

From The Records of R.V. Bey Publications – Notes of the Sojourn

The following is a part to information submitted to a Court, the Clerk and the Judge / Magistrate after the Judge / Magistrate said for the record that the submitted Supreme Court rulings did not apply to him and his court because they were from other states, thus a **Denial of Affidavits of Case Laws**. They CANNOT deny Affidavits – they MUST answer them. Estoppel until they do.

This information is certainly what you ought know, what you do with it, is another issue and is up to you. The fact that the people have not known this, and /or have not enforced it, as law, holds a great deal of, if not all of, the problem for the people. As for the officers of the court, and federal employees, and private policy enforcers (feigning as law enforcers), this is evidence that they are OUT-OF-ORDER, are violators of the law and are Tort-Feasors, which means wrong-doers, as well, they are warring against the people, which is TREASON. (See PDF ‘Reason For Treason’ on this same page – Drivers License Fraud)

As a matter of record, when I appeared in Court on the (date) Judge / Magistrate, **whomever** referred to the submitted Exhibits (A and B) as an Application to the Court, and proceeded to partially cure them by verbal response. When in fact they are evidence in this matter and failure to recognize and respond to them as such, is ‘tampering with evidence’ and lacks Due Process of Law. (Judge name) *verbally* and for the record, answered the “Averment of Jurisdiction (Exhibit B), by stating *he* has Jurisdiction. However, according to **LAW**, when the question of Jurisdiction is placed before ANY court, it must be physically produced. A Judge / Court cannot satisfy it by mere want. **Industrial Addition Association v. C.I.R., 323 US 310, 313.** Also See: Griffin v. Matthews, 310 F supra 341, 342 (1969)

These are rules of Law to protect and preserve the People and Rights of the People’ from being violated. Judge / Magistrate, (**whatever name**) also stated, for the record that “*he has heard this before and he would not ‘Move’ until he hears from the Feds*”, which is a direct willfulness on his part because Federal Rule operates under the guidelines of the Constitution for the United States of America. (Judge name) is clearly then, admitting to his willfulness to ignore his fiduciary duty and violate his Oath as a Trustee of the Supreme Law of the Land, wherein the Federal Government’s authority and His authority is derived.

If you have relied on prior decisions of the Supreme Court, you have the perfect defense for willfulness. **U.S. v. Bishop, 412 US 346.**

I am not certain of what he has heard before and how it has any bearing in this matter, however I do know this is a matter of established Rules of Law and is supported as Federal Rule and applies to ALL States, the several States and their divisions, sub-divisions, charters, sub-charters, corporations, entities, etc., i.e New Jersey State / THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY and the **WHATAEVER MUNICIPAL COURT**.

Additionally, Judge / Magistrate, (**judge name**) stated he has jurisdiction pursuant to the New Jersey State Constitution, of which he has taken an Oath to uphold. As well he stated for the record, that the “Stare Decisis” Case Laws that were submitted, contained within Exhibit A, did not apply to him, or to the WHATAEVER MUNICIPAL COURT, because they (the case laws) are from other States.

All Supreme Court Rulings are applicable to ALL States. The United States Constitution, via Art III, Section 2, is the granting authority to and for ALL States, several States, and all Courts, including Inferior Courts. Any and All Courts, Municipalities, States, States’ Constitutions, etc. cannot devise any instruments, pass any ordinances, statutes, policies, etc., that abrogate the rules established in the United States Constitution. This is clearly defined in Article VI, of the United States Constitution, of which, Judge / Magistrate, (**judge name**) has taken an Oath to uphold as well, and such Oath finds itself Superior to any other allegiances or Oaths he may have taken.

State Governments are but Trustees acting under a derived authority. **4 Wheat 402.**

If Officer (judge name), Prosecutor and Court Clerk's name have not taken an Oath to the Constitution, then they are sitting in the seats of government, operating outside of the Law, and the request for the Averment of Jurisdiction is highly penal in its effect, as every Citizen must be afforded Due Process of Law, and no Court, including inferior Courts (**Whatever MUNICIPAL COURT**) can overstep their boundaries, or violate the Rights of the People, established in the Supreme Rule of Law. Officer (**judge name**), **Prosecutor and Court clerk name**, may then be in violation of Impersonating an Officer of the Court.

I am a Natural Person, not to be misconstrued as a Corporate Person, who may be found to have no Rights to be denied, and I am not to be addressed in all CAPITAL letters, which by Law, such grammar indicates a Corporation, per the United States Government Printing Office.

My Rights are protected under that same United States Constitution and I must abide by it, and any and all Courts, and Officers of the Court, must do the same. Officers of the Court are Public Servants. The State of which they are employed as Federal employees, derives its authority from the Supreme Law of the Land. As a Public Servant, and Officer of the Court, if they fail to uphold their sworn Oath and fiduciary duty, yet proceed to act out and extract or make an Exaction of finances via fines, etc. from the People, and create Bills Of Attainder (*which are prohibited per Article I, Sec. 10 of the United States Constitution*), then they are not only in violation of said duty, and of Impersonating an Officer of the Court, they are also Co-Conspirators to Extortion of the People.

Exaction. The wrongful act of an officer or other person in compelling payment of a fee or reward for his services, under color of his official authority, where no payment is due. *See also Extortion.*

A Bill of Attainder is defined to be ‘a legislative Act which inflicts punishment without judicial trial’” “...where the legislative body exercises the office of judge, and assumes judicial magistracy, and pronounces on the guilt of a party without any of the forms or safeguards of a trial, and fixes the punishment.” **In re De Giacomo**, (1874) 12 Blatchf. (U.S.) 391, 7 Fed. Cas No. 3,747, citing *Cummings v. Missouri*, (1866) 4 Wall, (U.S.) 323.

In this case the Officers of the Court would be acting in Conspiracy to Extort in Collusion with the New Jersey Motor Vehicle System (MVS) and the New Jersey Motor Vehicle Violations Surcharge System (MVS), of which are Agencies, who have no Judicial Authority.

Upon substantiated knowledge, there are no rules of law within the United States Constitution, and the New Jersey State Constitution, which derives its authority from the United States Constitution, that gives **WHATEVER MUNICIPAL COURT** and their Officers immunity to the Supreme Rules established for the protection of the People. There is, however, Stare Decisis that absolutely applies to **WHATEVER MUNICIPAL COURT** and its Officers. **ASIS v. US, 568 F2d 284.** **Thompson v. Smith, 154 SE 583.** **Burns v. Sup., Ct., SF, 140 Cal. 1.**

