

EWING BROTHER'S TOWING COMPANY	§
LAS VEGAS REVIEW JOURNAL	§
ELI SEGALL	§
JASON GUNNELL	§
	§
	§
Counterdefendants	§
	§
	§

1. FOR NOW COMES THE CLAIMANT to move the court to demand a trial by jury.
For the jury selection will be from the people, members of the peerage, to review the case, in accordance with the common law.
2. For Defendant Mead has again shown his disdain for the rule of law and continues to conspire against The Constitution for the United States of America. Defendant Mead has referred to The Constitution for the United States of America as "archaic". The Constitution for the United States of America is the Supreme law of the land.
3. For Defendant Mead has repeatedly claimed that claimant Benson is a "sovereign citizen" or displays "sovereign citizen ideology". The terminology "sovereign citizen" is an oxymoron having no meaning as a sovereign is the highest authority and a citizen is a subject of government since the definition provided in the 14th Article of Amendment to The Constitution for the United States of America. Either Defendant Mead is extremely ignorant as to what either a sovereign or a citizen is, or it is an intentional tactic used as propaganda by the shadow government as reported by former CIA agent Kevin Shipp in his book "Company of Shadows". Kevin Shipp is a veteran CIA agent who exposed the shadow government operated by the CIA, FBI and NSA to wage mixed war against the people of the United States of America.

Kevin Shipp is a veteran CIA agent who worked for most of his fifteen years as a CIA agent in the anti-terrorism section of the CIA. There is no such thing as a sovereign citizen. Citizens are by the very definition in the 14th article of amendment to The Constitution for the United States of America subjects of government. People are sovereign as the people are the author of The Constitution for the United States of America. It was the people who "ordained and established" The Constitution for the United States of America. Only sovereigns can "ordain and establish" law. "The very meaning of 'sovereignty' is that the decree of the sovereign makes law." American Banana Co. v. United Fruit Co., 29 S.Ct. 511 , 513, 213 U.S. 347, 53 L. Ed. 826, 19 Ann. Cas. 1047." The fact that the people are sovereign has been upheld by the courts repeatedly. This can be seen in the following five case cites. "In our country the people are sovereign and the Government cannot sever its relationship to the people by taking away their citizenship. Our Constitution governs us and we must never forget that our Constitution limits the Government to those powers specifically granted or those that are necessary and proper to carry out the specifically granted ones." (emphasis added) Afroyim v. Rusk, 387 U.S. 253 (1967) "But be that as it may, there is no such thing as a power of inherent sovereignty in the government of the United States. It is a government of delegated powers, supreme within its prescribed sphere, but powerless outside of it. In this country, sovereignty resides in the people, and congress can exercise no power which they have not, by their constitution, entrusted to it; all else is withheld." Legal Tender Cases, 110 U.S. 421 (1884) "...at the Revolution, the sovereignty devolved on the people; and they are truly the sovereigns of the country, but they are sovereigns without subjects...with

none to govern but themselves....." Chisholm v. Georgia (US) 2 Dall 419, 454, 1 L Ed 440, 455 @ Dall (1793) pp 471-472 "The people of this State, as the successors of its former sovereign, are entitled to all the rights which formerly belonged to the King by his prerogative." Lansing v. Smith, 4 Wend. 9 (N.Y.) (1829), 21 Am.Dec. 89 10C Const. Law Sec. 298; 18 C Em.Dom. Sec. 3, 228; 37 C Nav.Wat. Sec. 219; Nuls Sec. 167; 48 C Wharves Sec. 3, 7. "In the United States, sovereignty resides in people." -- Perry v. U.S. (294 US 330). For although there is more case law that upholds the people are sovereign, the above five case cites should provide sufficient evidence that although the people are in fact sovereign, the courts have agreed repeatedly that the people are sovereign, yet defendant Mead in conspiracy with the other defendants, through their foreign-agent-BAR-members, have rebelled against the masters, the sovereign, who ordained and established the law of supreme law of the land.

4. For the law of the land at the time of the creation of the United States of America was the common law. Defendant MEAD has testified with disdain about the common law being the highest law of the land even though the courts have upheld that the common law is the "law of the land." "Due process of law is process according to the law of the land Due process of law in the latter [the Fifth Article of Amendment to the Constitution) refers to that law of the land which derives its authority from the legislative powers conferred upon Congress by the Constitution of the United States, exercised within the limits therein prescribed and interpreted according to the principles of the common law" Mr. Justice Matthews, delivering the opinion of the court in *Hurtado v. California*, 110 U.S. 516, 3 Sup. Ct. 111,292,28 L. Ed. 232 (1884).]

5. For the magistrate and clerks of the court have conspired with the foreign-agent-BAR-members to usurp the authority of this court. This court is a superior court of the united states of America. The United States District Court is merely the repository for the documents filed on the record in this court of record. Courts of record by definition proceed according to the common law. For it is with the conspiracy of the foreign-agent-BAR-members that the definition of a court of record was changed in the 5th edition of Black's law Dictionary to hide the fact that the duties of the magistrate are independent of the tribunal and the court "proceeds according to the common law." All courts that use statutes are "inferior courts". " 'Inferior courts' are those whose jurisdiction is limited and special and whose proceedings are not according to the course of the common law." Ex Parte Kearny, 55 Cal. 212; Smith v. Andrews, 6 Cal. 652
6. For defendant Mead and other defendants have been operating under "color of law". "Color of Law: The appearance or semblance, without the substance, of legal right. Misuse of power, possessed by virtue of state law and made possible only because wrongdoer is clothed with authority of state, is action taken under 'color of state law.' " Atkins v. Lanning, D.C.Okl., 415 F. Supp. 186, 188. For arresting and imprisoning any people of the united States of America and the Nevada state is a violation of 18 USC 242, Deprivation of rights under color of law. Although, said code is foreign to this court, it is a fact that said code is a regulation by which all public servants are obligated to abide.
7. The people are the masters who created the fictions known as the governments of the united States of America and the servant positions the defendants have filled,

commonly under an invalid oath of office, in violation with Article 6, Clause 3 of The Constitution for the united States of America. For the public servants are referred to as "servants" because they serve the people who created their positions. For the defendants are servants who were hired by the people to serve the people. For the servants have rebelled against the people and have ruled over the people for decades. For the acts of the servants ruling over the people is specifically defined as "mixed war" in Black's Law Dictionary.

8. For the courts spell the living man's name in all capital letters, because the inferior courts have no authority over living men and women. For the inferior courts must create fictions in order to take jurisdiction over the living man and hold said living man as surety against a bond the court offers on the open market for investors.
"Fictions are invented to give courts jurisdiction." Snider v. Newell 44 SE 354
9. For the clerk and magistrate of the court have conspired with the defendants to usurp the authority of this court of record. This court has issued a ruling in this case and the case is final. For the magistrate, in conspiracy with the defendants' foreign-agent-BAR-members has "stricken" the ruling of this court from the record without leave of court. For this can be construed as nothing less than treason. "The United States Supreme Court has clearly, and repeatedly, held that any judge who acts without jurisdiction is engaged in an act of treason." U.S. v. Will, 449 U.S. 200, 216, 101, S. Ct. 471, 66 L.Ed. 2d 392, 406 (1980); Cohens v. Virginia, 19 U.S. (6 Wheat) 264, 404, 5 L.Ed 257 (1821) "We have no more right to decline the exercise of jurisdiction which is given, than to usurp that which is not given. The one or the other would be treason to the constitution." Cohens v. Virginia, 19 U.S. 264, 6 Wheat. 265, 5 L.Ed.

257 (1821) For the Supreme Court of the United States of America has determined that it does not have the authority to question the decisions of a court of record. "The judgment of a court of record whose jurisdiction is final, is as conclusive on all the world as the judgment of this court would be. It is as conclusive on this court as it is on other courts. It puts an end to inquiry concerning the fact, by deciding it. "Ex parte Watkins, 3 Pet., at 202-203. [cited by SCHNECKLOTH v. BUSTAMONTE, 412 U.S. 218, 255 (1973)

10. For the above reasons, the claimant moves this court to submit this case to a jury of common law for review and determination as to the legitimacy of this court actions in accordance with the 7th Article of Amendment to The Constitution for the United States of America.

Witness the hand and seal of the court this 22nd day of September in the year of our Lord 2017.

The Court

Robert Ambrose Edwards

By: /s/ Thomas Benson
Attornatus Privatus