Sovereign man or woman." *Wilson v. Omaha Tribe*, 442 U.S. 653, 667



(1979) (quoting *United States v. Cooper Corp.*, 312 U.S. 600, 604 (1941). See also *United States v. Mine Workers*, 330 U.S. 258, 275 (1947).

12. US Supreme Court in *Luther v Borden*, 48 US1, 12 Led 581:

“...The government are but trustees acting under derived authority and have no power to delegate what is not delegated to them. But the people, as the original fountain, might take away what they have delegated and entrust to whom they please. ... The sovereign in every state resides in the people of the state and they may alter and change their form of government at their own pleasure.”

US Supreme Court in *Wilson v Omaha Indian Tribe* 442 US 653, 667 (1979):  
“In common usage, the term ‘person’ does not include the sovereign, and statutes employing the word are ordinary construed to exclude it.”

13. Rebuttable presumptions are, in effect, inferences that in the absence of any controverting evidence, the jury is required to make and in civil cases to accept as established facts.

[89. *People v Wong Sang Lung*, 3 CA 221, 84 P 843.]

14. BLACK’S LAW DICTIONARY, 6<sup>th</sup> Ed. (1990), p. 1267.

Rebuttable presumption: In the law of evidence, a presumption which may be rebutted by evidence is otherwise called a “disputable” presumption. A species of legal presumption which holds good until evidence contrary to it is introduced. *Beck v. Kansas City Public Service Co.*, Mo. App., 48 S.W. 2d 213, 215. It shifts burden of proof. *Heiner v. Donnan*, 285 U.S. 312, 52 S. Ct. 358, 362, 76 L.Ed. 772. It gives particular effect to certain group of facts in absence of further evidence, and presumption provides a prima facie “based on the first impression; accepted as correct until proved otherwise” case which shifts to defendant the burden to go forward with evidence to contradict or rebut fact presumed.

*Gulle v. Boggs*, Fla., 174 So.2d 26, 28.

15. BLACK’S LAW DICTIONARY, 6<sup>th</sup> Ed. (1990), p. 1185

Presumption: An inference in favor of a particular fact. A presumption is a rule of law, statutory or judicial, by which finding of a basic fact gives rise to existing of presumed fact, until presumption is rebutted. *Van Wart v. Cook*, Okl. App., 557 P2d 1161, 1163. A legal device which operates in the absence of other proof to require that certain inference be drawn from the available evidence.

*Port Terminal & Warehousing Co. v John S. James Co.* D.C. GA. 92 F.R.D. 100, 106.

16. UCC § 1-206. Presumptions. Whenever the Uniform Commercial Code creates a "presumption" with respect to a fact, or provides that a fact is "presumed," the trier of fact must find the existence of the fact unless and until evidence is introduced that supports a finding of its nonexistence.

17. <https://www.virtualunderwriter.com/en/underwriting-manuals/2005-11/UM00000251.html>

13.00.2 Presumption Of Identity

Presumption is an assumption of fact that the law requires to be made from another fact or group of facts found or otherwise established in the action. A presumption is not evidence. A presumption is either a conclusive-presumption or rebuttable. Any presumption of corporate existence is rebutted



and denied for its prejudicial impairing my constitutionally-protected liberty or property interests and have been held to violate due process and equal protection rights;

### CAVEAT

Any use of the term “law” by an actor acting as “government” directed at I, if not clarified with qualifier “private” or “public” clarifying the term “law” shall constitute:

1. A criminal attempt and conspiracy to recruit I to be a public officer styled a “person”, “taxpayer”, “citizen”, “resident”, “constituent”, etc;
2. A solicitation for illegal bribes styled “taxes” through a constructive fraud pretext to justify the actors’ engaging I as if I were a public officer for the actor’s profit;
3. A criminal conspiracy to convert Private rights into Public privilege as pretext to violate the protections in the bill of rights;

All rights and property shall be conclusively presumed to be exclusively private, beyond the control of a government or Civil statutory franchise codes unless and until that agent acting for a government meets the burden of proving, with sworn verified facts and evidence on the record of any proceeding evidencing that:

1. A specific private owner consented in writing to convert said property to public property;
2. The said private owner is either abroad, domiciled on, or at least present in federal territory, NOT protected by the Constitution, where the said agent has legal capacity to lawfully alienate Constitutionally protected rights or relieve a public servant of the fiduciary obligation to respect and protect my rights; for, those physically present but not necessarily domiciled in a constitutional but not statutory state, protected by the constitution, cannot lawfully alienate those rights to a real, de jure government, even with their consent;
3. If agents acting for a government refuse to meet the above burden of proof, it shall be conclusively presumed to be operating in a private corporate capacity on an equal footing with every other private corporation and which is therefore not protected by official, judicial, or sovereign or qualified immunity;

All punctuation herein is for emphasis whether in conformity with styles manuals or not, all time is now time, with all on a level plane; for I am with the divine right through divine intervention to determine words and their meaning in now-time; and where required, will clarify for conveying my intent as I determine my intents as best serves His divinely ordained purpose He purposes for His live-life that lives in I.



i:am I:as I-AM: in Esse: one body-soul-spirit: one divinely ordained tres faciunt collegium called by Christian name Gary Forrest, one in the ancestral-lineage in the Patriarchal house Edwards, styled Gary Forrest Edwards: one created in the image of Jehovah God ordaining that I be one who does sojourn in this temporal realm; and,

I do asseverate that I am not nor have I ever been a Corporation, Fiction of Law, Fictitious Entity, Corporate Persona, Non-Entity, Legal Entity or a Surety for any CIVILITER-MORTUUS creation of the STATE; and,

I further Asseverate that I Am that hath created, ordains this live-life living Man of male-gender is with grant of dominion grant over the earth and ordained by Divine intervention I do His will as He reveals Himself to be; and,

By the Grace of The Supreme Jehovah God, He ordained my American Sovereign birthright nationality upon the soil of Alabama with its Republic in administration by the STATE OF ALABAMA; and,

I, Gary Forrest Edwards the living Man reserve all rights, remedies and defenses waiving none; and,

I, Gary Forrest Edwards the living Man waive all benefits without God; and,

I, Gary Forrest Edwards the living Man I bring the land; and,

I reserve the right to alter, amend, or abolish any part or parcel or portion of this presentment as I deem fit, or necessary, to so alter and amend or abolish without prejudicing any other part or parcel or portion of this presentment; and,

Alabama state  
Shelby County } a.s  
United States of America

Statement in the style of an Affidavit  
in support of averments precedent

I, Gary Forrest Edwards have not seen any facts or evidence that the above enumerated presentments precedent supported herewith, are not true correct complete without misrepresentation or omission; and I believe none exist; and,



TRES-FACIUNT-COLLEGIUM

Likeness of:  
Gary Forrest Edwards  
Status: Private American  
National  
Nationality: Alabamian  
Domicile: an Estate within the Kingdom of Jehovah God  
Height: 17.50 hands  
Weight: 13.5 stone  
Eyes: Hazel Hair: Brown  
DOC: > Dec, A.D. 1958  
DON: 22 July, A.D. 1959  
Expiry: 9 November 2059  
Locale: NAC 5PG NH5CG

Communication portal:  
Gary Forrest Edwards.  
c/o Lord Master Executor & Steward.  
  
Big Oak Drive, # 158.  
Alabaster, Alabama.





**:Notice:** Using a notary on this instrument does not constitute any adhesion, nor does it alter my status in any manner. The notary is for the purpose of providing verification and identification only but is not a party to this claim and not for entrance into any foreign jurisdiction or benefit thereof.

By:   
Edwards, Gary Forrest

Subscribed and affirmed before me this 12th day November, 2024, by  
Edwards, Gary Forrest.

  
Notary Public



Living Landmarks			
Right Thumb Seal		Right Toe Standing	
			
Left Index	Right Index		
