

Appendix A

Case 3:22-cv-01433-AGS-MSB Document 26 Filed
09/08/23 PageID.274 Page 1 of 4

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Jeffrey-Allen WITZEMAN,
Plaintiff,

v.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No.: 22-cv-
1433-AGS-MSB

**ORDER
DISMISSING
COMPLAINT
AND DENYING
REMAINING
MOTIONS (ECF
11, 12, 13, 14, 22)**

This lawsuit arose because the County Recorder rebuffed plaintiffs attempt to record a self-styled "Declaration of Land Patent." If recorded, plaintiff believes it grants him "supreme title" to his land (ECF 1, at 9), which will shield it from future interference by, among others, the "STATE OF CALIFORNIA, a Municipal Corporation" (ECF 14, at 2-3). Perhaps he deserves a chance to test such legal theories in court, but not in federal court. This Court lacks subject-matter jurisdiction and must dismiss the complaint.

BACKGROUND

In 1919, the parcel of land at issue here was conveyed by land patent from the United States government to a private citizen. (ECF 1-2, at 41.) It was later

transferred to plaintiff Witzeman.ⁱ (*See id.* At 42.) In 2022, Witzeman sought to file with the San Diego County Recorder a self-created "Declaration of Land Patent" (ECF 1-2, at 36), in order to

ⁱ For simplicity, the Court will refer to plaintiff as Witzeman. Plaintiff renders his name in different ways-and sometimes with voluminous appellations after it-even in the same pleading. (Compare ECF 1, at 1 ("Jeffrey-Allen: family Witzeman") with *id.* at 1-2 ("Jeffrey-Allen: Witzeman . . . Sui Juris, Secured Party ... , NON-PERSON ..., NON-CITIZEN, NON-RESIDENT, NON-DEBTOR ..., NON-CORPORATED, NON-FICTION, NON-SUBJECT, NON-PARTICIPANT in any government programs, a Living flesh and blood man standing on the ground, SPC, under Special Appearance ... not Generally, ... Holder-In-Due-Course ... of all documentation ... of the 'Entity' Cestui Que Vie trust Jeffrey-Allen: Witzeman (c)™, representing the Corporate Fiction JEFFREY ALLEN WITZEMAN").)

22-cv-1433-AGS-MSB

Case 3:22-cv-01433-AGS-MSB Document 26 Filed
09/08/23 PageID.275 Page 2 of 4

obtain "perfect title" to the land and to ensure that "injunctions and mandamus proceedings will not be against it" (ECF 1, at 3).

The County Recorder rejected Witzeman's handiwork, informing him that "only documents ... authorized or required by law may be recorded." (ECF 1-2, at 50.) Witzeman sued the Recorder and others. (ECF 1, at 2-3.)

DISCUSSION

Federal courts have "an independent obligation to determine whether subject-matter jurisdiction exists." *Hertz Corp. v. Friend*, 559 U.S. 77, 94 (2010). "Federal courts are courts of limited jurisdiction," and it is "presumed that a cause lies outside this limited jurisdiction." *Kokkonen v. Guardian Life Ins. Co.*, 511 U.S. 375, 377 (1994). The burden of proving otherwise "rests upon the party asserting jurisdiction." *Id.* Witzeman does not claim diversity jurisdiction and rightly so, as all the parties appear to be California citizens. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a)(1). Instead, his filings hint at four potential sources of federal-question jurisdiction. *See id.* at § 1331.

First, Witzeman theorizes that the existence of a U.S. government land patent in his chain of title federalizes this dispute. ECF 1, at 9.) But "federal land patents do not confer federal question jurisdiction." *Virgin v. Vty. Of San Luis Obispo*, 201 F.3d 1141, 1143 (9th Cir. 2000) (citing *Shulthis v. McDougal*, 225 U.S. 561, 569-70 (1912)).

Second, he argues that there is jurisdiction under the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, which ceded California to the United States, because it "governs legal relations of the Land in question." (ECF 1, at 8); see Treaty of Peace, Friendship, Limits, & Settlement with the Republic of Mexico, Mex-U.S., Feb. 2, 1848, 9 Stat. 922. Yet just as government land transfers do not automatically confer federal-question jurisdiction, neither do transfers by treaty. *See Phelps v. Hanson*,

163 F.2d 973, 974 (9th Cir. 1947) (holding that federal-question Jurisdiction does not exist simply because litigants claim "title through the treaty"). Similarly, "[L]urisdiction does not attach merely because, in the course of litigation, it may become necessary to construe a law or treaty of the United States." *Id.* For federal-question jurisdiction, Witzeman must claim a "right created by treaty" that is

22-cv-1433-AGS-MSB

Case 3:22-cv-01433-AGS-MSB Document 26 Filed
09/08/23 PageID.276 Page 3 of 4

in "genuine and present controversy"-in other words, the right "will be supported if the treaty is given" Witzeman's preferred interpretation and "defeated if given the construction advocated by" the opposing side. *See Skokomish Indian Tribe v. France*, 269 F.2d 555,558 (9th Cir. 1959). Witzeman points to no such contested right. Through the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, the United States gained the land that is now the state of California- including the parcel here. The federal government later transferred that parcel into private hands. None of this is in dispute. And none of it requires a federal court's involvement.

Witzeman's third theory is that this Court derives jurisdiction through the Supremacy Clause. (ECF I, al 8--9); see V.S. Const. art. VI, cl. 2. But that Clause "is not the source of any federal rights," nor basis of any jurisdiction, "and certainly does not create a[ny] cause of action." *See Armstrong v. Exceptional Child Ctr., Inc.*, 575 U.S. 320, 324-25 (2015). It merely establishes

"a rule of decision" that courts "must not give effect to state laws that conflict with federal laws." *Id.* at 324.

Finally, one of Witzeman's causes of action-"Restraint of Trade"-is partly based on the federal conspiracy statute, 18 U.S.C. § 371. (ECF I, al 7.) This criminal statute, however, "does not provide a private cause of action." See *Lemke v. Jander*, No. 20-CV-362-JLS (KSC), 2021 WL 778653, at *4 (S.D. Cal. Mar. I, 2021).

When a court lacks subject-matter Jurisdiction, it "must dismiss the complaint in its entirety." *Arbaugh v. Y & H Corp.*, 546 U.S. 500, 514 (2006). Ordinarily, such a case "should be dismissed without prejudice so that a plaintiff may reassert his claims in a competent court." *Frigard v. United States*, 862 F.2d 201,204 {9th Cir. 1988). But given the special care taken \\1th self-represented plaintiffs, a court "should not dismiss a pro se complaint without leave to amend unless it is absolutely clear that the deficiencies of the complaint could not be cured by amendment." *Akhtar v. Mesa*, 698 F.3d 1202, 1212 (9th Cir. 2012) (cleaned up). While the Court doubts that Witzeman can conjure federal jurisdiction here, that outcome is not "absolutely clear."

CONCLUSION

22-cv-1433-AGS-MSB

Case 3:22-cv-01433-AGS-MSB Document 26 Filed
09/08/23 PageID.277 Page 4 of 4

leave to amend, and all pending motions are **DENIED AS MOOT.**

By October 6, 2023, plaintiff Witzeman may file an amended complaint addressing the deficiencies discussed in this order. That amended complaint "must be complete in itself without reference to" the original complaint, see S.D. Cal. CivLR 15.1, and any claim not realleged in the amended complaint will be considered waived, see *Lacey v. Maricopa Cty.*, 693 F.3d 896, 928 (9th Cir. 2012).

The Clerk is directed to close this case. The Clerk will postpone issuing a judgment until the deadline to amend passes without an amended complaint or until Witzeman affirmatively notifies the Court that he will not amend. If Witzeman files an amended complaint by the deadline, the Clerk will reopen this case.

Dated: September 8, 2023

Hon. Andrew G. Schopler

Hon. ew G. Schopler
United States District Judge

22-cv-1433-AGS-MSB

App. 1

Appendix B

Case 3:22-cv-01433-AGS-MSB Document 31 Filed
10/26/23 PageID.421 Page 1 of 1

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE
NINTH CIRCUIT **FILED**

OCT 26 2023

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

JEFFREY-ALLEN WITZEMAN,	No. 23-55820
Plaintiff-Appellant,	D.C. No.
v.	3:22-cv-01433-AGS-
STATE OF CALIFORNIA, et al.,	MSB Southern
Defendants-Appellees.	District of
	California, San
	Diego

ORDER

Before: W. FLETCHER, CALLAHAN, and
BENNETT, Circuit Judges.

A review of the record demonstrates that this court lacks jurisdiction over this appeal because the order challenged in the appeal is not final or appealable. *See WMX Techs., Inc. v. Miller*, 104 F.3d 1133, 1136 (9th Cir. 1997) (en banc) (dismissal of complaint with leave to amend is not appealable). Consequently, this appeal is dismissed for lack of jurisdiction.

DISMISSED.

OSA124

Appendix C

Case 3:22-cv-01433-AGS-MSB Document 32 Filed
11/03/23 PageID.422 Page 1 of 3

Jeffrey-Allen: Witzeman, living man **FILED**
On the county at Large, san diego NOV 03 2023
Non-Domestic CLERK, U.S.
c/o: 29513 Anthony Road DISTRICT
Valley Center, California [92082] COURT
Propria persona SOUTHERN
DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA
BY RC DEPUTY

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

Jeffrey-Allen: family)	Case No.: 22-cv-
Witzeman,)	1433-AGS-MSB
Plaintiff,)	
v.)	Notice and Motion
STATE OF CALIFORNIA,)	to Issue a
Attorney General, Rob)	Final Order
Banta, California Secretary)	(Mandate) for
of State, Shirley N. Weber,)	Appeal
Ph.D., COUNTY OF SAN)	
DIEGO, Ernest J.)	
Dronenburg, Jr., County)	
Recorder,)	
Defendants.)	

Now Comes Plaintiff, who notices this court that the
9th Circuit Court of Appeals has ruled that this court

App. 2

failed to issue a final order (see attached document) and hereby moves this court for said final order aka "Mandate."

Respectfully submitted this 3rd day of November 2023.

Jeffrey-Allen: Witzeman, living man
HDC/SPC

[(J Witzeman) Notice and Motion for Final Order 231102), Page 1 of 2

Case 3:22-cv-01433-AGS-MSB Document 32 Filed
11/03/23 PageID.423 Page 2 of 3

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

On or about the 3rd of November 2023, I did place a copy of the foregoing into USPS Certified mail as noted below.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
Attorney General, Rob Bonta
Office of the Attorney General
1300 "I" Street
Sacramento, California [95814 -2919]
USPS Certified Mail No. 7022 2410 0001 9269 9721

App. 3

Ernest J. Dronenburg, Jr., County Recorder
1600 Pacific Highway, Suite 260
PO Box 121750
San Diego, California [92112 - 1750]
USPS Certified Mail No. 7022 2410 0001 9269 9738

California Secretary of State
Shirley N. Weber, Ph.D.
1500 11th Street
Sacramento, California [95814]
USPS Certified Mail No. 9589 0710 5270 0310 8668
43

Respectfully submitted this 3rd day of November
2023.

Jeffrey-Allen: Witzeman

Jeffrey-Allen: Witzeman, living man
HDC/SPC

[(J Witzeman) Notice and Motion for Final Order
231102], Page 2 of 2

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE
NINTH CIRCUIT **FILED**

OCT 26 2023

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

JEFFREY-ALLEN WITZEMAN,
Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, et al.,
Defendants-Appellees.

No. 23-55820
D.C. No. 3:22-
cv-01433-AGS-
MSB
Southern
District of
California,
San Diego
ORDER

Before: W. FLETCHER~ CALLAHAN~ and
BENNETT, Circuit Judges.

A review of the record demonstrates that this court lacks jurisdiction over this appeal because the order challenged in the appeal is not final or appealable. *See WMX Techs., Inc. v. Miller*, 104 F.3d 1133, 1136 (9th Cir. 1997) (en bane) (dismissal of complaint with leave to amend is not appealable). Consequently, this appeal is dismissed for lack of jurisdiction.

DISMISSED.

OSA124

Appendix D

Case: 23-55820, 11/17/2023, ID: 12825508, DktEntry:
3, Page 1 of 1

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE
NINTH CIRCUIT

FILED

NOV 17 2023

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

JEFFREY-ALLEN WITZEMAN,
Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, et al.,
Defendants-Appellees.

No. 23-55820
D.C. No. 3:22-cv-
01433-AGS-MSB
U.S. Southern
District of
California,
San Diego
MANDATE

The judgment of this Court, entered October 26, 2023,
takes effect this date. This constitutes the formal
mandate of this Court issued pursuant to Rule 41(a)
of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.

FOR THE COURT:
MOLLY C. DWYER
CLERK OF COURT

Appendix E

Case: 23-3846, 12/05/2023, DktEntry: 3.1, Page 1 of 1

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE
NINTH CIRCUIT

FILED

DEC 5 2023

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

JEFFREY-ALLEN WITZEMAN, Plaintiff-Appellant, v. STATE OF CALIFORNIA, et al., Defendants-Appellees.
--

No. 23-3846
D.C. No. 3:22-cv-
01433-AGS-MSB
Southern
District of
California,
San Diego
ORDER

Appeal No. 23-3846 is dismissed as duplicative of
closed appeal No. 23-55820.

This order served on the district court will act as and
for the mandate of this court for appeal No. 23-3846.

FOR THE COURT:
MOLLY C. DWYER
CLERK OF COURT

App. 1

Appendix F

Case 3:22-cv-01433-AGS-MSB Document 27 Filed
09/27/23 PageID.278 Page 1 of 4

FILED

SEP 27 2023

CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT
COURT SOUTHERN
DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

BY DEPUTY

FROM: Jeffrey-Allen: Witzeman, living man
On the county at Large, san diego
Non-Domestic
c/o: 29513 Anthony Road
Valley Center, California (92082)
Bond Number 04211959-JAW-PRB
Propria persona

To: U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit
ATTN: CLERK [3X COPIES]
P.O. Box 193939
San Francisco CA [94119-3939]

U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE 9TH CIRCUIT

Jeffrey-Allen: family)	Case No.:
Witzeman,)	
Plaintiff,)	RE: UNITED
v.)	STATES
STATE OF CALIFORNIA,)	DISTRICT
Attorney General, Rob)	COURT
Banta, California Secretary)	SOUTHERN
of State, Shirley N. Weber,)	DISTRICT OF
Ph.D., COUNTY OF SAN)	CALIFORNIA
DIEGO, Ernest J.)	22-cv-1433-AGS-
Dronenburg, Jr., County)	MSB
Recorder,)	Notice of Appeal
Defendants.)	

INTRODUCTION

Now Comes Aggrieved party (U.C.C. §1 - 201 (2))
Jeffrey-Allen: Witzeman (hereinafter Aggrieved
party), Sui Juris, Secured Party (U.C.C. §9-105),
NON-PERSON (U . C.C . §1-20 1 (27)) , NON -
CITIZEN, NON-RESIDENT, NON-DEBTOR (28
U.S.C. §3002 (4)) , NON- CORPORATED, NON-
FICTION, NON-SUBJECT, NON-PARTICIPANT in
any government programs, a Living flesh and blood
Man standing on the ground, Sovereign, under Special
Appearance (Rule 8 (E)) not Generally, NON-
DEFENDANT (U.C.C. §1-201 (14)), Holder-In-Due -
Course

[(Jeff Witzeman) Notice of Appeal 23092] , Page I of 4

(U.C.C. §3-302 (A) (2)) of all documentation (U.C.C. §5-102 (6)) of the "Entity" Cestui Que Vie trust Jeffrey-Allen: Witzeman ©TM, representing the Corporate Fiction JEFFREY ALLEN WITZEMAN ©TM. Under no circumstances is the Plaintiff "Pro Se" as this Complaint is filed under the Holder-In-Due-Course; Jeffrey-Allen: Witzeman of the "Cestui Que Vie trust " of JEFFREY ALLEN WITZEMAN©™ - ESTATE/TRUST.

**AN authenticated FOREIGN DOCUMENT
HAGUE CONVENTION, 5 October 1961
NOTICE FOR; PUBLIC NOTICE, HONORABLE
CLARIFICATIONS
REASON(S) FOR APPEAL**

Judge **Andrew G. Schopler** dismissed plaintiff ' s case (ECF26), "ORDER DISMISSING COMPLAINT AND DENYING REMAINING MOTIONS." Judge is in error.

Notice from the court as to the Dismissal was received by plaintiff on September 20, 2023.

Plaintiff owns the Land at issue free and clear. Plaintiff invoked the Rights accompanying the Land Patent by and through the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. Treaty law is a federal issue. Venue and jurisdiction for this suit is proper in federal court. Plaintiff attempted to file his documents into the San Diego County Recorder's Office. Said Office PUBLIC Governmental Trustees denied said filing without grounds. Said Land is secure d by Land Patent and is

App. 4

no "real estate." Plaintiff is not a "minor " as defined at Title 31 CFR 363.6. Plaintiff's estate

Case 3:22-cv-01433-AGS-MSB Document 27 Filed
09/27/23 PageID.280 Page 3 of 4

is not held in trust by the "common-law trustee," Title 50 USC 4312. Therein, for these reasons and others to be amplified in the actual appellate brief, plaintiff files this Notice of Appeal.

**REMEDY REQUESTED BY THE NINTH
CIRCUITH COURT OF APPEALS**

Plaintiff seeks the enforcement of the public filing documenting plaintiff's evidence of his Land ownership.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeffrey-Allen: Witzeman, living man

[(Jeff Witzcman) Notice of Appeal 230921]. Page 3 of
4

Case 3:22-cv-01433-AGS-MSB Document 27 Filed
09/27/23 PageID.281 Page 4 of 4

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Jeffrey-Allen: Witzeman, have served the foregoing document upon the following parties by Certified Mail:

App. 5

U.S. District Court Southern District of California
Attn: Clerk of Court
333 W Broadway #420
San Diego, California [92101]
USPS Certified Mail No. 9589 0710 5270 0310 8667
75

U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit
ATTN: CLERK [3X COPIES]
P.O. Box 193939
San Francisco CA [94119-3939]
USPS Certified Mail No. 9589 0710 5270 0310 8667
82

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
Attorney General, Rob Bonta
Office of the Attorney General
1300 "I" Street
Sacramento, California [95814-2919]
USPS Certified Mail No. 9589 0710 5270 0310 8667
99

Ernest J. Dronenburg, Jr., County Recorder
1600 Pacific Highway, Suite 260
PO Box 121750
San Diego, California [92112-1750]
USPS Certified Mail No. 9589 0710 5270 0310 8668
05

App. 6

California Secretary of State
Shirley N. Weber, Ph.D.
1500 11th Street
Sacramento, California [95814]
USPS Certified Mail No. 9589 0710 5270 0310 8668
12

Done so on or about this 25th day of September 2023

Jeffrey-Allen: Witzeman

[(Jeff Witzeman) Notice of Appeal 230921], Page 4 of
4

Appendix G

Land Patent Case Law References

ADDITIONAL TITLE CASE LAW REFERENCES:

- a. MATTHEWS V., 10 GILL & J (MD) 443
- b. WALLACE V. ARMSTEAD, 44 PA. 492
- c. WENDELL V. CRANDALL, 1 N.Y. 491
- d. STANTON V. SULLIVAN 7A. 696
- e. McCARTEE V. ORPHUM'S ASYLUM. 9 COW
N.Y. 437, 18 AM. DEC. 516
- f. PEOPLE V. RICHARDSON, 269 M. 275, 109 N.E.
1033

**ADDITIONAL LAND PATENT CASE LAW
REFERENCES:**

- a. SANFORD V. SANFORD 139 US 642
- b. FENN v. HOLMES, 21 HOWARD 481
- c. LOMAX V. PICKERING, 173 US 26
- d. GIBSON V. CHOUTEAU, 80 US 92
- e. WILCOX V. JACKSON 13 PETER (US) 498
- f. UNITED STATES V. STONE, 2 US 525
- g. MINTER V. CROMMELIN, 18 US 87
- h. JOHNSON V. CHRISTIAN 128 US 374
- i. DOE v. AIKEN 31 FED. 393
- j. SARGENT V. HERRICK & STEVENS 221 US 404
- k. NORTHERN R.R. CO. V. TRAIL COUNTY, 115
US 600
- l. BEADLE V. SMYSER, 209 US 393
- m. BAGNELL V. BRODERICK, 13 PETER (US) 436
- n. STEEL V. ST. LOUIS SMELTING & REFINING
CO. 106 US 417
- o. HOGAN V. PACE 69 US 605
- p. LANGDON V. SHERWOOD 124 US 74

App. 2

- q. CARTER V. RUDDY 166 US 493
- r. RUDDY V. ROSSI 248 US 104
- s. GOLDING V. SCHUBAC 93 US 32
- t. SAVILLE V. CORLESS 46 US. 495
- u. ECHART V. COMMISSIONERS, C.C.A. 42 F2d 158; 283 US 140
- v. CLEVELAND V. SMITH 132 US 318
- w. PEOPLE V. HINES, 89 P. 858,5 CAL. APP. 122
- x. MITCHELL V. CITY OF ROCKLAND, 45 ME. 496
- y. STATE TREASURER V. WRIGHT 28 ILL 509
- z. WHITAKER V. HALEY 2 ORE. 128
- aa. TOWN OF FRANKFORT V. WALDO 128 ME. 1
- bb. McCARTHY V. GREENLAWN CEM. 158 ME. 388
- cc. CASSIDY V. AROOSTOCK 134 ME. 34
- dd. BARKER V. BLAKE, 36 ME. 1
- ee. MARSHALL V. LADD 7 WALL 74 US 106
- ff. UNITED STATES V. CREEK NATION 295 US 103
- gg. UNITED STATES V. CHEROKEE NATION 474 F 2d 628
- hh. MARSH V. BROOKS 49 U. S. 223
- ii. HOOPER V. SCHEIMER 64 U.S. 23 HOW 235
- jj. GREEN V. BARBER 66 N.W. 1032
- kk. W ALTON V. UNITED STATES 415 F 2d 121,123 (10th CIR.)
- ll. UNITED STATES V. BEAMON 242 F. 876
- mm. FILE V. ALASKA 593 P. 2d 268
- nn. □ LEADING FIGHTER V. COUNTY OF GREGORY, 230 N.W. 2d 114, 116
- oo. CHISHOLM V. GEORGIA, 2 DALL (U.S.) 419
- WILCOX V. CALLOWAY [I WASH. (VA.) 38-41]
- pp. STATE V.CRAWFORD 441 P. 2d 586590

App. 3

qq. YOUNG V. MILLER 125 SO. 2d 257,258
rr. BEAVER V. UNITED STATES, 350 F 2d 4 dert
denied 387 U.S. 937
ss. STOLL V. GOTTBREHT 176 N.W. 932,45 N.D.
158
tt. REICHERT V. JEROME H. SHEIP. INC 131 SO.
229, 22E ALA 133
uu. SUMMA CORPORATION V. CALIFORNIA ex.
rel. STATE LANDS COMMISSION, 80 L.ED 2d 237
vv. OLIPHANT V. FRAZHO 146 N.W. 2d 685
ww. UNITED STATES V. SPRAGUE 282 U. S. 716
xx. UNITED STATES V. REYNES, 9 HOW (U.S.)
127
yy. WISCONSIN C.R. CO. 124 U.S. 74,81
zz. PUTNUM V. ICKES, 78 F.2d 233, CERT.
DENIED 296 U.S. 612
aaa. KALE V. UNITED STATES 489 F2d
449,454
bbb. HOOFNAGLE V. ANDERSON, 20 U. S. (7
WHEAT) 212
ccc. THOMAS V. UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD
CO. 139 F.SUPP. 588596
ddd. STATE V. CRAWFORD 441 P.2d 586590
(ARIZ.APP) WINEMAN V. GASTREL 54 FED,
819,4 CCA 596,1 US APP 581
eee. CAGE V. DANKS 13 LA ANN 128
fff. U.S. V. STEENERSON 50 FED 504,1 CCA
552,4 U.S. APP 332
ggg. JENKINS V. GIBSON, 3 LA ANN 203
hhh. LITCHFIELD V. THE REGISTER, 9 WALL
(U.S.) 575,19 LED 681 UNITED STATES V. DEBEL
227F 760 (C8 sd, 1915)

App. 4

- iii. STANEK V. WHITE, 172 MINN. 390,215
N.W.R. 781,784 WARE V. HYLTON, 3 DALL (3 U.S.
199)
- jjj. LOMAS V. PICKERING 173 US 26 43 L. ED.
601

**ADDITIONAL COLOR OF TITLE CASE LAW
REFERENCES:**

- a. DINGEY V. PAXTON, 50 MISS 1038
- b. EHLE V. QUACKENBOSS 6 HILL NY 537
- c. OAKLEY V. COOK 41 N.J. EQ. 350A.2d 496
- d. DONOVAN V. PITCHER, 53 ALA 411
- e. BIRGE V. BOCK 44 MO APP 69
- f. CONVERSE V. KELLOGG 7 BARB N.Y. 590
- g. BLOCH V. RYAN, 4 AOO CAS, 283
- h. RYNOLDS V. BOREL, 86 CAL. 538
- i. MOORE V. WILLIAMS, 115 N.Y. 586,22N.E. 253
- j. ROBERTS V. BASSETT, 105 MASS 409
- k. WRIGHT V. MATTISON, 18 HOW. (U.S.) 50
- l. JOPLIN BREWING CO. V. PAYNE, 197 NO.422
94 S.W. 896
- m. ST. LOUIS V. GORMAN 29 MO 593
- n. RAWSON V. FOX, 65 ILL 200
- o. DAVID V. HALL, 92 R.I. 85
- p. MORRISON V. NORMAN, 47 ILL 477
- q. McCONNELL V. STREET 17 ILL 253
- r. MAHRENHOLZ V. COUNTY BOARD OF
SCHOOL TRUSTEES OF LAWRENCE COUNTY
etal. 93 ILL APP 3d 366
- s. DEMPSEY V. BURNS 281 ILL 644
- t. DRYDEN V. NEWMAN, 116 ILL 186
- u. HINCKLEY v. GREEN 52 ILL 223
- v. BUSCH V. HUSTON 75 ILL. 343
- w. CHICKERING V. FAILES, 26 ILL. 508

App. 5

- x. SAFFORD V. STUBBS 117 ILL. 389
- y. HOOW AY V. CLARK 27 ILL. 483
- z. McCELLAN V. KELLOGG 17 ILL 498
- aa. GRANT v. BENNETT 96 ILL. 513
- bb. MORGAN V. CLAYTON, 61 ILL 35
- cc. BRADY V. SPURCK 27 ILL 478
- dd. BUTTERFIELD V. SMITH ILL. 111
- ee. KENDRICK V. LA TRAM, 25 FLA. 819
- ff. HULS V. BUNTIN 47ll—L 396
- gg. WALKER V. CONVERSE 148 ll—L. 622
- hh. PEADRO V. CARRIKER 168ll—L 570
- ii. CHICAGO V- MIDDLEBROOKE, 143 ll—L 265
- jj. PIATT COUNTY V. GOODEN, 97 ILL 84
- kk. STUBBLEFIELD V. BORDERS 89 ILL 570
- ll. THOMAS V. ECKARD, 88 ILL 593.
- mm. COLEMAN V, BILLINGS, 89 ILL 183
- nn. WHITNEY V. STEVENS, 89 ILL. 53
- oo. HOLLOWAY V. CLARKE, 27 ILL. 483
- pp. BALDWIN V. RATCLIFF 125 ILL. 376
- qq. BRADLEY V. REES, 113 ILL 327
- rr. COOK V. NORTON, 43 ILL 391
- ss. COUNTY OF PIATT V. GOODELL, 97 ILL 84
- tt. SMITH V. FERGUSON, 91 ILL 304
- uu. HASSETT V. RIDGELY, 49 ILL 197
- vv. BROOKS V. BRUYN, 35 ILL. 507
- ww. McCLAGG V. HEACOCK, 34 ILL. 476
- xx. BRIDE V. WATT, 23 ILL 507
- yy. WOODWARD V. BLANCHARD, 16 ILL 424

**ADDITIONAL DEFECTIVE TITLE CASE LAW
REFERENCES:**

- a. HELLER V. COHEN 15 MISC. 378,36 N.Y. S. 668
- b. PLACE V. PEOPLE, 192 ILL 160,61 N .E. 354

App. 6

- c. COSPERTINI V. OPPERMANN, 76 CAL. 181,
18P. 256 RASCHELL V. PEREZ, 7 TEX, 348
HERMAN V.
- d. SOMERS, 158 PA. ST. 42427 A. 1050

**ADDITIONAL COMMON LAW CASE LAW
REFERENCES:**

- a. UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION
- b. WESTERN UNION TELEGRAPH CO. V. CALL
PUBLISHING CO. 181 U.S. 765
- c. ROBBEN V. OBERING 279 F. 2d 387(7th CIR.)
- d. KARLSON V. MURPHY 56 N.E. 2d 839387 ILL
436
- e. PEOPLE ex. reI. BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS V. BARRETT 46
N.E.2d 951,382 ILL. 321
- f. MITCHELL HUTCHINS AND CO. 54 N.E.2d
708322 ILL. APP. 409
- g. HEINEMAN V. HARMANN, 52 N.E. 2d 263, 385
ILL. 191
- h. WILLIAMSON V. WINNING