(People v. Superior Court (Williams) (1992) 8 Cal.App.4th 688, 699-700.) may not inquire into the good faith of the moving party's belief in the judge's prejudice.

THIS CLARIFY YOU DON'T GET TO GO AROUND CHANGING IT FOR YOURSELF

NO IMMUNITY

"Sovereign immunity does not apply where (as here) government is a lawbreaker or jurisdiction is the issue." Arthur v. Fry, 300 F.Supp. 622 "Knowing failure to disclose material information necessary to prevent statement from being misleading, or making representation despite knowledge that it has no reasonable basis in fact, are actionable as fraud under law." Rubinstein v. Collins, 20 F.3d 160, 1990

[a] "Party in interest may become liable for fraud by mere silent acquiescence and partaking of benefits *Bransom v. Standard Hardware, Inc., 874 S.W.2d 919,1994*

Ex dolo malo non oritur actio. Out of fraud no action arises; fraud never gives a right of action. No court will lend its aid to a man who founds his cause of action upon an immoral or illegal act. As found in Black's Law Dictionary, Fifth Edition, page 509. "Fraud destroys the validity of everything into which it enters," *Nudd v. Burrows, 91 U.S 426.* "Fraud vitiates everything" *Boyce v. Grundy, 3 Pet. 210*

"Fraud vitiates the most solemn contracts, documents and even judgments." *U.S. v. Throckmorton, 98 US 61*

When a Citizen challenges the acts of a federal or state official as being illegal, that official cannot just simply avoid liability based upon the fact that he is a public official. In *United States v. Lee, 106 U.S. 196, 220, 221, 1 S.Ct. 240, 261*, the United States claimed title to Arlington, Lee's estate, via a tax sale some years earlier, held to be void by the Court. In so voiding the title of the United States, the Court declared:*"No man in this country is so high that he is above the law. No officer of the law may set that law at defiance with impunity. All the officers of the government, from the highest to the lowest, are creatures of the law and are bound to obey it. It is the only supreme power in our system of government, and every man who by accepting office participates in its functions is only the more strongly bound to submit to that supremacy, and to observe the limitations which it imposes upon the exercise of the authority which it gives. "Shall it be said... that the courts cannot give remedy when the citizen has been deprived of his property by force, his estate seized and converted to the use of the government without any lawful authority, without any process of law, and without any compensation, because the president has ordered it and his officers are in possession? If such be the law of this country, it sanctions a tyranny which has no existence in the monarchies of Europe, nor in any other government which has a just claim to well-regulated liberty and the protection of personal rights."*

See *Pierce v. United States ("The Floyd Acceptances"), 7 Wall. (74 U.S.) 666, 677* ("We have no officers in this government from the President down to the most subordinate agent, who does not hold office under the law, with prescribed duties and limited authority");
Cunningham v. Macon, 109 U.S. 446, 452, 456, 3 S.Ct. 292, 297* ("In these cases he is not sued as, or because he is, the officer of the government, but as an individual, and the court is not ousted of jurisdiction because he asserts authority as such officer. To make out his defense he must show that his authority was sufficient in law to protect him... It is no answer for the defendant to say I am an officer of the government and acted under its authority unless he shows the sufficiency of that authority"); and *Poindexter v. Greenhow, 114 U.S. 270, 287, 5 S.Ct. 903, 912* WHEREAS, officials and even judges have no immunity *(See, Owen vs. City of Independence, 100 S Ct. 1398; Maine vs. Thiboutot, 100 S. Ct. 2502; and Hafer vs. Melo, 502 U.S. 21;* officials and judges are deemed to know the law and sworn to uphold the law; officials and judges cannot claim to act in good faith in willful deprivation of law, they certainly cannot plead ignorance of the law, even the Citizen cannot plead ignorance of the law, the courts have ruled there is no such thing as ignorance of the law, it is ludicrous for learned officials and judges to plead ignorance of the law therefore there is no immunity, judicial or otherwise, in matters of rights secured by the *Constitution for the United States of America. See: Title 42 U.S.C. Sec. 1983.

WHEREAS, officials and even judges have questioned immunity (See, Owen vs. City of Independence, 100 S Ct. 1398; Maine vs. Thiboutot, 100 S. Ct. 2502; and Hafer vs. Melo, 502 U.S. 21; officials and judges are deemed to know the law and sworn to uphold the law; officials and judges cannot claim to act in good faith in willful deprivation of law, they certainly cannot plead ignorance of the law, even the Citizen cannot plead ignorance of the law, the courts have ruled there is no such thing as ignorance of the law, it is ludicrous for learned officials and judges to plead ignorance of the law therefore there is no immunity, judicial or otherwise, in matters of rights secured by the Constitution for the United States of America. See: Title 42 U.S.C. Sec. 1983.

"When lawsuits are brought against federal officials, they must be brought against them in their "individual" capacity not their official capacity. When federal officials perpetrate constitutional torts, they do so ultra vires (beyond the powers) and lose the shield of immunity." *Williamson v. U.S. Department of Agriculture, 815 F.2d. 369, ACLU Foundation v. Barr, 952 F.2d. 457, 293 U.S. App. DC 101, (CA DC 1991).* "Personal involvement in deprivation of constitutional rights is prerequisite to award of damages, but defendant may be personally involved in constitutional deprivation by direct participation, failure to remedy wrongs after learning about it, creation of a policy or custom under which unconstitutional practices occur or gross negligence in managing subordinates who cause violation." (Gallegos v. Haggerty, N.D. of New York, 689 F. Supp. 93 (1988). *(HEAD DISTRICT ATTORNEY & HEADMASTER JUDGE)*

"The law requires proof of jurisdiction to appear on the record of the administrative agency and all administrative proceedings." Hagans v. Lavine, 415 U. S. 533

"Judge acted in the face of clearly valid statutes or case law expressly depriving him of (personal) jurisdiction would be liable." *Dykes v. Hosemann, 743 F.2d 1488 (1984).* "In such case the judge has lost his judicial function, has become a mere private person, and is liable as a trespasser for damages resulting from his unauthorized acts."

"Where there is no jurisdiction there is no judge; the proceeding is as nothing. Such has been the law from the days of the *Marshalsea, 10 Coke 68;*
also Bradley v. Fisher, 13 Wall 335,351." Manning v. Ketcham, 58 F.2d 948.

"A distinction must be here observed between excess of jurisdiction and the clear absence of all jurisdiction over the subject-matter any authority exercised is a usurped authority and for the exercise of such authority, when the want of jurisdiction is known to the judge, no excuse is permissible." *Bradley v.Fisher,13 Wall 335, 351, 352.*

The laws of nature are the ***laws of God***, whose authority can be **superseded by no power on earth**. A **legislature must not obstruct our obedience to him** from whose punishments they cannot protect us. **All human constitutions** which **contradict his cannot protect us**. All human constitutions which contradict his (God's) laws, **we are in conscience bound to disobey**. ***1772, Robin v. Hardaway, 1 Jefferson 109*. Supreme court cases from digging around Robin v. Hardaway 1790. *Biblical Law at "Common Law" supersedes all laws, and "Christianity is custom, custom is Law."***

(I, Me, Myself am a "state", with standing, standing in "original jurisdiction" know as the common law, Gods Law, a neutral traveling in itinerary, demanding all of my rights under God's Natural Law, recorded in part in the Bible, which law is recognized in *US Public Law 97-280* as "the word of God and all men are admonished to learn and apply it" so I demand anyone and everyone to notice God's Laws, which are My Makers Laws and therefore My Laws!)

- ***– Article 1 of the Bill of Rights – guarantees freedom of religion-***
  Constitution for the United States of America *ARTICLE IV, sect. 1*, Full faith and credit among states. (Self-executing constitutional provisions) Section 1. Full faith and Credit shall be given in each state to the public Acts, Records, and judicial Proceedings of every other state.

And the Congress may by general Laws prescribe the Manner in which such Acts, Records and Proceedings shall be proved, and the Effect thereof.

***Zeller v. Rankin, 101 S.Ct. 2020, 451 U.S. 939, 68 L.Ed 2d 326* When a judge knows that he lacks jurisdiction, or acts in the face of clearly valid statutes expressly depriving him of jurisdiction, judicial immunity is lost.**

JURISDICTION: NOTE: It is a fact of law that the person asserting jurisdiction must, when challenged, prove that jurisdiction exists; mere good faith assertions of power and authority (jurisdiction) have been abolished.

Albrecht v. U.S. Balzac v. People of Puerto Rico, 258 U.S. 298 (1922) "The United States District Court is not a true United States Court, established under Article 3 of the Constitution to administer the judicial power of the United States therein conveyed. It is created by virtue of the sovereign congressional faculty, granted under Article 4, 3, of that instrument, of making all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory belonging to the United States. The resemblance of its jurisdiction to that of true United States courts, in offering an opportunity to nonresidents of resorting to a tribunal not subject to local influence, does not change its character as a mere territorial court."

"Jurisdiction of court may be challenged at any stage of the proceeding, and also may be challenged after conviction and execution of judgment by way of writ of habeas corpus." [U.S. v. Anderson, 60 F.Supp. 649 (D.C.Wash. 1945)]

"**No judicial process, whatever form it may assume, can have any lawful authority outside of the limits of the jurisdiction of the court or judge by whom it is issued; and an attempt to enforce it beyond these boundaries is nothing less than lawless violence**." ***Stump v. Sparkman, id., 435 U.S. 349***.

Some Defendants urge that any act "of a judicial nature" entitles the Judge to absolute judicial immunity. But in a jurisdictional vacuum (that is, absence of all jurisdiction) the second prong necessary to absolute judicial immunity is missing. **A judge is not immune for tortious acts** committed in a purely Administrative, non-judicial capacity. ***Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S. (2 Cranch) 137, 180 (1803)*** "... the particular phraseology of the constitution of the United States confirms and strengthens the principle, supposed to be essential to all written constitutions, that a law repugnant to the constitution is void, and that courts, as well as other departments, are bound by that instrument."

"In declaring what shall be the supreme law of the land, the Constitution itself is first mentioned; and not the laws of the United States generally, but those only which shall be made in pursuance of the Constitution, have that rank". "All law (rules and practices) which are repugnant to the Constitution are VOID". Since the 14th Amendment to the Constitution states ***"NO State (Jurisdiction) shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the rights, privileges, or immunities of citizens of the United States nor deprive any citizens of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law, ... or equal protection under the law"***, this renders judicial immunity unconstitutional. ***Piper v. Pearson, 2 Gray 120, cited in Bradley v. Fisher, 13 Wall. 335, 20 L.Ed. 646 (1872)***

"Where there is no jurisdiction, there can be no discretion, for discretion is incident to jurisdiction." ***Chandler v. Judicial Council of the 10th Circuit, 398 U.S. 74, 90 S. Ct. 1648, 26 L. Ed. 2d 100*** Justice Douglas, in his dissenting opinion at page 140 said, ***"If (federal judges) break the law, they can be prosecuted."*** Justice Black, in his dissenting opinion at page 141) said, "**Judges, like other people, can be tried, convicted and punished for crimes...** The judicial power shall extend to all cases, in law and equity, arising under this Constitution".

Davis v. Burris, 51 Ariz. 220, 75 P.2d 689 (1938) A judge must be acting within his jurisdiction as to subject matter and person, to be entitled to immunity from civil action for his acts.

"Jurisdiction, once challenged, cannot be assumed and must be decided." Maine v. Thiboutot, 100 S. Ct. 250

Elliot v. Piersol, 1 Pet. 328, 340, 26 U.S. 328, 340 (1828) Under federal Law, which is applicable to all states, the U.S. Supreme Court stated that "if a court is without authority, its judgments and orders are regarded as nullities. They are not voidable, but simply void, and form no bar to a recovery sought, even prior to a reversal in opposition to them. They constitute no justification and all persons concerned in executing such judgments or sentences are considered, in law, as trespassers."

JUDICIAL IMMUNITY: **See also,** ***42 USC 1983 - Availability of Equitable Relief Against Judges***. Note: [Copied verbiage; we are not lawyers.] Judges have given themselves judicial immunity for their judicial functions. Judges have no judicial immunity for criminal acts, aiding, assisting, or conniving with others who perform a criminal act or for their administrative/ministerial duties, or for violating a citizen's constitutional rights. When a judge has a duty to act, he does not have discretion - he is then not performing a judicial act; he is performing a ministerial act. Nowhere was the judiciary given immunity, particularly nowhere in Article III; under our Constitution, if judges were to have immunity, it could only possibly be granted by amendment (and even less possibly by legislative act), as Art. I, Sections 9 & 10, respectively, in fact expressly prohibit such, stating, "No Title of Nobility shall be granted by the United States" and "No state shall... grant any Title of Nobility." Most of us are certain that Congress itself doesn't understand the inherent lack of immunity for judges. Article III, Sec. 1, "The Judicial Power of the United States shall be vested in one supreme court, and in such inferior courts, shall hold their offices during good behavior." Tort & Insurance Law Journal, Spring 1986 21 n3, p 509516, "Federal tort law: judges cannot invoke judicial immunity for acts that violate litigants' civil rights." - Robert Craig Waters.

"Ignorance of the law does not excuse misconduct in anyone, least of all in a sworn officer of the law." **In re McCowan** ***(1917), 177 C. 93, 170 P. 1100.***

"All are presumed to know the law." ***San Francisco Gas Co. v. Brickwedel (1882), 62 C. 641; Dore v. Southern Pacific Co. (1912), 163 C. 182, 124 P. 817; People v. Flanagan (1924), 65 C.A. 268, 223 P. 1014; Lincoln v. Superior Court (1928), 95 C.A. 35, 271 P. 1107; San Francisco Realty Co. v. Linnard (1929), 98 C.A. 33, 276 P. 368.***

"It is one of the fundamental maxims of the common law that ignorance of the law excuses no one." ***Daniels v. Dean (1905), 2 C.A. 421, 84 P. 332.***

Griffin v. Mathews, 310 Supp. 341, 423 F. 2d 272 Hagans v. Lavine, 415 U.S. 528 Howlett v. Rose, 496 U.S. 356 (1990) Federal Law and Supreme Court Cases apply to State Court Cases. ***Sims v. Aherns, 271 SW 720 (1925)*** "The practice of law is an occupation of common

right." ***Maine v. Thiboutot, 448 U.S. 1 Mookini v. U.S., 303 U.S. 201 (1938)*** "The term 'District Courts of the United States' as used in the rules without an addition expressing a wider connotation, has its historic significance. It describes the constitutional courts created under Article 3 of the Constitution. Courts of the Territories are Legislative Courts, properly speaking, and are not district courts of the United States. We have often held that vesting a territorial court with jurisdiction similar to that vested in the district courts of the ***United States (98 U.S. 145)*** does not make it a 'District Court of the United States'.

"***Not only did the promulgating order use the term District Courts of the United States in its historic and proper sense, but the omission of provision for the application of the rules the territorial court and other courts mentioned in the authorizing act clearly shows the limitation that was intended.***"

In ***Leiberg v. Vitangeli, 70 Ohio App. 479, 47 N.E. 2d 235, 238-39 (1942)*** "These constitutional provisions employ the word 'person,' that is. anyone whom we have permitted to peaceably reside within our borders may resort to our courts for redress of an injury done him in his land, goods, person or reputation. The real party plaintiff for whom the nominal plaintiff sues is not shown to have entered our land in an unlawful manner. We said to her, you may enter and reside with us and be equally protected by our laws so long as you conform thereto. You may own property and our laws will protect your title. "We, as a people, have said to those of foreign birth that these constitutional guaranties shall assure you of our good faith. They are the written surety to you of our proud boast that the United States is the haven of refuge of the oppressed of all mankind."

Court will assign to common-law terms their common-law meaning unless legislature directs otherwise. ***People v. Young (1983) 340 N.W.2d 805,418 Mich. 1.***

Common law, by constitution, is law of state. ***Beech Grove Inv. Co. v. Civil Rights Com'n (1968) 157 N.W.2d 213, 380 Mich. 405.*** "Common law" is but the accumulated expressions of various judicial tribunals in their efforts to ascertain what is right and just between individuals in respect to private disputes. ***Semmens v. Floyd Rice Ford, Inc. (1965) 136 N.W.2d 704,1 Mich.App. 395.***

Sovereignty itself is, of course, not subject to law, for it is the author and source of law; but in our system, while sovereign powers are delegated to the agencies of government, sovereignty itself remains with the people, by whom and for whom all government exists and acts. And the law is the definition and limitation of power. For the very idea that one man may be compelled to hold his life, or the means of living, or any material right essential to the enjoyment of life, at the mere will of another. seems to be intolerable on any country where freedom prevails, as being the essence of slavery.

Mattox v. U.S., 156 US 237,243. (1895) *"We are bound to interpret the Constitution in the light of the law as it existed at the time it was adopted."* ***Carolina v. U.S., 199 U.S. 437, 448 (1905).*** *"The Constitution is a written instrument. As such, its meaning does not alter. That which it meant when it was adopted, it means now."*

When there is substantive issues to the court's findings, and the court abused its discretion (see In re M.R. (2017) 7 Cal.App.5th 886, 902; Bridget A. v. Superior Court (2007) 148 Cal.App.4th 285, 300) in terminating jurisdiction and issuing the custody orders.

THIS CLARIFY YOU DON'T GET TO GO AROUND CHANGING IT FOR YOURSELF

28 U.S. Code § 144 - Bias or prejudice of judge

Whenever a party to any proceeding in a district court makes and files a timely and sufficient affidavit that the judge before whom the matter is pending has a personal bias or prejudice either against him or in favor of any adverse party, such judge shall proceed no further therein, but another judge shall be assigned to hear such proceeding.

The affidavit shall state the facts and the reasons for the belief that bias or prejudice exists, and shall be filed not less than ten days before the beginning of the term at which the proceeding is to be heard, or good cause shall be shown for failure to file it within such time. A party may file only one such affidavit in any case. It shall be accompanied by a certificate of counsel of record stating that it is made in good faith.

(June 25, 1948, ch. 646, 62 Stat. 898; May 24, 1949, ch. 139, § 65, 63 Stat. 99.)

Rule 2.3: Bias, Prejudice, and Harassment

(A) A judge shall perform the duties of judicial office, including administrative duties, without bias or prejudice.

(B) A judge shall not, in the performance of judicial duties, by words or conduct manifest bias or prejudice, or engage in harassment, including but not limited to bias, prejudice, or harassment based upon race, sex, gender, religion, national origin, ethnicity, disability, age, sexual orientation, marital status, socioeconomic status, or political affiliation, and shall not permit court staff, court officials, or others subject to the judge's direction and control to do so.

(C) A judge shall require lawyers in proceedings before the court to refrain from manifesting bias or prejudice, or engaging in harassment, based upon attributes including but not limited to race, sex, gender, religion, national origin, ethnicity, disability, age, sexual orientation, marital status, socioeconomic status, or political affiliation, against parties, witnesses, lawyers, or others.

(D) The restrictions of paragraphs (B) and (C) do not preclude judges or lawyers from making legitimate reference to the listed factors, or similar factors, when they are relevant to an issue in a proceeding.

Standing on YOUR rights as a citizen to use my rights as a citizen

Hale v. Henkel was decided by the united States Supreme Court in 1906. The opinion of the court states:
"The "individual" may stand upon "his Constitutional Rights" as a CITIZEN. He is entitled to carry on his "private" business in his own way. "His power to contract is unlimited." He owes no duty to the State or to his neighbors to divulge his business, or to open his doors to an investigation, so far as it may tend to incriminate him. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. "His rights" are such as "existed" by the Law of the Land (Common Law) "long antecedent" to the organization of the State", and can only be taken from him by "due process of law", and "in accordance with the Constitution." "He owes nothing" to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights."

HALE V. HENKEL 201 U.S. 43 at 89 (1906)
***Hale v. Henkel* is binding on all the courts of the United States of America until another Supreme Court case says it isn't. No other Supreme Court case has ever overturned Hale v. Henkel**

None of the various issues of Hale v. Henkel has ever been overruled Since 1906, Hale v. Henkel has been cited by the Federal and State Appellate Court systems over 1,600 times! In nearly every instance when a case is cited, it has an impact on precedent authority of the cited case. Compared with other previously decided Supreme Court cases, no other case has surpassed Hale v. Henkel in the number of times it has been cited by the courts. ***Basso v. UPL, 495 F. 2d 906 Brook v. Yawkey, 200 F. 2d 633***

Miller v. U.S., 230 F.2d. 486,489 *"The claim and exercise of a Constitutional right cannot be converted into a crime."*

Cooper v. Aaron, 358 U.S. 1, 78 S.Ct. 1401 (1958). *"No state legislator or executive or judicial officer can war against the Constitution without violating his undertaking to support it." The constitutional theory is that we the people are the sovereigns, the state and federal officials only our agents."*

Before we place the stigma of a criminal conviction upon any such citizen the legislative mandate must be clear and unambiguous. Accordingly that which Chief Justice Marshall has called 'the tenderness of the law ***Page 11 of 48 for the rights of individuals' [FN1] entitles each person, regardless of economic or social status, to an unequivocal warning from the legislature as to whether he is within the class of persons subject to vicarious liability.***
Congress cannot be deemed to have intended to punish anyone who is not 'plainly and unmistakably' within the confines of the statute. ***United States v. Lacher, 134 U.S. 624, 628, 10 S. Ct. 625, 626, 33 L. Ed. 1080; United States v. Gradwell, 243 U.S. 476,485, 37 S. Ct. 407, 61 L. Ed. 857. FN1 United States v. Wiltberger, 5 Wheat. 76, 95, 5 L.Ed. 37***.

We do not overlook those constitutional limitations which, for the protection of personal rights, must necessarily attend all investigations conducted under the authority of Congress. Neither branch of the legislative department, still less any merely administrative body, established by Congress, possesses, or can be invested with, a general power of making inquiry into the private affairs of the citizen. *Kilbourn v. Thompson, 103 U. S. 168,196 [26: 377, 386].* We said in *Boyd v. United States, 116 U. S. 616, 630 [29: 746, 751]*—and it cannot be too often repeated—that the principles that embody the essence of constitutional liberty and security forbid all invasions on the part of the government and its employs of the sanctity of a man's home, and the privacies of his life. As said by Mr. Justice Field in *Re Pacific R. Commission, 32 Fed. Rep. 241,250,* "of all the rights of the citizen, few are of greater importance or more essential to his peace and happiness than the right of personal security, and that involves, not merely protection of his person from assault, but exemption of his private affairs, books, and papers from the inspection and scrutiny of others. Without the enjoyment of this right, all others would lose half their value."

***Harris v. Harvey* (1979)** The jury concluded that Harvey was not eligible for judicial immunity for these actions, as such acts which were not part of the judge's normal duties (i.e. were "outside his jurisdiction"). The jury awarded Harris $260,000 damages. Another judge later added $7,500 legal fees. The United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit concurred with the jury's decision. Judge Harvey petitioned the Seventh Circuit court for an en banc rehearing, which was denied. His petition to the Supreme Court was also denied. *Harris v. Harvey* is the first case in the United States where a sitting court judge has been sued and lost in a civil action; it is a binding precedent in the Seventh Circuit and is persuasive authority in the other circuits.

***Supreme Court of Virginia v. Consumers Union* (1980)** Consumers Union filed a lawsuit in federal court against the Supreme Court of Virginia and others, under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, seeking to have the regulation declared unconstitutional and to enjoin the defendants from enforcing it.[22] The U.S. Supreme Court affirmed the Supreme Court of Virginia's legislative immunity:

***People v. Superior Court* (*Jones*) (1998) 18 Cal.4th 667, 680-681, 76 Cal.Rptr.2d 641, 958 P.2d 393.)** "Findings of fact are reviewed under a 'substantial evidence' standard." (*Ibid.*)

Under this standard, " 'a trial court's ruling will not be disturbed, and reversal of the judgment [or order] is not required, unless the trial court exercised its discretion in an arbitrary, capricious, or patently absurd manner that resulted in a manifest miscarriage of justice.' "
(People v. Hovarter (2008) 44 Cal.4th 983, 1004, 81 Cal.Rptr.3d 299, 189 P.3d 300 ;
see People v. Kipp (1998) 18 Cal.4th 349, 371, 75 Cal.Rptr.2d 716, 956 P.2d 1169 ["[a] court abuses its discretion when its ruling 'falls outside the bounds of reason'

Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S. (2 Cranch) 137, 180 (1803) *"... the particular phraseology of the constitution of the United States confirms and strengthens the principle, supposed to be essential to all written constitutions, that a law repugnant to the constitution is void, and that courts, as well as other departments, are bound by that instrument."* *Since the 14th Amendment to the Constitution states "NO State (Jurisdiction) shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the rights, privileges, or immunities of citizens of the United States nor deprive any citizens of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law, ... or equal protection under the law", this renders judicial immunity unconstitutional.*

State v. Sutton, 63 Min 147, 65 NW 262, 30 LRA630, AM ST 459 When any court violates the clean and unambiguous language of the Constitution, a fraud is perpetuated, and no one is bound to obey it.

Norton vs. Shelby County, 118 US 425 p. 442. "An unconstitutional act is not law; it confers no rights; it imposes no duties; affords no protection; it creates no office; it is in legal contemplation, as inoperative as though it had never been passed."

Bell v. Hood, 71 F.Supp., 813, 816 (1947) U.S.D.C. -- So. Dist. CA. History is clear that the first ten amendments to the Constitution were adopted to secure certain common law rights of the people, against invasion by the Federal Government."

SIMMONS v US, supra. "We find it intolerable that one constitutional right should have to be surrendered in order to assert another"