

INALIENABLE RIGHTS

INALIENABLE (Blacks 4th) Not subject to alienation (separation); the characteristic of those things which cannot be bought or sold or transferred from one person to another, such as rivers and public highways, and certain personal rights; e. g., liberty. Inalienable; incapable of being aliened, that is, sold and transferred.

RIGHT (Blacks 4th) "Rights" are defined generally as "powers of free action." And the primal rights pertaining to men are undoubtedly enjoyed by human beings purely as such, being grounded in personality, and existing antecedently to their recognition by positive law. FREE. Not subject to legal constraint of another. Unconstrained; having power to follow the dictates of his own will. Not subject to the dominion of another. Not compelled to involuntary servitude. Used in this sense as opposed to "slave."

BILL OF RIGHTS 5 ESSENTIAL POWERS REQUIRED TO CONTROL YOUR DESTINY

20 ESSENTIAL UNALIENABLE RIGHTS IF TAUGHT TO OUR CHILDREN AND EXERCISED WOULD RESULTS IN DOMESTIC TRANQUILITY AND CONTROL OF INDIVIDUAL AND NATIONAL DESTINY:

Religion	}	Spiritual power of destiny	-	-	-	-	-	<u>Amendment I</u>
Speech								"
Press								"
Assemble	}	Political power of destiny	-	-	-	-	-	"
Redress of grievances								"
Militia	}	Self-Defence power of destiny	-	-	-	-	-	<u>Amendment II</u>
Bear Arms								"
Be secure	}	Self-governing power of destiny	-	-	-	-	-	<u>Amendment III</u>
Grand Jury								<u>Amendment IV</u>
To not answer	}	Judicial power of destiny	-	-	-	-	-	<u>Amendment V</u>
Due process								"
Speedy & public trial								<u>Amendment VI</u>
Impartial jury	}	Judicial power of destiny	-	-	-	-	-	"
Confront witnesses								"
Assistance of Counsel	}	Judicial power of destiny	-	-	-	-	-	"
Trial by jury								<u>Amendment VII</u>
Common law								"
Excessive bail & fines	}	Judicial power of destiny	-	-	-	-	-	<u>Amendment VIII</u>
Cruel punishments								"

Any legislative regulation on Peoples' behavior is the beginning of the loss of sovereignty. People may participate in any behavior they wish as long as it causes no moral or physical harm to others, including immoral behavior in private by themselves or with other consenting adult(s).

RIGHT TO EXERCISE RIGHTS

Sherar v. Cullen, "There can be no sanction or penalty imposed upon one because of his exercise of constitutional rights¹."

Simmons v. United States, "The claim and exercise of a Constitution right cannot be converted into a crime"... "a denial of them would be a denial of due process of law²".

RIGHTS INDIRECTLY DENIED

Gomillion v. Lightfoot, "Constitutional 'rights' would be of little value if they could be indirectly denied³."

RIGHTS ARE NOT A CRIME

Miller v. U.S., The claim and exercise of a constitution right cannot be converted into a crime⁴.

Simmons vs. U.S.. We find it intolerable that one constitutional right should have to be surrendered in order to assert another⁵.

Miranda v. Arizona, "Where rights secured by the Constitution are involved, there can be no rule making or legislation which would abrogate them⁶".

Stuck v. Medical Examiners, "Once challenged, jurisdiction cannot be 'assumed', it must be proved to exist⁷."

RIGHT TO PRACTICE LAW

The American Bar Association (ABA), founded August 21, 1878, is a voluntary association of lawyers, and was incorporated in 1909 in the state of Illinois. The state does not accredit the law schools or hold examinations and has no control or jurisdiction over the ABA or its members. The ABA accredits all the law schools, holds their private examinations, selects the students they will accept in their organization, and issues them so-called license for a fee; but does not issue state licenses to lawyers.

The Bar is the only authority that can punish or disbar a Lawyer not the state. The ABA also selects the lawyers that they consider qualified for Judgeships and various other offices in the State. Under fiction of law only the Bar Association or their designated committees can remove any of these lawyers from public office. This is a tremendous amount of power for a private

¹ Sherar v. Cullen, 481 F. 2d 946 (1973)

² Simmons v. United States, 390 U.S. 377 (1968)

³ Gomillion v. Lightfoot, 364 U.S. 155 (1966), cited also in Smith v. Allwright, 321 U.S. 649.644

⁴ Miller v. U.S. 230 F 486 at 489

⁵ Simmons vs. U.S. 390, U.S. 389(1968)

⁶ Miranda v. Arizona, 384 U.S. 436, 491

⁷ Stuck v. Medical Examiners, 94 Ca2d 751.211 P2s 389

union to control and because of this unchecked power RICO run rampant throughout our government at every level, and We the People intend on extinguishing it.

The United States Constitution does not give anyone the right to a lawyer or the right to counsel, or the right to any other "hearsay substitute". The 6th Amendment is very specific, that the accused only has the right to the "assistance of counsel" and this assistance of counsel can be anyone the accused chooses without limitations.

Meyer v. Nebraska, *"The term [liberty] ... denotes not merely freedom from bodily restraint but also the right of the individual to contract, to engage in any of the common occupations of life, to acquire useful knowledge, to marry, to establish a home and bring up children, to worship God according to the dictates of this own conscience... The established doctrine is that this liberty may not be interfered with, under the guise of protecting public interest, by legislative action⁸."*

Schware v. Board of Examiners, *"The practice of law cannot be licensed by any State⁹."* ...

Schware v. Board of Bar Examiners, *"a State cannot exclude a person from the practice of law or from any other occupation in a manner or for reasons that contravene the Due Process Clause¹⁰."* ...

Sims v. Aherns, *"The practice of law is an occupation of common right¹¹."* ...

Sherar v. Cullen, *Therefore "there can be no sanction or penalty imposed upon one because of his exercise of Constitutional Rights¹²."*

Brotherhood of Trainmen v. Virginia State Bar, *"Litigants can be assisted by unlicensed laymen during judicial proceedings¹³..."*

NAACP v. Button, *"Members of groups who are competent non-lawyers can assist other members of the group achieve the goals of the group in court without being charged with "unauthorized practice of law¹⁴."* ...

Federal Rules of Civil Procedures, Rule 17, *"A next friend is a person who represents someone who is unable to tend to his or her own interest¹⁵."*

⁸ Meyer v. Nebraska, 262 U.S. 390, 399, 400

⁹ Schware v. Board of Examiners, United State Reports 353 U.S. pages 238, 239

¹⁰ Schware v. Board of Bar Examiners, 353 U.S. 232 (1957)

¹¹ Sims v. Aherns, 271 SW 720 (1925)

¹² Sherar v. Cullen, 481 F. 2d 946 (1973)

¹³ Brotherhood of Trainmen v. Virginia ex rel. Virginia State Bar, 377 U.S. 1; v. Wainwright, 372 U.S. 335; Argersinger v. Hamlin, Sheriff 407 U.S. 425

¹⁴ NAACP v. Button, 371 U.S. 415; United Mineworkers of America v. Gibbs, 383 U.S. 715; and Johnson v. Avery, 89 S. Ct. 747 (1969)

¹⁵ Federal Rules of Civil Procedures, Rule 17, 28 USCA "Next Friend

RIGHT TO PROCEED WITHOUT COST

Crandell v. Nevada, “natural man or woman is entitled to relief for free access to its judicial tribunals and public offices in every State in the Union¹⁶.”

Hale v. Henkel, Plaintiff should not be charged fees, or costs for the lawful and constitutional right to petition this court in this matter in which he is entitled to relief, as it appears that the filing fee rule was originally implemented for fictitious and subjects of the State and should not be applied to the Plaintiff who is a natural individual and entitled to relief¹⁷.

RIGHT TO TRAVEL

Thompson v Smith, *"The right of the citizen to travel upon the public highways and to transport his property thereon, either by carriage or by automobile, is not a mere privilege which a city may prohibit or permit at will, but a common right which he has under the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."*¹⁸

Schactman v Dulles, *"Undoubtedly the right of locomotion, the right to remove from one place to another according to inclination, is an attribute of personal liberty, and the right, ordinarily, of free transit from or through the territory of any State is a right secured by the 14th Amendment and by other provisions of the Constitution"*¹⁹.

State v. Johnson, "A citizen has the right to travel upon the public highways and to transport his property thereon"²⁰.

Kent v. Dulles, *"The right to travel is part of the Liberty of which the citizen cannot be deprived without due process of law under the Fifth Amendment"*²¹.

Edwards v. California, *"Where activities or enjoyment, natural and often necessary to the well being of an American citizen, such as travel, are involved, we will construe narrowly all delegated powers that curtail or dilute them... to repeat, we deal here with a constitutional right of the citizen"*²²

Chicago Motor Coach v Chicago, *"Even the legislature has no power to deny to a citizen the right to travel upon the highway and transport his property in the ordinary course of his business or pleasure, though this right may be regulated in accordance with the public interest and convenience "Regulated" here means stop lights, signs, etc. NOT a privilege that requires permission or unconstitutional taxation; i.e. - licensing, mandatory insurance, vehicle registration, etc., requiring financial consideration, which are more illegal taxes"*²³.

¹⁶ Crandell v. Nevada, 6 Wall 35

¹⁷ Hale v. Henkel; 201 U.S. 43

¹⁸ Thompson v Smith, 154 SE 579

¹⁹ Schactman v Dulles, 96 App D.C. 287, 293

²⁰ State v. Johnson, 245 P 1073

²¹ Kent v. Dulles 357 U.S. 116, 125. Reaffirmed in Zemel v. Rusk 33 US 1

²² Edwards v. California 314 US 160 (1941)

²³ Chicago Motor Coach v Chicago, 169 NE 22

Volunteer Medical Clinic, Inc. V. Operation Rescue, "Right to travel is constitutionally protected against private as well as public encroachment²⁴."

Blacks 2nd, "License: In the law of contracts, is a permission, accorded by a competent authority, conferring the right to do some act which without such authorization would be illegal, or would be a trespass or tort."

Trezevant v. City of Tampa, "Where an individual is detained, without a warrant and without having committed a crime (traffic infractions are not crimes), the detention is a false arrest and false imprisonment²⁵."

RIGHT OF PRIVACY

Boyd vs. U.S., Right of privacy²⁶.

Marchetti vs. United States, The Constitutional privilege was intended to shield the guilty and imprudent, as well as the innocent and foresighted²⁷.

Marchetti v. United States, "The government's anxiety to obtain information known to a private individual does not without more render that information public; if it did, no room would remain for the application of the constitutional privilege. Nor does it stamp information with a public character that the government has formalized its demands in the attire of a statue; if this alone were sufficient, the constitution's privilege could be [sic] entirely be abrogated by any act of Congress²⁸."

RIGHT TO BE LET ALONE

Holloman v. Life Ins. Co. of Virginia, The right to be let alone, the right of a person to be free from unwarranted publicity²⁹.

The right of an individual (or corporation) to withhold himself and his property from public scrutiny, if he so chooses. It is said to exist only so far as its assertion is consistent with law or public policy, and in a proper case equity will interfere, if there is no remedy at law, to prevent an injury threatened by the invasion of, or infringement upon, this right from motives of curiosity, gain, or malice. *Federal Trade Commission v. American Tobacco Co.*, 44 S.Ct. 336, 264 U.S. 298, 68 L.Ed. 696, 32 A.L.R. 786.

Olmstead v. U.S., "The right to be let alone - the most comprehensive of rights and the right most valued by civilized men. To protect that right, every unjustifiable intrusion by the

²⁴ *Volunteer Medical Clinic, Inc. V. Operation Rescue*, 948 F2d 218; *International Org. Of Masters, Etc. V. Andrews*, 831, F2d 843; *Zobel v. Williams*, 457 US 55, 102 Sct. 2309

²⁵ *Trezevant v. City of Tampa*, 241 F2d. 336 (11th CIR 1984)

²⁶ *Boyd vs. U.S.* 116, U.S. 616, 630, 29 LED 746, CT 524,1886

²⁷ *Marchetti vs. United States*, 390U.S. 39 at page 51

²⁸ *Marchetti v. United States* Page 57, 390 U.S. 39

²⁹ *Holloman v. Life Ins. Co. of Virginia*, 192 S.C. 454, 7 S.E.2d 169, 171, 127 A.L.R. 110.

government upon the privacy of the individual, whatever the means employed, must be deemed a violation of the Fourth Amendment³⁰.”

Katz v. U.S., Recording by police of conversation in public telephone booth was a violation of the Fourth Amendment, because the speaker had a reasonable expectation of privacy in the booth³¹.

RIGHT TO DEFEND

Runyan v. State, “When a person, being without fault, is in a place where he has a right to be, is violently assaulted, he may, without retreating, repel by force, and if, in the reasonable exercise of his right of self-defense, his assailant is killed, he is justified³².”

³⁰ *Olmstead v. U.S.*, 277 U.S. 438, 478 (1928)

³¹ *Katz v. U.S.*, 389 U.S. 347, 350 (1967).

³² *Runyan v. State*, 57 Ind. 80; *Miller v. State*, 74 Ind. 1