

| | |
|---|---------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FILED | <input type="checkbox"/> LODGED |
| <input type="checkbox"/> RECEIVED | <input type="checkbox"/> 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**

| | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|
| UNITED STATES OF AMERICA |) | Case No: CR-10-0400-PHX-MHM |
| |) | |
| Plaintiff, |) | FIRST MOTION IN LIMINE |
| Vs. |) | |
| |) | |
| Janice Sue Taylor, sui juris |) | |
| |) | |
| Defendant |) | |
| |) | Proposed Orders Attached |

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.

FIRST MOTION IN LIMINE

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, Person 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 moves this court in the nature of FRCrP rule 12(b)(3)(c) to Order that the Plaintiff and Defendants be excluded from using any reference to the legal terms "United States" or "State". In the context of this trial, all of its pleadings and testimony or otherwise, Plaintiff and Defendants shall substitute the words "DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA" for "United States" and "State". The District of Columbia is the proper territorial and personal jurisdiction for this case.

The Movant would be prejudiced and denied due process and a fair trial by the mere use of the words "United States" as they are employing its common usage, the jury assuming them referring to the people living in one of the 50 union States.

The Movant would be additionally prejudiced by the Plaintiff's knowing and misleading use of the following legally correct, applicable and -to the jurors- hidden definitions of the following words. And that their use in any of their pleadings, witness testimony, or otherwise; in ANY

1 way outside of the inherently limited definitions listed below as applicable to USE Title 26
2 Subtitle A taxes; would be prejudicial, and is a knowing, willing, deceptive denial of a fair trial
3 to the Movant.

4 This demand is a matter of law and equity that since all charges in the indictment of March
5 30, 2007, have their basis in USC Title 26, Subtitle A (hereinafter referred to as IRC) taxes.

6 Additionally, this request is for the purpose of judicial economy. If the court grants this
7 motion properly defining the legal terms below, Movant will not have to object to each and every
8 false, misleading or presumptuous use of said legal terms by the Plaintiff.

- 9
10 1. That the definition if the “**United States**” be limited to the following:

11 *26 USC §7701. Definitions*

12 *(a) When used in this title where not otherwise distinctly expressed or manifestly*
13 *incompatible with the intent thereof—*

14 *(9) United States*

15 *The term “United States” when used in a geographical sense includes only the States*
16 *and the District of Columbia.*

- 17 2. That the definition of those “**States**” be limited to the following:

18 *26 USC §7701 Definitions*

19 *(a)...(10) State*

20 *The term “State” shall be construed to include the **District of Columbia** where such*
21 *construction is necessary to carry out provisions of this title.*

22 Such construction IS necessary to carry out provisions of this title, because the constitutional
23 concepts of the **50 union States** and the **District of Columbia** are mutually exclusive by nature.

- 24 3. The Weasel Word “**Includes**” must be addressed here because the Plaintiff is wont to
25 deceptively use it in other matters and proceedings. The IRC definition is:

26 *26 USC §7701. Definitions*

27 *(a)...(11) Regulations*

28 *(c) Includes and including*

29
30 The terms “**includes**” and “**including**” when used in a definition contained in this title shall
31 not be deemed to exclude other things otherwise **within the meaning** of the term defined.
32

1 The best and most senseless circular example of this in the IRC is the definition of "Income"
2 as "Income"... One would be just as correct, in accordance with the §7701 (a)(11)(c), saying
3 that the definition of "Apple" is "Apple" and not naming its description, genus or species, yet it
4 tells us nothing. Plaintiff has not shown that "the 50 union States" are otherwise **within the**
5 **meaning of the "District of Columbia", "Puerto Rico", or of "the Territories"**. The IRC
6 definition, supra, is intentionally misleading in bad faith, both senseless and Nihil Dicit.

7
8 In fact, this definition would offend not only the Local Courts if one used it, but the County
9 and State Courts, the Supreme Court, the Maxims of Law, and the very concept of LANGUAGE
10 itself. One can easily picture the Plaintiffs, in their office, having descended to no more than a
11 collection of gestures, screams and grunts as their idea of language.

12
13 Movant demands this court require every use of the word "included" to conform to the
14 Supreme Court decision below as controlling on this court, as they are on the very rules of
15 statutory construction itself, as in:

16
17 *"Expressio unius est exclusion alterius. A maxim of statutory interpretation meaning that*
18 *the expression of one thing is the exclusion of another. See in the nature of Burgin v.*
19 *Forbes, 293 Ky. 456, 169 S.W.2d 321, 325; Newblock v. Bowles 170 Okla. 487, 40 P.2d*
20 *1097, 1100. Mention of one thing implies exclusion of another. When certain persons or*
21 *things are specified in a law, contract, or will an intention to exclude all other from its*
22 *operation may be inferred. Under this maxim, if statute specifies one exception to a general*
23 *rule or assumes to specify the effects of a certain provision, other exceptions or effects are*
24 *excluded" [Black's Law dictionary, Sixth Edition Page 581]*


25
26 **WITHOUT PREJUDICE**

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

RELIEF REQUESTED

In the context of this trial, in all of its pleadings, testimony and otherwise, an ORDER that Plaintiff and defendant shall **NOT** use the words “United States” or “State”, and instead substitute the words “**DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**”

Dated this 4th day of October, 2010



Janice Sue Taylor, sui juris

Of one's own right, possessing full social and Civil rights, sovereign character and capacity.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
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 First Motion in Limine, 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