State of Arizona

COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 14-054

Judge:

Complainant:

No. 103501068914893A

No. 103501068914893B

ORDER

The complainant alleged two superior court judges have violated and continue to violate his constitutional rights.

The responsibility of the Commission on Judicial Conduct is to impartially determine if the judges engaged in conduct that violated the provisions of Article 6.1 of the Arizona Constitution or the Code of Judicial Conduct and, if so, to take appropriate disciplinary action. The purpose and authority of the commission is limited to this mission.

After review, the commission found no evidence of ethical misconduct and concluded that the judges did not violate the Code in this case. The commission does not have jurisdiction to review the legal sufficiency of court rulings. Accordingly, the complaint is dismissed in its entirety, pursuant to Rules 16(a) and 23.

Dated: March 26, 2014.

FOR THE COMMISSION

/s/ George A. Riemer

George A. Riemer Executive Director

Copies of this order were mailed to the complainant and the judges on March 26, 2014.

This order may not be used as a basis for disqualification of a judge.

	8014 054
REF	COVER LETTER
	COMPLAINT
Date	:
From	
	, Arizona
70	Conduct Office
	1501 W. WASHINGTON St., Ste 229 Phoenix, Prizona 85007
-	

2014 054 · 10517 STATE OF ARIZONA (Legal Fiction) Vs. (Fact)) This complaints is being filed in requerds to the unlawful conviction on . This Complaint is also made in regards to the rulings made by Judges. æ on , , , On even refused to tell me the Jurisdiction of the Court in accordance with the 6th Amendment. Any matter brought in this Complaint is a matter for Public Records. On this day of , I family as Commonly Called do hereby give you this Complaint due to the mistaken identy, Assault, & Harrassment to participate in a fraud, Black Mail, Threats Distress & Coerison. I also give you Notice of Understanding Intent and Claim of Right. Judge has repeatedly devied my Constitutional Rights to Challenge Jurisdiction, Notice of Request for elevitication of Court Summon's and Non-Acceptance of Offered Services. This took place on . ON my proper status was taken away and to this date the STATE of ARIZONA has repeatedly harrassed me by trying to

2 of 12 Force me to accept the Services of an Attorney to place me as a ward of the court in relation to the attorney Attorney & Client Belationship) to place as person of uncound mind, so I may not file motions that Claim Common Law Jusisdiction, Challenge the Validity of the Statutes they claim against me, IN which THE PRIZONA COURT has no prudential license to decline to consider whether the statute under which the allodged defendent has been charged lacks constitutional application to my conduct See Eisenstadt V. Daird 405 U.S. 438, 452-455, 92 S. Ch. 1029, 31 1.Ed 2d 319 (1972). An individual has a direct interest in objecting to laws that upset the constitutional balance between National Concoursest and the states when the enforcement of these have causes injury that is concrete particular, and redressable, and fidelity to principles of federalism is ast for the states along to vindicate - But the People : Const. Amend. 10. And by the Troth Amendment Article III's case-or-contraverses requirement, my incorrection constitutes a concrete in yory, conserd by the STATE of ARIZONAS invalidation of statute application and incorrecting my phasical setter without consent. I also requested that the STATE of ARIZONA Give me "Proof of the Claims" they have against me and that they prove that I am the Logal Fiction of that they have an their charging instrument. At every bearing the services of an Altorney has been dewird. Judge A have continueously violated my Constitutional rights at every proceeding. Not only an I in custody in violation with the Constitution, Lows & Treaties of THE UNITED STATES of AMERICA 5th 6th 8th 9th 10th 11th & 19th Ancodments, but "SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES" warrants

C 12	
3 0 + 12	
-	
	the Immediate Attention and exercise of this Courts discretionary power
	These circumstances include the Cruel and Unusual Punishment to my phy
	being on by the order of Judge action
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	under the Color of Law, who ordered 'By Any Means Necessary the t
- <u> </u>	ing of my Biographical Property, My Finger Print to place on the chan
	instrument of a Legal Fictional CORPORATION, which would promote a Fre
<u></u>	Because I are a real live human being and in No way Fictional. The STI
	of ARIZONA by which and act under the color of low
	Maritime Law / Contract Law (Low of the Sea) use said finger prints a
	documents as an other from the STATE of ARIZONA or LOUNTY of
	et. al, establishes a mark of concent to contract for services & bear
	This is in direct violation of Common Low and the DAITER STATES CO
<u> </u>	
···	TITUTION without consent. After reaching an empass by the subsequen
····	order to obtain my fingerprint by Judge to that Deputy Sherrifs
	present again, by Any Means. Thus opening the " descrecitionary
·	Now to even Excessive Force of the deputies. Seeing the officers ing
	ressively approaching, I dearly and passively stated and and in the
	record in a Complaint fashion, "I am Lying down on the ground, in
	NON-combatative position. I do not wish to hurt anyone, but I ret
	to sive up MY fingerprint to Consent to establish my soft as a Legal t
	ion, Which is my Constitutional Right to refuce to participate in Anything
	fraudulent as adhering to the fistion of the separate existence of the con
	would sametion a fraud and promote injust
·····	Also as a Sovereign American Citizen I have the right to not delegate
	SovercigN Power to the STATE of ARIZONA. It should be noted that I was
	already handcuffed in the front and both my lege had ankle restraints.

1 oF IT The first officer repidly approached me and stearnly said, Give me your hands ... Then without hesitatian, aggressively tried to pull my arms and hands From worder me as I fay in a prove defenseless position on the ground. Suddowla a second officer grabbed my fast and against its wormal cange et motion, Twisted my foot back and forth repeatedly past it's Natural degree, causing extreme pain; I yelled in aganizing pain that he was training my leg. In myid succession a 3rd Officer using a pleathera of his body weight impacted his knee directly into the lower pertied at my spine, which I felt a Pap that made my eyes well up to the point of crying out in agonizing pain as well as tears, A the Officer immedially thereafter, began to apply pressure print techniques to my neck, Trapezious and shoulder areas squeezing with enough fore to bruise, again making me cry out again and again in front of Constroom Officers and Personell (State) with a front row in proximity view Now the first officer started to take my hands that were pulled out from under one and used pressure point to face my hands to open the violently dug his twent so hard that it broke the skin an my hand. I then standed to any out again as the and officer maliciously dropped his tare into my back again. I started to case due to the extreme amount of pain that I was id and the at Officer using an exorborrent amount of every stanned my face into the concrete floor which busted my lip and pushed back one of my teeth. I yelled not and cursed some more and the oth Officer started to chake me cutting off my sir. I sersamed out, "He's chaking me, I can't breath ." Upon which he immediately let go of my neck and threat. The 1st affirer maticed one finger an my left band that wascart completly closed all the way and that is because it had

5 of 12	
	dislocated prior in a fall. He then took this single digit
	they forcefully took My FingerPrint and placed it an a charging docume
	of a Legal Fiction. When I stood up I said that I wanted all those
	officers weres. told as that, "Attorney (would)
	give them to me an afficer of the court as a Private
	Bar Guild Member, just stood by and watched, and by her inaction to
·	defend, prevent or object to what was taken place she thus gave her
	demant i should have objected to this kind of to atment for her supposedly position of representation of a client, who
	claims Comman Law Jurisdiction, who declined Services offered by THE
	STATE of ARIZONA'S COURT. as a persod who is supp
	esedly knowledgable in Low, should have known that I had a right as a
	Sovereign American Lifizen to not participate in something fradulent, and
·	that is being identified without consent as a legal fiction for the purp
	of business. She should have protected my constitutional sovereign citize rights instead of trespassed against them.
	Breause of inaction, due to her conflict of intrest in
······	that he first duty is to the mount or Judge , prevented her
	From any actions on my behalf, cure to the point of standing by
	while I was being assaulted with no objection to what was taking
	place. For this reason alone should not have been allowed to assessment as ly The
	allowed to represent me by Judge
	Officers of the state who is acting in violation at rights protected

6 of 12 by the Constitution or lows or Treaties of the UNITED STATES claim protection of the Amendment, in as much as in so acting they lose their offical and representive capacity. - See Osborn V. BK U.S., 9 wheat. 738, 858-859, 868 (182+) Therefore Judges should be requarded as acting in their individual repacity in failing to act according to law. My 5th Amendment Rights were violated by repeatedly by usage of threats Distress, Correion & Blackmail to Force me to accept the Service of Ajudication by the CORPORATION of ARIZONA STATE SUPERIOR COURT under Contract Low is. Maritime Low, the Low gaverving contracts, which is the law of the Sea, & Those of us who know the truth, Know that Common Low is the Only have on the Land Even in the Constitution it states that: "Due Process is a Guarcutee that a man should be tried and convicted only in accordance with the Valid Lows of the LAND " My 9th Amendment Rights were violated by when they trespessed an my lights as a Sucreign American Citizen to claim Commod Law Judisdiction, To request clarification of Court Summers & work-Acceptance of affered services the insered states is a loundry under the Protection of Common Law Jurisdiction, and as a Sourceign American Citional I have the right to consent or deng Any Services offered by Any CORPORATON as established in Number 69th of my Claim of Right which was reviewed and accepted by THE STATE of ARIZONA without objection which which stands as Truth in Commercauce. Judge Officers

7 of 12. of the Court all tried to Force myself to accept their Services by taking away my Pro-Per Status, which would disable my ability to challenge their Jurisdiction or the Validity of the A.R.S. Statutes being applied by a Court De'facto, by the 10th Amendment. Under the 9th Amendment I retained my Sovereign Rights WITHOUT PREJUDICE, bot the STATE of ARIZONA under the representation of have construed to drawy them. And once again waive their immunities by acting in violation of my Rights protected by the Constitution or Lows or Treatics, in so acting they lase their offical & Represe-Ntive copacity. (See Osborn V. B'X) My 10th Amendment Rights were violated by 16 150 taying to exforce on myself have that are beyond the Power of Congress of the STATES. (See Nigro V. United States, 276 U.S. 332, 341, AB 5. Lt. 388, 72 L.Ed. 600 (1982). They are in violation of the Treatice of the UNITED STATES by trying to take control of Powers of the Sovereign American Peoples that have not been delegated to them by the Constitution which are retained by myself. The Amendment states, "but a Truism that bill is retained which has not bred successdered. So the STATE of ARIZON, Nor its representives may not exercise powers not Granted, but they are limited in scope unless granted by self which is declined. (See United States V. Sprague, 282 U.S. 716, 733 (1931). My 11th Amendment rights were violated by , by the denying my Common for Jurisdiction claim which established myself as a Sovereign State under the protection of the Treaties of the United

Q of 12	
	States as stated in Article TIL Sec. I of the Constitution that; "The Judicial power shall extend to all cases, in law and equity, arising
	under this Constitution, the law of the UNITED STATES, and Treatics Ma or, which shall be made, under their authority; to all cases of "Admiral
	and Maritime Jurisdiction; to controversies to which the UNITED STATES shall be a party; to controversies two or more states; between a STATE and Citiz- ens of another STATE; between citizens of the same STATE claiming land
	under grants of different stores, and between a state, or the citizen Hereat, and forcign states, citizens or subjects". Also Artical TT Sec.
	T states that, all treaties made as which shall be made by the UNITED STATES, shall be the SUPREME LAW of the LAND; and the judges in curr State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Canstitution of laws of Any
1997 - 1997 -	STATE to the contrary Not with standing.
	This being stated Judges acting under the color of law should know the difference between Common Law, the Oaly Law on
	the LAND, which the UNITED STATES SUPREME COURTS claim to uphold, & Maritime Law i.e. the Law of the Sea, which is the Law governing con- tracts which require consent. Under the 11th Amendment, The Immunity of
	a source dural Entity, is a privilege which it may waive at pleasure by
	(1883) as distinguished from appearing in a similar suit to defend its
	officals, and general low consenting to suit in the federal or State Courts Such consent must be clear and specific and consent to suit in its own courts does not imply a waiver of immunity to suit in the

Gof 17 Gof 17 Federal courts. As a Surresign State with immunities under the 11th Unrendenced T may chose or out close to unive these Rights and the STATE of RAIZONA court inter includenced states to unive these Rights and the STATE of RAIZONA court inter includenced states that " No STATE, (Including RAIDON Shell make or cubarce any law which shell abridge the Privaledges or Imm unities of Surresign descreas of the North abridge the Privaledges or Imm unities of Surresign descreas of the North abridge the Privaledges or Imm unities of Surresign descreas of the North abridge the Privaledges or Imm unities of Surresign descreas of the North approxed without Due Prevess of the valid Laws of the LAND; our devy to any presed within its yurisdiction the valid Laws of the LAND; our devy to any presed within its yurisdiction the cycle protection of the LAND; our devy to any presed within its yourisdiction the cycle protection of the Laws. A Subsecting American Concerns states Source igaty secures to citizens the liberty of end derive from the diffusion of Surresign Rower, (New York V. Wold States, Soe V. S. 144, 181, 10 C. C. 248 120 (1972) and relained respectively to the Proph. Federalism also protests the liberty of all presents within a STATE by evalues that laws extend in caccess of delegated gaucement complete durisdiction or control their actions. By demping any our gaucement complete durisdiction our all concerner of public life, federalism frateets the liberty of the civ- of rete State of Anzone, When state gaucement acte in excess of its lower of rete State of Retires that Extends on evaluate acte in excess of its lower of the limitations that Extends on evaluate acte in excess of its lower of the limitations that Extends on evaluate acte in the constance of state forms that liberty is at state. See Sand the state a matter of state formation of the the States. See Sand the safe when the states lower of the limitations that Extends on evalues and the safe in the safe of the constan	Federal courts. As a Survey State with immunities under the 11th Unrendment I may chose or out chose to while these Rights and the STATE of ARIZONA COURT INC. connect force me to do so. In Point of free the 11th Annuland states that; "No STATE, (Including PRODU Shall make or cufarce any law which shall abridge the Privaledges or Imm unities of Survey, describent Citizens of the United STATE, con shall day STATE, display describent Citizens of the United STATE, unitable unities of Survey, describent Citizens of the United STATE, unitable He valid hours of the LAND; was devy to any presend within its yorisdictie the valid hours of the LAND; was devy to any presend within its yorisdictie the valid hours of the LAND; was devy to any presend within its yorisdictie the coul pretection of the laws. I Sourceign Anticeal Conness States Source igarty secures to citizens the liberties that devive from the diffusion of Surreign Rower, (New York W. United States, Sos V. S. 114, 181, 112 S. 61 218 120 (1992) and retained respectivity to the Propte. Federalism also protects the liberty of all presens within a STATE by counting that laws emarked in causes of delegated governmental powers counted direc or control their actiones. By demying and, and government complete durisdicties divided from Reserve of public life, federalism Protects the liberty of the laws during the that in- divide from Reserve of public life, federalism forteets the liberty of the law for and concernes of public life, federalism forteets the liberty of the life of the secess of its and the state of an excess of the state. See hand to the secess of its lawful powers, that liberty is at take. See hand to the secess of its	Federal courts. As a Surveyed State with immunities under the 11th Inmudiment I may chose or not chose to unive these Rights and the STATE of RAIZONA COURT LOLE. connot force me to do so. In Point of fact the 11th Annualment states that; " No STATE, (Including PARDAM ideal make or enforce any law which shall abording the Privaledges or Iran Unities of Surveying Anerican Citizens of the United STATES; nor shall day STATE depice any present of life, likerity or property, without De Process. He will be any present of life, likerity or property, without De Process. He will be any present of life, likerity or property, without De Process. He will be any present of life, likerity or property, without De Process. He will be any present of the Laws. A Sourceign Ancient Concess States Source ignity secures to citizents the liberties that derive from the diffusion of Surreign Power, Univ Yack W. United States, Sos V. S. 144, 181, 112 S. 12 201 120 (1972) and relained respectively to the Reapte. Federalism also protects the liberty of all gavenmental powers counsed direct or control their actions. By demying any one gavenment complete durisdiction and concernes of public life, federalism Protects de liberty of the courts first laws exacted in creases of delegated gavenmental powers counsed direct or control their actions. By demying any one gavenment complete durisdiction and concernes of public life, federalism Protects de liberty of the in- divident from Arbitracy Power, such as these hild by the courts of THE STATE of Parzone, When MATE gavenment out in excess of its lawful powers, that likering is at state. See hand M. Ms., 181, 51, 51, 51, 52, 52, 52, 52, 52, 52, 52, 52, 52, 52		
Federal courts. As a Sourceign State with immunities under the 11th Annodement T muy chose or not chose to unive these Rights and the STATE OF ARIZONA COURT INC. connect force me to do so. The Point of foot the 11th Annodement states that; "No STATE, (Including PARDON Shell make or colores any low which chall abording the Prival-days or Imme Notites of Sourceign American Citizens of the Unived States; our shell days STATE displus any person of life, likerly or property, without Doe Provess of the valid four of the LAND; wer deay to any person within the yorisdiction the valid fours of the LAND; wer deay to any person within the yorisdiction the court of the LAND; we down force that derive from the diffusion of Sourceign Power, (New York V. Noited States, 505 V.S. 144, 181, 112 Sect 248 120 (1932) and retained respectivity to the Proph. Federalism also protects the liberty of all persons within a STATE by coursed direc or control their actions. By demining for the families that the forget. Federalism also protects the liberty of all persons within a STATE by counting that laws counced in courses of delegated gaugenement complete limitedictic ouse all conceases of public life, federalism fractes the liberty of the in- divide form Rebitracy Power, such as these that deleters the difference of the in- divide forme Rebitracy Power, such as these the success of its lawful powers, that liberty is at stake. See found the success of its lawful powers, that liberty is at stake. See found the success of its lawful powers, that liberty is at stake. See found the success of its lawful powers, that liberty is at stake. See found the success of its lawful powers, that liberty is at stake. See found therefore a matter	Federal courts. As a Surveying State with immunities under the 11th idential accents. As a Surveying State with immunities under the 11th idential accent I may chose or out close to unive these Rights and the STATE of RAIZONA COURT INC. consol force we to do so. To Book of Soil the 12th Amendment states that; "I do STATE, (Including BROOK State or cuforce any low which chall aberidge the Prival-days or Imme voities of Surveying devices (itering or property, without Des Process o the void tomes of the LAND; our deay to any property, without Des Process o the void tomes of the LAND; our deay to any proper within the yorisdictio The regul protection of the LAND; our deay to any property without Des Process o the void tomes of the LAND; our deay to any property states source ignity secures to efficients. Its Sourceign American Cohenes States Source ignity secures to efficients that decive from the diffusion of Surreign Rower, (New York V. United States, Sos V. S. 101, 101, 500 and [20 (1972) and retained respectivity to the Reapte. Federalism also protects the likering of all presses within a STATE by evants that and remarked in cacess of deceased governments complete durisdictie or control this actions. By dempty and our government complete durisdictie of THE State of BRIZONE. When these shall by the court for a state of the likering of the in- dividual from Arbitrary Rower, such as these hild by the court of the in- dividual from Arbitrary Rower, such as these hild by the court of the low full powers, that likering is at stake. See board 4. U.S., 121 Sect. 2335 (2019) The limitationes that Faderalism counties and the sole isted of 1965 belowing only to the States. See board 4. U.S., 121 Sect. 2408. An individual has a direct interest in objecting to low the of the constitutional that Exates. See board 4. U.S., 121 Sect. 2408. An individual has a direct interest in objecting to low the of the constitutional has a direct interest in objecting to low the upset the constitutional balance b	Federal courts. As a Surveyed State with immunities under the 11th Amendment I may chose or not chose to unive these Rights and the STATE of RAIZONA <u>course</u> into counce force me to do so. In Point of fact the 11th Amendment states that; " No STATE, (Including PARDAN Shell make or enforce any law which shell abording the Privaledges or Ioner writies of Surveyed American Citizens of the United STATES; nor shall day STATE display any person of life, likerity or property, without De Process. He will do and person of life, likerity or property, without De Process. He will do and of the Later of the Later of the United States; nor shall day state display any person of life, likerity or property, without De Process. He will do and of the Later of the Source of the desire of the diffusion of Surreign Protection of the Later of Source of the desire from the diffusion of Surreign Rower, Unit Yaway to the Reagh. Federal secures to citizens the liberties that desire from the diffusion of Surreign Rower, United respectively to the Reagh. Federalism also protects the liberty of all persons within a STATE by curves that laws exacted in creases of delegated governmental powers counsed direct or control their actions. By denying any one government complete durisdiction and concernes of public life, federalism Protects de liberty of the in exacted live account direct or control their actions. By denying any one government complete durisdiction and concernes of public life, federalism Protects de liberty of the in divident from Arbitracy Power, such as these hild by the <u>courses</u> of the live of the formed as the court of the state second of the state second of the state second of the state second of the second of the state second of the state second of the second of the state second of the state second the second of the second of the second of the state second the second of the second of the state second of the second of the second of the second of the state second the second of the second of the second of t		
Federal courts. As a Sourceign State with immunities under the 11th Arradoment T may chose or not chose to unive these Rights and the STATE OF ARIZONA COURT INC. connect force me to do so. The Point of food the 11th download states that; "No STATE, (Including ARIZON Shell make or cufarce any low which chall abording the Prival-days or Iome Houties of Sourceign directions of the Unived States; our shell day STATE deprive any presen of life, likely or property, without Doe Process of the valid found of the LAND; and deny to any present within the yorisdiction the valid found of the LAND; and deny to any present within the yorisdiction the court of the LAND; and deny to any presen within the yorisdiction the court of the LAND; and deny to any presen within the yorisdiction the court of the LAND; and deny to any present within the yorisdiction the court of the LAND; and deny to any present within the yorisdiction the court of the LAND; and deny to any present within the yorisdiction the court of the LAND; and the derive from the diffusion of Sourceign Bower, (Maw York V. Waited States, 505 V.S. 144, 181, 112 S. et 248 120 (1932) and retained respectivity to the Proph. Federalism also protects the likering of all presens within a STATE by courses that laws courted in causes of all presens within a STATE by course divide form Repiters. By denying any our gourcument complete durisdictie ource all conceases of public life, federalism frateets the likering of the in- divide forme Repitering laws, such as these hold by the court of THE STATE of BARZONE. When state gourcoment actes in excess of its lawful powers, that libering is at stake. See hand the V.S., 151 S. et , 2355 (2010). The limitations that Federalism evails are not therefore a matter	Federal courts. As a Surveying State with immunities under the 11th idential accents. As a Surveying State with immunities under the 11th idential accent I may chose or out close to unive these Rights and the STATE of RAIZONA COURT INC. consol force we to do so. The David of Bod the 12th Amendment states that; "I do STATE, (Including DATON State or cuforce any low which chall aberidge the Privaledges or Imme voities of Surveying devices (itizeus of the Unived STATES; our shall day state depoint any presson of the Unived states; out shall day state depoint any presson of the Unived states; out shall day state depoint any presson of the Unived states; out shall day state depoint any presson of the Unived states; out without Due Provess of the valid times of the LAND; our day to any presson within the yorisdictio the equal protection of the LAND; our day to any presson within the yorisdictio the equal protection of the Inves. It Sourceign American Cateron States Source ignity secures to extirce as the liberty of all pressons within a STATE by experision of Surreign Rower, (New York V. United States, Sos V. S. 100, 101, 101, 500, 200 Reductions also protects the liberty of all pressons within a STATE by experient that Inves constat in cacess of decount of a prove government complete durisdictie or control this actions. By dempty any our government complete durisdictie of THE STATE of DATEONE. When TATE government complete durisdictie of THE STATE of DATEONE. When TATE government acte in Access of its lawfel powers, that liberty is at stake. See band V. N.S., IN S. Ct. 2385 (2011). The limitations that Federalism cotails are not therefore a another of State state of Policies the States. See band V. N.S., IN S. Ct. 2385 (2011). The limitations that Federalism cotails are not therefore a another of State belowing only to the States. States are det the sole istead ed beineficiaries of federalism cotails are not the cote istead ed bereficiaries of federalism State States, states are det the so	Federal courts. As a Sourceign State with immunities under the 11th Amendment I may chose or not chose to unive these Rights and the STATE of RAIZONA court into count force me to do so. In Doint of fait the 11th Amendment states that; "No STATE, (Including DATAN shall make or enforce any law which shall abord the Privaledges or Imme unities of Sourceign American Citizens of the United States; nor shall day state define any presen of life, likering or property, without De Process. He valid have of the Latar for day to suppress within its yorisdick the valid have of the Latar for day to suppress within its yorisdick the valid have of the Latar day. A Sourceign American Citizens states source ignity secures to citizens the liberties that derive from the diffucient of Supercing Rower, United respectively to the Reapt. Federalism also protects the liberty of all persons within a STATE by custof that laws espected in creases of delegated gavecomental powers counted dires or control their actions. By denying any one gavecomental complet durisdicties or control their actions. By denying and power count dires or control their actions. By denying and power count to the liberty of the liberty of the liberty of the liberty of the count of the second dires or control their actions. By denying and one gavecomental complete durisdicties or control their actions. By denying and one gavecomental complete durisdicties out all concerns of public life, fideralism fictures the liberty of the im divide from Arbitracy Power, such as these hold by the count of THE STATE of Bazzone. When state success and the second of the count of the state actions. By denying and power and the second of the im affect from Arbitracy Power, such as these hold by the count of the State of Bazzone. When state success and therefore a mather lowful powers, that liberty is at state. See bood 4. 4.5, 151 s. ct. 2355 (2010. The limitations Het Federalism entails are see therefore a mather of sights belonging only to the states. Stat	0 of 12	
Ancedenced I may chose or vet chose to when these Rights and the STATE of ARIZONA In Point of fast the 19th Ancedenced states that; " No STATE, (Including ARIZON Shell make or exforce any law which shell abordage the Privaledages or Inne- workies of Surveying American Citizens of the United STATE; nor shall day STATE, deprive any person of life, liberty or property, without Due Process of the valid Laws of the LAMD; nor deay to any person within it's jurisdictio the equal protection of the LAMD; nor deay to any person within it's jurisdictio the equal protection of the LAMD; nor deay to ensy person within it's jurisdictio the equal protection of the LAMD; nor deay to ensy person within a state source igaty secures to citizens the liberty of states, sas uses life, is in sect 248 izo (1972) and relained respectivity to the Prople.	Anond merch I may chase or vert chase to unive these Rights and the STATE of BRIZONA IN Point of Sort the 19th Anondoment states that; "No STATE, (Including BRIZON Stall make or cubacce any law which chall abridge the Prival-days or Imme united of Swatce any law which chall abridge the Prival-days or Imme united of Swatce any law which chall abridge the Prival-days or Imme united of Swatce any person of life, liberty or property, without Doe Process of the valid Laws of the LAND; and draw to any person within it's verisdictio the could protection of the LAND; and change the diffusion of Source and protection of the LAND; and change the diffusion of Source and protection of the LAND; and change the diffusion of Source and protection of the LAND; and change the diffusion of Source and protection of the LAND; and change the diffusion of Source and protection of the LAND; and change the diffusion of Source and protection of the LAND; and change the diffusion of Source and protection of the laws. A Source and Land derive from the diffusion of Source and Protection of the laws of States, Soo U.S. 114, 101, 112, 112, 112, 112, 112, 112, 112	Anced ancet I may chose or not chose to unive these Rights and the STATE of ARIZONA The Point of fred the 19th Ancedanced states that; " No STATE, (Including PARCAN Shall make or colorce any law which chall abridge the Prival-days or Iran whites of Substraigh American Citizens of THE UNITED STATES; our shall Ang STATE deprive any person of life, likerby or property, without Due Prevess. the valid Laws of the LAND; wer daw to any person within its yorisdictic its equal protection of the Land, MAD; wer day to any person within its yorisdictic the equal protection of the Land, and Sourceign American Citizens State Source ignity secures to citizens the liberties that decive from the diffusion of Surreign Rower, (New York V. Woited States, 505 U.S. 114, 181, 112 S. 12 24 120 (1972) and retained respectivity to the Proper that laws exacted in excess of delegated gausement complete duried direct of control their actions. By demying any our gausement complete duries that laws exacted in excess of delegated gausement complete duries of the State of public life, federalism Pieteets the liberty of the in- dividual from Arbitracy Panes, such as those held by the courter of the form the liberty is at state. Suc book V. U.S. 13. Court duries of THE STATE of Parizon R. When STATE gausement acts in excess of its lawful powers, that liberty is at state. Suc book V. U.S. 13. C. 2355 (2019). The limitations that Federalism extails are not therefore a mather as eights belonging and get the States. Suc book V. U.S. 13. C. 2355		
Anend anext I may chose or vot chose to write these Rights and the STATE of ARIZONA In Point of fact the 19th Anendariat states that; " the STATE, (Including PARIONA Shell make or exforce any law which shell abridge the Privaledges or Imm- writtes of Surveying American Citizens of The United STATE; vor shall day STATE, deprive any person of life, likering or property, without Due Process of the valid times of the LARD; nor deay to any person within it's jurisdiction the valid times of the LARD; nor deay to any person within it's jurisdiction the equal protection of the LARD; and American Citizens States; soor shall day state equal protection of the laws. I Sourceign American Citizens States Source igaty secures to citizens the liberty of states, soo y, so 144, 181, 112 s. et 248 120 (1972) and relained respectivity to the Prople.	Anond merch I may chose or over chose to unive these Rights and the STATE of RAIZONA COURT INC. COMMON these me to do so. In Point of Sort the 19th Anondoment states that; "No STATE, (Including BAIZON Stall make or cubace any low which shall abridge the Privaledges or Imme united or Surveying developed States that;" No STATE, (Including BAIZON Stall make or cubace any low which shall abridge the Privaledges or Imme united of Surveying developed Citizenes of The WAIRD STATES; now shall day state depole and present of the thereby or property, without Doe Process of the valid Laws of the LAND; nor draw to any present within its variability the could protection of the LAND; and courge Anonical Citizenes States Survey ignity secures to citizenes the liberties that derive from the diffusion of Surveying Romer, (New York V. Whited States, Sos V. S. 114, 101, 112 Sect 248 120 (1972) and retained respectivity to the Reapt.	Anced arcot I may chose or not chose to unive these Rights and the STATE of ARIZONA IN Point of front the 19th Ancedment states that; " No STATE, (Including PARDAN Shall make or enforce any low which chall abridge the Prival-dayss or Inner weitres of Substraight American Citizens of THE UNITED STATES; our shall Ang STATE deprive any person of life, likerby or property, without Due Prevess. He valid Laws of the LAND; over dawy to any person within its yorisdictic its equal protection of the LAND; over dawy to any person within its yorisdictic its equal protection of the LAND; over day to any person within its yorisdictic its equal protection of the LAND; over day to any person within its yorisdictic its equal protections of the lows. I Sourceign American Citeres States Source ignity secures to citizens the liberties that derive from the diffusion of Surreign Romer, (New York V. United States, 505 U.S. 114, 181, 112 S. C. 1945 120 (1972) and retained respectivity to the People. Federalism also protects the liberty of all persons within a STATE by curvein that laws exacted in excess of delegated gaugement complete durisdiction out and retained respectivity for the people. Federalism also protects the liberty of all persons within a STATE by curvein that laws exacted in excess of delegated gaugement complete durisdiction out and retained respectivity for the people. Federalism also protects the liberty of all persons within a STATE by curvein that laws exacted in excess of delegated gaugement complete durisdiction out all conceases of public life, federalism fielders the liberty of the in: dividual from Arbitracy Pawer, such as those hild by the coust of the in- of THE STATE of ARIZONAR. When STATE gaugement acte in excess of its lawful powers, that liberty is at state. See bond V. N.S., 131 S. Ct. 2355 (2019). The limitations that Ederalism extails are not therefore a mather of cights belonging and and to states. States are not therefore a mather		
of ARIZONA COURT INC. comment force are to do so. In Point of East the 19th Annualment states that: "No STATE, (Including PARTON) Shell make or cubarce any law which shall abridge the Privaledges or Imm Valities of Sourceign American Citizons of THE UNITED STATES; nor shall Ang STATE deprive any person of life, libering or property, without Dos Process of the valid Laws of the LAND; nor deny to any person within its yerisdictio the capid protection of the LAND; nor deny to any person within its yerisdictio the equal protection of the LAND; nor deny to any person within its surisdictio the equal protection of the laws. I Sourceign American Citizons States Source ignity secures to citizens the liberties that derive from the diffusion of Sourceign Power, (New York V. Noited States, 505 U.S. 144, 181, 112 S.C. 128 120 (1972) and retained respectivity to the Prople. Federalism also protects the liberty of all persons within a STATE by curvein that laws exacted in excess of delegated governmental powers cannot direct or control their actions. Buy demying any owe government complete durisdictio and concerns of public life, federalism Protects the liberty of the in- dividual form Arbitrary Power, such as those held by the constant of that laws exacted in excess of delegated government complete durisdictio or control their actions. Buy demying any owe government complete durisdictio of THE STATE of PRIZONE, When STATE government acts in excess of its lawful powers, that liberty is at stake. See bood V. V.S., 131 S. C. 2355 (2011). The limitations that Federalism entails are not therefore a mather	of ARIZONA Two Deint of First the 14th Amendment states that i' the STATE, (Including BADOW Shell make or cubarce any law which shall abordge the Privaledges or Imm- waites of Subscript descised Citizens of The United States; our shall day state deprive any person of lite, liberty or property, without Des Process o the valid fame of the LAND; our deay to any person within it's jurisdictio the valid fame of the LAND; our deay to any person within it's jurisdictio the valid fame of the LAND; our deay to any person within it's jurisdictio the valid fame of the LAND; our deay to any person within it's jurisdictio the equal protection of the laws. I Sourceign American Citerous States Source is gaty secures to citizens the liberties that deave from the diffusion of Sourceign Power, (New York V. United States, Sos V. S. 144, 181, 10 s. et 248 (20 (1992) and retained respectivily to the Prope. Federalism also protects the liberty of all persons within a STATE by curve that laws exacted in excess of delegated gaueromental powers cannot direct or control their actions. By demytop any our gaueromet complete Jurisdictio and control their actions. By demytop any our gaueromet the second direct of THE STATE of Program, New state gaueroment and states in excess of its lawstal formers, that liberty is at state. See band V. N.S., 181 s. ct. 2355 (2011). The limitations that Federalism extails are not the sole interformer of rights belonging only to the STATEs of another of rights belonging only to the STATEs, states are det the sole interformer of the set at individual form the interfus a direct interest in objecting to laws the ed bracticianies of federalism. See New York, supres, at 181, 112 sect. 2408. An individual has a direct interest in objecting to laws the upset the constitutional balance between the National Gaueroment	of ARIZONA Tw Point of Beet the 14th Ancedment states that; "No STATE, (Including PARTON Shall make or externe any low which chall aboridge the Privaledges or Iran Unities of Sourceign American Citizens of THE United States; our shall Ang STATE deprive any person of life, liberty or property, without Due Process the valid tame of the LAND; nor deay to any person within it's periodicity is and protection of the LAND; wor deay to any person within it's periodicity the could form of the LAND; wor deay to any person within it's periodicity the could protection of the LAND; wor deay to any person within a states Source is any secures to citizens the liberties that derive from the diffusion of Sourceign Power, (New York V. United States, Sos V. S. 144, 181, 112 S. (1945) 120 (1932) and retained respectivity to the People. Federalism also protects the liberty of all persons within a STATE by council that laws counciled in cacess of delegated gavenmental powers counst direct or control their actions. By demying, any our gavenment complete Junisdiction our all conceases of public life, federalism Protects the liberty of the in dividual form Arbitracy Power, such as take. See board V. V.S., 131 S. et 2355 (2010). The limitations that liberty is at stake. See board V. V.S., 131 S. et 2355 (2010). The limitations that liberty and the STATES, states are stated in sole intervented of rights belonging and y to the States. States are stated for a sole intervented of rights belonging and y to the States. States are stated the sole intervented of the limitations that liberty is at stake. See board V. V.S., 131 S. et 2355 (2010). The limitations that Federalism estails are not therefore a matter of rights belonging and y to the States. States are the states in the sole intervented of costs belonging and y to the States. States are the the sole intervented of states belonging and y to the States.		Federal courts. As a Sourcian State with immunities under the 11th
In Paint of East the 19th Amendment states that; "No STATE, (Including PARION Shell make or conferre any law which shell abridge the Privaledges or Imm- varifies of Sourceign American Citizens of the United STATES; nor shall Ang STATE deprive any person of life, liberty or property, without Due Processe the Valid Laws of the LAND; war deay to any person within its jurisdictio the valid Laws of the LAND; war deay to any person within its jurisdictio the equal protection of the LAND; Sourceign American Citizens States Source ignety secures to citizens the liberties that derive from the diffusion of Sourceign Power, (New York V. United States, 505 U.S. 111, 181, 112 S.C. 1248 120 (1972) and retained respectivity to the Prople. Federalism also protects the liberty of all persons within a STATE by curvuis that laws exacted in excess of delegated gaucemental powers count direct or control their actions. Buy demying any owe gaucement complete durisdictio our control their actions. Buy demying any owe gaucement complete durisdictio our control their actions. Buy demying any owe gaucement acte in excess of its lawful powers, that liberty is at stake. See bood V. U.S., 131 S. Ct. 2355 (2019. The limitations that Federalism extails are not therefore a matter	The Point of Sect the 14th According states that;" No STATE, (Including PARCON Shall make or exterce any law which shall abridge the Privaledges or Ione: Writtes of Survey, described Citizens of The United STATEs; not shall day STATE deprive any person of lite, likering or property, without Due Process of the valid Laws of the LAND; not draw to any present within it's yorisdictio the valid Laws of the Laws. I Sourceign Acceleral Citizens States Source: ignity secures to citizens the liberties that derive from the diffusion of Surreign Power, UNW York V. United States, Sos U.S. 114, 181, 12 S.C. 148 120 (1972) and retained respectively to the Prope. Federalism also protects the liberty of all persons within a STATE by curves that laws exacted in carees of delegated gavenmental powers counset direc or control their actions. By demying any our gavenment complete durisdicts aure all concerns of public life, federalism fratects the liberty of the civ- dividual form Reberry Power, such as these held by the course of its. I will and concerns of public life, federalism fratects the liberty of the civ- dividual forms. By density out as the states are not therefore a mathematic or control their actions. By density and a the states we excess of its. I will concerns of public life, federalism fratects the liberty of the civ- dividual forms detained hereing is at stake. See band V. V.S., 121 S. ct. 2355 (2010. The limitations that Federalism coutails are not therefore a mathematic ed courter the limitations of gave to state. See band V. V.S., 121 S. ct. 2355 (2010. The limitations for federalism coutails are not therefore a mathematic ed boreficieries of federalism. See New York, soore, at 184 182 sect. 2408. An individual balance between the Network Gavernment - ed boreficieries of federalism. See New York, soore, at 184 182 sect. 2408. An individual balance between the Network Gavernment -	In Point of first the 19 th Annualment states that; "No STATE, (Including PRIMA Shall make or cubarce any law which shall abridge the Privaledges or Imme Northes of Sourceign American Citizens of THE United States; our shall day STATE deprive any person of life, liberty or property, without Due Provess. He valid Laws of the LAND; our devy to any person within it's jurisdiction the valid Laws of the LAND; our devy to any person within it's jurisdiction the valid Laws of the LAND; our devy to any person within it's jurisdiction the valid Laws of the LAND; our devy to any person within it's jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws. A Sourceign American Citerins States Source ignity secures to citizens the liberties that device from the diffusion of Sourceign Rower, (New York V. United States, 505 U.S. 114, 181, 112 S.C. 1245 Tao (1972) and retained respectivity to the People. Federalism also protects the liberty of all presents within a STATE by curvering that laws exacted in excess of delegated gaucenmental powers cannot direct or control their actions. By demying any our gaucenment complete durisdiction ource all concerns of public life, federalism Protects the liberty of the in- dividual From Arbitracy Power, such as these held by the courts of the State of American Resistory such as these held by the court of the State of Resistory Rower, such as these held by the court of the State of Resistory is at stake. See Doub V. U.S., 121 S. Ct. 2355 (2010). The limitations that Federalism entails are not therefore a matter of cights belowing and y to the States. States are not therefore a matter of cights belowing and y to the States. States are not therefore a matter		Amond ment I may chose or not chose to while these Rights and the STATE
Shell make or enforce any law which shall abridge the Privaledges or Irm: unifies of Sourceign American Citizens of the United States; nor shall dag STATE diprive any person of life, liberty or property, without Doe Process e the valid laws of the LAND; nor deay to any present within its verisdictic the coal protection of the LAND; nor deay to any present within its verisdictic the equal protection of the LAND; Nor deay to any present within its verisdictic the equal protection of the LAND; Nor deay to any present within its verisdictic the equal protection of the laws. I Sourceign American Citerous states Source: ig any secures to citizens the liberties that derive from the diffusion of Supercian Power, (New York V. United States, 505 U.S. 114, 181, 112 sect 208 120 (1992) and retained respectivily to the People. Federalism also protects the liberty of all persons within a STATE by curverian that laws exacted in excess of delegated gavernment al powers convolt direct or control their actions. By demying any our government complete duriedictian ource all concernes of public life, federalism Protects the liberty of the in: divident from Arbitrary Power, such as those the in excess of its lawful powers, that liberty is at stake. See band V. U.S., 131 S. Ct. 2355 (2011). The limitations that Federalism entails are not therefore a matter	ideal make or cataree any low which charly abridge the Privaledges or Iom: Unities of Sourceign described Citizens of The United States; our shall day state deprive any person of life, likering or property, without Des Process e the valid lowe of the LAND; nor devy to any property without Des Process e the valid lowe of the LAND; nor devy to any property without Des Process e inguity secures to citizens the liberties that derive from the diffusion of Sourceign Power, (New York N. Noiled States, sos u.s. 144, 181, 112 s. et 248 120 (1992) and retained respectivity to the Prope. Federalism also protects the liberty of all persons within a STATE by evaning that lows evaneted in cacess of delegated governmental powers cannot direct our all concerns of public life, federalism frontes the liberty of the in- dividual front Arbitrary Power, such as House he difficient of the in- dividual front Arbitrary Power, such as House he liberty of the in- dividual front Arbitrary Power, such as House he liberty of the in- of the State of Power, when the state government all buries its of the forme Arbitrary Power, such as House he diffice and the in- dividual front Arbitrary Power, such as House her the states of its lower all concerners of public life, federalism fronteets the liberty of the in- dividual former Arbitrary Power, such as House her the state of excess of its lower of the initiations that liberty is at stake. See Bood V. His, 131 s. et , 2355 (2010). The limitations that Federalism estails are not therefore a mather of rights belonging only to the States, states are not the sole interest et beoufficiaries of federalism. See New York, supra, at 181, 112 sect, 2408. An individual has a direct interest in objecting to lowes the undert the constitutional has a direct interest in objecting to lower the undert the constitutional has a direct interest in objecting to lower the	Shell make at cubarce any law which shall abridge the Privaledges at Irms woitles of Surveying described Citizens of The United STATES; were shall day STATE deprive any person of life, liberty or property, without Dee Provess the valid Laws of the LAND; were devy to any person within it's veriedictiv the valid Laws of the LAND; were devy to any person within it's veriedictiv the equal protection of the LAND; and Sourceign American Citrenes States Source is any secures to citizens the liberties that device from the diffusion of Sourceign Rower, (New York V. United States, 505 U.S. 144, 181, 112 S.C. 144 120 (1932) and relained respectivity to the Proph. Federalism also protects the liberty of all persons within a STATE by ensure of control their actions. By demying any one gousenment all powers cannot direc of the I have emacted in excess of delegated government all powers cannot direc of control their actions. By demying any one gousenment complete durisdiction avec all concerne of public life, federalism frateets the liberty of the in- divide of France Arbitracy Pawer, such as those held by the coust of the of THE STATE of BRIZONE. When STATEs are not the excess of its lawful powers, that liberty is at stake. See bood 4. Vise, 131 S. Ct. 2355 (2018). The limitations that Federalism entails are not the respec- of cights belowing only to the STATES. STATES and wort the sole interde- of cights belowing only to the STATES. STATES and of the sole interde-		of ARIZONA COURT INC. CONNOT Force me to do so.
Shell make or exterce any low which shall abridge the Privaledges or Irm: unifies of Sourceign American Citizens of the United States; nor shall day STATE deprive any person of life, liberty or property, without Doe Process e the valid lowe of the LAND; nor deay to any person within its jurisdictio the equal protection of the LAND; nor deay to any person within its jurisdictio the equal protection of the LAND; Nor deay to any person within its jurisdictio the equal protection of the LAND; Nor deay to any person within its jurisdictio the equal protection of the LAND; Nor deay to any person within its jurisdictio the equal protection of the lows. It Sourceign American Citrens States Source: ig aty secures to citizens the liberties that derive from the diffusion of Sourceign Power, (New York V. United States, 505 U.S. 114, 181, 112 Sect 200 120 (1992) and relained respectivily to the People. Federalism also protects the liberty of all persons within a STATE by curvering that lows exacted in excess of delegated government complete durisdictio or control their actions. By demying any and government complete durisdictio ource all conceases of public life, federalism Protects the liberty of the in- divider from Arbitrary Power, such as those hild by the course of THE STATE of BALCONG. When STATE government acts in excess of its lawful powers, that liberty is at stake. See Board V. U.S., 131 S. Ct. 2355 (2010). The limitations that Federalism entails are not therefore a matter	Shell make or catarre any law which shall abridge the Prival-dass or Iome Unities of Sourceign American Citizens of The United STATES; nor shall day STATE depine any person of life, liberty or property, without Dos Provess e the valid have of the sharp; nor deay to easy person within it's jurisdiction the valid have of the sharp; nor deay to easy person within it's jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws. I Sourceign American Citizens States Source ignity secures to citizens the liberties that decive from the diffusion of Sourceign Power, (New York V. Whited States, sos U.S. 144, 184, 17 s. 64 248 120 (1972) and retained respectively to the People. Extendison also protects the liberty of all persons within a STATE by curveris that laws exacted in cacess of delegated governmental powers compared direct or control their actions. By demying any our government complete durisdictie autor of their actions. By demying and government complete durisdictie or control their actions. By demying and government acts in excess of its liberty forms that liberty is at state. See bond V. V.S., 120 s. et 2355 (2010). The limitations that Externalism contails are not the control of control the limitations that Externalism contails are not the control dividual powers, that liberty is at state. See bond V. V.S., 121 s. et 2355 (2010). The limitations that Externalism contails are not the contained ed beneficiaries of factorism. See New York, super, at 184, 122 sect. 2409. An invitedial balance beduced the Netional Government of laws the upset the constitutional balance beduced the Netional Government of laws the upset the constitutional balance beduced the States for Actional the laws the upset the constitutional balance beduced the Netional Government of laws the	Shell make at cubarce any law which shall abridge the Privaledges at Irms woitles of Surveying described Citizens of The United STATES; were shall day STATE deprive any person of life, liberty or property, without Dee Provess the valid Laws of the LAND; were devy to any person within it's veriedictiv the valid Laws of the LAND; were devy to any person within it's veriedictiv the equal protection of the LAND; and Sourceign American Citrenes States Source is any secures to citizens the liberties that device from the diffusion of Sourceign Rower, (New York V. United States, 505 U.S. 144, 181, 112 S.C. 144 120 (1932) and relained respectivity to the Proph. Federalism also protects the liberty of all persons within a STATE by ensure of control their actions. By demying any one gousenment all powers cannot direc of the I have emacted in excess of delegated government all powers cannot direc of control their actions. By demying any one gousenment complete durisdiction avec all concerne of public life, federalism frateets the liberty of the in- divide of France Arbitracy Pawer, such as those held by the coust of the of THE STATE of BRIZONE. When STATEs are not the excess of its lawful powers, that liberty is at stake. See bood 4. Vise, 131 S. Ct. 2355 (2018). The limitations that Federalism entails are not the respec- of cights belowing only to the STATES. STATES and wort the sole interde- of cights belowing only to the STATES. STATES and of the sole interde-		In Point of fact the 11th Amendment states that; " No STATE, (Including ARIZONI
Voities of Surreign American Citizens of THE UNITED STATES; Not shall day STATE displace any person of life, liberty or property, without Due Process of the valid have of the LAND; not deay to any person within it's jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws. I Sourreign American Citernes States Sources ignity secures to citizens the liberties that derive from the diffusion of Sourceign Power, (New York V. Noited States, sos U.S. 144, 181, 112 S.C. 1248 120 (1992) and retained respectivity to the People. Federalism also protects the liberty of all persons within a STATE by evanues that laws exacted in excess of delegated gavernmental powers cannot direct or control their actions. By demying any oue government liberty of the in- direct all concerns of public life, federalism Platects the liberty of the in- direct all concerns of public life, federalism Platects the liberty of the in- direct of Researce of public life, federalism Platects the liberty of the in- direct of Researce, New State state. See bond V. N.S., 131 S. Ct. 2355 (2011). The limitations that Federalism entails are not therefore a matter	voities of Surreign American Citizons of The Warred States; war shall day STATE deprive any person of life, liberly or property, without Due Process of the valid have of the LAND; wer devy to any person within the periodicitie the could fame of the LAND; wer devy to any person within the periodicitie the could fame of the LAND; wer devy to any person within the periodicitie the could fame of the LAND; wer devy to any person within the periodicitie the could fame of the LAND; wer devy to any person within the periodicitie the could fame of the LAND; wer devy to any person within the period of Surreign Remer, (New York V. Voited States, Sas V. S. 144, 181, 112 S. Ct 248 The (1972) and retained respectivily to the People. Federalises also protects the liberty of all persons within a STATE by countries that laws estated in excess of delegated gavenmental powers counsed direct or control their actions. By demyon any gave gaverament complete durisdicties outer all concerns of public, life, federalism flattets the liberty of the in- dividual from Arbitrary Pawer, such as these hild by the <u>count</u> of rights belowing only to the states. States are wet therefore a mather of rights belowing only to the states. States are wet therefore a mather of rights belowing only to the states. States are wet therefore a mather of rights belowing only to the states. States are wet therefore a mather of rights belowing only to the states. States are wet therefore a mather of rights belowing only to the states. States are wet the sole interest ed beneficiaries of federalism. See New York, supre, at 181, 112 sect- 2408. An individual has a direct interest in objectiving to laws the upset the constitutional balance between the Netional Governament of any the suprest the objectiving to laws the	 Unifies of Survey deverient Citizens of The United States; not shall day State deprive any person of life, liberty or property, without Due Process, the valid Laws of the LEND; not deay to any person within it's jurisdiction the equal protection of the LEND; not deay to any person within it's jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws. I Sourceign American Citzens states Source ignity secures to citizens the liberties that derive from the diffusion of Sourceign Power, (New York V. Noited States, Sos U.S. 144, 181, 112 S.C. 244 120 (1972) and retained respectivity to the People. Federalism also protects the liberty of all persons within a STATE by enjoy drive that laws exacted in excess of delegated gavernmental powers cannot direc or control their actions. By demying any and gavernmental complete Jurisdiction auer all concerns of public life, federalism fratects the liberty of the inite dividual from Arbitrary Power, such as those held by the could the could dividual from Arbitrary Power, when state see band V. U.S. 131 S. ct. 2355 (2010). The limitations that Federalism entails are not therefore a matter affects belonging and y to the States. States are Not the sole interfore affects belonging and y to the States. States are Not the sole interfore and the limitations that Federalism entails are not the colorer of interform and the limitations that Federalism entails are not the sole interfore affects belonging and y to the States. States are Not the sole interfore all could be powers, that liberty is at stake. States are Not the sole interfore affects belonging and y to the States. States are Not the sole interfore affects belonging and y to the States. States are Not the sole interfore and the state and the states. States are not the sole interfore and the states the states. States are Not the sole interf		, i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i
STRIE deprive any person of life, liberty or property, without Due Process - the valid Laws of the LAND; wer deay to any person within it's jurisdictio the equal protection of the laws. A Sourceign Anceican Citreme States Source ignity secures to citizens the liberties that derive from the diffusion of Sourceign Power, (New York V. Woited States, 505 U.S. 144, 181, 112 S. et 248 120 (1972) and retained respectivity to the People. Federalism also protects the liberty of all persons within a STATE by evolves that laws exacted in excess of delegated gavernmental powers counsed direct or control their actions. By demying any one gavernmental powers counsed direct or control their actions. By demying any one gavernment for the difference diverties dividual from Arbitrary Power, such as those held by the couplet dividual from Arbitrary Power, such as those held by the couplet of THE STATE of BRIZONE, When STATE government acts in excess of its lawful powers, that liberty is at stake. See band V. N.S., 131 S. et. 2355 (2011). The limitations that Federalism entails are not the coupler a matter	STRTE diprive any person of 126, liberty or property, without Dec Process. the valid huma of the LAND; was deay to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws. I Sourceign American Creanes States Sources ignity secures to citizens the liberties that deains from the diffusion of Sourceign Power, (New York V. Noited States, Sos V.S. 144, 181, 112 Sect 248 120 (1972) and retained respectivily to the People. Federalism also protects the liberty of all persons within a STATE by curveis that laws exacted in excess of delegated governmental powers count direct or control their actions. By deming any our government complete Junisdicties divident from Arbitrary Power, such as those bild by the course of protects of public life, federalism flateets the liberty of the in- divident from Arbitrary Power, such as those bild by the courses of public life, States Sec build by the courses of public life, States Sec build by the course of the liberty is at state. Sec bood V. N.S., 121 S. et. 2355 (2011). The limitations that Federalism events's are set therefore a mosther of control the interfacions of federalism. Sce New York, supra, at 181, 112 Sect. 2408. An invited only a fact and interest in objecting to laws the upset the constitutional balance between the Neting for any the upset the constitutional balance between the Neting of any the upset the constitutional balance between the Neting of Laws the upset the constitutional balance between the Neting of Sourcement	STATE dispive any person of life, liberty or property, without Due Process the valid haves of the LAND; not deay to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws. I Sourceign American Citerous states Source ignity secures to citizens the liberties that devive from the diffusion of Sourceign Power, (New York V. Noited States, 505 U.S. 144, 181, 112 S. et 248 120 (1972) and retained respectivily to the People. Federalism also protects the liberty of all persons within a STATE by events that laws exacted in excess of delegated gavernmental powers caunat direc or control their actions. By demying any out gavernment complete durisdiction dividual from Arbitrary Power, such as those held by the course of THE STATE of PRIZONE. When STATE gavernment acts in excess of its lawful powers, that liberty is at state. See bond V. U.S. 131 s. et 2355 (2011). The limitations that Federalism entails are not therefore a mather of rights belonging any and states. States are not therefore a mather of rights belonging any to the States. States are Not the sole interefore of rights belonging any to the States. States are Not the sole interefore		
the valid Laws of the LAND; wer devy to any person within its jurisdictio the equal protection of the laws. A Sourceian American Citrons states source: ignity secures to citizens the liberties that derive from the diffusion of Sourceign Power, (New York V. Woited states, 505 V.S. 144, 181, 112 s.et 200 120 (1992) and retained respectivity to the People. Federalism also protects the liberty of all persons within a STATE by evolution that laws exacted in excess of delegated governmental powers count diffusion or control their actions. By demying any out government complete durisdictio auer all concerns of public life, federalism floteets the liberty of the iv- dividual from Arbitrary Power, such as those held by the cours of the of the STATE of PRIZONE. When STATE government acts in excess of its lawful powers, that liberty is at stake. See bond V. V.S., 131 s. ct, 2355 (2010). The limitations that Federalism entails are not therefore a mather	the valid Laws of the LAND; werdery to any presen within its verisidictio the equal protection of the LAND; and Sourceign American Citerns states source ignety secures to citizens the liberties that derive from the diffusion of Sourceign Power, (New York V. Noited States, sas U.S. 144, 181, 12 sect 248 120 (1922) and retained respectivity to the Prople. Federalism also protects the liberty of all persons within a STATE by curve in that laws exacted in excess of delegated gavernmental powers cannot direct or control their actions. By demying any one gavernment complete durisdictio auer all concerns of public. Life, federalism Protects the liberty of the in- divident from Arbitracy Power, such as those bid by the coust is first State of PRIZONE, when state gavernment and excess of its lawful powers, that liberty is at stake. See bond V. N.S., 131 S. Ct. 2355 (2011). The limitations that Federalism extails are not the sole inter- of rights belowing and the states. State sole of the root of the sole divident from Arbitracy Power, such as there for a mother of rights belowing and the states. See band V. N.S., 131 S. Ct. 2355 (2011). The limitations that Federalism extails are not the sole inter- ed beneficiaries of federalism. See New York, supra, at 181, 112 sect. 2308. An individual has a direct interest in objecting to laws the upset the constitutional balance between the National Gavernment	the valid Lowe of the LAND; wer dawy to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the lows. A Sourceign Anceican Citrans States Source ignity secures to citizens the liberties that derive from the diffusion of Sourceign Power, (New York V. Naited States, So5 V. S. 144, 181, 117 S. et 244 120 (1972) and retained respectivity to the People. Federalism also protects the liberty of all persons within a STATE by ensuring that laws exacted in excess of delegated gavenmental powers caused direc or control their actions. By demying any one gavenment complete durisdiction auer all concerns of public life, federalism Protects the liberty of the control that concerns of the liter such as these for a success of its dividual from Arbitrary Power, such as those held by the court of THE STATE of PRIZONE, When STATE gavenment and excess of its lawful powers, that liberty is at stake. See board V. N.S., 131 S. et . 2355 (2010). The limitations that Federalism entails are not therefore a mather of rights belowing only to the STATES. STATES are Not the sole interded		
the equal protection of the laws. A Sourceign American Citrens States Source: ignety secures to citizens the liberties that derive from the diffusion of Sourceign Power, (New York V. Noited States, 505 U.S. 144, 181, 112 S. et 248 120 (1972) and retained respectivily to the People. Federalism also protects the liberty of all persons within a STATE by cusuria that laws exacted in excess of delegated gauernmental powers caunot direct or control their actions. By demying any one gauernment a liberty of the in- dividual from Arbitrary Power, such as those held by the <u>country</u> dividual from Arbitrary Power, such as those held by the <u>country</u> of THE STATE of PRIZONE. When STATE gauernment acte in excess of its lawful powers, that liberty is at stake. See Bood V. U.S., 131 S. et. 2355 (2010). The limitations that Federalism entails are not therefore a matter	the equal protection of the laws. A Sourcign American Citerons States Source. ignity secures to citizens the liberties that derive from the diffusion of Sourceign Rower. (New York V. Noited States, 505 U.S. 144, 181, 112 Sect 248 120 (1972) and relained respectivity to the People. Federalism also protects the liberty of all persons within a STATE by ensuring that laws emarted in excess of delegated gavernmental powers cannot direct or control their actions. By demying any our gavernment complete durisdiction auce all concerns of public life, federalism Protects the liberty of the in- divident from Arbitrary Power, such as those bild by the constraint of THE STATE OF PRIZOND, When STATE gavernment and excess of its lawful powers, that liberty is at stake. See Bood V. U.S., 131 S. et. 2355 (2011). The limitations that Federalism contails are not therefore a matter of rights belonging and the STATES. STATES are Not the sole interden- ed beneficiaries of federalism. See New York, super, at 181, 112 Sect. 2408. An individual has a direct interest in objecting to laws the upset the constitutional balance between the National Government	the equal protection of the laws. A Sourceign American Citrens States Source ignity secures to citizens the liberties that derive from the diffusion of Sourceign Power, (New York V. Noited States, 505 N.S. 144, 181, 112 S.C. 244 120 (1972) and retained respectivily to the People. Federalism also protects the liberty of all persons within a STATE by ensure that laws enacted in excess of delegated governmental powers cannot direc or control their actions. By denning any one governmental powers cannot direc ource all concerns of public life, federalism flates the liberty of the in: dividual from Arbitrary Power, such as those bold by the court of THE STATE OF BRIZONE. When STATE government acts in excess of its lawful powers, that liberty is at stake. See bond V. N.S., 131 S. Ct. 2355 (2011). The limitations that Federalism entails are not therefore a mather of eights belonging only to the STATES. STATES are Not the sole interded		
ignty secures to citizens the liberties that derive from the diffusion of Sourceign Power, (New York V. Whited States, 505 U.S. 144, 181, 112 S.C. 1288 120 (1992) and retained respectivly to the People. Federalism also protects the liberty of all persons within a STATE by curveris that laws exacted in excess of delegated governmental powers counst direct or control their actions. By demytog and our governmental powers counst direct our all concerns of public life, federalism flotects the liberty of the in- dividual from Arbitrery Power, such as those bild by the <u>course</u> of THE STATE of ARIZONE. When STATE government acts in excess of its lawful powers, that liberty is at stake. See bond V. U.S. 131 S. Ct. 2355 (2017). The limitations that Federalism entails are not therefore a mather	ignty secures to citizens the liberties that decive from the diffusion of Sourceign Romer, (New York V. Noited States, 505 U.S. 144, 181, 112 Sect 248 120 (1992) and retained respectivily to the Reaple. Federalism also protects the liberty of all persons within a STATE by converi- that laws exacted in excess of delegated gavernmental powers cannot direct or control their actions. By demying any one gavernment lowers cannot direct aver all concerns of public life, federalism flotects the liberty of the in- dividual from Arbitrary Power, such as those hild by the coust of THE STATE OF RAIZONE. When STATE gavernment acte in excess of its lawful powers, that liberty is at stake. See board V. U.S., 131 S. Ct. 2355 (2010). The limitations that Federalism entails are not the sole interest of rights belonging only to the STATES. STATES are Not the sole interest at 100 for the sole of federalism. See New York, supra, at 184, 112 sect. 2408. And individual has a direct interest in objecting to laws the upset the constitutional balance between the Netional Gavernment	ignity secures to citizens the liberties that derive from the diffusion of Sourcian Power, (New York V. Noited States, 505 N.S. 144, 181, 112 S. et 246 120 (1972) and retained respectivily to the People. Federalism also protects the liberty of all persons within a STATE by evolution that laws exacted in excess of delegated governmental powers cannot direct or control their actions. By demying any one governmental complete Junisdiction ouer all concerns of public life, federalism Protects the liberty of the in- dividual from Arbitrary Power, such as those hild by the court of the STATE of PRIZONE. When STATE government acts in excess of its lawful powers, that liberty is at stake. See bond V. N.S., 131 S. et. 2355 (2011). The limitations that Federalism entails are not therefore a matter of eights belonging only to the STATES. STATES are Not the confirmed		
Surreign Power, (New York V. Noited States, 505 U.S. 144, 181, 112 S. Ct 248 120 (1972) and retained respectivly to the People. Federalism also protects the liberty of all persons within a STATE by evolution that laws exacted in excess of delegated governmental powers caunat direct or control their actions. By demying any and government complete durisdiction ouser all concerns of public life, federalism Protects the liberty of the in- dividual from Arbitrary Power, such as those held by the <u>course</u> of THE STATE of PRIZONE. When STATE government acts in excess of its lawful powers, that liberty is at stake. See bond V. N.S. 131 S. Ct. 2355 (2011). The limitations that Federalism entails are not therefore a mather	Surreign Power, (New York V. United States, 505 U.S. 144, 181, 117 S. et 248 120 (1992) and retained respectivily to the People. Federalism also protects the liberty of all persons within a STATE by converi- that laws exacted in excess of delegated governmental powers convot direct or control their actions. By denning any one government complete durisdiction ouer all concerns of public life, federalism Protects the liberty of the in- dividual from Arbitracy Power, such as those hold by the cover of THE STATE of PRIZONE. When STATE government wet in excess of its lawful powers, that liberty is at stake. See Doubly V. U.S., 131 S. et. 2355 (2011). The limitations that Federalism entails are not therefore a matter of rights belonging only to the STATES, STATES are not therefore a matter of rights belonging only to the STATES. STATES are not the sole interd- ed beneficiaries of federalism. See New York, sopra, at 181, 112 Seet. 2408. And individual has a direct interest in objecting to laws the ugset the constitutional balance between the National Government	Sourceign Power, (New York V. Noited States, 505 U.S. 144, 181, 112 S. et 248 120 (1992) and retained respectivly to the People. Federalism also protects the liberty of all persons within a STATE by evalue that laws enacted in excess of delegated governmental powers counted direc or control their actions. By demying any one government complete durisdiction ouser all concerns of public life, federalism flatects the liberty of the in dividual from Arbitrary Power, such as those held by the count of THE STATE OF PRIZONE. When STATE government with excess of its lawful powers, that liberty is at state. See bood V. U.S., 131 S. et. 2355 (2017). The limitations that Federalism entails are not therefore a matter of eights belonging only to the STATES. STATES are Not the sole interdent		
In (1992) and retained respectivly to the People. Federalism also protects the liberty of all persons within a STATE by convering that laws exacted in excess of delegated governmental powers cannot direct or control their actions. By demying any our government complete durisdiction ouer all concerns of public life, federalism Protects the liberty of the in- dividual from Arbitrary Power, such as those held by the couper of THE STATE of BRIZONA. When STATE government acts in excess of its lawful powers, that liberty is at stake. See band V. V.S. 131 s. ct. 2355 (2011). The limitations that Federalism entails are not therefore a mather	120 (1992) and retained respectivly to the People. Federalism also protects the liberty of all persons within a STATE by ensuring that laws enacted in excess of delegated gausenmental powers cannot direct or control their actions. By denning any one gausenment complete Junisdiction ouer all concerns of public life, federalism fratects the liberty of the in- dividual from Arbitrary Power, such as those bild by the <u>court</u> of THE STATE of PRIZONE. When STATE government acts in excess of its lawful powers, that liberty is at stake. See band V. U.S., 131 s. ct. 2355 (2011). The limitations that Federalism entails are not therefore a mather of rights belonging only to the STATES. STATES are Not the sole intend- ed beneficiaries of federalism. See New York, supra, at 181, 112 sect. 2408. An individual has a direct interest in objecting to laws the ugset the constitutional balance between the National Government	120 (1992) and retained respectivly to the People. Federalism also protects the liberty of all pressons within a STATE by curvering that laws exacted in excess of delegated governmental powers count direct or control their actions. By demying any one government complete durisdiction ouse all concerns of public life, federalism frateets the liberty of the in- dividual from Arbitrary Power, such as those held by the count of THE STATE of BRIZONE. When STATE government acts in excess of its lawful powers, that liberty is at stake. See bond V. V.S., 131 S. Ct. 2355 (2017). The limitations that Federalism entails are not therefore a mather of rights belonging only to the STATES. STATES are Not the sole interded		
Ecteralism also protects the liberty of all persons within a STATE by ensuring that laws exacted in excess of delegated governmental powers cannot direct or control their actions. By demains any one government complete durisdiction ouer all concornes of public life, federalism fratects the liberty of the in- dividual from Arbitrary Power, such as those held by the court of THE STATE of PRIZONE. When STATE government acts in excess of its lawful powers, that liberty is at stake. See bond V. N.S., 131 S. Ct. 2355 (2011). The limitations that Federalism entails are not therefore a matter	Federalism also protects the liberty of all persons within a STATE by curvering that laws exacted in excess of delegated governmental powers cannot direct or control their actions. By demying any one government complete durisdiction ours all concerne of public life, federalism frateets the liberty of the in- dividual from Arbitrary Power, such as those hold by the coust of THE STATE of PRIZONE. When STATE government acts in excess of its lawful powers, that liberty is at state. See bond V. N.S., 131 S. Ct. 2355 (2011). The limitations that Federalism entails are not therefore a matter of rights belonging only to the STATES. STATES are Not the sole intend- ed beneficiaries of federalism. See New York, supra, at 181, 112 sect. 2408. An individual has a direct interest in objecting to laws the upset the constitutional balance between the National Government	Ecderalism also protects the liberty of all persons within a STATE by curvin that laws exacted in excess of delegated governmental powers cannot direc or control their actions. By demying any one government complete durisdiction auce all concerns of public life, federalism fratects the liberty of the in- dividual from Arbitrary Power, such as those held by the court of THE STATE of PRIZONE. When STATE government acts in excess of its lawful powers, that liberty is at stake. See bond V. V.S., 131 S. ct. 2355 (2011). The limitations that Federalism entails are not therefore a mather of eights belonging only to the STATES. STATES are Not the sole intend-		
that laws exacted in excess of delegated governmental powers cannot direct or control their actions. By demying any one government complete durisdictio over all concerns of public life, federalism frateets the liberty of the in- dividual from Arbitrary Power, such as those held by the <u>court</u> of THE STATE of PRIZONE. When STATE government acts in excess of its lawful powers, that liberty is at stake. See Bond V. V.S., 131 S. Ct. 2355 (2010. The limitations that Federalism entails are not therefore a matter	that laws constitutional balance between the National Gavernment of the sovernment of the second direct of control their actions. By demaining any one government complete durisdiction over all concerns of public life, federalism flatects the liberty of the in- dividual from Arbitrary Power, such as those held by the couper of THE STATE OF PRIZONA, When STATE government acts in excess of its lawful powers, that liberty is at stake. See bond V. V.S., 131 S. Ct. 2355 (2011). The limitations that Federalism entails are not the refore a matter of eights belonging only to the STATES. STATES are Not the sole intended and the states of the superior of the sole intended and the states of the superior of the sole intended and the states of the sole intended and the sole intended and the superior of the sole intended and the superior of the sole intended and the sole intended	that laws exacted in excess of delegated governmental powers cannot direc or control their actions. By demying any one government complete durisdictio over all concerns of public life, federalism frotects the liberty of the in- dividual from Arbitrary Power, such as those held by the court of THE STATE of BRIZONB. When STATE government acts in excess of its lawful powers, that liberty is at stake. See Bond V. V.S., 131 S. Ct. 2355 (2010). The limitations that Federalism entails are not therefore a matter of rights belonging only to the STATES. STATES are Not the sole intend-		11 10 LITTLI and retained respectivly to the Keople.
that laws exacted in excess of delegated governmental powers cannot direct or control their actions. By demuing any one government complete durisdiction over all concerns of public life, federalism frateets the liberty of the in- dividual from Arbitrary Power, such as those held by the <u>court</u> of THE STATE of ARIZONA. When STATE government acts in excess of its lawful powers, that liberty is at stake. See Bond V. V.S., 131 S. Ct. 2355 (2010. The limitations that Federalism entails are not therefore a matter	that laws exacted in excess of delegated governmental powers cannot direct or control their actions. By demying any one government complete durisdiction over all concerns of public life, federalism frateets the liberty of the in- dividual from Arbitrary Power, such as those held by the <u>coupt</u> of THE STATE OF BRIZONA, When STATE government acts in excess of its lawful powers, that liberty is at stake. See Bood V. N.S., 131 S. Ct. 2355 (2011). The limitations that Federalism entails are not therefore a matter of rights belonging only to the STATES. STATES are Not the sole intended ed beneficiaries of federalism. See New York, supra, at 181, 112 sect. 2408. An individual has a direct interest in objecting to laws the upset the constitutional balance between the Netional Government the	that laws exacted in excess of delegated governmental powers cannot direc or control their actions. By demying any one government complete durisdictio over all concerns of public life, federalism frotects the liberty of the in- dividual from Arbitrary Power, such as those held by the court of THE STATE of BRIZONB. When STATE government acts in excess of its lawful powers, that liberty is at stake. See Bond V. V.S., 131 S. Ct. 2355 (2010). The limitations that Federalism entails are not therefore a matter of rights belonging only to the STATES. STATES are Not the sole intend-		
or control their actions. By demuine any one government complete durisdictio over all concerns of public life, federalism frateets the liberty of the in- dividual from Arbitrary Power, such as those held by the <u>court</u> of THE STATE of PRIZONA. When STATE government acts in excess of its lawful powers, that liberty is at stake. See Bond V. V.S., 131 S. Ct. 2355 (2011). The limitations that Federalism entails are not therefore a matter	or control their actions. By demying any one government complete durisdictio over all concerns of public life, federalism Protects the liberty of the in- dividual from Arbitrary Power, such as these hild by the <u>coust</u> of THE STATE of PRIZONP. When STATE government acts in excess of its lawful powers, that liberty is at stake. See Bond V. V.S., 131 S. Ct. 2355 (2011). The limitations that Federalism entails are not therefore a matter of rights belonging only to the STATES. STATES are Not the sole intend- ed beneficiaries of federalism. See New York, supra, at 181, 112 sect. 2408. An individual balance between the National Government to upset the constitutional balance between the National Government to	or control their actions. By demying any one goussement complete durisdiction over all concerns of public life, federalism Protects the liberty of the in- dividual from Arbitrary Power, such as those held by the court of THE STATE of PRIZONA. When STATE government acts in excess of its lawful powers, that liberty is at stake. See Band V. V.S., 131 S. Ct. 2355 (2011). The limitations that Federalism entails are not therefore a matter of rights belonging only to the STATES. STATES are Not the sole intend-		
aver all concerns of public life, federalism fratects the liberty of the in- dividual from Arbitrary Power, such as those held by the <u>court</u> of THE STATE OF BRIZONE. When STATE government acts in excess of its lawful powers, that liberty is at stake. See Bond V. U.S., 131 S. ct. 2355 (2011). The limitations that Federalism entails are not therefore a matter	ouse all concernes of public life, federalism Protects the liberty of the in- <u>dividual from Arbitrary Power, such as those held by the</u> <u>court</u> of THE STATE of BRIZONB. When STATE government acts in excess of its lawful powers, that liberty is at stake. See Bond V. N.S. 131 S. Ct. 2355 (2011). The limitations that Federalism entails are not therefore a matter of rights belonging only to the STATES. STATES are Not the sole intend- ed beneficiaries of federalism. See New York, supra, at 181, 112 sect. 2408. An individual has a direct interest in objecting to laws that upset the constitutional balance between the National Government	Quer all concernes of public life, federalism fratects the liberty of the in dividual from Arbitrary Power, such as those hild by the court of THE STATE of PRIZONE. When STATE government acts in excess of its lawful powers, that liberty is at stake. See Bond V. U.S., 131 S. Ct. 2355 (2011). The limitations that Federalism entails are not therefore a matter of rights belonging only to the STATES. STATES are Not the sole intend-		
<u>dividual from Arbitrary Power, such as those held by the</u> <u>court</u> of THE STATE OF PRIZONE. When STATE government acts in excess of its lawful powers, that liberty is at stake. See Bond V. V.S., 131 s. ct. 2355 (2011). The limitations that Federalism entails are not therefore a matter	dividual from Arbitrary Power, such as those hild by the <u>coust</u> of THE STATE of BRIZOND. When STATE government acts in excess of its lawful powers, that liberty is at stake. See Bond V. N.S., 131 S. Ct. 2355 (2011). The limitations that Federalism entails are not therefore a matter of rights belonging only to the STATES. STATES are Not the sole intend- ed beneficiariss of federalism. See New York, supra, at 181, 112 sect. 2408. An individual has a direct interest in objecting to laws the upset the constitutional balance between the National Covernment	<u>dividual from Arbitrary Power, such as those hold by the</u> <u>of THE STATE of BRIZONB</u> . When STATE government acts in excess of its lawful powers, that liberty is at stake. See Bond V. N.S., 131 S. Ct. 2355 (2011). The limitations that Federalism entails are not therefore a matter of sights belonging only to the STATES. STATES are Not the sole intend-		• - •
of THE STATE OF PRIZONA. When STATE government meter in excess of its lawful powers, that liberty is at stake. See Bond V. U.S., 131 S. Ct. 2355 (2011). The limitations that Federalism entails are not therefore a matter	of THE STRIE OF BRIZOND, When STATE government acts in excess of its lowful powers, that liberty is at stake. See Bond V. U.S., 131 S. Ct. 2355 (2011). The limitations that Federalism entails are not therefore a matter of rights belonging only to the STATES. STATES are Not the sole intend- ed beneficiaries of federalism. See New York, supra, at 181, 112 sect. 2408. An individual has a direct interest in objecting to laws the upset the constitutional balance between the National Government	of THE STRIE OF ARIZONA. When STATE government acts in excess of its lawful powers, that liberty is at stake. See Bond V. U.S., 131 S. Ct. 2355 (2011). The limitations that Federalism entails are not therefore a matter of rights belonging only to the STATES. STATES are Not the sole intend-		ouse all concerns of public life, federalism Protects the liberty of the in-
(2011). The limitations that Federalism entails are wat therefore a matter	Inwful powers, that liberty is at stake. See Bond V. N.S., 131 S. Ct. 2355 (2011). The limitations that Federalism entails are not therefore a matter of rights belonging only to the STATES. STATES are Not the sole intend- ed beneficiaries of federalism. See New York, supra, at 181, 112 sect. 2408. An individual has a direct interest in objecting to laws the upset the constitutional balance between the National Government	(2011). The limitations that Federalism entails are not therefore a matter of rights belonging only to the STATES. STATES are Not the sole intend-		dividual from Arbitrary Power, such as those held by the court
(2011). The limitations that Federalism entails are wat therefore a matter	Inwful powers, that liberty is at stake. See Bond V. N.S., 131 S. Ct. 2355 (2011). The limitations that Federalism entails are not therefore a matter of rights belonging only to the STATES. STATES are Not the sole intend- ed beneficiaries of federalism. See New York, supra, at 181, 112 sect. 2408. An individual has a direct interest in objecting to laws the upset the constitutional balance between the National Government	(2011). The limitations that Federalism entails are not therefore a matter of rights belonging only to the STATES. STATES are Not the sole intend-		of THE STATE OF ARIZONA, When STATE government wete in excess of its
(2011). The limitations that Federalism entails are not therefore a matter	(2011). The limitations that Federalism entails are not therefore a matter of rights belonging only to the STATES. STATES are Not the sole intend- ed beneficiaries of federalism. See New York, supra, at 181, 112 sect. 2408. An individual has a direct interest in objecting to laws the upset the constitutional balance between the National Government	(2011). The limitations that Federalism entails are not therefore a matter of rights belonging only to the STATES. STATES are Not the sole intend-		
of rights belonging only to the STATES. STATES are Not the sole intend-	ed beneficiaries of federalism. See New York, supra, at 181, 112 sect. 2408. An individual has a direct interest in objecting to laws the upset the constitutional balance between the National Government			
	ed beneficiaries of federalism. See New York, supra, at 181, 112 sect. 2408. An individual has a direct interest in objecting to laws the upset the constitutional balance between the National Government			of sights belonging only to the STATES. STATES are Not the sole intend-
	upset the constitutional balance between the National Government	ed beneticiaries of tederalism. See New York supra, at 181. 112' sect.		
	upset the constitutional balance between the National Government		1	
				1

•	
10 04 12	
	concrete, particular, and redressable. Fidelity to principles of foderalism
	Not for the STATES alove to vindicate, and therefore I have the right to
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	challenge the STATE of ARIZONAS COURTS JURISDILTION in Pro-Pa
·····	as well as the validity of the statutes being applied, to make sure
	that the prosecution by the STATE of PRIZONA is Lawful, Proper and
**********	Constitutional. So that I can determine that they or others with in the
	venue did not committ " Lorstitutional Impermissable application of the
	Statutes or Low in this matter.
	On I wrote a motion that tend
	Labeled Notice of Non-Acceptance & Proof of claim request Exibit 'P'
*********	Letting her know that I was not accepting the services of Attorney
	or any other thereof. Also I requested that the STA
	give me Proof of the Claim, upon which she refused to accept stating
	that I have counsel to represent me. I've requested several times in
	these proceedings that provide proof of contract as provided for
	in the Rules of Criminal Proceedings & Lode of Conduct. I also infor
	med her that a change of council was filed a notice to cease have.
	assement against as well as a civil complaint again
	herself This established a clear conflict of
	interest and even under the sTMES and rules she proceeded under under
	ation of Code of Conduct ER 1.7. Conflict of interest.
	On the STREE of ARIZONA began trial proceeding with
	out proper identification of a Legal fiction and this has been the
	process at every proceeding. On the 2nd, 3rd, 4th, & 5th I write
	y y y y y y y y y y y y y y y y y y y

۰.

11. of 17	
	and participation in these proceedings in accordance with the 5th 19th 10th 11th, Balt Amendments; but the STATE of ARIZONA cont- tinues to violate my rights and have used Threats Distress & Co- ercian as well as physical Force & Torture as a means.
	In conclusion, their are Exceptional Circuinstances in this case that shall be brought to the attention of a higher court upon which the proper extict ease be sought. There is no may to correct the Physical Damag dripticat invary to my personage. The grace negligence of misapplica- tion of Maritime law Statutes upon dry LAND, causing Due Process via- lation for the valid laws of the LAND. Direct injury to liberties cause by the proceedings at the ANZONA STATE systems misapplication of stat- utes, vialation of due process, frond, we jurisdiction, no full disclosu due to the connectial nature of THE STATE of ANZONA SUPERIOR Court I therefore move to dismiss these statute charges out of the STATE of ARI- zona due to, the Tacif Coursent by the STATE to the Notice of Understad- ding and Intent and Claim of Right filed on Upon which these fourteen days (14), to respond, Also by the STATEs failure to the re- spond in substance to avoid dishanor, to the Notice of Claim; The STATES failure to avoid dishanor, to the Notice of Claim; The STATES failure to avoid dishanor, to the Notice of Claim; The STATES failure to establish the process of a lagol fiction for the purpose of ajudication, the fact that I clearly stated in record that these Services of Advisation by the STATE of ARIZONA. Court are not being accepted and provided the Court with written notice to the services of Advisation by the STATE of ARIZONA is record that these Services of Advisation by the STATE of ARIZONA is record that these Services of Advisation by the STATE of ARIZONA

12 of 17 Finally I of the family as commonly called, an actual human bring and in No way fictional Legal or otherwise once again move for these ARS. statutes be dismissed due to the fact that the A.R.S. Statutes are beyond Congress or STATES Constitutional authority to exact without being delegated by myself. The ARIZONA Statute under which I am bring held, exceeds languess or STATES enumerated power and violates the 10th Amendment. It exceeds Congress power because it violates the Ex Post Facto Clause, the Establishment Clause & The Due Process Clause " An offence created by Eas unconstitutional law] i.e. Maritime Low the United States Supreme Court has held " is not a crime" Exporte Sichold, 100 U.S. 371, 376. 35 L.Ed. 717 (1880). A conviction under Esuch a Inw] is not presely ecroacous, but illegal and void, and cannot be a legal cause of imprisonment. Ed., at . . If a law is invalid a applied to the criminal defendants conduct the defendant is entitled to g free. For this reason THE STATE of BRIZONIA SUPERIOR COURT has no prudential license to decline to consider whether the statute under which the alledges defendant has been charged lacks constitutional application to my cond. In short a law beyond the Power of Congress," for any reason is No law at al." Written this day of WITHOUT PREANDICE