Terry I. Major, Trustee
Fox Group Trust
P.O. Box 2023
Cottonwood, Arizona 86326
tmajor@greytechs.com

(928) 634-7023

FILED LÓDGED

REGEIVED GOFY

AUG 2 1 2012

CLERK U S DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF ARIZONA
BY Z DEPUTY

## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Plaintiffs.

Civ. No. 11-0698-PHX-FJM

JAMES LESLIE READING, CLARE L. READING, FOX GROUP TRUST, MIDFIRST BANK, CHASE, FINANCIAL LEGAL SERVICES, STATE OF ARIZONA, Defendants.

REPLY TO UNITED STATES'
OPPOSITION TO TERRY MAJOR'S
EMERGENCY MOTION TO STAY
PROCEEDINGS PENDING
INTERLOCUTORY APPEAL

Hon. Frederick J. Martone

As has been previously stated, the case of *C.E. Pope Equity Trust* does not apply in this case. In this case, the order precludes a defendant from defending substantive rights and places defendant, Fox Group Trust, in a position where it's only asset, the subject property in this case, is threatened. Thus, it is the obligation of the Trustee to defend on behalf of the trust.

Indeed, Fox Group Trust has already been damaged by having been precluded from filing an answer to the Government's Motion for Summary Judgment as the Trustee was not permitted to represent the Trust and no attorney has agreed to provide *Pro bono publico* representation.

The court has stated that Fox Group Trust must be represented by an attorney. Fox Group Trust has no means to hire an attorney, especially since Plaintiff in this case has encumbered the only asset of Fox Group Trust with notices of Federal Tax Lien so that obtaining a loan on the only asset in order to pay for legal counsel is impossible. It must be a nice position to be in, encumber a defendant so that hiring an attorney is not possible, and then require the defendant to hire an attorney. This does not exactly seem like a fair representation of justice. It is similar to putting Don Knotts in the ring with Muhammad Ali and tying Don's hands behind his back. There would be no defense, and the result would probably not result in many laughs.

This is clearly a Constitutional issue. For the courts to deny a Trustee the right to defend trust property when there are no means to hire legal counsel, leaves a defendant trust with no means of defense.

It should not be a matter of being "allowed" to represent the trust. It must be viewed as a substantive right to defend. The form of trust, in this case, is an irrevocable trust. The Trust is defined by a private contract between the parties to the contract. The Trustee is a party and is duty bound to defend the trust property when it is under attack. The references and rules cited by plaintiff's counsel and the court regarding representation of an "entity" simply do not apply to the instant case. In the case of an irrevocable, contractual form of trust, the Fox Group Trust and the Trustee must be considered inseparable for purposes of any legal action. The Trustee is the trust and may thus represent himself, as the

Trust. Without this capability, the trust loses by default. The Trustee and the Trust must be considered one, and the Trustee is representing *pro se* and/or *pro per* as a matter of right.

What happens if this court's order stands? The case proceeds and Fox Group Trust, a named defendant in this case, goes unrepresented. Indeed, the Trustee is barred from representing. Thus, the position of Fox Group Trust is silenced. This would definitely create a reviewable situation where the Plaintiff and the court have effectively required the representative of one defendant to obtain "court approved" counsel yet did not require other defendants to do so. If Fox Group Trust was named as a defendant, it must be allowed representation.

It was never the intention of this nation's founders that the courts should be the exclusive jurisdiction of those designated as "lawyers" or "duly qualified counsel". The courts are supposed to be the people's courts and were to have been open to all citizens. To close the courts to all but "bar certified lawyers", removes the foundation stone of our liberty and makes the citizens of this great land the mere subjects to the whim of an oligarchy.

Statutorily defined entities must be represented by Attorneys. These would include: Corporations, Limited Liability Companies and Limited Partnerships. These entities are found within the statutory scheme and are thus regulated and required to have attorneys represent them.

Fox Group Trust, however, was not statutorily created nor defined. A trust and/or a contract in the form of a trust is not required to be filed with the state

23

24

25

and not subject to the control of the state but is protected by Article One, Section Ten of the United States Constitution which supersedes and is superior to all the legal cites made by the government and the court in the instant case. Additionally, it would seem that justice dictates that courts may be barred from ruling upon documents the court has neither seen nor read. This Court has placed a label on Fox Group Trust without reading its controlling documents. "Designation of form of trust is not controlling; court will look to substance of circumstances and not labels placed on them by parties." Johnson v. Hychyk 517 P 2d 1079. How can the Court look to the substance of this case without reading the controlling documents? The contractual form of an irrevocable trust makes it a completely different form of entity. The one placing assets into the trust is no longer in control of the assets, the Trustee is in control. As such, the Trustee must be able to defend. The entity is defined by the contract and the Trustee and Trust are to be considered inseparable from the standpoint of legal action. The Trust and the Trustees are as one.

Terry I. Major, Trustee of Fox Group Trust, requests this honorable court stay these proceedings pending the outcome of the Appeal on the issue of representation of Fox Group Trust or in the alternative, simply permit the Trustees of Fox Group Trust to participate through *pro per* representation of the Fox Group Trust.

Submitted this 20th day of August, 2012

Terry I. Major, Trustee,

in Pro Per

Cert No: 7011 1570 0003 6914 2614

1	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	
2	On August 20th, 2012 the original of the REPLY TO UNITED STATES OPPOSITION TO TERRY MAJOR'S EMERGENCY MOTION TO STAY PROCEEDINGS PENDING INTERLOCUTORY APPEAL was mailed by United States Certified Mail for filing to the Clerk of the District Court along with a copy to Honorable Judge Frederick J. Martone. In addition, copies	
3		
4		
5	were mailed by United States Mail t	0:
6	CHARLES M. DUFFY	KATHRYN KENEALLY
7	Attorney for Plaintiff	Attorney for Plaintiff
0	Trial Attorney, Tax Division	Assistant Attorney General, Tax Division
8	U.S. Dept. of Justice, Tax Div. PO Box 683	U.S. Dept. of Justice, Tax Div.
9	Ben Franklin Station	PO Box 683 Ben Franklin Station
10	Washington, DC 20044	Washington, DC 20044
11	A NINI DIDMINICHA M. CCHIEFE	TA MEG I DOLLD DE ADDIG
12	ANN BIRMINGHAM SCHEEL Attorney for Plaintiff	JAMES LESLIE READING CLARE LOUISE READING
ł	Acting United States Attorney	Defendants, Pro Se
13	District of Arizona	2425 East Fox Street
14	Two Renaissance Square	Mesa, AZ 85213
15	40 North Central Ave. Suite 1200 Phoenix, AZ 85004	
լ6		
ا 7	ROBERT P. VENTRELLA	PAUL M. LEVINE, ESQUIRE
Ī	Assistant Attorney Congress	LAKSHMI JAGANNATH, ESQUIRE
18	Assistant Attorney General 1275 West Washington Street	Attorneys for Defendant, Midfirst Bank McCarthy, Holthus, Laving Lavy Firms
ا 19	Phoenix, Arizona 85007-2926	McCarthy, Holthus, Levine Law Firm 8502 E. Via de Ventura, Suite 200
20	,	Scottsdale, Arizona 85258
21		$\mathcal{I}$ 0 $\mathcal{M}$
İ	_	Levy X Maga TTES
22		Terry I. Major, Trustee, in <i>Pro Per</i>
23		Fox Group Trust
4		PO Box 2023
		Cottonwood, AZ 86326
25		Email: tmajor@greytechs.com
	,	928-634-7023 (Home)
		623-451-5588 (Cell)
		623-243-4158 (Fax)