

TO:

Brent Vennaman
U.S. Attorneys Office
400 East Ninth Street
Kansas City, Missouri 64106

RE:

case no. 4:10-cr-00162-FJG-6

1.) Please be advised that this Common-Law Constitutional Entity is a common-law, contractually-created entity and Declaration of Pure Contract Trust Organization under and protected by the U.S. Constitution. This Common-Law Constitutional Entity operates in accordance with the following U.S. Supreme Court ruling:

"There is a clear distinction in this particular case between an individual and a corporation, and that the latter has no right to refuse to submit its books and papers for an examination at the suit of the State. The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights as a citizen. He is entitled to carry on his private business in his own way. His power to contract is unlimited. He owes no such duty to the State, since he receives nothing therefrom, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State, and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the constitution. Among his rights are a refusal to incriminate himself, and the immunity of himself and his property from arrest or seizure except under a warrant of the law. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights." Hale v. Henkel, 201 U.S. 43 at 47.

2.) If you allege that this common-law constitutional entity is subject to some statute, rule, or regulation, please put that in writing, and furthermore, please state what jurisdiction the statutory agency you represent has over this common-law entity.

3.) Please take cognizance of the following rules:

(a) "The law provides that once State and Federal jurisdiction has been challenged, it must be proven." Main v. Thiboutot, 100 S.Ct. 2502 (1980).

(b) "Once jurisdiction is challenged, it must be proven." Hagans v. Lavine, 415 U.S. 533.

(c) "Where there is absence of jurisdiction, all administrative and judicial proceedings are a nullity and confer no right, offer no protection, and afford no justification, and may be rejected upon direct collateral attack." Thompson v. Tolmie, 2 Pet. 157, 7 L.Ed. 381; Griffith v. Frazier, 8 Cr. 9, 3 L. Ed. 471.

(d) "The proponent of the rule has the burden of proof." Title 5 U.S.C., Sec. 556(d).

(e) "No sanctions can be imposed absent proof of jurisdiction." Standard v. Olsen, 74 S.Ct. 768; Title 5 U.S.C., Sec. 556 and 558(b).

(f) "Jurisdiction can be challenged at any time, even on final determination." Basso v Utah Power & Light Co., 495 2nd 906 at 910.

4. This statement serves as Constructive Notice that this common-law constitutional entity, in the eyes of the Law, intends to prosecute to the fullest extent of the law anyone who infringes its rights.

Date:

Common-Law Constitutional Entity

By: Naricco T. Scott

Place: WITH PREJUDICE UCC 1-308
CCA
100 Highway Terrace
Leavenworth, KS 66048

Naricco Scott

Witness:
(Optional)

James N. Hughes Jr.
JAMES N. HUGHES JR.
Notary Public - State of Kansas
My Appt. Expires 12/2/13

NOTARY: