No. ___ - ________

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Henri Jean-Baptiste,

Petitioner

v.

SAP, NATIONAL SECURITY SERVICES, INC.

Respondents

On Petition for a Writ of Certiorari
to the United States Court of Appeals
for the Fourth Circuit

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Henri Jean-Baptiste, ; SAP, NATIONAL SECURITY SERVICES, INC./
P.O BOX 5863 UNITED STATES DISTRICT OF MARYLAND
Bethesda, MD 20824 (Greenbelt, Maryland)
hjbaptiste@gmail.com

December 28, 2017

RECEIVED
DEC 27 2017
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

Congress enacted the Act of 1871 with implied consent, changed the form of the Government enable Corporations as Person status, defer mitigating conflicts of interest inherent in the relationship between Natural-Sovereign Human and the unequal protection of Rights in favor of Corporations it creates, expect the Courts to decide in accordance to the Constitution; did congress acted in compliance with Article One Section ninth which restrict congress powers. See Acts of the Forty-First Congress," Section 34, Session III, chapters 61 and 62. That Act imposes on all-natural Sovereign Citizens and the Fourteenth Amendment 'citizens as artificial fiction personhood. Since this Act was later abolished by the new Act of **1874**, Congress replaced the District's quasi-elected territorial government with an appointed three-member Board of Commissioners- An **Act** for the Government of the District of Columbia and other purposes – 18 Stat 116. further provides that, in such an action, "unspecified approval for all other purposes by the Commissioners 'Board, includes (Title 28 USC 1330 states that the United States District Court has to grant permission for the suit to be pursued once the court has been supplied sufficient proof that the United States citizen is actually a corporate entity) not conclusive; but "shall be given such consideration by the court as is deemed appropriate under all the circumstances." Id. § 80a-35(b)(2). The question presented is: Whether the Commissioners Board's actions above erroneously held, in conflict with Article One Section Ninth and its removal, Sovereign indigent' Rights , the Fourteenth Amendment citizens of the Constitutions; subsequently give rise to the current Corporate hustle takeover of the District Court to be the gate keepers of Corporations.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

CASES

United States v. California, 297 U.S. 175, 186 (1936). See also Jefferson County Pharmaceutical Assn., Inc. v. Abbott Laboratories, 460 U.S. 150, 161, n 21 (1983). Furthermore, as explained in United States v. Herron, 20 Wall, 251, 255 (1874), even the principle as applied to the enacting Sovereign is not without limitations.

STATUTES AND RULES

§ On December 26, 1933, 49 Statute 3097, Treaty Series 881, "Convention on Rights and Duties of States", CONGRESS replaced STATUTES with international law, placing all states under international law.

§ On December 9, 1945, International Organization Immunities Act relinquished every public office of the United States to the United Nations.

§ 22 CFR (Code of Federal Regulations) 92.12-92.31 FR Heading "Foreign Relationship" states that oath is required to take office

§ Title 8 U.S.C. 1481 states, once oath of office is taken citizenship is relinquished, thus the oath taker becomes a foreign entity, agency, or state. That means every public office is a foreign state, even all political subdivisions; i.e., every single court is considered a separate foreign entity.

§ Title 22 USC, "Foreign Relations and Intercourse", Chapter 11 identifies all public officials as foreign agents.

Federal Civil Judicial Procedures and Rules, Rule 4(j) states that the Court jurisdiction and immunity fall under a foreign State and refers reader to Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act of 1976, 28 U.S.C. §1608.

Federal Civil Judicial Procedures and Rules, Rule 81(f) DEFINITION, OFFICERS OF THE UNITED STATES. "Under any rule in which reference is made to an officer or agency of the United States, the term “officer” includes a district director of internal revenue, a former district director or collector of internal revenue, or the personal representative of a deceased district director or collector of internal revenue. Title 5 U.S.C. §552a(a)(2) or (a) (13) which shows an ‘individual’ [as legally defined] to be a ‘public officer’ or ‘federal personnel’.

§ 22 U.S.C. § 611, DEFINITIONS, it states in part, “As used in and for the purposes of this subchapter.

Title 18 U.S.C. §3077(4) states:

The term “includes” excludes everything that is not listed thereafter. See 26 U.S.C. 7001(c): The terms "include" and "including" when used in a definition contained in this title shall not be deemed to exclude other things otherwise within the meaning of the term defined. This double talk means that if not included within the list then it is EXCLUDED and not applicable.
(Ed. Note)

The term “United States” means the District of Columbia and it ten sub district or regions: 16 Statutes at Large 419, February 21, 1871.

Title 28 U.S.C. §3002 (15) (A) states that the United States is “a Federal Corporation” and not Government, State or Republic, which mean the Judiciary Procedure are corporate rules.

Supplement 46 U.S.C. §§ 1176 – 1282, where taxpayers are referred to as “vessels”.

PERSON - In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labor organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers. See e.g. National Labor Relations Act, Partnership Act, §2. Scope and delineation of term is necessary for §2(1), 29 U.S.C.A. §152; Uniform determining those to whom Fourteenth Amendment of Constitution affords protection since this Amendment expressly applies to individual, partnership, and corporation, but not governmental unit. Bankrupt Code - "Person" includes organization. U.C.C. §1-201(30). Definition of "person" or U.S.C.A. §101; Commercial Law - An individual or "municipal utility operators suing as plaintiffs seeking damages persons" covered by anti-trust laws includes cities, whether as for antitrust violations or as operators being sued as defendants. City of Lafayette, La. v. Louisiana Power & Light Co., La., 435 U.S. 389, 98 S.Ct. 1123, 1128, 55 L.Ed.2d 364. --*Black's Law Dictionary*,

Seventh Edition, The West Group ©1999. [underlining added] The word "person" in legal terminology is perceived as a general word, which normally includes in its scope a variety of entities other than human beings. See e.g. 1 U.S.C. sec. 1. Church of Scientology v U.S. Dept. of Justice, (1979) 612 F. 2d 417, 425.

Statutes employing the "person are ordinarily construed to exclude the Sovereign." Wilson v. Omaha Tribe, 442 U.S. 600, 604 (1941). See also, United States v. Mine Workers, 330 U.S. 258, 275 (1947).

U.S. Supreme Court Justice Holmes explained: "A Sovereign is exempt from suit, not because of any formal conception or obsolete theory, but on the logical and practical ground that there can be no legal Right as against the authority that makes the law on which the Right depends." Kawananakoa v. Polyblank, 205 U.S. 349, 353, 27 S. Ct. 526, 527, 51 L. Ed. 834 (1907).

The Sovereignty devolved on the people and they are truly the Sovereigns of the country. But they are Sovereigns without subjects and have none to govern but themselves. The citizens of America are equal as fellow citizens and as joint tenants in the Sovereignty. Chisholm v. Georgia, (February Term, 1793) 2 U.S. 419 2D all. 419, 1 L Ed 440.

This Sovereign individual paradigm is explained by the following U.S. Supreme Court case: "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 such duty (to submit his books and papers for an examination) to the State since he receives nothing therefrom 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. Among his Rights are a refusal to incriminate himself and the immunity of himself and his property from arrest or seizure except under a warrant of the law. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their Rights." Hale v. Henkel, 201 U.S. 43 at 47 (1905).

(AS PER THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT REGARDING PRACTICE OF LAW;
A. The practice of Law CANNOT be licensed by any state/State Schware v. Board of Examiners, 353 U.S. 238, 239
B. The practice of Law is AN OCCUPATION OF COMMON RIGHT!
Sims v. Aherns, 271 S.W. 720 (1925)

1 See United States v. Lee, 106 U.S. 196 (1882); Alden v. Maine, 527 U.S. 706 (1999); Hans v. Louisiana, 134 U.S. 1 (1890). 2 See, e.g., College Sav. Bank v. Florida Prepaid Postsecondary Educ. Exp. Bd., 527 U.S. 666 (1999); Florida Prepaid Postsecondary Educ. Exp. Bd. v. College Sav. Bank, 527 U.S. 627 (1999); Seminole Tribe v. Florida, 517 U.S. 44 (1996); Alden, 527 U.S. at 706. 3 See, e.g., Federal Tort Claims Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1346(b); Tucker Act, 28 U.S.C. §1491. 4 209 U.S. 123 (1908).

LEGISLATIVE MATERIALS

Title 22 USC (Foreign Relations and Intercourse) Chapter 11 identifies all public officials as foreign agents.

Title 28 USC 3002 Section 15A states that the United States is a Federal Corporation and not a Government, including the Judiciary Procedural Section.

Federal Rules of Civil Procedure (FRCP) 4j states that the Court jurisdiction and immunity fall under a foreign State.

The 11th Amendment states "The Judicial power of the United States shall not be construed to extend to any suit in law or equity, commenced or prosecuted against one of the United States by Citizens of another State, or by Citizens or Subjects of an Foreign State." (A foreign entity, agency, or state cannot bring any suit against a United States citizen without abiding the following procedure.)

Title 22 CFR 93.1-93.2 states that the Department of State has to be notified of any suit, and in turn has to notify the United States citizen of said suit.

Title 28 USC 1330 states that the United States District Court has to grant permission for the suit to be pursued once the court has been supplied sufficient proof that the United States citizen is actually a corporate entity.

Title 28 USC 1608 I have Absolute Immunity as a Corporation

Title 28 USC 1602-1611 (Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act) allows the jurisdiction of a court to be challenged, and a demand of proper jurisdiction to be stated.

July 27th 1868 15 Statutes at Large Chapter 249 Section 1 "Acts Concerning American Citizens in a Foreign State", expatriation, is what is broken when jurisdiction is demanded, and it is not met with an answer.

Under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 12b 6 the prosecution has failed to provide adequate proof that the parties involved in this situation are actually corporate entities. I have provided ample proof that the prosecution and other agents are actually corporations.

'1950 81st Congress Investigated the Lawyers Guild and determined that the B.A.R. Association by definition is founded and run by communists. Thus, any elected official that is a member of the B.A.R. will only be loyal to the B.A.R. entity and never have allegiance to the people.'

INTRODUCTION

The Fourth Circuit in this case expressly affirm the District Court' decision to dismiss the Complaint for lack of jurisdiction and failure to state a claim. The fact that the District Court granted Petitioner's Motion to Proceed in Forma Pauperis, ECF No.3. ''Hereto he appears to be indigent'' is clearly conflicted, in which, the Fourth Circuits should have addressed this conflict in assessing the jurisdiction of indigent Sovereignty aspect of the case. - A Statutory under Title 28 USC 1330 states that the United States District Court has to grant permission for the suit to be pursued once the court has been supplied sufficient proof that the United States citizen is actually a corporate entity. - The 14th Amendment Section 1, 1868, the adhesion contract required a subject to be a citizen of the State he resides. The indigent' address is: P.O. Box 5863, Bethesda, MD {20824}, that does not constitute citizenship or residency for the Sovereign indigent. Judges of the Fourth Circuit: NIEMEYER, TRAXLER, HAMILTON reviewed and find no conflict or reversible error. The panel's analysis" warrant further review; the symbiotic relationship between Federal Corporations, Agents, Officers and procedures, "the forces of arm's-length bargaining" over collector's justification "do not work for the Sovereign-Natural Personhood in the same manner as artificial fictional Person. Title 28 U.S.C. §3002 (15) (A) states that the United States is "a Federal Corporation" and not Government, State or Republic, which mean the Judiciary Procedure are corporate rules. William Dixon v. The United States, 1 Marsh 117, 181 (1811), Justice John Marshall explained that "The United States of America" was a corporation and all of the politicians, judges were the officers of that corporation.

Why aren't Sovereigns-indigent Petitioner subject to the District Court judgement? Because of the concept of office. The state is attempting to prosecute only a particular office known as "person." If you are not in that state-created office of "person," the state statutes simply do not apply to you. For example, if you are not in the state of Wisconsin, then Wisconsin rules do not apply to you. For the state to control someone, they have to first create the office. Then they must coerce a warm-blooded creature to come fill that office. They want you to fill that office; in this case, the State in collusion with SAP National Security Services, Inc. resulted in damages and the loss of his properties, render Petitioner Homeless and an indigent-Sovereign. Here is the often-expressed understanding from the United States Supreme Court that in common usage, the term "person" does not include the Sovereign. Statutes employing the "person are ordinarily construed to exclude the Sovereign." Wilson v. Omaha Tribe, 442 U.S. 600, 604 (1941). See also, United States v. Mine Workers, 330 U.S. 258, 275 (1947).

U.S. Supreme Court Justice Holmes explained: "A Sovereign is exempt from judgement, not because of any formal conception or obsolete theory, but on the logical and practical ground that there can be no legal Right as against the authority that makes or not subject to law on which the Right depends." Kawananakoa v. Polyblank, 205 U.S. 349, 353, 27 S. Ct. 526, 527, 51 L. Ed. 834 (1907).

The majority of American states fully embrace the Sovereign immunity theory as well as the federal government. See Restatement (Second) of torts 895B, comment at 400 (1979).

"This Sovereign individual paradigm is explained by the following U.S. Supreme Court case: "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 such duty (to submit his books and papers for an examination) to the State since he receives nothing therefrom 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.

Among his Rights are a refusal to incriminate himself and the immunity of himself and his property from arrest or seizure except under a warrant of the law. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their Rights." Hale v. Henkel, 201 U.S. 43 at 47 (1905)."

The proper interpretation of this case and its importance surpassing 44 percent of American families with their rights being ignored before a judicial system that categorize them as person not as Human beings; therefore, does not serve or represent them. This Court's immediate review is warranted to resolve the square conflict of the District Court on the homeless Sovereign-indigent and whether the

Fourth Circuits exercised its fiduciary duty "with respect to its affirmation of the District Court's decision.

STATEMENT

A quick Summary History of Corporations in America

When American colonists declared independence from England in 1776, they also freed themselves from control by English corporations that extracted their wealth and dominated trade. After fighting a revolution to end this exploitation, our country's founders retained a healthy fear of corporate power and wisely limited corporations exclusively to a business role. Corporations were forbidden from attempting to influence elections, public policy, and other realms of civic society.

Initially, the privilege of incorporation was granted selectively to enable activities that benefited the public, such as construction of roads or canals. Enabling shareholders to profit was seen as a means to that end. The states also imposed conditions (some of which remain on the books, though unused) like these*:

- Corporate charters (licenses to exist) were granted for a limited time and could be revoked promptly for violating laws.
- Corporations could engage only in activities necessary to fulfill their chartered purpose.
- Corporations could not own stock in other corporations nor own any property that was not essential to fulfilling their chartered purpose.
- Corporations were often terminated if they exceeded their authority or caused public harm.
- Owners and managers were responsible for criminal acts committed on the job.
- Corporations could not make any political or charitable contributions nor spend money to influence law-making.

For 100 years after the American Revolution, legislators maintained tight control of the corporate chartering process. Because of widespread public opposition, early legislators granted very few corporate charters, and only after debate. Citizens governed corporations by detailing operating conditions not just in charters but also in state constitutions and state laws. Incorporated businesses were prohibited from taking any action that legislators did not specifically allow.

States also limited corporate charters to a set number of years. Unless a legislature renewed an expiring charter, the corporation was dissolved and its assets were divided among shareholders. Citizen authority clauses limited capitalization, debts, land holdings, and sometimes, even profits. They required a company's accounting books to be turned over to a legislature upon request. The power of large shareholders was limited by scaled voting, so that large and small investors had equal voting rights. Interlocking directorates were outlawed. Shareholders had the right to remove directors at will.

In Europe, charters protected directors and stockholders from liability for debts and harms caused by their corporations. American legislators explicitly rejected this corporate shield. The penalty for abuse or misuse of the charter was not a plea bargain and a fine, but dissolution of the corporation.

In 1819 the U.S. Supreme Court tried to strip states of this sovereign right by overruling a lower court's decision that allowed New Hampshire to revoke a charter granted to Dartmouth College by King George III. The Court claimed that since the charter contained no revocation clause, it could not be withdrawn. The Supreme Court's attack on state sovereignty outraged citizens. Laws were written or re-written and new state constitutional amendments passed to circumvent the

(Dartmouth College v Woodward) ruling. Over several decades starting in 1844, nineteen states amended their constitutions to make corporate charters subject to alteration or revocation by their legislatures. As late as 1855 it seemed that the Supreme Court had gotten the people's message when in Dodge v. Woolsey it reaffirmed state's powers over "artificial bodies."

But the men running corporations pressed on. Contests over charter were battles to control labor, resources, community rights, and political sovereignty. More and more frequently, corporations were abusing their charters to become conglomerates and trusts. They converted the nation's resources and treasures into private fortunes, creating factory systems and company towns. Political power began flowing to absentee owners, rather than community-rooted enterprises.

The industrial age forced a nation of farmers to become wage earners, and they became fearful of unemployment–a new fear that corporations quickly learned to exploit. Company towns arose. and blacklists of labor organizers and workers who spoke up for their rights became common. When workers began to organize, industrialists and bankers hired private armies to keep them in line. They bought newspapers to paint businessmen as heroes and shape public opinion. Corporations bought state legislators, then announced legislators were corrupt and said that they used too much of the public's resources to scrutinize every charter application and corporate operation. "Corporations engineered the Civil War just as all Wars of present day" Government spending during the Civil War brought these corporations fantastic wealth. Corporate executives paid "borers" to infest Congress and state capitals, bribing elected and appointed officials alike. They pried loose an avalanche of government financial largesse. During this time, legislators were persuaded to give corporations limited liability, decreased citizen authority over them, and extended durations of charters.

Attempts were made to keep strong charter laws in place, but with the courts applying legal doctrines that made protection of corporations and corporate property the center of constitutional law, citizen sovereignty was undermined. As corporations grew stronger, government and the courts became easier prey. They freely reinterpreted the U.S. Constitution and transformed common law doctrines.

One of the most severe blows to citizen authority arose out of the 1886 Supreme Court case of Santa Clara County v. Southern Pacific Railroad. Though the court did not make a ruling on the question of "corporate personhood," thanks to misleading notes of a clerk, the decision subsequently was used as precedent to hold that a corporation was a "natural person. From that point on, the 14th Amendment, enacted to protect rights of freed slaves, was used routinely to grant corporations constitutional "personhood." Justices have since struck down hundreds of local, state and federal laws enacted to protect people from corporate harm based on this illegitimate premise. Armed with these "rights," corporations increased control over resources, jobs, commerce, politicians, even judges and the law.

A United States Congressional committee concluded in 1941, "The principal instrument of the concentration of economic power and wealth has been the corporate charter with unlimited power...."

Before HJR 192 was passed, Executive Order 6102 was signed into effect by President Roosevelt. This executive order required all gold and gold certificates to be surrendered to the federal government by May 1, 1933. House Joint Resolution 192 was then passed by Congress on June 5, 1933. This law was passed to do away with the gold clause in the constitution and in all public and private contracts.

1933 was also when the United States went bankrupt, which was not the first time that it went bankrupt. In fact, the United States was so far in debt that it went bankrupt two additional time previously – once in 1789 (forming the Constitution so the states could sign on as security for the fed's debts), and then in 1861 (when the Southern State's said "No More" and wanted to succeed rather than sign on to another pledging of assets to pay the federal government's debt).

Then, in 1933, and with HJR192, they took all the Gold, all the true money, all the property (and instituted eminent domain and property taxes/divided land titles), and instituted the income tax to control the labor of the people. In addition, with HJR 192 is when they instituted the Birth Certificates to control the people and have the future American people become the collateral for all the federal governments debts. – your birth certificate is the TITLE to your body and it has been pledged as an asset. The holder has the right to the taxes and fines, fees, etc. that you pay to the government through judgments, court cases, payroll, income taxes, property taxes, etc.

From the very beginning, the government was indebted to European bankers as a result of the revolution. How ironic that we had to borrow money from England to pay for the war we fought against them.

So, fast forward to the early 1900's and you'll come across several key events that make it quite obvious there was a master plan at work to enslave the people.

The Creature from Jeckyll Island, you'll become intimately acquainted with the happenings in the year 1910, when 6 men, who were either elite bankers and/or politicians, met in secret in a place named Jeckyll Island. The purpose of this meeting was to formulate plans for economic reforms for the United States. This is where the banking cartel began in this country. The idea of a central bank had always been rejected, and so the men who met on Jeckyll Island, needed to come up with a way to trick the people into allowing a central bank to be instituted.

Three years later, in 1913, President Wilson signed the Federal Reserve Act into effect, which is the current central bank in the United States, even though it is actually not governed by any agency of the Federal Government. Eight years later, in 1921, the Maternity Act was passed which required all birth to be registered with the state. So, now all key pieces were in place for the upcoming bankruptcy default and restructure.

In 1933, when the Federal Government went bankrupt, they passed EO 6102 and HJR 192 and pledged us as collateral to back the government debt.

They made us slaves. But they couldn't technically make us slaves, because that would be illegal. So, they had to give us a remedy. So, what is the HJR 192 Remedy? It is that the government has the obligation to discharge and settle any debts we may incur in our daily lives. Yes, this includes mortgages, car loans, utilities, etc.…But wait! Wasn't HJR 192 repealed? Technically, it was but the provisions that brought us into having no money of substance still exist and apply. In other words, we didn't go back to using "real money" (gold/silver) again; and therefore, the maxim of "whoever brings the obligation must bring the remedy" still applies. So, the government still has the fiduciary duty to discharge and settle your debts, because we still don't have access to money of real substance, AND because the USA is still in bankruptcy mode. So, the Secretary of the Treasury is still the "Receiver" in a Bankruptcy. Your birth certificate is still a bond and your debts are still prepaid by your future labor, property, and taxes that they are assuming the Administration of as the Office of the Executor of the ESTATE of the ALL CAPS JOHN H DOE name. They still hypothecated the Birth Certificate and made Billions of the birth (or Naturalization) of every new citizen. In fact, in every court case over $7,000, there are new bonds created and traded off your BC ESTATE.

The fact of the matter is this is just the tip of the ice berg, and the rabbit hole goes far deeper than any of us ever imagined. The current National debt is climbing Twenty-One plus trillions, and our GDP is not growing fast or high enough to even service the interest of the debt let alone pay for other services of the Nation- because the Federal Taxes revenues are still being divided between City of London, the Federal Reserve and the Vatican. It will take massive amounts of studying and a healthy dose of trial and error. We are being prepared for the crash of the dollar and another bankruptcy. The danger is as previews bankruptcies, many U.S.-based corporations are now transnational, and multi-International but the corrupted charter remains the legal basis for their existence. Our only hope to restore sanity and to prevent total destruction of our society is an independent-impartial nonpolitical Supreme Court; we believe citizens can reassert the convictions of our nation's founders who struggled successfully to free us from corporate rule in the past. These changes must occur at the most fundamental level — the Courts, people, with the original U.S. Constitution.

JURISDICTION

The Fourth Circuit entered its Mandate on September 28, 2017, pursuant to Rule 41(a) of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure and Affirmed the District judgement of February 15, 2017. See Pet. App. This Court's jurisdiction is invoked under 28 U.S.C. § 1254(1).

OPINIONS BELOW

The opinion of the United States Court of Appeals for The Fourth Circuit (Pet. App.) is unreported at ... The opinion of the district court (Pet…) is not reported but is available at ….

STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

Relevt. provisions: **Article One Section 9: Limits on Congress, WHERE IS IT?**

WHAT HAPPEN TO ARTICLE ONE SECTION NINTH OF THE CONSTITUTION?

Statutory and Regulatory Background

A. Most state constitutions have a section that declares the fundamental power of the people:
Political power – All political power is inherent in the people. The enunciation herein of certain Rights shall not be construed to deny or impair others retained by the people. Notice that this says "people" ... it does not say "persons." This statement declares beyond any doubt that the people are Sovereign over their created government. This is natural law and the natural flow of delegated power.

A Sovereign is a private, non-resident, non-domestic, non-person, non-individual person, NOT SUBJECT to any real or imaginary statutory regulations of quasi-laws enacted by any state legislature which was created by the people.

Here is the often-expressed understanding from the United States Supreme Court that in common usage, the term "person" does not include the Sovereign. Statutes employing the "person are ordinarily construed to exclude the Sovereign." Wilson v. Omaha Tribe, 442 U.S. 600, 604 (1941). See also, United States v. Mine Workers, 330 U.S. 258, 275 (1947).

The idea that the word "person" ordinarily excludes the Sovereign can also be traced to the "familiar principles that the King is not bound by any act of Parliament unless he be named therein by special and particular words." Dollar Savings Bank v. United States, 19 Wall 227, 239 (1874). As this passage suggests, however, this interpretive principle applies only to the enacting Sovereign, United States v. California, 297 U.S. 175, 186 (1936). See also Jefferson County Pharmaceutical Assn., Inc. v. Abbott Laboratories, 460 U.S. 150, 161, n 21 (1983). Furthermore, as explained in United States v. Herron, 20 Wall, 251, 255 (1874), even the principle as applied to the enacting Sovereign is not without limitations. "Where an act of Parliament is made for the public good, as for the advancement of religion and justice or to prevent injury and wrong, the king is bound by such act, though not particularly named therein, but where a statute is general and thereby any prerogative, right, title, or interest is divested or taken from the king in such case the king is not bound, unless the statute is made to extend to him by express words."

U.S. Supreme Court Justice Holmes explained: "A Sovereign is exempt from suit, not because of any formal conception or obsolete theory, but on the logical and practical ground that there can be no legal Right as against the authority that makes the law on which the Right depends." Kawananakoa v. Polyblank, 205 U.S. 349, 353, 27 S. Ct. 526, 527, 51 L. Ed. 834 (1907).

The majority of American states fully embrace the Sovereign immunity theory as well as the federal government. See Restatement (Second) of torts 895B, comment at 400 (1979). The following U.S. Supreme Court case makes clear all these principals. I shall have occasion incidentally to evince how true it is that states and governments were made for man, and at the same time, how true it is that his creatures and servants have first deceived, next vilified, and at last oppressed their master and maker.

B. A state, useful and valuable as the contrivance is, is the inferior contrivance of man, and from his native dignity derives all its acquired importance. Let a state be considered as subordinate to the people. But let everything else be subordinate to the state. The latter part of his position is equally necessary with the former. For in the practice and, even at length in the science of politics, there has very frequently been a strong current against the natural order of things, and an inconsiderate or an interested disposition to sacrifice the end to the means. As the government has claimed precedence over the people, so, in the same inverted course of things, the government has often claimed precedence over the state; and to this perversion in the second degree, many of the volumes of confusion concerning Sovereignty owe their existence. The ministers, dignified very properly by the appellation of the magistrates, have wished, and have succeeded in their wish, to be considered as the Sovereigns of the state. This second degree of perversion is confined to the old world and begins to diminish even there, but the first degree is still to prevalent even in the Several states of which our union is composed. By a state, I mean a complete body of free persons united together for their common benefit, to enjoy peaceably what is their own, and to do justice to others. It is an artificial person. It has its affairs and the interests; it has its rules; it has its Rights; and it has its obligations. It may acquire property distinct from that of its members. It may incur debts to be discharged out of the public stock, not out of the private fortunes of individuals. It may be bound by contracts and for damages arising from the breach of those contracts. In all our contemplations, however, concerning this feigned and artificial person, we should never forget that in truth and nature, those who think and speak and act are "men." Is the foregoing description of a state a true description? It will not be questioned, but it is. It will be sufficient to observe briefly that the Sovereignties in Europe, and particularly in England, exist on feudal principles. That system considers the prince as the Sovereign, and the people as his subjects; it regards his person as the object of allegiance and excludes the idea of his being on an equal footing with a subject, either in a court of justice or elsewhere. That system contemplates him as being the fountain of honor and authority; and from his grace and grant derives all franchise, immunities and privileges. It is easy to perceive that such a Sovereign could not be amenable to a court of justice or subjected to judicial control and actual constraint. It was of necessity, therefore, that suability became incompatible with such Sovereignty. Besides, the prince having all the executive powers, the judgment of the courts would in fact be only monitory, not mandatory to him, and a capacity to be advised is a distinct thing from a capacity to be sued. The same feudal ideas run through all their jurisprudence and constantly remind us of the distinction between the prince and the subject.

No such ideas exist here (speaking of America). At the Revolution, the Sovereignty devolved on the people and they are truly the Sovereigns of the country. But they are Sovereigns without subjects (unless the African slaves among us may be so called) and have none to govern but themselves. The citizens of America are equal as fellow citizens and as joint tenants in the Sovereignty. Chisholm v. Georgia, (February Term, 1793) 2 U.S. 419 2D all. 419, 1 L Ed 440. There are many ways you can give up your Sovereign power and accept the role of "person." One is by receiving state benefits. Another is by asking permission in the form of a license or permit from the state.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

The proper interpretation of this case and its importance, presents an opportunity for this Court to re-visit the issue of Corporate's personhood: One of the most severe blows to citizen authority arose out of the 1886 Supreme Court case of Santa Clara County v. Southern Pacific Railroad. Though the court did not make a ruling on the question of "corporate personhood,". This Court's immediate review therefore is warranted to resolve THAT ISSUE and the square conflict of the District Court on the Sovereign-indigent and whether the Fourth Circuits exercised its fiduciary duty "with respect to its affirmation of the District Court decision.

CONCLUSION

The petition for writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted

Henri Jean-Baptiste,

Henri Jean-Baptiste, ; SAP, NATIONAL SECURITY SERVICES, INC./

P.O BOX 5863 UNITED STATES DISTRICT OF MARYLAND

Bethesda, MD 20824 (Greenbelt, Maryland)

hjbaptiste@gmail.com

December 28, 2017