	Case 2:10-cr-00400-DGC Document 219 Filed 03/25/11 Page 1 of 2				
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	DENNIS K. BURKE United States Attorney District of Arizona FRANK T. GALATI Assistant U.S. Attorney Arizona State Bar No. 003404 frank.galati@usdoj.gov JAMES R. KNAPP Assistant U.S. Attorney Arizona State Bar No. 021166 james.knapp2@usdoj.gov Two Renaissance Square 40 N. Central Avenue, Suite 1200 Phoenix, Arizona 85004-4408 Telephone: (602) 514-7500				
8	3 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT				
9	DISTRICT OF ARIZONA				
 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 	United States of America, Plaintiff, v. Janice Sue Taylor, Defendant. The United States, through undersigned counsel, responds to Defendant's motions to quash the indictment (Doc. 214) and dismiss the case for lack of jurisdiction (Doc. 215). This Court's February 11, 2011, Order states that "Defendant is advised that motions in limine are not substantive motions on the merits of the case. The deadline for such motions has passed." (Doc. 196 at 1-2.) The motions are therefore untimely. In addition, the motions appear to be more of what another district judge called "legalistic				
 gibberish": Based on her papers, [Plaintiff Nonnie] Chrystal-who identifies herself as "Ambassador nonnie: chrystal" of "satellite beach, Florida, Republic; near [32937]"-has fallen in with the Sovereign Citizen/Tax Protestor movement. In common with other so-called sovereign citizens, she appears to believe that ours is a legal system, not of statutes and precedent, but of sorcery, with parties prevailing as a result of their incantation of out-of-context passages from Black's Legal Dictionary. <i>Chrystal v. Huntington Nat'l Bank</i>, No. 6:10-cv-668, 2010 WL 1965870, at *1 (M.D. Fla. I 17, 2010). Here, too, Defendant dresses up her motions with legal terms and citations to case? 					

Case 2:10-cr-00400-DGC	Document 219	Filed 03/25/11	Page 2 of 2
			1 ugc 2 01 2

	Case 2:10-cr-00400-DGC Document 219 Filed 03/25/11 Page 2 of 2				
1	but the arguments are largely unintelligible and appear to recycle many of the same claims				
2	already rejected by this Court and Judge Murguia.				
3	As a result, the United States moves the Court to strike the motions as untimely, and will				
4	not respond to the motions unless directed to do so by the Court.				
5					
6	Respectfully submitted this 25 th day of March, 2011.				
7	DENNIS K. BURKE				
8	United States Attorney District of Arizona				
9	s/ James Knapp				
10	FRANK T. GALATI				
11	JAMES R. KNAPP Assistant U.S. Attorneys				
12					
13	Certificate of Service				
14	I hereby certify that on 3/25/2011, I electronically transmitted the attached document to the Clerk's Office using the CM/ECF system for filing and transmittal of a Notice of Electronic Filing to the following CM/ECF registrants:				
15					
16	Susan Anderson				
17	In addition, I mailed copies of the attached document to the following:				
18	Janice Sue Taylor				
19	3341 Arianna Ct. Gilbert, AZ 85298				
20	s/ James Knapp				