

Darrin Leland Reber Sui Juris, © all rights reserved

American State National

In Care of, Rural Route

2340 Mullan Road

Missoula, MT

ORIGINAL

FILED

04/08/2019

Bowen Greenwood  
CLERK OF THE SUPREME COURT  
STATE OF MONTANA

FILED

APR 08 2019

Bowen Greenwood  
Clerk of Supreme Court  
State of Montana

Supreme  
IN THE COURT

IN THE STATE OF MONTANA

A Private for profit government services Corporation

STATE OF MONTANA – DUN AND BRAD #945782027

A private registered legal business entity

A subsidiary corporation of UNITED STATES Corporation.

A De Facto for profit Governmental Services Corporation

VS

DARRIN LELAND REBER dba

An artificial entity created through fraud, and Unlawful

Conversion of natural Name by the STATE OF MONTANA

Unlawfully Detained, the man being involuntarily held as

Surety

Appearing by special appearance of Darrin Leland;

Of family of Reber

A Living Soul, A man of GOD, Bondservant of Christ,

Non Personam,

Sui Juris a Non-Representative/ Non-agent

Case #DA-17-0577

Demand

Challenge of my Rights,

Status, Standing &

Jurisdiction;

a Notice of Discovery of

Fraud and Impropiety;

a Writ of Habeas Corpus;

a Demand for Remedy; and

a Claim for Compensation

Notice to principle is notice to agent, Notice to agent is notice to principle

Pursuant to Darrin Leland Reber Rules, Defendant hereby moves to Court to dismiss Plaintiff's Complaint with prejudice. The bases for this Demand are set forth in the accompanying notation.

1) Comes now a belligerent claimant by special appearance of Darrin Leland; a family of Reber, a Living Soul, a man of GOD, Bondservant of Christ, Non Personam, Sui Juris a Non-representative/ Non-agent.

2) I, Darrin Leland Reber (The Man) not DARRIN LELAND REBER (THE FEDERAL CORPORATION) hereby Demand a Dismissal with extreme prejudice, as I am NOT, nor have I ever been that Fictional Entity called as DARRIN LELAND REBER which was created by you, the UNITED STATES, the STATE OF MONTANA and NOT I, and that further perpetrated through the fraud upon my Mother, and upon myself at my Birth.

### **FRAUD**

The thing about fraud is this: At some point in time, it must be recognized, learned, and vitiated. Only then is justice obtained. Only then is Liberty achieved.

Please let me explain the Claim above so you may rule any and all contracts pertaining to this matter and any previous matters of the court pertaining to this man Void Ab Initio.

### **The Living story of the Fraud of the Cestui Que Vie Act of 1666**

- My Mother, a woman, a living soul, created by God, of flesh and blood, very much alive; went into the "foundling" (a safe place to abandon a child) hospital believing she would get care but instead was falsely declared indigent, a pauper.
- Then.... Having recently undergone the extreme duress of a major medical trauma commonly known as childbirth, and under the influence of painkillers, being anxious to go home to her comfortable bed, in order to pursue a happy life with her beautiful, newly born baby.
- She filled out some dubious and unexplained forms put before her.
- By the presumptive Tacit agreement of government she was unknowingly coerced into signing them as an "informant", (one who gives someone up), and as a citizen, as a person, as a resident by historical definitions of a "city employee",

a "dead legal entity or office of person", and "as someone there temporarily to do business".

- And... My innocent mother thus failing to recognize the lifelong consequences of her actions as there was no "Full and Honest Disclosure" nor any "Meeting of the Minds" which surely Vitiates any contract.
- This form that my mother signed was fraudulently used to create a document of title, a Bond, a Insured Security, and was then sent to the Department of Human Resources registered as human capital, Slavery jointly by the founding Hospital and by the STATE.
- This Action created a Copyright infringement and Unlawful Conversion of given Christian born Name converted to birthed NAMES and bonded, their attached CUSIP #'s attached to the CESTUI QUE VIE trust, all "look alike sound a like" names, a constructive fraud.
  - *It was a fraud created by powerful and corrupt groups of controlling men.*
- Since DARRIN LELAND REBER Was Fraudulently created by STATE OF MONTANA, with its creation date as recorded on the 5th day of August, 1981, as file No. 125-8 132-07455, of Official Records of Missoula County, Department of Human Resources of the STATE of MONTANA. With its Own unique CUSIP ##REDACTED##. is also Dead. Plaintiff has no remedy available to its Fictionally Dead Entity. Unless the trust is collapsed by the administrate as an appointed trustee.
- While I, Darrin, Leland; Reber Born on the different date of 26th of July 1981 at 8:58 pm upon the Land Jurisdiction known as a Montana De Jure republic, was, as its signatory officer, without "full and honest disclosure" of what that meant, was not a party to the contract.
- As mentioned above, at some point in time one recognizes the fraud as the man, the living soul, this child of god, has done and has awoke to the fact that it is his blood, sweat, and the tears and pains of his labor, the man's, that has been fraudulently held as the surety and the debtor when he is truly the holder in due course and the actual creditor.
- But No, he is deemed "LOST AT SEA" by his very co-trustee of his own (E)state while his employees (Government Corporations) steals from the fruits of his labor.

- Then through this fraud tried to make the Man, the living soul, a signatory officer (into a "PERSON") a fraudulently created dead dog Latin entity, an unknowing party to the Bankrupt Corporation the UNITED STATES and STATE of MONTANA subsidiary, all just more constructive fraud.
- I ask you this; Is the Man and Living soul an Executor to, a Beneficiary of, or in any other way, is he one who enjoys any financial benefit to this Cestui Que Vie Trust estate?
- Or, does one have to call in a federal bankruptcy judge to dissolve the Cestui Que Vie Trust and settle and claim the estate / the minor account?
- Or, does one just claim it by asking the administrator, as the law states?
- These private secret trusts are set up under Canonum De Ius Positivum Canons of Positive Law....
- Canon 2048  
Since 1933, when a child is borne in a State (Estate) under inferior Roman law, three (3) Cestui Que (Vie) Trusts are created upon certain presumptions, specifically designed to deny the child forever any rights of Real Property, any Rights as a Free Person and any Rights to be known as man and woman rather than a creature or animal, by claiming and possessing their Soul or Spirit.
- Canon 2049  
Since 1933, upon a new child being borne, the Executors or Administrators of the higher Estate willingly and knowingly convey the beneficial entitlements of the child as Beneficiary into the 1st Cestui Que(Vie) Trust in the form of a Registry Number by registering the Name, thereby also creating the Corporate Person and denying the child any rights as an owner of Real Property.
- Canon 2050  
Since 1933, when a child is borne, the Executors or Administrators of the higher Estate knowingly and willingly claim the baby as chattel to the Estate. The slave baby contract is then created by honoring the ancient tradition of either having the ink impression of the feet of the baby onto the live birth record, or a drop of its blood as well as tricking the parents to signing the baby away through the deceitful legal meanings on the live birth record. This live birth record as a promissory note is converted into a slave bond sold to the private reserve bank of the estate and then conveyed into a 2nd and separate Cestui Que (Vie) Trust

per child owned by the bank. Upon the promissory note reaching maturity and the bank being unable to "seize" the slave child, a maritime lien is lawfully issued to "salvage" the lost property and itself monetized as currency issued in series against the Cestui Que (Vie) Trust.

- Canon 2051

Each Cestui Que Vie Trust created since 1933 represents one of the 3 Crowns representing the 3 claims of property of the Roman Cult, being Real Property, Personal Property and Ecclesiastical Property and the denial of any rights to men and women, other than those chosen as loyal members of the society and as Executors and Administrators.

- Canon 2052

The Three (3) Cestui Que Vie Trusts are the specific denial of rights of Real Property, Personal Property and Ecclesiastical Property for most men and women, corresponds exactly to the three forms of law available to the Galla of the Bar Association Courts. The first form of law is corporate commercial law is effective because of the 1st Cestui Que Vie Trust. The second form of law is maritime and trust law is effective because of the 2nd Cestui Que Vie Trust. The 3rd form of law is Talmudic and Roman Cult law is effective because of the 3rd Cestui Que Vie Trust of Baptism.

- Canon 2053

The Birth Certificate issued under Roman Law represents the modern equivalent to the Settlement Certificates of the 17th century and signifies the holder as a pauper and effectively a Roman Slave. The Birth Certificate has no direct relationship to the private secret trusts controlled by the private banking network, nor can it be used to force the administration of a state or nation to divulge the existence of these secret trusts.

- Canon 2054

As the Cestui Que Vie Trusts are created as private secret trusts on multiple presumptions including the ongoing bankruptcy of certain national estates, they remain the claimed private property of the Roman Cult banks and therefore cannot be directly claimed or used.

- Canon 2055

While the private secret trusts of the private central banks cannot be directly addressed, they are still formed on certain presumptions of law including claimed ownership of the name, the body, the mind and soul of infants, men and women. **Each and every man and woman has the absolute right to rebuke and reject such false presumptions as holder of their own title.**

- Canon 2056

**Given the private secret trusts of the private central banks are created on false presumptions, when a man or woman makes clear their Live Borne Record and claim over their own name, body, mind and soul, any such trust based on such false presumptions ceases to have any property.**

- Canon 2057

**Any Administrator or Executor that refuses to immediately dissolve a Cestui Que (Vie) Trust, upon a Person establishing their status and competency, is guilty of fraud and fundamental breach of their fiduciary duties requiring their immediate removal and punishment..**

- Canon 2124

When a person has re-established their competent living status, then by law the Cestui Que (Vie) Trust is dissolved and they return to being acknowledged as a beneficiary or a some higher standing if a trust. In either case, it is both unlawful and a serious fraud against the law to seek Income Taxes once the Cestui Que Vie is dissolved and no (dead) body corporate exists to use as argument for rent.

- Canon 2127

When a person has re-established their competent living status, then no Cestui Que (Vie) Trust may exist in their place. Therefore, a Company must be formed as a Trust instead of a Cestui Que Vie and company tax cannot be charged for rent under its present form.

#### QUESTION FOR THE PROSECUTION;

IS IT TRULY YOUR HONEST INTENTION TO DEFRAUD ME OR INJURE ME IN ANY WAY OR IS IT YOUR INTENT TO CONSPIRE OR DENY ME ANY BASIC GOD- GIVEN, GUARANTEED CONSTITUTIONAL and INTERNATIONAL RIGHTS, HERE?

3) I, Darrin Leland Reber (THE MAN) not DARRIN LELAND REBER (THE FEDERAL CORPORATION), a living soul, a man of GOD, Sui Juris, having only just recently learned of the fraud committed by the courts, the BAR Association and those of perceived authority claiming to represent this De Facto Government; A foreign Corporation, calling itself the UNITED STATES. It's subsidiary corporation the STATE OF MONTANA. Who having created a false fictional entity known as, DARRIN LELAND REBER and that it is this , fictional entity being charged as such. NOM DE GUERRE, PERSONATE false person name is a breach of the International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Part 1, Amendments 1-27. It is in breach of U.S.C. Title 18:§1342:[Point A-d] the use of Fiction names against

living-souls is a breach of U.S.C. Title 18:§1341[Point A-e] to cause a Fraud and Swindle. For the defendant(s) by showing their true identity in upper and lowercase lettering with punctuation, the court is in breach of F.R.C.P. RULE: 10(a):[Point A-f] using the proper name of the Party, and a breach of F.R.C.P. RULE:17, [Point A-g] only the real party of concern can be sued in the admiralty.

4) I, Darrin Leland Reber (The Man) not DARRIN LELAND REBER (THE FEDERAL CORPORATION) do hereby declare through my right of self-determination given to me by the International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights establish my status as a man, a living soul, that I am Sui Juris and demand that I, be recognized as such. "Merely being native born within the territorial boundaries of the United States of America does not make such an inhabitant, a Citizen of the United States subject to the jurisdiction of the Fourteenth Amendment.

5) Sui Juris, I, Darrin Leland Reber (The Man) not DARRIN LELAND REBER (THE FEDERAL CORPORATION) declare I am not Pro Se. I am as stated and I am not here in any representative position, except as a man.

6) I, Darrin Leland Reber (The Man) not DARRIN LELAND REBER (THE FEDERAL CORPORATION), I, am NOT a "PERSON." I, am NOT a "US CITIZEN." I, am NOT an EMPLOYEE of the STATE, UNITED STATES, UNITED NATIONS, or the DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, and therefore I am NOT subject to its rules, codes, and statutes. I, do NOT Consent and I, do NOT Pledge my Allegiance to any other, than my GOD, for it is by his Grace alone, that I, shall live. "The word 'person' in legal terminology is perceived as a general word which normally includes in its scope a variety of entities other than human beings., see e.g.1, U.S.C. §para1."

7) I, Darrin Leland Reber (The Man) not DARRIN LELAND REBER (THE FEDERAL CORPORATION) declare I, am NOT a Resident of the District of Columbia or any "districts" so claimed by "The Corporation" and/or any of its Zip Codes calling itself the "UNITED STATES" or any Appellation thereof. I do NOT consent. "Every State law must conform in the first place to the Constitution of the United States, and then to the subordinate constitutions of the particular state; and if it infringes upon the provisions of either, it is so far void." Houston v. Moore, 18 US 1, 5L.Ed19(1840) The federal Constitution makes a careful distinction between natural born citizens and citizens of the United States\*\*(compare 2:1:5 with Section 1 of the Fourteenth Amendment). One is an unconditional Sovereign by natural birth, who is endowed by the Creator with certain unalienable rights; the other has been granted the revocable privileges of U.S.\*\* citizenship, endowed by Congress of the United States\*\*. One is a Citizen; the other is a subject. One is a Sovereign; the other is a subordinate. One is a citizen of our constitutional Republic;

the other is a citizen of a legislative democracy (federal zone). Notice the superior/subordinate relationship between those two statuses.

8) I, <sup>Darrin</sup> [REDACTED] Leland Reber (The Man) not DARRIN LELAND REBER (THE FEDERAL CORPORATION), am quite aware that the UNITED STATES is a Foreign Entity, the STATE being a Foreign STATE, the Court being a Foreign Entity, and its Agents being Foreign Agents. I state for the record that I am a State National, Foreign to the De Facto UNITED STATES Corporation. This is ~~All~~ De Facto Government without any such De Jure Jurisdiction over living souls it did NOT create. I declare this as a challenge of jurisdiction. "Once jurisdiction is challenged, the court cannot proceed when it clearly appears that the court lacks jurisdiction, the court has no authority to reach merits, but, rather, should dismiss the action." *Melo v. US*, 505 F2d 1026. "There is no discretion to ignore that lack of jurisdiction." *Joyce v. US*, 474 F2d 215. "The burden shifts to the court to prove jurisdiction." *Rosemond v. Lambert*, 469 F2d 416. "Court must prove on the record, all jurisdiction facts related to the jurisdiction asserted." *Lantana v. Hopper*, 102 F2d 188; *Chicago v. New York*, 37 F Supp 150. "A universal principle as old as the law is that a proceedings of a court without jurisdiction are a nullity and its judgment therein without effect either on person or property." *Norwood v. Renfield*, 34 C 329; *Ex parte Giambonini*, 49 P. 732. "Jurisdiction is fundamental and a judgment rendered by a court that does not have jurisdiction to hear is void ab initio." *In Re Application of Wyatt*, 300 P. 132; *Re Cavitt*, 118 P2d 846. "Thus, where a judicial tribunal has no jurisdiction of the subject matter on which it assumes to act, its proceedings are absolutely void in the fullest sense of the term." *Dillon v. Dillon*, 187 P27. "A departure by a court from those recognized and established requirements of law, however close apparent adherence to mere form in method of procedure, which has the effect of depriving one of a constitutional right, is an excess of jurisdiction." *Wvest v. Wvest*, 127 P2d 934, 937. "Where a court failed to observe safeguards, it amounts to denial of due process of law, court is deprived of juris." *Merritt v. Hunter*, C.A. Kansas 170 F2d 739. "No sanction can be imposed absent proof of jurisdiction." *Stanard v. Olesen*, 74 S. Ct. 768. "Once challenged, jurisdiction cannot be 'assumed', it must be proved to exist." *Stuck v. Medical Examiners*, 94 Ca2d 751, 211 P2d 389. "Jurisdiction, once challenged, cannot be assumed and must be TIMELY PROVEN AND EMPHATICALLY DECIDED." *Maine v. Thiboutot*, 100 S. C. 2502. "The law requires proof of jurisdiction to appear on the record of the administrative agency and all administrative proceedings." *Hagans v. Lavine*, 415 U.S. 533. "If any tribunal finds absence of proof of jurisdiction over person and subject matter, the case must be dismissed." *Louisville R.R. v. Motley*, 211 U.S. 149, 29 S. Ct. 42. Governments have no jurisdiction over man. Governments have jurisdiction only over artificial entities and over its own employees. "Inasmuch as every government is an artificial person, an abstraction, and a creature of the MIND ONLY with other artificial persons. The imaginary, having neither actuality nor substance, is foreclosed from creating and attaining parity with the tangible. The legal manifestation of this is that NO government, as well as any law agency, aspect, court etc., can concern itself with anything other that Corporate, Artificial Persons and Contracts between them." S.C.R. 1795, *Penhallow v. Doane's Administrators* 3 U.S. 54; 1L. Ed 57; 3 Dall. 54, Supreme Court of the United States 1795, [Not the "United States Supreme Court"-ed.]



9) I, Darrin Leland Reber (The Man) not DARRIN LELAND REBER (THE FEDERAL CORPORATION) do hereby declare that I do NOT consent to any Presumptions or Assumptions or Hearsay on your part but only on Truth and Facts. "Every State law must conform in the first place to the Constitution of the United States, and then to the subordinate constitutions of the particular state; and if it infringes upon the provisions of either, it is so far void." *Houston v. Moore*, 18 US 1, 5 L.Ed 19 (1840). The opinion of the court states: "The 'individual' may stand upon 'his Constitutional Rights.' 'His rights' are such as 'existed' by the Law of the Land (Common Law) '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.'" Bill of Rights Section I Par. III. No person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property, except by due process of law. The Constitution is the law of the land and there can be no statutes or rule making that would abrogate the Constitution. The general principle is: anything that is repugnant to or abrogates the Constitution is null and void of law. "Where rights secured by the Constitution are involved, there can be no rule making or legislation, which would abrogate them." *Miranda v. Arizona*, 384 U.S. 436, (1966). "The Constitution of these United States is supreme law of the land. Any law that is repugnant to the Constitution is null and void of law." *Marbury v. Madison*, 5 US 137, (1803). The Constitution clearly states that only congress can pass laws, yet since incorporated every act of congress has a line in it that reads, "this act shall not effect any rights thus previously established." This means congress cannot pass any ex-post facto laws. 16 Am Jur 2d, Sec 177 late 2d, Sec 256: The general misconception is that any statute passed by legislators bearing the appearance of law constitutes the law of the land. The U.S. Constitution is the supreme law of the land, and any statute, to be valid must be in agreement. It is impossible for both the Constitution and a law violating it to be valid; one must prevail. This is succinctly stated as follows: The General rule is that an unconstitutional statute, though having the form and name of law is in reality no law, but is wholly void, and ineffective for any purpose; since unconstitutionality dates from the time of its enactment and not merely from the date of the decision so branding it. An unconstitutional law, in legal contemplation, is as inoperative as if it had never been passed. Such a statute leaves the question that it purports to settle just as it would be had the statute not been enacted. Since an unconstitutional law is void, the general principles follow that it imposes no duties, confers no rights, creates no office, bestows no power or authority on anyone, affords no protection, and justifies no acts performed under it. A void act cannot be legally consistent with a valid one. An unconstitutional law cannot operate to supersede any existing valid law. Indeed, insofar as a statute runs counter to the fundamental law of the land, it is superseded thereby. No one is bound to obey an unconstitutional law no courts are bound to enforce it. Title 28 USC 3002 Section 15A states the United States is a Federal Corporation and not a government, including the Judicial Procedural Section. In numerous cases, SCOUTS has said: 1) That since governments chose to incorporate themselves, they must abide the same rules as any other corporations. 2) That governments are now de facto, as corporations; and that they pass no laws, but only corporate bylaws called rules, codes, statutes, executive orders, ordinances and policies. 3) That all rules, codes, statutes, executive orders, ordinances and policies are "colored/

colorable" and governed only by the consent of the governed and through the fraudulent creation and unlawful conversion of man-kind into a legal Person, Citizen, Resident.

10) I, Darrin Leland Reber (The Man) not DARRIN LELAND REBER (THE FEDERAL CORPORATION) Claim that no crime by me exists as I have not knowingly or willfully injured another soul. Therefore, if the woman/man calling herself/himself as so named as the "STATE OF MONTANA" shall come forward in her/his own flesh body showing acceptable identification, can point me out across the room identifying I, as having done her/him some injury, I, shall make amends giving fair and just compensation to discharge this matter. An impossibility! "For crime to exist, there must be an injured party. There can be no sanction or penalty imposed upon one because of this exercise of Constitutional Rights." -Shear v. Cullen, 482 F. 945. "A 'Statute' is not a Law," (Flournoy v. First Nat. Bank of Shreveport, 197 La. 1067, 3 So. 2d 244, 248), "A 'Code' is not Law," (In Re Self v. Rhay Wn 2d 261), in point of fact in Law, a concurrent or 'joint resolution of legislature is not "Law," (Koenig v. Flynn, 258 N.Y. 292, 179 N. E. 705, 707; Ward v. State, 176 Okl. 368, 56 P. 2d 136, 137; State ex rel. Todd v. Yelle, 7 Wash. 2d 443, 110 P. 2d 162, 165). All codes, rules and regulations are for government authorities only, not Living Souls/ Creators in accord with GOD's Laws. "All codes, rules, and regulations are unconstitutional and lacking due process of law." (Rodriques v. Ray Donovan, U.S. Department of Labor, 769 F. 2d 1344, 1348 (1985)) "All laws, rules and practices which a repugnant to the Constitution are null and void." [Marbury v. Madison, 5th US (2 Cranch) 137, 180] The individual Rights guaranteed by our Constitution and treaties cannot be compromised or ignored by our government or by its courts!

11) I, Darrin Leland Reber, having recently learned of the fraud, do state for the record that "THERE IS NO CONTRACT" with the "UNITED STATES", "STATE of MONTANA", "ANY COURT", "JUDGE", "ATTORNEY", "ADMINISTRATOR", "AGENT" or "POLITICIAN" thereof. That I am rescinding all signatures. That there has never been present the 8 elements of a contract or any Full and Honest disclosure. Nor was there ever a time where I was not under threat and duress. Neither was there, both I, and another(s) wet ink signatures on any such document(s). I, do NOT Consent.

See Below 8 Elements of a contract

#### 1. Parties competent to contract

The parties to a contract should be competent, being of the age of

consent, of sound mind, not disqualified from contracting by any law to which s/ he is subject. A flaw in capacity may be due to minority, lunacy, idiocy, drunkenness, or dissimilarity of kind. The parties should be of the same kind, being either

legal fiction actors, or natural living men/women, allowing more than two parties, but never a mixture of these kinds and their respective jurisdictions.

## 2. Free and genuine consent

The consent of the parties to the agreement must be free and genuine. The consent of the parties should not be obtained by misrepresentation, fraud, undue influence, coercion or mistake. If the consent is obtained by any of these means, then the contract is not valid or legally/lawfully enforceable.

## 3. Full disclosure

When negotiating a contract, full disclosure is the step of providing all material information, or telling the "whole truth", about any matter which may influence the decision-making of the other party or parties before they decide to enter into a contract. If either party fails to make full disclosure, the contract is null and void.

## 4. Valuable consideration

The consideration is something of value possessed by the parties that is brought to the contract table. This something of value is bargained for and given in exchange for a promise or a performance. The parties must each receive a benefit and each suffer a detriment. To be enforceable, a contract must have valuable consideration. A contract is unenforceable if it has insufficient or unequal consideration without agreement.

## 5. Certainty of terms

The Terms and Conditions of the contract must be fully disclosed and agreed upon, and must be certain and fixed. Any subsequent variation of terms must be agreed.

#### 6. Meeting of the minds

A meeting of the minds "consensus ad idem", occurs between the parties when they recognize each other, understand their mutual obligations, and agree. A meeting of the minds occurs between living men/women in lawful matters (Common Law jurisdiction), and between legal fiction actors in legal matters (Admiralty Maritime jurisdiction). A contract must be either Lawful or Legal. If one party to a contract makes a "signature" as an "accommodation party" to a legal fiction person, while the other party makes an "autograph" for a living man or woman, the parties are of unequal kinds, and the contract is null & void.

#### 7. Autographs or Signatures

Lawful written contracts between living men/women must carry the wet ink autographs of the parties, comprising living identification such as a thumbprint, but more often living standing is recognized by an unambiguous declaration with the handwritten wet ink autograph, including the prefix "By:", and/or the words "All Rights Reserved," and "Without Prejudice," written below. Legal written contracts between legal fiction actors must carry the wet ink signatures of the parties, as an accommodation from a man/woman.

#### 8. Privity of contract

A contract exists only between the parties. No third-party can obtain rights contained within a contract, or buy or sell a contract, without the express permission of the original parties.

12

●) I, Darrin Leland Reber (The Man) not DARRIN LELAND REBER (THE FEDERAL CORPORATION) giving notice that I, am quite aware of the Bid sf-273, Payment sf-274 and Performance Bonds sf-275, and the fraud associated therewith. As well as its "Net Retentions" paid to judges and prosecutors. "DOJ is by far the largest contributor to the Federal Budget." Department of Fiscal Services. "Citizens are human capital." (Executive Order 13037) I am aware the court is a for profit business, a bank, that judges are bankers, that an indictment is a true bill, that if the bill is unpaid your charged, that all crimes are commerce, that the administrator is after the bond of the Cestui Que Vie. This is all fraud without full and honest disclosure. As a man I, refuse to be held as surety. When I, am the creator, the true holder in due course, I hereby claim my Estate. Canon 2057- Any Administrator or Executor that refuses to immediately dissolve a Cestui Que (Vie) Trust, upon a Person establishing their status and competency, is guilty of fraud and fundamental breach of their fiduciary duties requiring their immediate removal and punishment. 50 USC 4305 B (2) Judges are presumed to know the law of where to find it. The petitioner David Moleski from Neptune, New Jersey claims he was falsely imprisoned by Judge Wolfson. The argument presented was that Judge Wolfson obstructed justice pursuant to 18 USC § 1512, et. seq. because she knew in advance that judges have no authority to "prosecute, adjudge or imprison" living souls. Attorneys for Moleski and other social justice groups thoroughly researched the issue and found that the law granting District Court Judges the authorization to send any defendants in any criminal case to prison invalid because of the bill that passed the House in 1947 did not match the one that passed the Senate in 1948. If Public Law 80-772 is indeed not valid, then thousands of prisoners were and are sent to prison illegally. Public Law 80-772 was signed into law on June 25, 1948. Thus, ostensibly rewrote Title 18 of the United States Code. However, a different bill passed the House in 1947 than passed the Senate in 1948, rendering that law unconstitutional. Until the Senate and the House pass the EXACT SAME BILL, there is no law. District Court Judges effectively have no jurisdiction to either classify defendants in the Bureau of Prisons or to hold them at all. In 2008 Department of Justice advised the head of the Bureau of Prisons that the 18-USC §3231 is unconstitutional. By the grace of almighty, and through the supremacy clause of the Constitution and the treaties of the supreme law, it is I, alone, who shall determine my status, standing, honor and jurisdiction. Article VI. Clause 2: This Constitution, the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance therefore; and all Treaties made, or which shall be made, under the Authority of the United States, shall be the supreme Law of the Land; and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby, any Thing in the Constitution or Laws of any State to the Contrary notwithstanding. Clause 3: The Senators and Representatives before mentioned, and the Members of the several State Legislatures, and all Executive and Judicial Officers, both of the United States and the several States, shall be bound by Oath or Affirmation, to support this Constitution; All government, corporations, agencies, officers, in every level in government and in every state, county, municipality, and in every capacity, must obey this Constitution and these treaties if they are brought forward into the light.

13

12) I, Darrin Leland Reber (The Man) not DARRIN LELAND REBER (THE FEDERAL CORPORATION) would like to bring it to the attention of the court and its officers that "An officer of the court may be held liable in damages to any person injured in consequence of a breach of any of the duties connected with his office...the liability for nonfeasance, misfeasance, and for malfeasance in office is in his 'Individual Capacity', not his official capacity..." sec 70 Am. Jur. 2<sup>nd</sup> Sec. 50, VII Civil Liability. "When Lawsuits are brought against federal officials, they must be brought against the in their "individual" capacity not their official capacity. When federal officials perpetrate constitutional torts, they do so ultra vires (beyond the powers) and lose the shield of immunity." Williamson v. U.S. Department of Agriculture, 815 F. 2d. 369, ACLU Foundation v. Barr, 952 F. 2d. 457, 293 U.S. App DC 101, (CA DC 1992). The same rule applies to state officials. Under 42 U.S.C section 1983, you may sue state or local officials for "deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and Federal Laws." Under Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents of Federal Bureau of Narcotics, 403 U.S. 38 (1971).

14

13) I, Darrin Leland Reber (The Man) not DARRIN LELAND REBER (THE FEDERAL CORPORATION) a Princial Creditor, and Beneficiary of the Cestui Que Vie trust by Special Appearance only, do hereby, appoint you judge and administrator as trust fiduciary and command you to settle this matter. On my knees before GOD, through his beloved Son, Jesus Christ, and the Holy Spirit, a man, a servant of the Lord. Proceeding from here and forever as Sui Juris, a Non-Representative, Non-Agent, Non Personam, by all rights and powers as ordered by the 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> Amendment of the Bill of Rights and Bill of Provisions by the United States of America Constitution. In accord with the supreme treaties listed in this document including the International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. (1976) Signed by United States 1993. In accordance with UCC 1-308, As On of We the People, I, do hereby politely and with honor command you, our public servant to follow this direction and Void Ab Inito. "Your Honor, my bond is being used to fund these proceedings. I wish to subrogate the case contract, eliminate the record, and dismiss the charges with extreme prejudice." I wish to live a free inhabitant. "I wish for this case contract to be dismissed with prejudice and proceedings to be eliminated for the record and for the Prosecutor to pay me three times damages for my harm suffered and inconvenience." If he fails to do so, he is in Dishonor and you can ask the Bailiff to arrest him for Gross Negligence and Fraud Upon the Court.

15

14) I, Darrin Leland Reber, instruct you to discharge this entire matter, with extreme prejudice and award the penalties for the crimes to be paid to me in compensation and damages for bringing false charges and arrest against my soul. Plus a charge of ~~\_\_\_\_\_~~ / per day, from date of first indictment to date of my dismissal and release. Take Notice! This is my fee schedule. You have ordered off my freedom menu. There is a cost.

11  
3,000

I, Darrin Leland Reber (The Man) not DARRIN LELAND REBER (THE FEDERAL CORPORATION) Demand that if you do not dismiss with extreme prejudice, that you provide me with a copy of the IRS form 1120, the Judge's Oath of Office and both Public Servant Bonds, and copy of all Agents registrations as Foreign Agents, for my review and for my appeal.

For the reasons stated above the demands in this Document need be granted. This Document needs to be ruled on point by point and as a whole.

Dated this 10 day of March 2019

Darrin Reber

All Rights Reserve Without Prejudice

Tim Fox  
STATE OF MONTANA Attorney General  
215 N. Sanders St  
Helena MT 59601

~~Missoula County Attorney~~

KIRSTEN H. PABST

Missoula County Attorney

Missoula County Courthouse

Missoula, Montana 59802

(406) 258-4737

"NOTICE TO CLERK" I hereby Mandate you to record this Document and Demand that it be made available on The Record under referenced case until such time of my dismissal and release. I, Darrin Leland Reber (The Man) not DARRIN LELAND REBER (THE FEDERAL CORPORATION) would like to bring it to the attention of the court that I have filed a Notice of Status and Standing with the Clerk of Courts that establishes that I, Darrin Leland Reber's status is and forever will be Sui Juris.

4th District

# Certificate of Service

Tim Fox STATE OF MONTANA Attorney General

215 N. Sanders St.

Helena MT 59601

Kirsten H. Pabst MISSOULA COUNTY Attorney

200 W. Broadway

- Missoula MT, 59802