

NOTICE TO ALL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS, SUPERVISORS AND COMMANDERS

I am an **unarmed, non-combatant** and I travel by means of a private conveyance, personal automobile or a personal motorcycle, all of which, being my personal property and private/personal means of conveyance, to get myself and guests **peacefully and peaceably**, from place to place, in the pursuit of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. My level of competency and proficiency to do said things, is that I've been doing them since the age of majority, **peacefully and peaceably**.

I do this on public roads and highways that are literally defined in and by State, Foreign State and Federal Statutes, Codes and Case Law as being; " **Every way, lane, road, street, boulevard, and every way or place in the united States of America and elsewhere, open as a matter of right to public vehicular travel both inside and outside the limits of incorporated cities and towns;**".

Dear Police Officer, Code Enforcement Officer, Government Agent, Sheriff, Law Enforcement Officer, or Peace Officer, please, read and comprehend fully this Notice before you presume 'Jurisdiction' and attempt to Engage this Common Law Private Sovereign into Statutory Law, i.e.: Public Policy Enforcement/Revenue Generation.

Please be informed that this '**Sovereign Private Traveler**' is **NOT** engaged in **ANY COMMERCIAL Activity** where **MOTOR VEHICLE** Licensing is mandatory. This '**Sovereign Private Traveler**' is a "**Free-Born and Natural (Wo)Man**", "riding a motor bike" or "traveling for pleasure in an Automobile", and this "Conveyance" form of "Locomotion" is **his/her "Private Property" for private use only**. This '**Sovereign Private Traveler**' is **NOT "DRIVING OR OPERATING a Public Property 'MOTOR VEHICLE'** and therefore **NOT Engaged in the 'Activity of Commerce'**, and thereby **NOT** Liable under the "**MOTOR VEHICLE STATUTORY LAW**" or subject to your Jurisdiction.

If a '**Public Official**' 'assumes Jurisdiction' and insists in his/her pursuit in engaging a "**Sovereign Private Traveler**' without a "**Viable Sworn Claim of Liability**", i.e.: '**Affidavit**' or a '**Warrant**', he/she is "trespassing" and is therefore no longer 'immune to prosecution' and will be '**held personally accountable**' in his/her '**Private Capacity**' for acting outside of his/her '**Official Capacity**' and will thereby be 'charged' with a 'Hostile Act of Official Aggression' in an **Article 3 Court**.

The '**Sovereign Private Traveler**' honorably and passively, presenting this knowledge to you in "good faith", is doing so in an attempt to **protect you from yourself**.

I have a great deal of respect for the '**Public Service**' you are committed to, and fully comprehend how difficult it is to seek out and prosecute criminals. However, this Notice is presented at a 'traffic stop', **and therefore is now a mandatory part of the Official Record of any ensuing action, and MUST be introduced as prima facie Discovery Evidence in said action.**

It will be noted that willful suppression of 'Evidence' is a 'Felony'. Any cause of action will result in a lawsuit under USC Title 18, Title 28, and Title 42, 1983.

This "**NOTICE**" has been submitted upon **DEMAND** of a '**Driver's License, 'Registration, 'Proof of Insurance, ' or ANY other State issued Privilege, Permit or License.**

I am of sound mind and body and reserve all of my unalienable Rights and Liberties. I do not waive **ANY** of my Rights, **EVER**. I do not recognise you. I do not understand your offer. I do not consent & waive all benefits/privileges, and I will not contract with you.

I am not a **'person,' a 'federal US 'citizen,' a 'passenger,' a 'corporation,' or a 'taxpayer.'** I do not **'drive' commercially**. My private conveyance, truck, automobile, motorcycle or bicycle, are my private possessions. The fact the conveyance, truck or automobile I'm traveling in, is not recorded on your States register, exempts STATE jurisdiction. Just as you may choose to not answer my question(s), I am not compelled under law to reply to you either. Officer, I cannot and will not provide you with any information that may later be used against me in a civil or criminal proceeding. This includes producing documents that may or may not be in my possession.

As a **'Private Sovereign traveler, reserving and invoking his/her unalienable Rights** this **Sovereign traveler**, has **Constitutional protections**.

The most important **Constitutional protection** being the **Fifth Amendment Right: "To Remain Silent"** (Miranda Warning). MIRANDA v. ARIZONA, 86 S.CT. 1602, 384 U.S. 436 (1966).

Do not take offense or be insulted because I choose to Remain Silent and NOT be **compelled** to co-operate with **your 'verbal interrogation'**.

"The Fifth Amendment provides that no person shall be **compelled** in any criminal case to be a witness against himself in a criminal prosecution but also privileges him not to answer **Official** questions put to him in any other proceeding, **civil** or **criminal**, formal or informal, where the answers might incriminate him in future **criminal proceedings**." LEFKOWITZ v. TURLEY, 94 S. CT. 316, 414 U.S. 70 (1973).

"The privilege is not ordinarily dependent upon the nature of the proceeding in which the testimony is sought or is to be used. It applies alike to civil and criminal proceedings, wherever this might tend to subject to criminal responsibility on him who gives it. The privilege protects a mere witness as fully as it does one who is a party defendant." MC CARTHY v. ARNDSTEIN, 266 U.S. 34, 40, 45 S.CT. 16, 17, 69 L.ED. 158 (1924).

"...where the Fifth Amendment privilege against self-incrimination is involved...the court has always construed its protection to ensure that an individual is not compelled to produce evidence which later may be used against him as an accused in a criminal action. ... The protection does not merely encompass evidence which may lead to criminal conviction, but includes information which would furnish a link in the chain of evidence that could lead to prosecution, as well as evidence which an individual reasonably believes could be used against him in a criminal prosecution." HOFFMAN v. UNITED STATES, 341 U.S. 479, 486, 71 S.CT. 814, 95 L.Ed. 1, 18 (1951).

"in KASTIGAR v. UNITED STATES, 406 U.S. 441, 92 S. CT. 1653, 32 L.Ed. 212 (1972), we recently reaffirmed the principle that the privilege against self incrimination can be asserted in any proceeding, civil or criminal, administrative or judicial, investigatory or adjudicatory. Id., at 444, 92 S.Ct. AT 1656; LEFKOWITZ v. TURLEY, 414 U.S. 70, 94 S.CT. 316, 322, 38 L.Ed. 274 (1973).

"WE have recently noted that the privilege against self-incrimination - -the essential mainstay of our adversary system -- is founded in a complex of values. ... To maintain a fair state individual balance, to require the government to shoulder the entire load... to protect the inviolability of the human.

personality, our accusatory system of criminal justice demands that the government seeking to punish an individual produce the evidence against him by its own independent labors, rather than by the cruel, simple expedient of compelling it from his own mouth.... In sum, the privilege is fulfilled only when the person is guaranteed the right to remain silent unless he chooses to speak in the unfettered exercise of his own will."

"...there can be no doubt that the Fifth Amendment privilege is available outside of criminal court proceedings and serves to protect persons in all settings in which their freedom of action is curtailed in any significant way from being compelled to incriminate themselves." MIRANDA v. ARIZONA, 86 S.CT. 1602, 384 U.S. 436 (1966).

Please also NOTE: the above, as stated by the Supreme Court, are rights and privileges as guaranteed by the Constitution, and anyone (including judges) who knowingly violates those rights may be **civilly** and **criminally** liable under several federal statutes. Please see: United States Code, Title 18 Section 241 (**Conspiracy against Rights**), and Section 242 (**Deprivation of Rights under color of Law**); Title 42 Section 1983, 1985, 1986 (Civil Rights).

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 imprisonment. Damages awarded. Trezevant v. City of Tampa, 741 F.2d 336 (11th Cir. 1984)

Motorist illegally held for 23 minutes in a traffic charge was awarded \$25,000 in damages. The above case sets the foundation for ~\$65,217 dollars per hour, or ~\$1,800,000 (1.8 M) dollars per day. Hence my warning about protecting you from yourself, However, If you want to make me rich - detain me for as long as you like.

Due to this **Sovereign travelers** past naivety with Statutory Law, this **Traveler** has since learned that one cannot listen oneself into trouble. This **Traveler** now realizes it is a **Public Official's** Intent to lure one into a Verbal, then Written, **CONTRACT**.

Therefore, this **Traveler must** inform/remind **you** of the reservation and invocation of **his/her unalienable Rights** and not help you to coerce him/her into some **Statute** of which **he/she** is **NOT** Liable.

This **Traveler** does not willfully choose to Consent to your "**Offer to Contract**" nor to be '**compelled**' to Incriminate **themselves** by answering **ANY** questions and, thereby, entering into **ANY** sort of Verbal Agreement.

Unless you have a Warrant for this **Sovereign Travelers** Arrest, i.e.: a '**Valid Sworn Claim of Liability**', or have seen this **Sovereign Traveler** Commit a **Felony**, you have **NO Probable Cause** to detain **him/her** as **he/she** has the "**Right to Free and Unencumbered Travel**".

If you are **Arresting** this **Sovereign Traveler** Without A **Warrant**, you must **IMMEDIATELY** take him/her before a Judicial Officer of competent jurisdiction to **Demand a Bill of Particulars** to determine whether the Arrest was **lawful** or if there was '**Probable Cause**' for the Arrest, or **you** will be held **personally liable and accountable** for **False Arrest (Kidnapping)** and Sued in your **Official Capacity**. (see above ref to Trezevant v. City of Tampa, 741 F.2d 336 (11th Cir. 1984) The **arrest** shall not be based upon hearsay unless supported by a **Warrant** accompanied by a Bona-Fide **Affidavit**. Said '**Warrant**' and '**Affidavit**' must be based upon first-hand knowledge of the **Affiant** who has a claim against **him/her**, charging **him/her** with a **Felony** or other infamous **crime**. This **Sovereign Traveler** must be allowed the right to face **his/her accuser**.

If you deny this **Sovereign Traveler** that right, it will be a violation of the Sixth Amendment, and if you act unreasonably in your investigation or use excessive force, it will be a violation of the Fourth Amendment. This '**Constitutional Rightful Demand**' must be met prior to booking. If you do not comply with this '**Rightful Demand**', **You may be Sued**.

Hale v. Henkel -the united States supreme Court when speaking on the "Law of the Land," The opinion of the court stated:

"The individual may stand open upon his/her constitutional rights. S/he is entitled to carry on his/her business in his/her own way. His/Her power to contract is unlimited. He/She owes no duty to the state or to his/her neighbors, to divulge his/her business, or to open his/her doors to investigation, so far as it may tend to incriminate him/her. He/She owes no duty to the state since he/she receives nothing therefrom, beyond the protection of his/her life and property."

Thank you for your valuable time and consideration in this instant matter. I value your assistance and respect your obligations.