

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

GEORGE A. TEACHERSON

APPELLANT

VS.

COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE

APPELLEES

|
|
|
|
|

23-6780

PETITION FOR REHEARING

Appellant requests this high court's opinion, in a constitutional case under Rule 44 with implied cause of action re: agency violation of the founding documents, on the exact wording of the Declaration of Independence with the request that these founding words be openly and directly addressed and not ignored. - As they are of substantial importance to Freedom and Liberty and the very founding of this nation from before there was a nation. They form the significant Substance of this case.

These are Rights of Individuals recognized by the Founding Fathers as existing before there was a nation. It is Appellant's personal Right as a free person to live his life as his choice under the founding Guarantees of this nation and said Rights are protected regardless of how others live their lives.

To wit: John Hancock said that the Declaration is "the Ground and Foundation of a future Government." Congressional vote June 11, 1776. Randy E Barnett, Our Republican Constitution, (New York, Broadside Books, 2016) p. 32.

I wish the court to explain the following Rights and/or explain why these "unalienable Rights" seem to be no longer with us. They are:

“Truths ... with certain unalienable Rights...to secure these Rights Governments derive their just Powers from the Consent of the Governed.”

“opposing...Invasions on the Rights of the People.”

“sent hither Swarms of Officers to harass our People and eat out their Substance.”

“For imposing taxes on us without our Consent.”

“destroyed the lives of our People.”

“a Tyrant is unfit to be the Ruler of a Free People.”

These quotations are the exact wording of the Declaration of Independence.

No one from the lower courts up to this one has made an explanation of these substantial Individual Rights and why they are being ignored while being recognized as existing for individuals from before there was a Nation by the Founding Fathers. (See Hancock, *supra*. And Et.al. in the case body) Originalism and textualism is expected in the answer to Appellant’s queries. To have this is Appellant’s basic Right existing from before there was a nation.

This direct request re: quoted originating text, has not been presented to the high court before. Why would refusal to uphold such clear and direct nation-originating words be held constitutional? Or allow judges to refuse them in their opinions?

These direct questions have not been asked and have definitely not been answered anywhere in the history of this case. Their refusal represents Invasions on Appellant’s Rights. They are controlling. And they have been wrongfully ignored.


This is the significant Substance of this case. If such Substance correctly quotes the Ground and Foundation of this Nation (Hancock) then Honor it.

Appellees practice tyranny and are unfit to be Rulers of a Free People. Appellant demands his freedoms be preserved from before there was a Nation. Appellant demands his providential Right to be a Free Person as defined in the Declaration.

If the significant Substance is correct, Appellant wins and demands \$172 Million for Life-destroyed ruination and a court order preventing Harassment of any kind by appellees, who act as Tyrants with Swarms of Officers sent against Appellant with unremitting harassment (Declaration) in any future situation. Appellant has never given Consent to appellees to "eat out" or reduce his personal Substance in any form. He asks this august body not to ignore founding documents. He asks that constitutional Consent not be ignored from the very beginning of this Nation.

In propria persona, sui juris

All Rights Reserved without Prejudice



George A. Teacherson, GT, Pro Per

Citizen of the Republic

4150 Westgate Ave, Apt. 221

West Palm Beach, Florida

561-290-6426

3/28/24; corrected compliance 4/29/24 – Rule 44.6.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Appellant serves a true and correct copy of this document to counsel for the opposing party via first class mail.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

GEORGE A. TEACHERSON

APPELLANT

VS.

23-6780

COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE

APPELLEES

REHEARING CERTIFICATION

Appellant certifies to this high court, in a constitutional case under Rule 44.2. that this request for Rehearing is not for delay and is presented in Good Faith.

The grounds for Rehearing are Substantial and in fact, Controlling in effect.

The details have not been previously presented and are individual Rights that have never been addressed by any lower court in any respect. Said Rights exist since before there was a Nation and pertain to individuals as delineated by "We" and "us" in the Declaration of Independence.

The instant individual demands his Rights as guaranteed by the Founding Documents and has been consistently ignored in every respect by all the lower courts. Please uphold the text of the Founding Documents. No other court would.

This certification and its copies are in accordance with Rule 44.6. One copy is to be signed and the others are attached to the petition copies [Rule 44.1].

In propria persona, sui juris

All Rights Reserved without Prejudice



George A. Teacherson, GT, Pro Per, Citizen of the Republic

4150 Westgate Ave, Apt. 221, West Palm Beach, Florida

561-290-6426

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Appellant serves a true and correct copy of this document to counsel for the opposing party via first class mail.

RECEIVED

MAY - 1 2024

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.