

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FILED	<input type="checkbox"/> LODGED
<input type="checkbox"/> RECEIVED	<input type="checkbox"/> COPY
AUG 23 2010	
CLERK U S DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF ARIZONA	
BY _____	P DEPUTY

**Janice Sue Taylor**

**Appearing Specially, Not Generally**

**Legal Address.** Commencing, in suf. det., at w 1/4 corner of section 26, T.2S.-R.6E., G & SRB & M, thence S. 0° 07' 22" W. to 332.12 ft. to SW corner of section 26, thence bearing 0° S. 7' 22" W. from SW. corner of section 26, 332.12 ft. distant therefrom, thence southerly of N. Section 26 - 858.78 ft to the True Point of the Beginning, continuing thence 164.91 ft. to SE corner, thence 164.91 ft. to SW corner, to True Point of the Beginning; organic city of Gilbert, organic county of Maricopa, organic State of Arizona; —not owned or possessed by the United States of America; —not a post Road; —not on a post Road; —not in a U.S. district.

(response information at certificate of service page)

**IN THE [ALLEGED] UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE [ALLEGED] DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**

[The United States of America] /  
The Internal Revenue Service  
federal agency

ALLEGED AS PLAINTIFF,

v.

Janice Sue Taylor

ALLEGED AS DEFENDANT

cc: National Ninth Tribunal Court

**AFFIDAVIT OF JANICE SUE  
TAYLOR IN SUPPORT OF  
MOTION TO OBEY CONSTITUTION**

Case # CR 10-400-PHX-MHM (ECV)

LIABLE NOTICE: Clerk Of Court

NOTICE: Mary H. Murguia

**VERIFICATION**

STATE OF ARIZONA            )  
  : SS  
COUNTY OF MARICOPA        )

AFFIANT having been duly sworn deposes and says:

1. That Affiant is a citizen of the United States, and is a citizen and a permanent resident, with full Legal Address domicile in the State of Arizona, and not elsewhere;
2. That Affiant is of sufficient legal age to make this Affidavit;
3. That Affiant is aware of the material content contained in the said Motion To Obey the United States Constitution in the above numbered case;
4. That this Affidavit has been made in support of said Motion To Obey the United States Constitution in the above numbered case;
5. That Affiant does not reside, have abode, or otherwise conduct any business or other activities in any U.S. district of or for the United States;
6. That the proposed Constitution continues to have and hold out the same Rights for the people of the several States of the United States commencing from January 1, 1945, as it did on the date of December 31, 1944, the day before that date, and back to the time of September 17, 1787, 1st Session;
7. That the Constitution For The United States was in full force for all years commencing from 1787, inclusive of 1789, 1795, 1818, 1824, 1833, 1848, 1884, 1919, 1937, 1945, and any and all other pertinent years thereafter, or before if inadvertently not included herein, and all facts and Constitutional Conclusions of Law applicable to those years are binding upon this UnLawfully claimed case today;
8. That in a letter by Mr. Founder James Madison to Mr. Founder Thomas Jefferson, dated October 17, 1788, Mr. Founder Madison, in his regards to the question of a need for a bill of rights to control the federal government, stated that he had "never thought the omission [of one] to be a material defect;

9. That [no] “material defect” means that Mr. Founder Madison believed that he knew that the Constitution had been constructed so perfectly, that it was in fact, virtually perfect for the purpose of controlling, absolutely, the Congress, and the Courts, and thereby the Executive Branch, of the United States, even though his demise brought no explanation as to precisely what he meant by that;
10. That no Constitution-authority exists, or ever has existed, on behalf of the Congress, to provide it the *extended* power to pass any law to allow it to escape the precise boundaries that it was granted by Clause 17, of Article I, Section 8, of the particular properties and places that it, by precise means and measures set forth therein, was authorized to employ thereunder, to declare itself to permeate “America’s landscape,” nor to alter or modify one whit of the said Constitution to apply to the governments of the several States, or the people residing or having abode therein, in order to escape its constrained jurisdiction imposed upon the United States as a part of the no “material defect” that Mr. Founder Madison knew legally existed, and by scientific operation of law, had power to prevail sufficient to prevent the Congress from doing anything that the Constitution, not the courts, did not let it do;
11. That there has at no time been any performance of any chief officer of any department or for the United States in or on any Legal Address – not a post Road; not on a post Road, not in any U.S. district, of Demandant, nor the authority of any agency, department, employee, or operative thereunder, as the Congress, in compliance with its constrained duties under the Constitution, did require at Title 4, U.S. Code, Section 72 establish to prevent operations of the United States in places not truthfully established as a legitimate particular place for operations of the United States, which Demandant’s Legal Address – not a post Road; not on a

post Road; not in any U.S. district, is included as such a particular excluded address;

12. That the court alleged, in reviewing the particular pleadings that duly challenge the constructive subject matter jurisdiction of this court, now to have specific fundamental knowledge that enhances the court's responsibility as it pertains to the above numbered case of Janice Sue Taylor, has been made officially aware of the true whereabouts of demandant, denying the court the legal ability or discretion to chose to commit collateral attack against the Defendant's rights as they exist at such Legal Address: - not a post Road; - not on a post Road; not in a U.S. district; in order to circumvent the straight forward Constitution-rights of Janice Sue Taylor, and all others residing or having abode therein;
13. That much more than this exists, going back to year of 1789, and thereafter, as evidence denying this court any jurisdiction at all in any such case as this numbered instant case purports to be, which if the amount of evidence pertaining to the challenge for subject matter jurisdiction is not sufficient as provided in the above named filed document, this case will be brought forward in a True Court of the United States, as a case of first impression, before the 9<sup>th</sup> Tribunal Court of the United States, with all necessary [alleged] district court procedural paperwork being conveyed to that court for a full and unique original action case therein, with plenary jurisdiction applicable thereto as a matter of proper and true Constitution-Law;
14. That the question of what is and what is not a "post Road" of the United States, and upon what basis the same may be at all regulated, and where and where not any such "post Road" may or does exist - except there be an occurrence of fraud by claim of de facto jurisdiction - is a matter that requires considerably greater examination of the matter to expose the unlawful political ramblings at law-


making of one or more reckless and derelict congresses of the United States to the courts and to the people, than the time constraints that this proceeding has provided for may admit;

- 15. That this Affidavit supports Demandant's Motion To Obey The Constitution For The United States Above All Other Laws Applicable Thereto in its summary submission to the above named court, specially, not generally, recognized in such a matter for motion, even if held to not have Subject Matter Jurisdiction and Constructive Subject Matter Jurisdiction in the above numbered case, and this paragraph serves exclusively such said motion, but may not be construed as to denying any other part of this Affidavit as supporting such said motion as well;
- 16. That Affiant swears and deposes that the facts, findings, evidences, and conclusions of law contained therein she knows to be true of her own knowledge.

Respectfully and Objectively Submitted,

**UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY**


8 23, 2010


  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 Janice Sue Taylor – Affiant

**NOTARY PUBLIC'S VERIFICATION**

Personally appeared before me, a Notary Public, was **Janice Sue Taylor**, who stated that she had read the foregoing Affidavit, and stated that the foregoing is true as to her own knowledge, and that she voluntarily affixed her signature above.

Dated this 23<sup>rd</sup> day of August, 2010 AD.



  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 Notary Public