

1 DENNIS K. BURKE
United States Attorney
District of Arizona

2 FRANK T. GALATI
3 Assistant U.S. Attorney
Arizona State Bar No. 003404
frank.galati@usdoj.gov

4 JAMES R. KNAPP
5 Assistant U.S. Attorney
Arizona State Bar No. 021166
james.knapp2@usdoj.gov
6 Two Renaissance Square
40 N. Central Avenue, Suite 1200
7 Phoenix, Arizona 85004-4408
Telephone: (602) 514-7500

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

10 United States of America,
11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

13 Janice Sue Taylor,
14 Defendant.

CR-10-00400-PHX-MHM

**UNITED STATES' RESPONSE TO
NOTIFICATION FOR CLAUSE 14
DENIAL OF GOVERNMENT'S
RULES TO PRIVATE PERSON, etc.**

15
16 The United States, through undersigned counsel, responds to Taylor's Notification for
17 Clause 14 Denial of Government's Rules to Private Person Due to Fundamental Right of
18 Ignorance, Said Right Extended to Any Attorney, Whether or Not at Bar, etc. (doc. 139). This
19 is another of Taylor's pleadings which is almost entirely gibberish and leaves the United States
20 in the position of having to divine what defendant's arguments really are. We attempt to do so
21 in the following paragraphs. ^{1/}

22 **1. Jurisdiction.** It appears that Taylor is once again proclaiming that the United States
23 has no standing to bring this criminal prosecution and that the Court does not have jurisdiction
24 over the subject matter of this case. (Motion, ¶I(1), at 2). This subject has been addressed in
25

26
27 ^{1/} This "Notification" is perhaps meant to be a trial brief of sorts, setting out defendant's
28 view of the law and facts. If that is what it is, a response is not called for at this time, but we err
on the side of caution.

1 three of Taylor’s previous filings (docs. 117, 119, 135). The United States has responded (docs.
2 132, 133) and we respectfully stand on those responses.

3 **2. Ignorance.** Defendant presents some musings about the right of a citizen to be
4 ignorant of “rules” of the government. (Motion, at 6-21). Taylor makes reference to *Cheek v.*
5 *United States*, 498 U.S. 192 (1991). The United States, of course, recognizes that in a tax
6 evasion case and pursuant to *Cheek*, we have the burden of negating defendant’s claim of
7 ignorance of the law or a claim that due to a misunderstanding of the law, defendant had a good-
8 faith belief that she was not violating the tax laws. This is a matter of evidentiary proof during
9 trial and jury instruction near the conclusion of trial. Accordingly, we submit that nothing more
10 need be said now.

11 **3. Lawyers and the Organized Bar.** Taylor goes on for almost 10 pages offering some
12 views about lawyers and the bar. (Motion, at 21-30). The undersigned is unable to discern any
13 prayer for relief concerning these musings about attorneys and does not understand what Taylor
14 is talking about. Accordingly, we offer no response on the subject.

15 **4. Violation of September 30, 2010 Order.** Taylor has defied the Court’s order of
16 September 30, 2010 by once again listing her purported “legal address” on the first page of both
17 her “Exception of Previous Order, etc.” (doc. 135) and this “Notification” (doc. 139). An
18 attachment to this Notification (doc. 139-1, at 16) contains the same “Legal Notice” that the
19 Court’s September 30, 2010 order found to be “meaningless and of no legal significance” and
20 ordered not be included in any future filings (doc. 107). Because both of these pleadings fail to
21 comply with the Court’s order of September 30, 2010 and defendant’s non-compliance appears
22 to be entirely willful, we suggest that the Court, in the exercise of its sound discretion, strike
23 them.

24 **5. Attachments to Document 139.** Defendant’s “Notification” is 30 pages long. Many
25 documents are appended to it, making the entire submission approximately 369 pages in length.
26 Pursuant to Local Criminal Rule 12.1 and Local Civil Rule 7.2(e) “...a motion including its
27 supporting memorandum, and the response including its supporting memorandum, each shall not
28

1 exceed seventeen (17) pages, exclusive of attachments and any required statement of facts.”
2 The United States does *not* object to the Court considering this entire document, but we are
3 unable to discern where it is that defendant’s pleading ends and her attachments begin.
4 Specifically, we point the Court to page 33 of document 139. There we find what appears to be
5 a pleading which challenges the legality of defendant’s arraignment. Is it an exhibit to the
6 “Notification” or is it a separate pleading? If it is meant to be the latter, the United States
7 submits that defendant has offered nothing which supports her apparent request that her
8 arraignment be vacated.

9 Likewise, defendant has offered no support for her claim of entitlement to “a 10 day
10 **fundamental rights extension** of time to proceed at the National Ninth Tribunal Court level
11 (AKA “United States Circuit Court of Appeals”) for an Extraordinary Writ for Extraordinary
12 Remedy under Rule 21(c) of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedures (sic)...” (doc. 139-1, at
13 11-12). This appears to be a request for a stay of proceedings. Taylor is, of course, free to
14 pursue Writs of Mandamus or Prohibition at the Court of Appeals if she wishes, but she has
15 presented no grounds which justify issuance of a stay for her to do so.

16 Respectfully submitted this 1st day of November, 2010.

17 DENNIS K. BURKE
18 United States Attorney
19 District of Arizona

20 *s/ Frank T. Galati*

21 FRANK T. GALATI
22 JAMES R. KNAPP
23 Assistant U.S. Attorneys

24 Certificate of Service

25 I hereby certify that on 11/1/2010, I mailed copies of the attached document to the following:

26 Janice Sue Taylor
27 3341 Arianna Ct.
28 Gilbert, AZ 85298

s/ Michelle L. Colberg