

Janice Sue Taylor
Near 3341 Arianna Court
Near Gilbert, Arizona

FILED	LOGGED
RECEIVED	COPY
OCT 04 2010	
CLERK U S DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF ARIZONA	
BY _____	S DEPUTY

**DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**

<p>UNITED STATES OF AMERICA</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Plaintiff,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Vs.</p> <p>Janice Sue Taylor, sui juris</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Defendant</p>	<p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p>	<p>Case No: CR-10-0400-PHX-MHM</p> <p>MOTION FOR A FAIR TRIAL</p> <p>MOTION FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE</p> <p>ON CERTIFIED SELF EXECUTING</p> <p>DOCUMENT TITLED</p> <p>"FIRM OFFER TO SETTLE"</p>
---	--	--

NOTICE TO THE COURT, CLERK OF COURT and UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

This motion is filed for above caption hearing in the district court of the United States", and not the "United States District Court". If the recipient clerk is unable to process this pleading, please direct it to the proper official.

MOTION FOR A FAIR TRIAL

Comes now Janice Sue Taylor, a living woman, not a corporation or other type of artificially created person, and not domiciled in the District of Columbia; hereinafter the MOVANT, by Special Visitation or Appearance, not granting jurisdiction nor recognizing this court's right to try her; but intervening in a foreign jurisdiction on behalf of the Alleged Defendant, Persona JANICE SUE TAYLOR, hereinafter the Accused. Movant is not trained in the law, nor is She an attorney, nor is She appearing Pro Se; but rather of right in Sui Juris.

Movant requests this court to provide her A FAIR TRIAL in accordance with the source of the FRCrP at 28 §USC 2072(b) "*Such rules shall not abridge, modify or enlarge any substantive right* ", and to abide by the following issues:

1. To honor, uphold and abide by the oaths taken by the presiding judge and attending court officers, pursuant to the Constitution for the united States of America, Article VI, Clauses 2 and 3 in this matter;
2. To provide due process of law pursuant to the First, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, Ninth, Tenth and Thirteenth Articles of Amendments of the Constitution for the united States of America 1791 A.D., and as required by the aforementioned oaths taken by the presiding judge and attending court officers, in this matter;
3. To provide equal protection under the law, as required by the original National and state Constitutions and pursuant to the referenced oaths;
4. To acknowledge the Separation of Powers Doctrine inherent in the Constitution of the united States of America 1791 A.D., and provide the Movant with a true judicial trial in accordance with Article III of the Constitution, supra. "United States District Court"

1 appears to be a creature of the Administrative Branch of the U.S government. The
2 Plaintiff / Prosecutor's office is the so called Department of Justice, which is also a part
3 of the Administrative Branch of government, as is the "Internal Revenue Service".
4 Perhaps we should rename the whole thing the Department of JUST US? Is the plaintiff
5 acting as a literal Persecutor? Such a cabal cannot grant Movant an impartial trial.

6 5. To respect, protect and uphold the Rights of the Movant in this matter, Rights which are
7 secured by the National and state Constitutions, pursuant to referenced oaths;

8 6. Movant demands that the Judge's and Prosecutor's Oaths of office be entered on the
9 record as evidence sworn true and correct as to the Constitutionality involved in this case.

10 7. There are essential elements to prove in any case or controversy, whether administrative
11 or judicial, arising under Article III §2, (arising under) of the Constitution for the united
12 States of America, ratified 1791 A.D., and the laws thereof.. The following elements are
13 essential:

14 A. When Challenged; standing, venue and all elements of subject matter
15 jurisdiction, including compliance with substantive and procedural due process
16 requirements, must be established in the record.

17 B. Facts of the case must be established in the record.

18 C. Unless stipulated by agreement, facts must be verified by competent
19 witnesses via testimony, affidavit, deposition or direct oral examination
20 with firsthand knowledge.

21 D. the LAW of the case must affirmatively appear in the record, which in the
22 instance of a tax controversy necessarily includes taxing and liability statutes
23 with attending regulations. See in the nature of United States of America v.
24 Menk 260 F. Supp. 784 at 787; United States of America v. Community TV
25 Inc. 327 F.2d 79 (10th Cir. 1964).

26 E. The advocate of a position must prove application of law to stipulated or
27 otherwise provable facts.

28 F. The trial court, whether administrative or judicial, must render a written
29 decision that includes findings of fact and conclusions of law. See in the
30 nature of Federal Maritime Commission v. South Carolina Ports Authority,
31 535 U.S. (2002)

32 8. Movant here claims She would be prejudiced and denied due process and a fair trial
should the court fail to address the issues expressed in the "Motion to quash" and the
"Notice of Firm Offer to Settle", Which has been settled, by the principal of Estoppel,
in the year 2005. Proving Movant has filed her returns. No rebuttals to date. This
indictment is null and void on its face ab initio. SEE CERTIFIED EXHIBIT "E".

9. This request is a matter of law and equity in that all Officers of this Court have their

1 Oaths of Office under; and that due process rights of the Movant are secured against
2 trespass by this Court by the Constitution for the united States of America 1791 A.D.


3
4 **WITHOUT PREJUDICE**

5 Pursuant to UCC 1-308: "I reserve my right not to be compelled to perform under any
6 contract, commercial agreement or bankruptcy that I did not enter knowingly, voluntarily,
7 and intentionally. And furthermore, I do not and will not accept the liability of the
8 compelled benefit of any unrevealed contract or commercial agreement or bankruptcy". I
9 have made a timely and explicit reservation of my rights and insist that any statutes used in
10 my defense shall be construed to be in harmony with the Common Law.

11
12 **RELIEF REQUESTED**

- 13
14 1. Movant demands this court to grant the attached ORDER to provide Movant a fair trial in
15 accordance with the points above.
- 16 2. Movant demands this court to take judicial notice on the Certified copy of the Self
17 executing document attached herewith named "Firm Offer to Settle".
- 18 3. Movant demands this court to provide documentation sworn true, correct and complete of
19 the Constitutionality of all issues herein. Findings of fact and conclusions of law are
20 required on all documents in answer to any issues herein.
- 21 4. In the alternative Movant demands this court to dismiss with prejudice.

22 NO INFORMED CONSENT HAS BEEN GIVEN BY Janice Sue Taylor

23
24 
25 Janice Sue Taylor, sui juris - 10-4-2010
26 Of one's own right, possessing full social and
27 Civil rights, sovereign character and capacity
28
29
30
31
32

Certificate of Service


I, Janice Sue Taylor, hereby declare and state that I have filed a true and correct copy of the above document Motion for a fair trial, Said Right Extended To Any Attorney, Whether Or Not At Bar, If Providing Or Proposing To Provide "Assistance - Not Force - Of Counsel" with the Clerk of the Court for the [Alleged] United States District Court For The [Alleged] District Of Arizona, said [Alleged] Court Appearing And Existing [Supposedly] As A Possession Of Its Own And NOT Lawfully Existing In The Legal or Organic County of Maricopa, Legal or Organic [Proposed] State of Arizona, and have mailed a copy hereof, postage prepaid thereon, to the Alleged U.S. Attorney's Office at the following addresses set forth below.

Frank T. Galati,
James Richard Knapp,
Office of the Alleged U.S. Attorney
40 N. Central Ave. # 1200
Phoenix, Arizona near 85004

Susan Anderson
850 W. Adams Street, Suite 201
Phoenix, Arizona near 85007

RESPONSE TO THIS EXHIBITED NOTICE IS REQUIRED - *Qui Tacit, Consentire Videtur, Ubi Tractatur De Ejus Commodo* (He[She] who is silent is considered as assenting [to the matter in question] when his[her] interest is as stake.)

Dated this 4TH day of October, 2010 A.D



Janice Sue Taylor, sui juris

Janice Sue Taylor
Near 3341 Arianna Court
Near Gilbert, Arizona

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

vs.

Janice Sue Taylor,

Defendant

) Case No: cr-10-04000PHX-MHM
)

) ORDER FOR A FAIR TRIAL
) ACCORDING TO THE
) STIPULATIONS IN THE
) MOTION FOR A FAIR TRIAL
)

) DATED October 4, 2010
)

This court grants this ORDER to provide Movant a fair trial in accordance with the points in the Motion for a fair trial, Docket # _____.

Dated this day of October, 2010

Judge Mary H. Murguia
