

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FILED	<input type="checkbox"/> LODGED
<input type="checkbox"/> RECEIVED	<input type="checkbox"/> COPY
APR 19 2011	
CLERK U S DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF ARIZONA	
BY _____	Z DEPUTY

1. Janice Sue Taylor,
 2. # 3341 Arianna Court
 3. Near Gilbert, Arizona
 4. Mailing Address of Convenience
 5. Not a claimed residence or domicile
 6. Without the United States

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

PHOENIX ARIZONA

8. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,) CASE NO. CR-10-400 PHX-DGC
 9.)
 10. Alleged Plaintiff) POINTS AND AUTHORITIES
 11. v.) IN SUPPORT OF DEMAND FOR
 12.) COMMON LAW JURY OF MY PEERS
 13. Janice Sue Taylor,)
 14.)
 15. Alleged Defendant)
 16.)
 17.)
 18.)

POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

16. 1. Every individual charged with a crime has an absolute and
 17. fundamental right to a fair and impartial trial, and it is the
 18. duty of the courts, and also the government, to insure that this
 19. right is safeguarded and preserved at all times. U.S. v.
 20. Titworth, (1976) 422 F. Supp. 587.

22. 2. Right to a fair and impartial trial may not be abrogated
 23. even if evidence of guilt is overwhelming. Imbler v. Craven,
 24. (1969) 298 F. Supp. 795, affirmed 424 F.2d. 631, Cert. den. 91
 25. S.Ct. 100, 400 U.S. 865, 27 L.Ed.2d. 104. Thus the convening of
 26. a jury of judicially biased people, who owe their substance to

1. the State or the Federal government would not constitute a fair
2. and impartial jury.


3. 3. The trial by jury required by the Constitution includes all
4. the essential elements of jury trial which were recognized in
5. this country and in England when the Constitution was adopted,
6. Patton v. United States, (1930) 281 U.S. 276; the Alleged
7. Defendant, being an Arizonian, does not receive any type of
8. Federal or State assistance, and does not work for any state, or
9. Federal agency, and is entitled to a jury of her peers.

10. 4. This Amendment (6th), aiming to preserve to the Citizens of
11. the United States, whose primary citizenship as Citizens of one
12. of the Several States is the right of trial by jury, has
13. reference to that right as it existed at the time of the
14. adoption of such Constitutional guaranty. It must be construed
15. with reference to the common-law right to a jury trial as the
16. same existed at the time of its adoption as part of the Federal
17. Constitution. West v. Gammon, C.C.A. (1899) 98 F. 426.

18. 5. Failure to object to the composition of the jury results in
19. a waiver of right of alleged defendant under this amendment to
20. be heard by an impartial jury. U.S. v. Ragland, (1967) 375
21. F.2d. 471, cert. den., 88 S.Ct. 1463, 390 U.S. 925, 19 L.Ed.2d.
22. 747. The alleged Defendant therefore objects to the composition
23. of a jury of people who are biased and not impartial. The

1. jury may not consist of any of the following: anyone who is
2. either a current or retired government official, or an attorney,
3. anyone who receives Social Security or any type of Federal or
4. State pay or assistance, anyone who works, has worked, or has
5. applied to work with or for any state or Federal agency. The
6. Alleged Defendant demands that the court convene a jury of
7. independent businessmen and independent workers to be the jury
8. of her peers.

9.
10. Dated 4/19/2011,

11. Respectfully Submitted
12. 
13. Janice Sue Taylor
14. Janice Sue Taylor
15.
16.
17.
18.
19.
20.
21.
22.
23.
24.
25.
26.
27.

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.


Certificate of Service

I, Janice Sue Taylor, hereby declare and state that I have filed a true and correct copy of the above document JURY OF MY PEERS POINTS AND AUTHORITIES. 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

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 19th day of April, 2011 A.D



Janice Sue Taylor, sui juris
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,