

Janice Sue Taylor
3341 Arianna Court
Near Gilbert, Arizona
County of Maricopa
Pursuant to U.S.C. 28 §1746 (1)

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FILED	<input type="checkbox"/> LODGED
<input type="checkbox"/> RECEIVED	<input type="checkbox"/> COPY
NOV 09 2010	
CLERK U S DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF ARIZONA	
BY _____ M DEPUTY	

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)	Case No: CR-10-0400-PHX-MHM
)	REBUTTAL TO GOVERNMENTS
Alleged Plaintiff,)	FIRST MOTION IN LIMINE
Vs.)	
)	
Janice Sue Taylor, sui juris)	
)	
Alleged Defendant)	

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.

**REBUTTAL TO GOVERNMENTS RESPONSE TO
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, 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 accepts Prosecutors response to the first motion in Limine (doc 126) stating that the motion submitted by Movant is Frivolous, upon proof of claim that the following is not true, and has no basis which would impact Movant negatively in any due process or fair trial proceedings.

1. Movant moves this court in the nature of FRCrP rule 12(b)(3)(c) to Order that the Alleged Plaintiff and Alleged Defendant 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, Alleged Plaintiff and Alleged Defendant shall substitute the

1 words "**DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**" for "**United States**" and "**State**". The District of
2 Columbia is the proper territorial and personal jurisdiction for this case.

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

6 3. The Movant would be additionally prejudiced by the Alleged Plaintiff's knowing and
7 misleading use of the following legally correct, applicable and –to the jurors- hidden
8 definitions of the following words. And that their use in any of their pleadings, witness
9 testimony, or otherwise; in ANY way outside of the inherently limited definitions listed
10 below as applicable to USE Title 26 Subtitle A taxes; would be prejudicial, and is a
11 knowing, willing, deceptive denial of a fair trial to the Movant.

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

15 5. Additionally, this request is for the purpose of judicial economy. If the court grants this
16 motion properly defining the legal terms below, Movant would not have to object to each
17 and every false, misleading or presumptuous use of said legal terms by the Alleged
18 Plaintiff.

19 6. That the definition of the "**United States**" be limited to and means the following:

20 *26 USC §7701. Definitions*

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

23 *(9) United States*

24 *The term "**United States**" when used in a geographical sense includes only the States*
25 *and the District of Columbia.*

26 7. That the definition of those "**States**" be limited to and means the following:

27 *26 USC §7701 Definitions*

28 *(a)...(10) State*

29 *The term "**State**" shall be construed to include the **District of Columbia** where such*
30 *construction is necessary to carry out provisions of this title.*
31
32

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

4 9. The Weasel Word **“Includes”** must be addressed here because the Alleged Plaintiff is
5 wont to deceptively use it in other matters and proceedings. The IRC definition is:

6 26 USC §7701. Definitions

7 (a)...(11) Regulations

8 (c) Includes and including

9
10 10. The terms **“includes”** and **“including”** when used in a definition contained in this title
11 shall not be deemed to exclude other things otherwise **within the meaning** of the term
12 defined.

13
14 11. The best and most senseless circular example of this in the IRC is the definition of
15 “Income” as “Income”... One would be just as correct, in accordance with the §7701
16 (a)(11)(c), saying that the definition of “Apple” is “Apple” and not naming its
17 description, genus or species, yet it tells us nothing. Alleged Plaintiff has not shown that
18 **“the 50 union States”** are otherwise **within the meaning of the “District of Columbia”**,
19 **“Puerto Rico”**, or of **“the Territories”**. The IRC definition, supra, is intentionally
20 misleading in bad faith, both senseless and Nihil Dicit.

21
22 12. In fact, this definition would offend not only the Local Courts if one used it, but the
23 County and State Courts, the Supreme Court, the Maxims of Law, and the very concept
24 of LANGUAGE itself.

25
26 13. Movant demands this court require every use of the word “included” to conform to the
27 Supreme Court decision below as controlling on this court, as they are on the very rules
28 of statutory construction itself, as in:

29 *“Expressio unius est exclusion alterius. A maxim of statutory interpretation*
30 *meaning that the expression of one thing is the exclusion of another. See in the*
31 *nature of Burgin v. Forbes, 293 Ky. 456, 169 S.W.2d 321, 325; Newblock v. Bowles*
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 Rebuttal to governments 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 9th day of November, 2010 A.D



Janice Sue Taylor, sui juris
Of one's own right, possessing full social and
Civil rights, sovereign character and capacity.
Pursuant to U.S.C. 28 §1746 (1)
Without the United States.