Case 2:10-cr-00400-MHM Document 164
Janice Sue Taylor Filed 11/46/10 Page 1 of 4 FILED LODGED 3341 Arianna Court RECEIVED Near Gilbert, Arizona COPY Pursuant to U.S.C. 28 §1746 (1) NOV 1 6 2010 Without the United States. CLERK U S DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF ARIZONA 1 2 DEPUTY 2 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA 3 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Case No.: CR-10-400-PHX-MHM 4 Alleged Plaintiff, REBUTTAL TO GOVERNMENTS **BILL OF PARTICULARS DOC #149** 5 VS. 6 Janice Sue Taylor, 7 Alleged Defendant FRCrP 7(f) 8 REBUTTAL TO GOVERNMENTS MOTION for BILL of PARTICULARS 9 10

COMES NOW the Alleged Defendant, by special appearance only and without waiver of challenges to jurisdiction, pursuant Rule 7(f) FRCrP, to state:

This Alleged Defendant accepts the Prosecutors response to the demand of "Bill of Particulars",(doc 149) UPON PROOF OF CLAIM that all of the following questions in #1 and 2,a-o, are only theories and not inquiries about the Tax laws, Statutes and Regulations, in an earnest attempt to acquire the facts. The Prosecutor has scooted around the factual issues claiming Alleged Defendant is asking about legal theories, in this "Bill of Particulars" and not the facts. The underlying statutes that have effect on Alleged Defendant must be shown on record before any facts can apply to the case. If there are no Statutes then the facts are on the moon. It does not matter what facts Prosecutor may have if there is not a Statute to make it a crime, attaching to Alleged Defendant. Therefore Alleged Defendant demands Prosecutor answer this Bill of Particulars in full in order to preserve justice and make sure Alleged Defendant is not being charged fraudulently nor denied any Due Process.

1. This Alleged Defendant comprehends that a Bill of Particulars cannot "cure" a defective or insufficient indictment or information, nevertheless because the Indictment here does not properly comply with Rule 7(c) FRCrP in that the Information does not cite or otherwise specify the particular statute, or section thereof, allegedly violated, nor cite or identify a particular administrative regulation (if any) supposedly violated, this Alleged Defendant is extremely

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

handicapped and cannot understand how or even if an unspecified statute or regulation might have been violated.

2

pers Yes or no?

4 5

6

7

9

10 11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

2324

25

27

26

28

regulation might have been violated.

A. Is there delegated authority in the U.S. Constitution to make or force a free person, to consent, as in signing his name?

- B. Is there delegated authority in the U.S. Constitution to tax any of the rights "We the People" have secured there?

 Yes or no?
- C. Is there delegated authority in the U.S. Constitution to make or force a free person to swear or affirm?

 Yes or no?
 - 2. In particular, this Alleged Defendant needs to know the following specific things:
 - (a) What statute, or section thereof, imposes a duty or requirement "to make an income tax return"?
 - (b) IF a duty or requirement "to make an income tax return" was or has been imposed by an administrative rule or regulation, this Alleged Defendant needs a copy of the applicable rule or regulation.
 - (c) What statute, or section thereof, imposes a duty or requirement "to make an income tax return TO said District Director of the Internal Revenue Service"? (emphasis added to clarify this point)
 - (d) IF a duty or requirement "to make an income tax return <u>TO said District Director of the Internal Revenue Service"</u> was or has been imposed by an administrative rule or regulation, this Alleged Defendant needs a copy of the applicable rule or regulation.
 - (e) What statute, or section thereof, imposes a duty or requirement "to make an income tax return <u>TO said Director of the Internal Revenue Service Center"?</u> (emphasis added for clarification)
 - IF a duty or requirement "to make an income tax return TO said Director of the Internal Revenue Service Center" was or has been imposed by an administrative rule or regulation, this Alleged Defendant needs a copy of the applicable rule or regulation.
 - (g) What statute, or section thereof, imposes a duty or requirement "to make an income tax return TO any proper officer of the IRS."? (emphasis added to clarify this point).
 - (h) IF a duty or requirement "to make an income tax return <u>TO any proper officer of the IRS</u>" was or has been imposed by an administrative rule or regulation, this Alleged Defendant needs a copy of the applicable rule or regulation.
 - (i) What statute, or section thereof, imposes a duty or requirement "to make an income tax return TO any other proper officer of the United States."? (emphasis added to clarify this point).

Case 2:10-cr-00400-MHM Document 164 Filed 11/16/10 Page 3 of 4
Janice Sue Taylor
3341 Arianna Court
Near Gilbert, Arizona
Pursuant to U.S.C. 28 §1746 (1)
Without the United States,

(j) IF a duty or requirement "to make an income tax return TO any ot

(j) IF a duty or requirement "to make an income tax return <u>TO any other proper officer of the United States"</u> was or has been imposed by an administrative rule or regulation, this Alleged Defendant needs a copy of the applicable rule or regulation.

What statute or section thereof, defines the difference between the "United States" and the "United States of America"? This Alleged Defendant needs a copy of the applicable Statute or section.

(l) If an Indictment is issued under the name of the "United States of America" as plaintiff, the Alleged Defendant needs a copy of real party in interest.

(m) Please define the phrase "United States of America" as used as plaintiff in the Indictment. Who is the real party in interest?

(n) Please define the phrase "any proper officer of the United States" as used in the Indictment. Does this phrase refer to a de jure officer of the United States as appointed by the President of the U.S. pursuant Article II, §2 of the Constitution? Or does it refer to some other claimed to be "officer of the United States"? Specify the WHO that "other proper officer" is!

(o) Is the language of "fail to make an income tax return" a cryptic euphemism used in lieu of a direct and positive statement of "fail to file an income tax return"?

This Alleged Defendant cannot understand a so-called "charge" not made nor can a defense be effective. If the laws affecting Alleged Defendant are clear and precise the Prosecutors should have no problem answering these questions. If they cannot or will not answer these questions in the matter of justice, then there must be a cover up or fraudulent accusations against this Alleged Defendant.

THEREFORE: The government attorney(s) should be required to reply and respond to all of the above. Be it so ordered.

WITHOUT PREJUDICE

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

11/15/2010

Unice Sue Taylor, sui juris W.O.P. 1-308
Of one's own right, possessing full social
Civil rights, sovereign character and capacity
Pursuant to U.S.C. 28 §1746 (1)

Pursuant to U.S.C. 28 §1746 (1) Without the United States,

 Case 2:10-cr-00400-MHM Document 164 Filed 11/16/10 Page 4 of 4 Janice Sue Taylor

Janice Sue Taylor
3341 Arianna Court
Near Gilbert, Arizona
Pursuant to U.S.C. 28 §1746 (1)
Without the United States,

Certificate of Service

I, Janice Sue Taylor, hereby declare and state that I have filed a true and correct copy of the above document RESPONSE OF GOVERNMENTS BILL OF PARTICULARS. 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 15th day of Novemberber, 2010 A.D_

Janice Sue Taylor, sui juris, W.O.P. 1-308 Of one's own right, possessing full social Civil rights, sovereign character and capacity Pursuant to U.S.C. 28 §1746 (1) Without the United States

.