

Janice Sue Taylor  
Near 3341 Arianna Court  
Near Gilbert, Arizona

FILED	LODGED
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**

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA** ) **Case No: CR-10-0400-PHX-MHM**  
 )  
 ) **Plaintiff,** ) **SECOND 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.*

**SECOND 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 to limit the argument and references to law, for both the Defendants and the Plaintiff, to citing nothing outside of USC Title 26, the decisions of the supreme court, and the Constitution for the united States of America 1791 A.D., and the amendments therewith. In fact Movant specifically demands that the IRS and Plaintiff submit sworn statements true and correct as to the constitutionality of all the laws they are applying. Otherwise they might be in constitutional Contempt. Specifically excluded are the following: the regulations at 26 CFR, particularly §301 which apply to Title 27 ATF; and to all cites from all decisions from the U.S. circuit court of Appeals, U.S. District courts, Tax and other lower Courts.

1 This is a matter of law and equity since all charges in the indictment of March 30, 2007 have  
2 their basis in USC Title 26, Subchapter A taxes.

3 This demand is also a matter of Policy. The rules of the investigating agency, IRS, which  
4 initiated the instant prosecution state, in their controlling Handbook:

5 Internal Revenue Manual

6 4.10.7.2.9.8. (05-14-1999)

- 7 1. Decisions made at various levels of the court system...
- 8 2. Decisions made by the U.S. Supreme Court become the law of the land and takes  
9 precedence over decisions of lower courts. **The Internal Revenue Service must follow**  
10 **Supreme Court decisions.** For examiners, Supreme Court decisions have the same  
11 **weight as the Code.**
- 12 3. **Decisions made by lower courts, such as Tax Courts, district Courts, or Claims Court**  
13 **are binding on the service only for the particular taxpayer and the years litigated.**  
14 Adverse decisions of lower courts do not require the Service to alter its position for other  
15 taxpayers.  
16

17 It actually needs no emphasis added to see that NO decision below the Supreme Court is  
18 binding on the IRS, or in its capacity here, on this proceeding in Equity and fairness.

19 Furthermore, ALL IRS literature, everything on their website, by the admission of the IRS  
20 Internal Revenue Manual itself, should **NOT** be relied upon as a basis of belief. Apparently  
21 everything by their own admission is "**FRIVOLOUS**", by implication.

22  
23 *IRS Publications and by implication, all of the information they contain, issued by the*  
24 *National Office, explains the law in plain language for taxpayers and their advisors...*  
25 *While a good source of general information publications should not be cited to sustain a*  
26 *position" IRM 4.10.7.2.8.(05-14-1999)*

27 Added emphasis is not necessary to see that if IRS states that "publications should not be  
28 used to sustain a position", there is NO legitimate use for ANY IRS Publication in this  
29 proceeding. WHO CAN I COUNT ON, IF I CAN'T COUNT ON YOU??

30  
31 **WITHOUT PREJUDICE**

32 Pursuant to UCC 1-308: "I reserve my right not to be compelled to perform under any  
contract, commercial agreement or bankruptcy that I did not enter knowingly, voluntarily,


1 and intentionally. And furthermore, I do not and will not accept the liability of the  
2 compelled benefit of any unrevealed contract or commercial agreement or bankruptcy". I  
3 have made a timely and explicit reservation of my rights and insist that any statutes used in  
4 my defense shall be construed to be in harmony with the Common Law.  
5

6  
7 **RELIEF REQUESTED**

8 In the context of this trial, to ORDER the exclusion of any man, woman or person with an  
9 apparent or possible conflict of interest from the jury.  
10

11 Further Relief requested: Should your HONOR feel that in the context of the issues  
12 elaborated above, you perhaps have a potential conflict of interest, Movant asks that your honor  
13 recuse yourself.  
14

15 Dated this 4<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2010

16   
17 Janice Sue Taylor, sui juris  
18 Of one's own right, possessing full social and  
19 Civil rights, sovereign character and capacity.  
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 Second 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.)**



Janice Sue Taylor, *sui juris*  
Dated this 4<sup>TH</sup> day of October, 2010