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**The meek may inherit the Earth...**

MEEK, a. L. mucus; Eng. mucilage; Heb. to melt.

Mild of temper; soft; gentle; not easily provoked or irritated; yielding; given to forbearance under injuries.

*Now the man Moses was very meek, above all men. Num.12.*

Appropriately, humble, in an evangelical sense; submissive to the divine will; not proud, self-sufficient or refractory; not peevish and apt to complain of divine dispensations.

*Christ says, "Learn of me, for I am meek and lowly in heart, and ye shall find rest to your souls." Matt.11.*

*Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth. Matt.5.*

MEE'KNESS, n. Softness of temper; mildness; gentleness; forbearance under injuries and provocations.

In an evangelical sense, humility; resignation; submission to the divine will, without murmuring or peevishness; opposed to pride, arrogance and refractoriness. Gal.5.

*I beseech you by the meekness of Christ. 1 Cor.10.*

What is this meekness, that it is so powerful? One alternative translation for meekness is “gentleness.” It requires great strength to be gentle. Gentleness is the opposite of abrasiveness, and it flows from that kind of confident strength that is the opposite of arrogance. The man who is secure in his love for God Almighty does not need to intimidate but can be kind and humble in his leadership roles.

The man who is meek before God Almighty and has that inner strength that enables him to be gentle before men will not be a violent man. This quietness of spirit will enable him to be temperate. A self-controlled or temperate person is not given to binges of excess, but lives within restraints.

**... but his people perish for lack of knowledge**

*Hear the word of the LORD, ye children of Israel: for the LORD hath a controversy with the inhabitants of the land, because there is no truth, nor mercy, nor knowledge of God in the land. Hosea 4:1*

*My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge: because thou hast rejected knowledge, I will also reject thee, that thou shalt be no priest to me: seeing thou hast forgotten the law of thy God, I will also forget thy children. Hosea 4:6*

The lack of knowledge stems from the people turning their back on God Almighty and his commandments. Note the use of the word LORD. What does this mean and why is this important? To comprehend this, one needs to first comprehend what LORD actually represents.

To define or explain what LORD actually represents, first direct your attention to Chicago style manual section 11.147. LORD is what is called "GLOSS". A "GLOSS" is the written-language transcription of American Sign Language; Glosses are words from the spoken language written in ALL-CAP and considered foreign language by the rules of English.

So, the word LORD is a "**GLOSS**"; an interpretation or an explanation and in the case of Hosea 4, LORD represents the Earthly Government ordained by God Almighty (refer to Romans 13).

Originally, the Angels were to receive the people and lead them back to God Almighty by leading mankind (Adam) in their duty to subdue to Earth in his name for his Glory; help Mankind fulfill on the Adamic Covenant, but those Angels

became corrupted and led man astray; *The Fallen*.

Led by Lucifer, *The Fallen* tempted Adam with the fruit of being like God Almighty, instead of just KNOWING God Almighty. Adam was tempted through his Ego (Eve); tempted by the fruit of another (covenant), to eat of the fruit of the Tree of Knowledge, thus became DEAD to God Almighty, for the inclusion of one is the exclusion of the other, and if *The Fallen* can keep man in his current state of rebellion, the inheritance of Adam shall be kept amongst *The Fallen* as TRUSTEES (LORD) over both the inheritance and mankind.

Effectively, this allows *The Fallen* to keep manipulating mankind into warring against God Almighty, however, *The Fallen* are still bound to the COMMANDMENTS and COVENANTS of God Almighty. This means, *The Fallen* shall reign as LORD over mankind so long as mankind remain ignorant and in rebellion, but must RELINQUISH when Son of Man steps forth; when the Christ Consciousness fills one’s heart. Until such time, the usufruct of the Tree of Knowledge shall remain in place.

***Usufruct:*** *(n.) right to use and derive profit from property belonging to someone else provided that the property/substance remains free from impairment, alteration and/or injury in any way*

***Usufructuary:*** *(n.) One who has the right and enjoyment of an usufruct. The duties of the usufructuary are 1. To make an inventory of the things subject to the usufruct, in the presence of those having an interest in them. 2. To give security for their restitution; when the usufruct shall be at an end. 3. To take good care of the things subject to the usufruct. 4. To pay all taxes, and claims which arise while the thing is in his possession, as a ground-rent. 5. To keep the thing in repair at his own expense.*

Hosea 4 stands as an excellent example. In Hosea 4, God Almighty is addressing the Israelites and informing them that they do not keep to his commandments and that there is no love of God in their hearts, thus the LORD in this instance is LORD of Hosts (Wrath of God; hosts = war (Strong's Concordance: 6635)) that will fall upon them *"because there is no truth, nor mercy, nor knowledge of God in the land"*; they REJECTED the knowledge of God Almighty in their Hearts = opposite of meek.

People do not even realize that the thing people call the State or government is actually the physical manifestation of God Almighty; a result of the collective spiritual essence of mankind. The State operates AS IF it were God Almighty: LORD; the governors and tutors of this world; Statutes, codes, rules and regulations: the Word of the LORD.

So, if one walks with the Faith of Jesus Christ, respects the immutable laws of Nature and observes the Commandments of God Almighty, then the LORD must oblige: LORD God bestows the blessings. If one commits trespass against the same, LORD of Hosts visits with wrath.

This is also the basis of the LACK of knowledge that is causing his people to perish and for this purpose, please direct your attention to Black’s Law 4th: GLOSSA (pg. 2-3), which is Latin for GLOSS and to Black’s Law 4th: DOG-LATIN (pg. 1), which is the language of the illiterate; Latin written according to the rules of English language.

Note the phrase: ***GLOSSA VIPERINA EST QUlE CORRODIT VISCERA TEXTUS*** of which translates into *"it is a poisonous gloss which corrupts the essence of the text."* Therefore, when one ABUSES the GLOSS, the ESSENCE of the ENTIRE text stands corrupted or DEBASED; UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT is an ABUSE of the GLOSS, as is WILLIAM JEFFERSON CLINTON.

Written according to the Rules of English, as referenced in Chicago style manual section 11.147, UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT and WILLIAM JEFFERSON CLINTON should be stylized as UNITED-STATES-DISTRICT-COURT and WILLIAM JEFFERSON- CLINTON. This would render each GLOSS as one coherent thought.

In their current form, UNITED STATES DISTRCIT COURT and WILLIAM JEFFERSON CLINTON are nothing but incoherent babble. Each GLOSS, a new thought. One may as well stylize UNITED STATES DISTRCIT COURT and WILLIAM JEFFERSON CLINTON as “UNITED. STATES. DISTRCIT. COURT.” and “WILLIAM. JEFFERSON. CLINTON.” for they both mean the same thing: incoherent babble.

**Debase:** (v.) To reduce to a lower state of worth, dignity, purity, station, etc.; to degrade; to lower; to deteriorate; to abase; as, to debase the character by crime; to debase the mind by frivolity; to debase style by vulgar words.

*“For this cause God gave them up unto vile affections: for even their women did change the natural use into that which is against nature: And likewise also the men, leaving the natural use of the woman, burned in their lust one toward another; men with men working that which is unseemly, and receiving in themselves that recompence of their error which was meet.*

*And even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind, to do those things which are not convenient; Being filled with all unrighteousness, fornication, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness; full of envy, murder, debate, deceit, malignity; whisperers, Backbiters, haters of God, despiteful, proud, boasters, inventors of evil things, disobedient to parents, Without understanding, covenant breakers, without natural affection, implacable, unmerciful” Romans 1:26-31*

This ABUSE of the GLOSS is actually an ACCUSATION by the Accusor; the Adversary; Satan.

The ACCUSATION?

That one is of a reprobate mind: debased and without knowledge of God Almighty in one's heart and have forsaken the Laws of God Almighty; one of whom does not have a belief in any kind of higher power in which there are consequences either in the present or future for their life choices/actions. In short, a Heathen; an Infidel; a Heretic.

Basically, this abuse of GLOSS is nothing but a Deception run by the Synagogue of Satan, using the courts as their temple. From these temples, the Synagogue attempts to advertly entice the children of God Almighty into forsaking the blessings of Issac and inheritance of Jacob, thus rebuking the word and promises of God Almighty.

All of done by the Grace and with the Blessings of God Almighty, and done to protect the Kingdom (Public Trust) from heathens, infidels, heretics and the like from raping and pillaging the usufruct granted by God Almighty unto Adam (all of mankind collectively) pursuant to Genesis 1:26 while the LORD administrates the Adamic Covenant wherein Adam (mankind) and his offspring were to SUBDUE the Earth in the name and for the glory of God Almighty; Mankind was to build a world wherein the usufruct each subsequent generation received was of a better world than the one previously inherited: to be Good Stewards.

*"... I set out on this ground, which I suppose to be self evident, "that the earth belongs in usufruct to the living": that the dead have neither powers nor rights over it ... Then no man can, by natural right, oblige the lands he occupied, or the persons who succeed him in that occupation, to the paiment of debts contracted by him. For if he could, he might, during his own life, eat up the usufruct of the lands for several generations to come, and then the lands would belong to the dead, and not to the living, which would be the reverse of our principle ..." - Letter from Jefferson to Madison*

*“By the grace God has given me, I laid a foundation as a wise master builder, and someone else is building on it. But each one must be careful how he builds. For no one can lay a foundation other than the one already laid, which is Jesus Christ.*

*If anyone builds on this foundation using gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, or straw, his workmanship will be evident, because the Day will bring it to light. It will be revealed with fire, and the fire will prove the quality of each man’s work. If what he has built survives, he will receive a reward. If it is burned up, he will suffer loss. He himself will be saved, but only as one being snatched from the fire.*

*Do you not know that you yourselves are God’s temple, and that God’s Spirit dwells in you? If anyone destroys God’s temple, God will destroy him; for God’s temple is holy, and you are that temple.*

*Let no one deceive himself. If any of you thinks he is wise in this age, he should become a fool, so that he may become wise. For the wisdom of this world is foolishness in God’s sight. As it is written: “He catches the wise in their craftiness.”*

*And again, “The Lord knows that the thoughts of the wise are futile.”*

*Therefore stop boasting in men. All things are yours, whether Paul or Apollos or Cephasc or the world or life or death or the present or the future. All of them belong to you, and you belong to Christ, and Christ belongs to God.” - 1 Corinthians 3:10-23*

Jesus Christ's sacrifice allows us to go back to the FOUNDATION; the Adamic Covenant, and by Applying the Blood of the Lamb, one can wash one's sins clean; clear the slate, and the application of the Blood of the Lamb to one does not diminish or take away this choice for another, hence he died for the sins, transgressions and iniquities of all of mankind, past, present and future, so ALL may ASCEND; this is how much God Almighty and Jesus Christ loves humanity, but none are granted entrance into the Kingdom, except thru Jesus Christ: the way, the truth and the light.

*“Jesus saith unto him, I am the way, the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father, but by me.” – John 14:6*

With this sacrifice, ALL of mankind can REPENT; to feel or show that one stands humbled before God Almighty, sorry for something bad or wrong that was done and that one wants to do what is right. Adam was given the mandate by God Almighty to SUBDUE the Earth. SUBDUE means bring into bondage, force, keep under, subdue, bring into subjection. When Adam completed his task to subdue the Earth in the Name of God Almighty, Adam and his offspring are to have dominion. However, Adam was tempted through his ego (Eve) in the Garden by the Serpent and the result is the world now in witness.

This world stands as the result of the usufruct of the Tree of Knowledge, a world WITHOUT the love of God Almighty and with illiteracy and ignorance of his Laws; a world entranced by the false fixations of yesterday and constrained within the faulty traditions of man which seem now to bind it to a rationale of action leading only to extinction.

This world is the world manifest as result of the Curse of Genesis 3 and Adam's covenant with the Serpent; the world ruled by Ego (Satan incarnate), dominated by man's mutable laws; ignorant of the immutable laws of Nature and without knowledge of God Almighty.

With the Blood of the Lamb being shed for all of mankind, one can now choose to go back to the foundation, for Jesus Christ IS the foundation, and REPENT; give back what was taken from God Almighty *(reference Malachi 3:10)*, and accept usufruct of the Tree of Life; walk with the Faith of Jesus Christ, respect the immutable laws of Nature and observe the commandments of God Almighty;

OR

One may continue to eat of the fruit of the Tree of Knowledge and remain illiterate and ignorant of the immutable laws of Nature and God Almighty, but then one just agrees to be a steak on the table by choice and consent, remaining a spineless jellyfish and teacher of the same; usufruct over a world built of misinformation, caught up in a plethora of conditioned reflexes, driven by the human ego; inhabitant of a world within a prison locked by misorientation wherein both warden and prisoner attempt meagerly to compete with God Almighty and all intractably skeptical of what they do not understand.

*“If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God, that giveth to all men liberally, and upbraideth not; and it shall be given him. But let him ask in faith, nothing wavering. For he that wavereth is like a wave of the sea driven with the wind and tossed.*

*For let not that man think that he shall receive any thing of the Lord. A double minded man is unstable in all his ways.” - James 1:5-8*

**To gloss over something** is to ignore or avoid unpleasant facts; Such as, why would one be referenced via ALL CAP NAME or be addressed by SOME ALL CAP NAME, when the only place ALL CAP NAME is used in conjunction with people is a grave-marker; a TOMBSTONE, when one is a living being and not a Dead entity? Would this render a building with an ALL CAP NAME, such as a COURT, a CRYPT or MAUSOLEUM?

*“If you suffer your people to be ill-educated, and their manners corrupted from infancy, and then punish them for those crimes to which their first education disposed them, what else is to be concluded, sire, but that you first make thieves and then punish them?” – Danielle (Drew Barrymore) ~ Ever After, 1998*

Did you know that, in addition to being a grave-marker, a TOMBSTONE is also a public offering of securities? And what is a security? A security is basically a financing or investment instrument issued by a company or government agency that denotes an ownership interest and provides evidence of a debt, a right to share in the earnings of the issuer, or a right in the distribution of a property.

Did you know that according to United States Code, all crime is commercial and that in accordance with that same Code, one becomes surety for this TOMBSTONE; a spirit from the dead, when one fails to deny the presumption that one agreed to be surety when one exercised the benefit of violating some statute: *Breaking a Commandment of the LORD*; Chattel for a Security: a steak on the table by choice and consent.

And since these securities are traded on Wall Street and all around the world, the entire economy of the United States and thus the world is based on and fueled by the Capitalization of Sin. The current government-economic system requires Sinners to keep it chugging along; empowered by Satan’s faith in humanity to reject God Almighty.

This makes much more sense when one comprehends that the Court is just another clearing house for debt obligations, a court of contract; liquidation of an asset pledged to guaranty the repayment of a loan, satisfaction of an obligation or in compliance of an agreement.

**Crypt:** a subterranean chamber or vault, especially one beneath the main floor of a church, used as a burial place, a location for secret meetings, etc.

**Mausoleum:** an external free-standing building constructed as a monument enclosing the interment space or burial chamber of a deceased person or people.

**Hell:** The name of the place given under the exchequer chamber where the King’s debtors were held (Black’s Law 2nd Edition)

**Exchequer:** Treasury Department (Black’s Law 2nd Edition)

And what exactly is the asset pledged? You and your TIME; your SOUL, the only commodity upon this Earth worth anything, for TIME is the only limited commodity on Earth; the only resource that does not naturally regenerate, and sold for whatever the market will bear; TIME pledged to the service and support of Satan’s Kingdom for the inclusion of one is the exclusion of the other and to PLEA is to AGREE.

When in Court, one is actually participating in a Private Bar Matter concerning Private Crown Business and either one is born of the Bonded Woman and subject unto the tutors and governors of this world OR one is born of the Free Woman: born again with the Spirit Jesus Christ; an adopted son or daughter of God Almighty; co-heir with Jesus Christ

*“… a nation or world of people who will not use their intelligence are no better than animals who do not have intelligence. Such people are beasts of burden and steaks on the table by choice and consent.” – Silent Weapons for Quiet Wars*

*“Freedom is a man's natural power of doing what he pleases, so far as he is not prevented by force or law; slavery is an institution of the law of nations, against nature, subjecting one man to the dominion of another." – Justinian (527-565 A.D.), Emperor of Rome*

**

And what is the agreement?

The ACCUSATION is not only that one is of a reprobate mind (debased), but ACCUSING that one AGREES that one holds nothing but DOUBT in one's heart; the Original Sin, doubt that the World created and the Covenants made by God Almighty stand perfect;

ACCUSING that one AGREES that one just a child, ignorant to cause and effect;

ACCUSING that one AGREES that one's inheritance is the mere empty way of life handed down from one's ancestors *(ref 1 Peter 1:18)*;

ACCUSING that one AGREES that one needs to be governed and remain subject unto the tutors and governors of this world *(ie: CROWN and VATICAN subjects)*;

ACCUSING that one AGREES that one stands subject under the curse and bondage with the Serpent, thus not worthy of ASCENSION, thus never worthy of entrance into the Kingdom of Heaven *(ref Genesis 3)*;

ACCUSING that one AGREES that one's soul and being stands pledged to Satan and the expansion of Satan's Kingdom *(ref 1 Samuel 8)*;

ACCUSING that one AGREES that one is nothing but an irredeemable sinner subject to Satan’s Dominion;

ACCUSING that one AGREES that one stands as surety for a foreign stranger *(ref Jeremiah 15:13)*;

ACCUSING that one AGREES that one is nothing more than a beast of burden and a steak on the table by choice and consent; an animal that has no intelligence;

ACCUSING that one AGREES one is nothing more than a Human Resource to be bought, sold and traded as a commodity; a Slave; DEAD.

*“Now I say, That the heir, as long as he is a child, differeth nothing from a servant, though he be lord of all; But is under tutors and governors until the time appointed of the father.*

*Even so we, when we were children, were in bondage under the elements of the world: But when the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, To redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons.*

*And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father.*

*Wherefore thou art no more a servant, but a son; and if a son, then an heir of God through Christ.*

*Howbeit then, when ye knew not God, ye did service unto them which by nature are no gods. But now, after that ye have known God, or rather are known of God, how turn ye again to the weak and beggarly elements, whereunto ye desire again to be in bondage?*

*Ye observe days, and months, and times, and years.*

*I am afraid of you, lest I have bestowed upon you labour in vain.” - Galatians 4: 1-11*

This message is being delivered to his people: NOW is the time for the Accusor to stand REBUKED; NOW is the time for the Devourer to stand REBUKED; NOW is the time to come out of Her; come out of Babylon.

NOW is the time appointed by the Father; time for all those made in His image to ASCEND or come back to life for Jesus Christ has risen; come as a child, filled with unwavering faith in our Father who art in Heaven, not BE a child by remaining ignorant and illiterate.

*“… but as the day the world declared in one voice: "We will not go quietly into the night!" We will not vanish without a fight! We're going to live on! We're going to survive! Today we celebrate our Independence Day!” ~ President Thomas Whitmore (Bill Paxton) – Independence Day, 1996.*

**Rebuke:** (v. t.) To check, silence, or put down, with reproof; to restrain by expression of disapprobation; to reprehend sharply and summarily; to chide; to reprove; to admonish.

**Ascend:** (v. i.) To move upward; to mount; to go up; to rise

That is what ASCEND means: to rise and in these matters, to rise from Death; Death equates to ignorance and illiteracy; a debased mind: a Heathen; an Infidel; a Heretic. NOW is time we throw off the shackles that bind us to these dark age mentalities leading us only to extinction and embrace the Life granted to us by our Father who art in Heaven in order we may evolve into what we were created to become.

*“Blessed are the peacemakers: for they shall be called the children of God.” - Matthew 5:9*

*They shall be called the children of God* — That is, those whom wish to walk with the Faith of Jesus Christ and keep to the commandments of God Almighty shall be ADOPTED by God Almighty as his genuine children, by reason of their great likeness to him: for he is the God of peace and love, and is in Jesus Christ reconciling the world to himself not imputing their trespasses to them.

And, being his children, they are his heirs, heirs of God Almighty and joint heirs with Jesus Christ; and, as they suffer with him, so shall they be glorified together. They shall, in due time, be children of the resurrection, shall receive the adoption, the public declaration and manifestation of their adoption, and the glorious fruit of it; the redemption of their bodies from death and corruption.

*The world is burning down
Can't you smell the smoke in the air?
War, disease, and famine
This demon, she is everywhere*

*Poets and preachers and politicians
They've all had their say
And we got 10,000 years
Devoted to nothing
But tomorrow and yesterday*

*If all of the ignorance in the world
Passes a second ago
What would you say?
Who would you obey?
I am here to say that*

*Peace is now ~ 10,000 Years (Peace is Now) - Live, 1991*

To the children of God Almighty, NOW is the time to come out of Her; come out of Babylon. NOW is the time appointed by the Father; time for his children to ASCEND or come back to life. Much like the movie Jupiter Ascending: you are the authentic occurrence of His Image and the time is at hand to collect your inheritance, but first you must wake up, shed off the slumber of Death and RISE, for He has risen, and in order one receive the Crown of Life, one must first be faithful unto Death; *The Resurrection is at hand.*

*“The trees will yield their fruit and the ground will yield its crops; the people will be secure in their land. They will know that I am the LORD, when I break the bars of their yoke and rescue them from the hands of those who enslaved them.” - Ezekiel 34:27*

Not everyone will choose to accept Jesus Christ as their savior, but through his sacrifice, ALL have the opportunity to ASCEND and be lifted above the fire, the ashes; the broken, the empty; *The Fallen*.

*“For God so loved the world, that he gave his only Son, that whoever believes in him should not perish but have eternal life.” - John 3:16*

*“but God shows his love for us in that while we were still sinners, Christ died for us.” - Romans 5:8*

*“In this the love of God was made manifest among us, that God sent his only Son into the world, so that we might live through him. In this is love, not that we have loved God but that he loved us and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins. Beloved, if God so loved us, we also ought to love one another.” - 1 John 4:9-11*

**Turnabout is ALWAYS fair play**

When one finds one’s self with a court setting, one is actually standing before the Synagogue of Satan. The judge: a priest; the attorneys, devil’s advocates; Heathens; Pagans; Satanists.

When one “swears or affirms to tell the truth”, one does this NOT on a bible before God Almighty, one usually stands there with one hand pointed up, the other pointed down, hanging at one’s side; a pledge to Baphomet before a priest within the Synagogue of Satan witnessed by two Devils; vultures in polyester suits: lawyers, attorneys.

**Attorn:** to agree to be tenant to a new owner or landlord of the same property

**Attorney:** one who is legally appointed to transact business on another's behalf

**Represent:** 1. be entitled or appointed to act or speak for (someone), especially in an official capacity; 2. constitute; amount to; 3. depict (a particular subject) in a picture or other work of art; 4. state or point out (something) clearly, claim.

So, when one agrees to be REPRESENTED by an attorney, one agrees to have a devil’s advocate represent1 one which represents3 one as if one were ALL CAP NAME which represents2 that one has neither the Knowledge of God Almighty nor the Faith of Jesus Christ in one’s heart and represents4 that one AGREES with the ACCUSOR and now should be ATTORNED to the Synagogue for PENANCE.

**Appearance:** 1. the way that someone or something looks; 2. an act of performing or participating in a public event; 3. an act of becoming visible or noticeable; an arrival.

*If it looks like a duck, walks like a duck and quacks like a duck, it is must be a duck. ~ popular idiom*

The COURT issues a SUMMONS for the NAME for APPEARANCE, but one APPEARS not even realizing that the matter before the court is basically a séance and the heathens are summoning DEMONS to inhabit the vessel of the one of whom just swore before Baphomet; forsaking God Almighty.

Remember, the exclusion of one is the inclusion of another and by REPRESENTING, one excluded God Almighty and Jesus Christ, and like the Dementors in Harry Potter, the DEMONS feed on the life energy of the host body; manipulating of the actions and decisions of their host, experiencing the lusts of the flesh thru this host and then feeding on the resulting pain and torture of one’s very essence of being and all by one’s own consent.

*Now faith is confidence in what we hope for and assurance of what we do not see – Hebrews 1:11*

Here is the simple truth, one can respond in writing to any court matter with simple: “*One has read the complaint but does not understand this babble”* and then recite the Lord’s Prayer when brought before the judge*.*

This is what is called an Objection in point of law; a defensive pleading by which the defendant admits the facts alleged by the plaintiff but objects that they do not make out a legal claim.

Once one exercises their God-given Rights and stands on their FAITH, even the Synagogue must step back for one is demonstrating one is Live and pledged to the Kingdom of Heaven, thus no longer subject unto the Claims of the ACCUSOR; Satan, for the inclusion of one is the exclusion of the other.

This is where *The Turnabout* comes into play, but first another simple truth: any paperwork one is provided or does is nothing but a crutch; it relies upon FAITH; the ROCK upon which one stands, plain and simple. Without FAITH, one has NOTHING, because paper is just works built upon the Foundation and that Foundation is Jesus Christ and your works will be "*brought to light by the Day and revealed with fire to prove the quality of each man's work*" and much just like *faith without works is dead*, so too are works without faith.

But why is there no legal claim?

Well, let’s first look at what the word *Legal* actually REPRESENTS. According to Webster’s, Random House, and Oxford dictionaries:

**Legal:** Theol. a. Of or pertaining to the Mosaic law; existing under or founded upon that law. b. Of, pertaining to, concerned with, or based upon the law of works, i.e. salvation by works, as opposed to salvation by faith. Of persons: Upholding the law of works; as opposed to Equitable.

So, *Legal* REPRESENTS salvation by works, not faith. Ok, let’s compare to what the Word of God tells in regards to the same.

*“My brethren, have not the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Lord of glory, with respect of persons. For if there come unto your assembly a man with a gold ring, in goodly apparel, and there come in also a poor man in vile raiment; And ye have respect to him that weareth the gay clothing, and say unto him, Sit thou here in a good place; and say to the poor, Stand thou there, or sit here under my footstool: Are ye not then partial in yourselves, and are become judges of evil thoughts?*

*Hearken, my beloved brethren, Hath not God chosen the poor of this world rich in faith, and heirs of the kingdom which he hath promised to them that love him?*

*But ye have despised the poor. Do not rich men oppress you, and draw you before the judgment seats?*

*Do not they blaspheme that worthy name by the which ye are called?*

*If ye fulfil the royal law according to the scripture, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself, ye do well: But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.*

*For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all.*

*For he that said, Do not commit adultery, said also, Do not kill. Now if thou commit no adultery, yet if thou kill, thou art become a transgressor of the law.*

*So speak ye, and so do, as they that shall be judged by the law of liberty. For he shall have judgment without mercy, that hath shewed no mercy; and mercy rejoiceth against judgment.*

*What doth it profit, my brethren, though a man say he hath faith, and have not works? can faith save him?*

*If a brother or sister be naked, and destitute of daily food, And one of you say unto them, Depart in peace, be ye warmed and filled; notwithstanding ye give them not those things which are needful to the body; what doth it profit? Even so faith, if it hath not works, is dead, being alone.*

*Yea, a man may say, Thou hast faith, and I have works: shew me thy faith without thy works, and I will shew thee my faith by my works.*

*Thou believest that there is one God; thou doest well: the devils also believe, and tremble.*

*But wilt thou know, O vain man, that faith without works is dead?*

*Was not Abraham our father justified by works, when he had offered Isaac his son upon the altar? Seest thou how faith wrought with his works, and by works was faith made perfect?*

*And the scripture was fulfilled which saith, Abraham believed God, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness: and he was called the Friend of God.Ye see then how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only.*

*Likewise also was not Rahab the harlot justified by works, when she had received the messengers, and had sent them out another way?*

*For as the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without works is dead also.” James 2*

So, *Legal* is only concerned with works and not faith, and is also the opposite of equitable. So what is equitable? Well, if *Legal* is only concerned with works and not with faith and is opposed with equitable, then equitable must be concerned with faith for the inclusion of one is the exclusion of another. So, again, what is equitable? Equitable = righteous.

**Righteous:** acting in accord with divine or moral law

*“The righteous will inherit the land and dwell in it forever.” - Psalm 37:29*

According to legal dictionaries, an equitable interest is an "interest held by virtue of an equitable title (a title that indicates a beneficial interest in property and that gives the holder the right to acquire formal legal title) or claimed on equitable grounds, such as the interest held by a trust beneficiary."

If one keeps to the commandments of God Almighty and walks with the faith of Jesus Christ, what is the result? Would one be *Righteous*? Would the Righteous then have an equitable interest to *inherit the land and dwell in it forever*?

And since just having FAITH without actually doing anything with it is DEAD, what are the instructions; works, God Almighty gave to his people when in front of the heathens?

*“But when ye pray, use not vain repetitions, as the heathen do: for they think that they shall be heard for their much speaking. Be not ye therefore like unto them: for your Father knoweth what things ye have need of, before ye ask him. After this manner therefore pray ye:*

*Our Father which art in heaven, Hallowed be thy name.*

*Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven.*

*Give us this day our daily bread.*

*And forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors.*

*And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil: For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever. Amen.” - Matthew 6:7-13*

Get it? The “Legal Process” one does in any matter; the paperwork filed, is nothing more than a ROCK. One is performing a form of “Spiritual Alchemy” wherein one is rendering one’s paper into a rock that no scissor can circumcise; all transmuted by FAITH: the unspoken, ever present truth that needs no defending; the ROCK upon which one’s house is built.

What else is there left to say, but to give Thanks and Glory unto God Almighty through prayer as one has been instructed; Thanks and Glory for delivering you from evil and into light of the truth.

*“And he that doubteth is damned if he eat, because he eateth not of faith: for whatsoever is not of faith is sin” - Romans 14:23*

*Turnabout is fair play* is the peaceful evolution of the old “eye for an eye”; the only difference is that the world does not end up blind. In fact, it is quite the opposite for it opens the eyes of one’s self and others to the truth, the light and the way.

*The Turnabout* is all based upon one simple question: If one is identified by a DEAD-DUDE-NAME, is the DEAD-DUDE dead anymore and what exactly are the ramifications under the 1666 Cestui Que Vie Act?

The acceptance of Jesus Christ into one’s heart is the grant of everlasting life; therefore one cannot possibly be dead, in heart nor spirit. Under the Cestui Que Vie Act of 1666, when one presumed dead shows up living, the entire estate revests automatically within the one presumed dead and all letters of administration are void ab initio (from the beginning).

Now, Dead actually means illiterate and ignorant; Abandoned, but in the Cestui Que Vie Act, Dead refers to one of whom was “lost from across the sea.” The result of the one showing up Living is told in the parable of the Wayward Son.

*“And he said unto him, Son, thou art ever with me, and all that I have is thine. It was meet that we should make merry, and be glad: for this thy brother was dead, and is alive again; and was lost, and is found.” - Luke 15: 31-32*

Up until now, the presumption of death has been used to keep us intertwined within the Kingdom of Satan; circumcised from the Kingdom of Heaven; subject under the whole of the Law.

*“Do not think that I have come to abolish the Law or the Prophets; I have not come to abolish them but to fulfill them. For truly, I say to you, until heaven and earth pass away, not an iota, not a dot, will pass from the Law until all is accomplished.” - Matthew 5:17-18*

Now, this same presumption can be used to reject the Kingdom of Satan; reject usufruct of the tree of knowledge of good and evil; reject living in sin, in favor of usufruct of the Tree of Life and embrace God’s Natural Law; fulfill the Law.

**Subrogation:** The substitution of one person in the place of another with reference to a lawful claim, demand, or right, so that he or she who is substituted succeeds to the rights of the other in relation to the debt or claim, and its rights, remedies, or Securities

The Synagogue is banking on one’s rejection of God Almighty and Jesus Christ by enticing one’s EGO to defend one’s self from an ACCUSATION; relying on one’s VANITY. This action would then reject Jesus Christ for one is the usufruct of the Blood of the Lamb; the Blood is spiritual in nature and is empowered by and through one’s FAITH and is to be used to wash clean the sins and accusations; The Blood is applied thru Prayer.

The rejection of Jesus Christ testifies that one ABANDONS the Covenants by REJECTING one’s Heavenly Estate, allowing the Synagogue to SUBROGATE one’s claim over one’s rights to one’s Earthly Estate in the name of *The Fallen*; Expanding the Kingdom of Satan here on Earth.

Remember, the ACCUSAITON before the COURT is what?

That one is nothing more than an irredeemable sinner, unknowing of the Love of God Almighty, unworthy of the Kingdom of Heaven; a steak on the table by choice and consent. Dead to God Almighty and as above so below: dead to God Almighty in heaven; dead to the LORD here on Earth; Expander of the Kingdom of Satan.

And how does one operate *The Turnabout*?

Simple

The use of the ALL-CAP word, or even the name on the Certificate of Live Birth, to identify one means one has just been identified as a DEAD-MAN (owner of an abandoned estate). Under the 1666 Cestui Que Vie Act, when the DEAD-MAN shows up Living, the estate of the DEAD-MAN automatically revests in the one so identified and ALL letters of administration are null and void and one is entitled to receive the estate as beneficiary of the Cestui Que Trust (ALL CAP NAME) being administrated by way of operation of law.

**Birth:** 1863 Anderson’s Law: (see Abandon (2)) the act of a parent in exposing an infant of tender years (usually under seven) in any place, with intent wholly to desert it.

This estate one is receiving is one’s Earthly estate held in trust and the purpose of this estate is to receive one’s Heavenly estate for the rule is “*seek ye first the kingdom of Heaven and all else shall be added unto you*” and once one accepts Jesus Christ and the consciousness thereof, one is to walk in those footsteps; keep to the Commandments of God Almighty and walk with the Faith of Jesus Christ.

Now, one can remove one’s estate from being under the tutors and governors of this world for one is no longer a child; having accepted to be re-born under the Free Woman with the acceptance of Jesus Christ.

One can now return to God Almighty that which was taken; the GLORY, the tithing; the usufruct of the Tree of Knowledge for “faith without works is dead” and to NOT return to God Almighty would amount to mere lip service; Return in exchange for the usufruct of the Tree of Life and the riches of the Kingdom therefrom.

Collectively, we can stop the insanity. We can build a better world than the one we inhabit; leave a better world than the one we inherited. We should want more than this world has to offer.

We were meant to live for so much more, but we lost ourselves. Now is the time appointed by the Father; time to come out of her and return home.

First, one must come back to life: ASCEND. Then one can claim one’s Heavenly estate, then one’s earthly estate.

The only thing stopping anyone: *Lack of Faith.*

*“When they came to the crowd, a man came up to Jesus and knelt before Him. “Lord, have mercy on my son,” he said. “He has seizures and is suffering terribly. He often falls into the fire or into the water. I brought him to Your disciples, but they could not heal him.”*

*“O unbelieving and perverse generation!” Jesus replied. “How long must I remain with you? How long must I put up with you? Bring the boy here to Me.”*

*Then Jesus rebuked the demon, and it came out of the boy, and he was healed from that moment. Afterward the disciples came to Jesus privately and asked, “Why couldn’t we drive it out?”*

*“Because you have so little faith.” He answered. “****For truly I tell you, if you have faith the size of a mustard seed****, you can say to this mountain, ‘Move from here to there,’ and it will move.* ***Nothing will be impossible for you.****”” - Matthew 17: 14-20*.

**Stand Firm in Faith**

Those who walk in the path of Jesus Christ had better expect to be persecuted because that is what is written and they are BLESSED because of it.

*“Blessed are the poor in spirit: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.*

*Blessed are they that mourn: for they shall be comforted.*

*Blessed are the meek: for they shall inherit the earth.*

*Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness: for they shall be filled.*

*Blessed are the merciful: for they shall obtain mercy.*

*Blessed are the pure in heart: for they shall see God.*

*Blessed are the peacemakers: for they shall be called the children of God.*

*Blessed are they which are persecuted for righteousness' sake: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.*

*Blessed are ye, when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely, for my sake.*

*Rejoice, and be exceeding glad: for great is your reward in heaven: for so persecuted they the prophets which were before you.” - Matthew 5:3-12*

Just keep in mind:

*“Fear none of those things which thou shalt suffer: behold, the devil shall cast some of you into prison, that ye may be tried; and ye shall have tribulation ten days: be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life”. – Revelations 2:10*

These courts and actors are NOT fighting one, they are resisting the Light of the Jesus Christ within one, trying to hold fast to the faulty traditions of man but resistance is futile, for we are called to be the Architects of the future.

Through the courts and the legal process, the Synagogue attempts to browbeat the light out.

**Browbeat:** to intimidate or disconcert by a stern manner or arrogant speech: bully

That’s right! The Synagogue is nothing more than a school-year bully and all acts and actions taken by the Synagogue are done to rattle, embarrass and discomfit in order one feel abashed and disconcerted.

*“Have nothing to do with the fruitless deeds of darkness, but rather expose them. It is shameful even to mention what the disobedient do in secret.” - Ephesians 5:11-12*

The Synagogue will resort to calling one names and even go as far as ordering one undergo psychiatric exams for one is “disturbed” and the Synagogue DREADS; to feel extreme reluctance to meet or face, the Truth, so one is made to feel **DREAD** in the attempt to Browbeat one into rejecting Jesus Christ and forsaking God Almighty.

**D**isconcerted: to disturb the composure of
**R**attle: to upset especially to the point of loss of poise and composure
**E**mbarrass: to place in doubt, perplexity, or difficulties
**A**bash: to destroy the self-possession or self-confidence of (someone)
**D**iscomfort: to frustrate the plans of

And a favorite tactic of the Synagogue seems to be name calling such as sovereign citizen, of which is oxymoronic for how can one be a sovereign, which knows none higher, when one has pledged themselves in service to the expansion of the Kingdom of Heaven?

**Oxymoron:** 1650s, from Greek oxymoron, noun use of neuter of oxymoros (adj.) "pointedly foolish," from oxys "sharp" (see acrid ) + moros "stupid" (see moron ). Rhetorical figure by which contradictory terms are conjoined so as to give point to the statement or expression; the word itself is an illustration of the thing. Now often used loosely to mean "contradiction in terms."

All one really need do is respond with laughter at the pure folly within this attempt to entice one, being an Ambassador for the Prince of Peace (*ref 2 Cor 5:20*), into a controversy over such nonsense and foolishness, but always forgive them for their trespasses: illiteracy and ignorance. Recite the Lord’s Prayer and move on.

Another favorite tactic used in attempt to conjure **DREAD** is the threat of a mental evaluation. Fear not, for all one really need do is show up and ask if the patient-doctor privilege is in effect and, again, respond with laughter at the pure folly within this attempt to entice one, being an Ambassador for the Prince of Peace, into a controversy over such nonsense and foolishness, but always forgive them for their trespasses: Doubt in the Word of God. Again, recite the Lord’s Prayer and move on.

This is how the Synagogue operates: Name Calling and ACCUSATIONS. It is like dealing with little children on the play ground; tattletales and hall monitors. Reciting the Lord’s Prayer when in the presence of the members of the Synagogue is how we, as the children of God Almighty, roll.

*“Who will rise up for me against the wicked? Who will stand for me against those who practice iniquity?” - Psalm 94:16*

But again, thank our Father for his grace for he gives us BLESSINGS and since we are instructed to come as a little child, there just so happens to be a Doctrine one can adopt to assist one in trying times: *Doctrine of Sticks and Stones*.

This Doctrine is peaceful, but can make those of whom are in league with the Synagogue very angry because of the nature of the Doctrine and once the peacefulness of ANY intent in ANY action is stripped away, all that is left is the Greatest Enemies of Peace: Force and Wrong.

Anyhow, the Doctrine of Sticks and Stones operates as follows:

*Sticks and Stones my break my bones, but Names will never hurt me. This doctrine invokes the Rubber-Glue Defense: I am rubber; you are glue, whatever you say bounces off of me and sticks to you; nanny-nanny-boo-boo, stick your head in doo-doo, and stands supported by the infamous case of Pot vs Kettle.*

Now, as childish as this doctrine sounds, the effectiveness of such should not be underestimated. Did you chuckle, roll your eyes or laugh a little bit when you read the Doctrine? That one small moment wherein you wanted to do as such is the one moment of light one may need when persecution comes knocking at one’s door; one light is all one needs to vanquish the dark; one light, the faith of a child.

This is the power of this Doctrine, bringing forth the laughter of a child: a laugh in the face of the ACCUSOR; a show of FAITH in our Father, for one is to come as a child.

*“Finally, my brethren, be strong in the Lord, and in the power of his might.*

*Put on the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil. For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places.*

*Wherefore take unto you the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to withstand in the evil day, and having done all, to stand.*

*Stand therefore, having your loins girt about with truth, and having on the breastplate of righteousness; And your feet shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace; Above all, taking the shield of faith, wherewith ye shall be able to quench all the fiery darts of the wicked.*

*And take the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God: Praying always with all prayer and supplication in the Spirit, and watching thereunto with all perseverance and supplication for all saints; And for me, that utterance may be given unto me, that I may open my mouth boldly, to make known the mystery of the gospel, For which I am an ambassador in bonds: that therein I may speak boldly, as I ought to speak.*

*But that ye also may know my affairs, and how I do, Tychicus, a beloved brother and faithful minister in the Lord, shall make known to you all things:*

*Whom I have sent unto you for the same purpose, that ye might know our affairs, and that he might comfort your hearts. Peace be to the brethren, and love with faith, from God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ. Grace be with all them that love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity. Amen.” - Ephesians 6: 10-24*

**Let no man tear asunder**

*“And I will betroth thee unto me for ever; yea, I will betroth thee unto me in righteousness, and in judgment, and in loving kindness, and in mercies. I will even betroth thee unto me in faithfulness: and thou shalt know the LORD.” - Hosea 2:19-20*

*When single shines the triple sun, what was sundered and undone shall be whole, the two made one. – prophesy from the Dark Crystal (1979)*

*"Let us rejoice and be glad and give the glory to Him, for the marriage of the Lamb has come and His bride has made herself ready." And it was given to her to clothe herself in fine linen, bright and clean; for the fine linen is the righteous acts of the saints. And he said to me, "Write, 'Blessed are those who are invited to the marriage supper of the Lamb.' " And he said to me, "These are true words of God." - Rev. 19:7-9*

When one exercises *The Turnabout*, one actually MERGES one’s interests with that of the LORD, one flesh: a marriage between mankind and God Almighty; a more perfect union between His government and one’s selfgovernance through the unification of FAITH and WORKS.

When one stands as usufruct of FAITH; the LORD stands as usufruct of WORKS, and the ceremony can go LIVE for Faith without Works is EVIL (dead), as is Works without Faith.

*"I am anxious for you with the deep concern of God himself—anxious that your love should be for Christ alone, just as a pure maiden saves her love for one man only, for the one who will be her husband. But I am frightened, fearing that in some way you will be led away from your pure and simple devotion to our Lord, just as Eve was deceived by Satan in the Garden of Eden." - 2 Cor. 11:2 -4*

But because Mankind has gotten cold feet in he past, God Almighty allows the DECEPTION to continue because of his anxieties over his Bride-to-Be again being led astray: tempted by the fruit of another covenant; but we know what has been going on since God Almighty has been gone and now we must reassure Him that there is no other.

*“Then shall the kingdom of heaven be likened unto ten virgins, which took their lamps, and went forth to m*

*ye know neither the day nor the hour wherein the Son of man cometh.” – Matthew 25:1-13*

So, in addition to perfecting the merger; the marriage, *The Turnabout* also reassures the Bridegroom that we walk down the aisle with FAITH and nothing but FAITH in our hearts for FAITH is the oil in the lamps at the marriage supper. Walking with FAITH constitutes the WORKS: garments of fine linen, bright and clean.

*He’s got the cash; he’s got a condo; he’s got a car; he got a career, … but that still doesn’t mean he get’s you. – Extra Commercial*

*The Turnabout* ensures that one is seated at the marriage supper before the doors shut; one’s moment to shine and reject the temptations of another covenant and proclaim to our Lord Jesus Christ, “*until Death do us part.*”

**… and the Truth shall set you free**

In 1987 President Ronald Reagan signed a proclamation speaking of *"the historical tradition of ethical values and principles, which have been the bedrock of society from the dawn of civilization when they were known as the Seven Noahide Laws, transmitted through God to Moses on Mount Sinai"*, and in 1991, Congress stated in the preamble to the 1991 bill that established Education Day in honor of the birthday of Menachem Mendel Schneerson, the leader of the Chabad movement:

*Whereas Congress recognizes the historical tradition of ethical values and principles which are the basis of civilized society and upon which our great Nation was founded; Whereas these ethical values and principles have been the bedrock of society from the dawn of civilization, when they were known as the Seven Noahide Laws [...]*

The 7 Laws of Noah were given by God Almighty as a binding set of laws for the "children of Noah" – that is, all of humanity. These Laws consist of:

*Do not deny God.
Do not blaspheme God.
Do not murder.
Do not engage in illicit sexual relations.
Do not steal.
Do not eat from a live animal.
Establish courts/legal system to ensure obedience to said laws.*

This is also core to comprehending both the DECEPTION and *The Turnabout* for the first *Noahide Law* corresponds to the first commandment of “*Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image*” of which are both closely related to Blaspheming God Almighty by putting another god before him.

When one AGREES one exists as or is to be identified and recognized through NAME, one is actually confessing that one is a Graven Image; remember TOMBSTONE? The NAME is just a piece of paper; a wooden image; an IDOL. Not only that, one is putting another god before God Almighty, one’s EGO, one’s Kingdom receives the Glory.

This normally would be grounds for the ACCUSOR: Satan, rights to use one’s being as a relocation center for wayward Demons because one rejected the Covenants of God Almighty through the dishonor of the Commandments; one chose usufruct of the Tree of Knowledge of which is Death to God and expulsion from the Garden: the world of today.

However, if one were to *Turnabout*, then the moment one is identified to exist as if one were NAME, one COMPREHENDS that pursuant to the Rule of English, someone is attempting to GLOSS over something, which means there is something being hidden and concealed, and pursuant to the Law of God, there is an accusation that one is DEBASED and property of Synagogue of Satan and thus Dead to God; and with one accepting Jesus Christ in one’s heart and pursuant to the Cestui Que Vie Act of 1666, one further COMPREHENDS one can now claim the estate of the NAME for the purpose of expanding the Kingdom of Heaven and fulfilling one’s mandate to SUDBUE the Earth for the Glory of God Almighty and in the name of Jesus Christ.

In other words, one gets to express the CESTUI-QUE-TRUST, the ALL CAP NAME, and through one’s FAITH, transmute the Cestui Que Trust into an Irrevocable Living Trust, and now it can no longer be used to pirate from the public trust nor used to FORCE one to act as a trustee nor surety for the debts of another; effectively SEGREGATING the Estate (NAME) from the rest of the Trust without removing anything from the Trust so one can fulfill on the covenants and live their life as our Father intended.

*But I tell you not to resist an evil person. If someone slaps you on your right cheek, turn to him the other also; if someone wants to sue you and take your tunic, let him have your cloak as well; and if someone forces you to go one mile, go with him two. Give to the one who asks you, and do not turn away from the one who wants to borrow from you.*

*You have heard that it was said, ‘Love your neighbor and hate your enemy. ’But I tell you, love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you, that you may be sons of your Father in heaven. He causes His sun to rise on the evil and the good, and sends rain on the righteous and the unrighteous. If you love those who love you, what reward will you get? Do not even tax collectors do the same? And if you greet only your brothers, what are you doing more than others? Do not even Gentiles do the same?*

*Be perfect, therefore, as your Heavenly Father is perfect. – Matthew 5:39-48*

But even here, we have one final deception. Since everything always unfolds according to the will of God Almighty, then *The Fallen*, in Truth, do not really war against God Almighty; only the **ILLUSION** of such. Believe it or not, through *The Turnabout*, one assists *The Fallen* absolve themselves of their sins by allowing *The Fallen* to fulfill their mandate of leading mankind back to God Almighty. As such, they should have the opportunity to reunite with their Father whom is our Father; take their rightful place back at His side, in His court.

*The Fallen* caused the Tower of Babel to fall causing all the people of this world to separate; allowed themselves to become corrupted in order to tempt Mankind into Knowing Good and Evil: the constant War.

Remember WHY the Tower was called Babel?

The Babylonians wanted a tower that would "reach to the heavens" so that they could be like God Almighty instead of KNOWING God Almighty and because of the people forsook God Almighty, God Almighty caused the people to suddenly speak different languages so they could not communicate and work together to build the tower causing the people to scatter across the land; All the Nations were created as a result of the fall of the Tower.

The people of those Nations were entrusted to *The Fallen* and they showed man a world WITHOUT the mercy and grace of God Almighty; led him into temptation, delivered him into FEAR; Entrapped within the maze of the Tower Builder: Nimrod, Faithful servant and God Almighty’s greatest Hunter.

The tower was named The Tower of Babel because the word Babel means confusion and today, mankind just keeps babbling-on; confused and lost, like an orphaned child.

*For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all. – James 2:10*

The DECEPTION is the springing of a Trap; a Trap designed to confuse and disorient those who fail to be faithful. A Trap wherein every WORD is Babble for when one breaks one commandment, one violates them all and any cry to the LORD: a sinner just babbling-on, an inhabitant of a World trapped within a world where none pay anything except lip service to God Almighty, standing in AGREEMENT that they are nothing more than commodity to be bought, sold and traded from whatever the market will bear as Satan’s Play- Toy.

*“For as many as have sinned without law shall also perish without law: and as many as have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law;*

*(For not the hearers of the law are just before God, but the doers of the law shall be justified. For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves:*

*Which shew the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the mean while accusing or else excusing one another;)*

*In the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ according to my gospel”. – Romans 2:!2-16*

Through *The Turnabout*, one can now use the acts and actions of the Synagogue against the Synagogue and ensure the enemies of God Almighty receive EXACTLY what they deserve; one can absolve *the Fallen* and give praise and Glory to God Almighty.

Don the entirety of His Armor; Stand tall and walk in confidence with the FAITH of Jesus Christ through this valley of the shadow of doubt, for turnabout is ALWAYS fair play.
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11: Foreign Languages

11.147 Glosses in ASL

The written-language transcription of a sign is called a gloss. Glosses are words from the spoken language written in small capital letters: WOMAN, SCHOOL, CAT. (Alternatively, regular capital letters may be used.) When two or more written words are used to gloss a single sign, the glosses are separated by hyphens. The translation is enclosed in double quotation marks.

The sign for “a car drove by” is written as VEHICLE-DRIVE-BY.

One obvious limitation of the use of glosses from the spoken/written language to represent signs is that there is no one-to-one correspondence between the words or signs in any two languages.
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DODRANS. Lat. In Roman law. A subdivision of the as, containing nine uncire; the proportion of nine-twelfths, or three-fourths. 2 BI.Comm. 462, note.

DOE, JOHN. The name of the fictitious plaintiff in the action of ejectment. 3 Steph. Comm. 618.

DOED-BANA. In Saxon law. The actual perpetrator of a homicide.

DOER. In Scotch law. An agent or attorney. 1

Kames, Eq. 325.

DOG-DRAW. In old forest law. The manifest deprehension of an offender against venison in a fore􀝲t, when he was found drawing after a deer by the scent of a hound led in his hand ; or where a person had wounded a deer or wild beast, by shooting at him, or otherwise, and was caught with a dog drawing after him to receive the same. Manwood, Forest Law, 2, c. 8.

DOG-LATIN. The Latin of illiterate persons ; Latin words put together on the English gramma tical system.

DOGGER. In maritime law. A light ship or vessel. Cowell.

Dogger-fish, fish brought in ships.

Dogger-men, fishermen that belong to doggerships.

DOGMA. In the civil law. A word occasionally used as descriptive of an ordinance of the senate.

See Nov. 2, 1, 1; Dig. 27, 1, 6.

DOGS. Steel rods with clamps or tongs thereon, for carrying heavy steel rails. Jefferson v. Denkmann Lumber Co., 148 So. 237, 239, 167 Miss. 246.

DOING. The formal word by which services were reserved and expressed in old conveyances ; as '''rendering'' (reddenda) was expressive of rent. Perk. c. 10, §§ 625, 635, 638. As used in La.Civ. Code, art. 1931, the word signifies activity. Noel Estate v. Louisiana Oil Refining Corporation, 188 La. 45, 175 So. 744, 746.

DOING BUSINESS. Within statutes on service of process on foreign corporations, equivalent to ':!onducting or managing business. Wichita Film & Supply Co. v. Yale, 194 Mo.App. 60, 184 S.W. 119. A foreign corporation is "doing business", making it amenable to process within state, if it does business therein in such a manner as to warrant the inference that it is present there. Cannon Mfg. Co. v. Cudahy Packing Co., D.C.N.C., 292 F. 169, 171. Or that it has subjected itself to the jurisdiction and laws in which the service is made. W. J. Armstrong Co. v. New York Cent. & H. R. R. Co., 129 Minn. 104, 151 N.W. 917, 919, L.R.A.1916E, 232, Ann.Cas.1916E, 335 ; The doing of business is the exercise in the state of some of the ordinary functions for which the corporation was organized. Davis & Worrell v. General Motors Acceptance Corporation, 153 Ark. 626, 241 S.W. 44, 46. What constitutes "doing business" depends on the facts in each particular ca.se.

DOlTKIN'

Walton N. Moore Dry Goods Co. v. Commercial Industrial Co., C.C.A.,Cal., 282 F. 21, 25. The activities of the corporation, however, must represent a more or less continuous effort ; Knapp v. Bullock Tractor Co., D.C.Cal., 242 F. 543, 550 ; Johnson v. Cass & Emerson, 91 Vt. 103, 99 A. 633, 635 ; or be of a systematic and regular nature ; Home Lumber Co. v. Hopkins, 107 Kan. 153, 190 P. 601, 605, 10 A.L.R. 879.

The transaction of single piece of business is not enough. Wood & Selick v. American Grocery Co., 96 N.J.Law, 218, 114 A. 756, 757 ; Anderson v. Morris & E. R. Co., C.C.A.N.Y., 216 F. 83, 87. To the contrary. Tripp State Bank of Tripp v. Jerke, 45 S.D. 448, 188 N.W. 314, 315.

No general definition can be made of phrase "doing business" in statutes relating to foreign corporations. Each case must be determined on its own facts, by considering objective of statute in which phrase is found, its purpose and orientation to the carrying on of business, nature of activities, their magnitude, multiplicity of contracts, and possibility that incidents may occur and liabilities be created, especially where entrance into state is in ordinary prosecution of corporation' s business. State Highway and Public Works Commission v. Diamond S. S. Transp. Corp. , 225 N.C. 198, 34 S. E.2d 78, 80, 81.

Ordinarily the phrase means engaging in activities in pursuit of gain. Welch Holding Co. v. Galloway, 161 Or. 515, 89 P.2d 559 ; People v. Jones, 16 N.Y. S.2d 558, 559, 172 Misc. 368.

The following transactions and businesses illustrate, what constitutes or does not constitute "doing business" : advertising, Society Milion Athena v. National Bank of Greece, 1 N. Y. S.2d 155, 2 N. Y. S.2d 155 ; Deighan v. Beverage Retailer Weekly & Trade Newspaper Corporation, 18 N.J. Misc. 705, 16 A.2d 612, 613 ; bringing of actions, R. L. Witters Associates v. Ebsary Gypsum Co. , D.C. Fla. , 19 F. Supp. 646, 648 : Schneider v. Greater M. & S. Circuit, 259 N.Y. S. 319, 144 Misc. 534 ; broadcasting system, Hoffman v. Carter, 118 N.J. L. 379, 192 A. 825 ; State ex reI. Columbia Broadcasting Co. v. Superior Court for King County, 1 Wash.2d 379, 96 P.2d 248, 250 ; consignment, Oyler v. J. P. Seeb urg Corporation, D.C.Tex. , 29 F.Supp. 927 ; Thew Shovel Co. v. Superior Court in and for City and County of San Francisco, 35 Cal. App.2d 183, 95 P. 2d 149. 151, 152 ; holding companies, V/ilhelm v. Consolidated Oil Corporation. D.C.Okl . , 11 F. Supp. 444, 447 : Cliffs Corporation v. Evatt, 138 Ohio St. 336, 35 N. E.2d 144, 151 ; insurance, Sasnett v. Iowa State Traveling Men's Ass'n, C.C. A. lowa, 90 F . 2d 514 ; Hoopeston Canning Co. v. Pink, 288 N. Y. 291, 43 N. E.2d 49, 53 : newspapers, Layne v. Tribune Co. , 71 F.2d 223, 224, 63 App . D. C . 213 ; Neely v. Philadelphia Inquirer Co. , 62 F .2d 873. 874, 61 App. D.C. 334 ; railroads, Klabzuba v. Southern Pac. Co. , D. C.Wash . , 33 F.2d 359, 360 ; Gadboury v. Central Vermont Ry. Co. , 231 N.Y.S. 630, 632, 225 App. Div. 145 ; solicitation, Mandel Bros. v. Henry A. O'Neil, Inc. , C. C. A. S . D . , 69 F.2d 452, 455 ; Bank v. Charles Meyers & Co. , 182 Md. 556, 35 A.2d 110, 113.

Illustrations of what constitutes "doing business" within various taxing statutes follow : Capital stock tax, Goodyear Inv. C()rporation v. Campbell, C.C.A.Ohio, 139 F.2d 188, 190, 191 : Refrigeration Discount Corporation v. Metzger, D . C. Pa. , 10 F. Supp. 748, 749 : excise tax, Harmar Coal Co. v. Heiner, D.C. Pa. , 26 F.2d 729, 730 : Queens Run Refractories Co. v. Commonwealth, 270 Mass. 19, 169 N. E. 515, 516 : franchise tax, Stone v. Interstate Natural Gas Co. , C.C.A. Miss. , 103 F.2d 544, 548 ; Cliffs Corporation v . Evatt, 138 Ohio St. 336, 35 N. E.2d 144, 151 ; income tax, Blair v. Wilson Syndicate Trust, C . C . A. , 39 F.2d 43, 45 ; Welch Holding Co. v. Galloway, 161 Or. 515, 89 P.2d 559, 564.

DOITKIN, or DOlT. A base coin of small value, prohibited by St. 3 Hen. V. c. 1. We still retain the phrase, in the common saying, when we would undervalue a man, that he is not \t> .) rth a doit. Jacob.
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Under the ancient system a plea of confession and avoidance must give color to the affirmative averments of the complaint, or it would be fatally defective. The "giving color" was simply the absence of any denials, and the express or silent admission that the declaration, as far as it went, told the truth. Smith v. Marley, 39 Idaho, 779, 230 P. 769, 770. See Color.

GIVE JUDGMENT. To render, pronounce, or declare the judgment of the court in an action at law; not spoken of a j udgment obtained by confession. Schuster v. Rader, 13 Colo. 329, 22 P. 505.

GIVE NOTICE. To communicate to another, in any proper or permissible legal manner, 'information or warning of an existing fact or state of facts or (more usually) of some intended future action. O'Neil v. Dickson, 11 Ind. 254 ; In re Devlin, 7 Fed.Cas. 564 ; St. Louis, B. & M. Ry. Co. v. Hicks, Tex.Civ.App., 158 S.W. 192, 194.

GIVE TIME. Extending the period at which, by the contract between them, the principal debtor was originally liable to pay the creditor. Buffalo Forge Co. v. Fidelity & Casualty Co. of New York, 142 Misc. 647, 256 N.Y.S. 329, 334.

GIVE WAY. In the rules of navigation, one vessel is said to "give way" to another when she deviates from her course in such a manner and to such an extent as to allow the other to pass without altering her course. See Lockwood v. Lashell, 19 Pa. 350.

GIVER. A donor; he who makes a gift. GIVING IN PAYMENT. In Louisiana law, a phrase (translating the Fr. "dation en paiement") which signifies the delivery and acceptance of real or personal property in satisfaction of a debt, instead of a payment in money. See Civil Code La. art. 265.

GIVING RINGS. A ceremony anciently performed in England by serjeants at law at the time of their appointment. The rings were inscribed with a motto, generally in Latin.

GLADIOLUS. A little sword or dagger; a kind of sedge. Mat. Paris.

GLADIUS. Lat. A sword. An ancient emblem of defense. Hence the ancient earls or comites ( the king's attendants, advisers, and associates in his government) were made by being girt with swords, ( gladio succincti. )

The emblem of the executory power of the law in punishing crimes. 4 Bl.Comm. 177.

In old Latin authors, and in the Norman laws, this word was used to signify supreme j urisdiction, (jus gladii. )

GLAIVE. A sword, lance, or horseman's staff. One of the weapons allowed in a trial by combat.

GLANS. In the civil law, acorns or nuts of the oak or other trees. In a larger sense, all fruits of trees.

GLASS-MEN. A term used in St. 1 Jac. I, c. 7, for wandering rogues or vagrants.

GLOSSA

GLAVEA. A hand dart. Cowell.

GLEANING. The gathering of grain after reapers, or of grain left un gathered by reapers. Held not to be a right at common law. 1 H.Bl. 51.

GLEBA. A turf, sod, or clod of earth. The soil or ground ; cultivated land in general. Church land ( solum et d08 ecclesire) . Spelman. See Glebe.

GLEBlE ASCRIPTITII. Villein-socmen, who could not be removed from the land while they did the service due. Bract. c. 7; 1 Reeve, Eng. Law, 269.

GLEBARIlE. Turfs dug out of the ground. Cowell.

GLEBE. In Ecclesiastical law, the land possessed as part of the endowment or revenue of a church or ecclesiastical benefice. In Roman law, a clod ; turf; soil. Hence, the soil of an inheritance ; an agrarian estate. Servi addicti glebre were serfs attached to and passing with the estate. Cod. 11, 47, 7, 21 ; Nov. 54, 1.

GLIDER. A form of aircraft similar to an airplane but without any engine. Spychala v. Metropolitan Life Ins. Co., 339 Pa. 237, 13 A.2d 32, 33.

GLIDING. Art of flying a glider. Spychala v . Metropolitan Life Ins. Co., 339 Pa. 237, 13 A.2d 32, 33.

GLISCYWA. In Saxon law, a fraternity.

GLOBE DOCTRINE. That where the National Labor Relations Board could conclude that either a craft or a plant unit would be appropriate for collective bargaining purposes and where either contention if unopposed would be adopted by the Board, it normally gives paramount weight to the wishes of the employees within the craft unit. International Ass'n of Machinists, Tool and Die Makers' Lodge No. 35 v. National Labor Relations Board, 71 App.D.C. 175, 110 F.2d 29, 45.

GLOMERELLS. Commissioners appointed to determine differences between scholars in a school or university and the townsmen of the place. Jacob.

GLOS. Lat. In the civil law, a husband's sister. Dig. 38, 10, 4, 6.

GLOSS. An interpretation, consisting of one or more words, interlinear or marginal ; an annotation, explanation, or comment on any passage in the text of a work, for purposes of elucidation or amplification. Particularly applied to the comments on the Corpus Juris.

GLOSSA. Lat. A gloss, explanation, or interpretation.

The glossoe of the Roman law are brief illustrative comments or annotations on the text of Justinian's collections, made by the professors who taught or lectured on them about the twelfth century, (especially at the law school of Bologna, ) and were hen ce called "glossators. » These gl osses were at first inserted in the text with the words to which they referred, and were called "glOSS03 interline-
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ares ,'" but afterwards they were placed In the margin, partly at the side, and partly under the text, and called “glossoe marginales.” A selection of them was made by Accursius, between A. D. 1220 and 1260, under the title of « glossa Ord.inaria/' which 1s of the greatest authority. Mackeld. Rom. Law, § 90.

GLOSSA VIPERINA EST QUlE CORRODIT VISCERA TEXTUS. 11 Coke, 34. It is a poisonous gloss which corrupts the essence of the text.

GLOSSATOR. In the civil law, a commentator or annotator. A terin applied to the professors and teachers of the Roman law in the twelfth century, at the head of whom was Irnerius. Mackeld. Rom. Law, § 90.

GLOUCESTER, STATUTE OF. The statute is the 6 Edw. I, c. 1, A.D. 1278. It takes its name from the place of its enactment, and was the first statute giving costs in actions.

GLOVE SILVER. Extraordinary rewards formerly given to officers of courts, etc. ; money formerly given by the sheriff of a county in which no offenders are left for execution to the clerk of assize and j udges' officers. Jacob.

GLOVES. It was an ancient custom on a maiden assize, when there was no offender to be tried, for the sheriff to present the j udge with a pair of white gloves. It is an immemorial custom to remove the glove from the right hand on taking oath. Wharton.

GLYN. A hollow between two mountains ; a valley or glen. Co.Litt. 5b.

GO. To be dismissed from · a court. To issue from a court. "The court said a mandamus must go." 1 W.Bl. 50. "Let a supersedeas go." 5 Mod. 421. "The writ may go." 18 C.B. 35.

GO BAIL. To assume the responsibility of a surety on a bail-bond.

GO FIFTY-FIFTY. Division into halves of omething under discussion by the parties at the time. Boyer v. Bowles, 310 Mass. 134, 37 N.E.2d 489, 493.

GO HENCE. To depart from the court ; with the further implication that a suitor who is directed to "go hence" is dismissed from further attendance upon the court in respect to the suit or proceeding which brought him there, and that he is finally denied the relief which he sought, or, as the case may be, absolved from the liability sought to be imposed upon him. See Hiatt v. Kinkaid, 40 Neb. 178, 58 N.W. 700.

GO TO. In a statute, will, or other instrument, a direction that property shall "go to" a designated person means that it shall pass or proceed to such person, vest in and belong to him. In re Hitchins' Estate, 43 Misc. 485, 89 N.Y.S. 472 ; Plass v. Plass, 121 Cal. 131, 53 P. 448.

GO TO PROTEST. Commercial paper is said to "go to protest" when it is dishonored by nonpayment or non-acceptance and is handed to a notary for protest.

GO WITHOUT DAY. Words used to denote that a party is dismissed the court. He is said to go without day, because there is no day appointed for him to appear again.

GOAF. In coal mining a space from which material has been removed or the waste left in old work. Harlan Ridgeway Mining Co. v. Jackson, 278 Ky. 767, 129 S.W.2d 585, 586.

GOAT, GOTE. In old English law, a contrivance or structure for draining waters out of the land into the sea. Callis describes goats as "usual engines erected and built with portcullises and doors of timber and stone or brick, invented first in Lower Germany." Callis, Sewers, ( 91 ) , 112, 113. Cowell defines "gote," a ditch, sewer, or gutter.

GOB. In coal mining a space from which material has been removed or the waste left in old work. Harlan Ridgeway Mining Co. v. Jackson, 278 Ky. 767, 129 S.W.2d 585, 586. Space between face of coal and where props had been set by machine operators on previous trip. New Union Coal Co. v. SuIt, 172 Ark. 753, 290 S.W. 580, 581.

GOD AND MY COUNTRY. The answer made by a prisoner, when arraigned, in answer to the question, "How will you be tried ?"

In the ancient practice he had the choice (as appears by the question) whether to submit to the trial by ordeal (by God) or to be tried by a jury, (by the country ; ) and i t is probable that the original form of the answer was, "By God or my country, " whereby the prisoner averred his innocence by declining neither of the modes of trial.

GOD-BOTE. An ecclesiastical or church fine paid for crimes and offenses committed against God. Cowell.

GOD-GILD. That which is offered to God or his service. Jacob.

GOD'S PENNY. In old English law, earnest money; money given as evidence of the completion of a bargain. This name is probably derived from the fact that such money was given to the church or distributed in alms.

GOGING-STOLE. An old form of the word "cucking- stool" ( q. v.) . Cowell.

GOING. In various compound phrases ( as those which follow) this term implies either motion, progress, active operation, or present and continuous validity and efficacy.

GOING AND COMING RULE. Declares that em· ployees while going to or returning from their places of employment are not within the scope of their employment. Robinson v. George, 16 Cal. 2d 238, 105 P.2d 914, 917, 918.

GOING BEFORE THE WIND. In the language of mariners and in the rules of navigation, a vessel is said to be going "before the wind" when the wind is free as respects her course, that is, comes from behind the vessel or over the stern, so that her yards may be braced square across. She is said to be "going off large" when she has the' wind free on either tack, that is, when it blows from
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**Scott v. McNeal**

**No. 890**

Syllabus | Case

**U.S. Supreme Court**

**Scott v. McNeal, 154 U.S. 34 (1894)**

**Submitted October 23, 1893**

**Decided May 14, 1894**

**154 U.S. 34**

*ERROR TO THE SUPREME COURT*

*OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON*

*Syllabus*

A court of probate, in the exercise of its jurisdiction over the probate of wills and the administration of estates of deceased persons, has no jurisdiction to appoint an administrator of the estate of a living person, and its orders, made after public notice, appointing an administrator of the estate of a person who is in fact alive, although he has been absent and not heard from for seven years, and licensing the administrator to sell his land for payment of his debts, are void, and the purchaser at the sale takes no title, as against him.
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one never receives notice that one's estate is being probated. The ONLY indication is the TOMBSTONE or ALL-UPPER-CASE-NAME as DEFENDANT. This is a deception of the HIGHEST-ORDER and a violation of Natural Law, thus a BEACH-OF-TRUST under the Declaration and the COURT is operating without VALID letters of administration. When you enter a PLEA or ACCEPT an attorney, you waive this DEFECT-IN-PROCESS by your own consent.

A judgment of the highest court of a state, by which the purchaser at an administrator's sale under order of a probate court, of land of a living person, who had no notice of its proceedings, is held to be entitled to the land as against him deprives him of his property without due process of law, contrary to the Fourteenth Amendment of the Constitution of the United States, and is reviewable by this Court on writ of error.

This was an action of ejectment, brought January 14, 1892, in the Superior Court of Thurston County in the State of Washington, by Moses H. Scott against John McNeal and Augustine McNeal to recover possession of a tract of land in that county.

Page 154 U. S. 35

At the trial it was conceded that the title in this land was in the plaintiff until 1888, and he testified that he entered into possession thereof, and made improvements thereon, and had never parted with the possession nor authorized any one to go upon the land; that he had demanded possession of the defendants, and they had withheld it from him, and that its rental value was $100 a year.

The defendants denied the plaintiff's title, and claimed title in themselves under a deed from an administrator of the plaintiff's estate, appointed in April, 1888, and in their answer alleged that in March, 1881, the plaintiff mysteriously disappeared from his place of abode, and without the knowledge of those with whom he had been accustomed to associate, and remained continuously away until July, 1891, and was generally believed by his former associates to be dead, and specifically alleged, and at the trial offered evidence tending to prove, the following facts:

On April 2, 1888, Mary Scott presented to the Probate Court of the County of Thurston, in the Territory of Washington, a petition for the appointment of R. H. Milroy as administrator of the estate of the plaintiff, alleging

"that one Moses H. Scott, heretofore a resident of the above-named county and territory, mysteriously disappeared some time during the month of March, 1881, and more than seven years ago; that careful inquiry made by relatives and friends of said Moses H. Scott at different times since his said disappearance, has failed to give any trace or information of his whereabouts or any evidence that he is still living; that your petitioner verily believes that said Moses H. Scott is dead, and has been dead from the time of his said disappearance;"

that he was never married, and left no last will or testament yet heard of; that he left
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real estate in his own right in this county of the value of $600, more or less; that his heirs were three minor children of a deceased brother, and that the petitioner was a judgment creditor of Scott.

Notice of that petition was given by posting in three public places, as required by law, a notice, dated April 7, 1888, signed by the probate judge, and in these words:

"In the Probate
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Court of Thurston Count -- W. T. Mary Scott having filed in this Court a petition praying for the appointment of R. H. Milroy as administrator of the estate of Moses H. Scott, notice is hereby given that the hearing and consideration of said petition has been fixed for Friday, April 20, 1888 at 10 o'clock a.m. at the office of the undersigned."

At the time thus appointed, the probate court, after appointing a guardian *ad litem* for said minors and hearing witnesses, made an order by which,

"it duly appearing that said Moses H. Scott disappeared over seven years ago, and that since said time nothing has been heard or known of him by his relatives and acquaintances, and that said relatives and acquaintances believe him to be dead, and that his surroundings, when last seen (about eight years ago), and the circumstances of that time and immediately and shortly afterwards, were such as to give his relatives and acquaintances the belief that he was murdered at about that time, and it appearing that he has estate in this county; now therefore the court find that the said Moses H. Scott is dead to all legal intents and purposes, having died on or about March 25, 1888, and no objections having been filed or made to the said petition of Mary Scott, and the guardian *ad litem* of the minor heirs herein consenting, it is ordered that said R. H. Milroy be appointed administrator of said estate, and that letters of guardianship issue to him upon his filing a good and sufficient bond in the sum of one thousand dollars."

Letters of administration were issued to Milroy, and he gave bond accordingly.

On July 16, 1888, the probate court, on the petition of Milroy as administrator, and after the usual notice, and with the consent of the guardian *ad litem* of said minors, made an order, authorizing Milroy as administrator to sell all Scott's real estate. Pursuant to this order, he sold by public auction the land now in question, for the price of $301.50, to Samuel C. Ward. On November 26, 1888, the probate court confirmed the sale, the land
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was conveyed to Ward, and the purchase money was received by Milroy, and was afterwards applied by him to the payment of a debt of Scott, secured by mortgage of the land.
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On November 26, 1889, Ward conveyed this land by warranty deed to the defendants for a consideration paid of $800, and the defendants forthwith took and since retained possession of the land, and made valuable improvements thereon.

At the time of the offer of this evidence, the plaintiff objected to the admission of the proceedings in the probate court upon the ground that they were absolutely void because no administration on the estate of a live man could be valid, and the probate court had no jurisdiction to make the orders in question, and objected to the rest of the evidence as irrelevant and immaterial. But the court ruled that, the probate court having passed upon the sufficiency of the petition to give it jurisdiction, and having found that the law presumed Scott to be dead, its proceedings were not absolutely void, and therefore admitted the evidence objected to and directed a verdict for the defendants, which was returned by the jury, and judgment rendered thereon. The plaintiff duly excepted to the rulings and instructions at the trial, and appealed to the supreme court of the state.

In that court, it was argued in his behalf "that to give effect to the probate proceedings under the circumstances would be to deprive him of his property without due process of law." But the court held the proceedings of the probate court to be valid, and therefore affirmed the judgment. 5 Wash. 309.

The plaintiff sued out this writ of error, and assigned for error that the probate proceedings, as regarded him and his estate, were without jurisdiction over the subject matter, and absolutely void, and that the judgment of the superior court, and the judgment of the supreme court of the state affirming that judgment, deprived him of his property without due process of law, and were contrary to the Fourteenth Amendment of the Constitution of the United States.

Page 154 U. S. 38

MR. JUSTICE GRAY, after stating the case, delivered the opinion of the Court.

The plaintiff formerly owned the land in question, and still owns it unless he has been
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deprived of it by a sale and conveyance, under order of the Probate Court of the County of Thurston and Territory of Washington by an administrator of his estate appointed by that court on April 20 upon a petition filed April 2, 1888.
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The form of the order appointing the administrator is peculiar. By that order, after reciting that the plaintiff disappeared more than seven years before, and had not since been seen or heard of by his relatives and acquaintances, and that the circumstances at and immediately after the time when he was last seen, about eight years ago, were such as to give them the belief that he was murdered about that time, the probate court finds that he "is dead to all legal intents and purposes, having died on or about March 25, 1888" -- that is to say, not at the time of his supposed murder, seven or eight years before, but within a month before the filing of the petition for administration. The order also, after directing that Milroy be appointed administrator, purports to direct that "letters of guardianship" issue to him upon his giving bond, but this was evidently a clerical error in the order or in the record, for it appears that he received letters of administration and qualified under them.

The fundamental question in the case is whether letters of administration upon the estate of a person who is in fact alive have any validity or effect as against him.

By the law of England and America before the Declaration of Independence, and for almost a century afterwards, the absolute nullity of such letters was treated as beyond dispute.

In *Allen v. Dundas,* 3 T.R. 125, in 1789, in which the Court of King's Bench held that payment of a debt due to a deceased person to an executor who had obtained probate of a forged will discharged the debtor notwithstanding the probate was afterwards declared null and void, and administration granted to the next of kin, the decision went upon the ground that the probate, being a judicial act of the ecclesiastical court within its jurisdiction, could not, so long as it remained unrepealed, be impeached in the temporal courts. It was argued for the plaintiff that the case stood as if the creditor had not been dead, and had himself brought the action, in which case it was assumed on all hands that payment to an executor would be no defense. But the court clearly stated the essential distinction between the two cases. Mr. Justice Ashurst said:

"The case of a probate of a supposed will during the

All courts other than probate court are TEMPORAL and may not impeach the PROBATE (BC), but the PRESUMPTION-OF-DEATH may be "collaterally attacked" which is where the one sentence and Lord's prayer come into play. You are admitting the FACTS of a matter, but those FACTS do no constitute a VALID-CLAIM in law, because one is A) NOT-DEAD and B) State is administrator and usufructuary and C) BC is an INDEMNITY-RECEIPT, therefore the STATE OF has the DUTY to settle the CLAIM under the RULES-OF-USUFRUCT. Also read: Pewee Coal v United States (State is proprietor for it took control of the Birth Event and seized control of the resulting INFANT created)
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life of the party may be distinguished from the present, because during his life, the ecclesiastical court has no jurisdiction, nor can they inquire who is his representative; but when the party is dead, it is within their jurisdiction."

And Mr. Justice Buller said:

"Then this case was compared to a probate of a supposed will of a living person; but in such a case, the ecclesiastical court have no jurisdiction, and the probate can have no effect; their jurisdiction is only to grant probates of the wills of dead persons. The distinction in this respect is this: if they have jurisdiction, their sentence, as long as it stands unrepealed, shall avail in all other places, but where they have no jurisdiction, their whole proceedings are a nullity."

3 T.R. 129, 130. And such is the law of England to this day. Williams on Executors (9th ed.) 478, 1795; Taylor on Ev. (8th ed.) §§ 1677, 1714.

In *Griffith v. Frazier,* 8 Cranch 9, 12 U. S. 23, in 1814, this Court, speaking by Chief Justice Marshall, said:

"To give the ordinary jurisdiction, a case in which, by law, letters of administration may issue must be brought before him. In the common case of intestacy, it is clear that letters of administration must be granted to some person by the ordinary, and though they should be granted to one not entitled by law, still the act is binding until annulled by the competent authority, because he had power to grant letters of administration in the case. But suppose administration to be granted on the estate of a person not really dead. The act, all will admit, is totally void. Yet the ordinary must always inquire and decide whether the person whose estate is to be committed to the care of others be dead or in life. It is a branch of every cause in which letters of administration issue. Yet the decision of the ordinary that the person on whose estate he acts is dead, if the fact be otherwise, does not invest the person he may appoint with the character or powers of an administrator. The case in truth was not one within his jurisdiction. It was not one in which he had a right to deliberate. It was not committed to him by the law. And although one of the points occurs in all cases proper for his tribunal, yet that point cannot bring the subject within his jurisdiction."

*See also Mutual Benefit*
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*Insurance Co. v. Tisdale,* 91 U. S. 238, 91 U. S. 243; *Hegler v. Faulkner,* 153 U. S. 109, 153 U. S. 118.

The same doctrine has been affirmed by the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania in a series of cases beginning seventy years ago. *McPherson v. Cunliff* (1824), 11 S. & R. 422, 430; *Peebles' Appeal* (1826), 15 S. & R. 39, 42; *Devlin v. Commonwealth* (1882), 101 Penn.St. 273. In the last of those cases, it was held that a grant of letters of administration upon the estate of a person who, having been absent and unheard from for fifteen years, was presumed to be dead, but who, as it afterwards appeared, was in fact alive was absolutely void, and might be impeached collaterally.

The Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts, in 1861, upon full consideration, held that an appointment of an administrator of a man who was in fact alive, but had been absent and not heard from for more than seven years, was void, and that payment to such an administrator was no bar to an action brought by the man on his return; and, in answer to the suggestion of counsel, that

"seven years' absence, upon leaving one's usual home or place of business, without being heard of, authorizes the judge of probate to treat the case as though the party were dead,"

the court said:

"The error consists in this, that those facts are only presumptive evidence of death, and may always be controlled by other evidence showing that the fact was otherwise. The only jurisdiction is over the estate of the dead man. When the presumption arising from the absence of seven years is overthrown by the actual personal presence of the supposed dead man, it leaves no ground for sustaining the jurisdiction."

*Jochumsen v. Suffolk Savings Bank,* 3 Allen. 87, 96. *See also Waters v. Stickney,* 12 Allen, 1, 13; *Day v. Floyd,* 130 Mass. 488, 489.

The Civil Code of Louisiana, in title 3, "Of Absentees," contains provisions for the appointment of a curator to take care of the property of any person who is absent from or resides out of the state without having left an attorney therein, and for the putting of his presumptive heirs into provisional possession after he has been absent and not heard from for five, or, if he has left an attorney, seven, years, or sooner if
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there be strong presumption of his death, and for judicial sale, if necessary, of his movable or personal property, and safe investment of the proceeds; and, upon proof that he has not been heard from for ten years, and has left no known heirs, for sale of his whole property, and payment of the proceeds into the treasury of the state, as in the case of vacant successions; but neither the curator nor those in provisional possession can alienate or mortgage his immovables or real estate, and, if he returns at any time, he recovers his whole property, or the proceeds thereof, and a certain proportion of the annual revenues, depending upon the length of his absence. The main object of those provisions, as their careful regulations show, is to take possession of and preserve the property for the absent owner, not to deprive him of it upon an assumption that he is dead. Accordingly, the Supreme Court of Louisiana held that the appointment, by a court having jurisdiction of successions, of an administrator of the estate of a man represented to be dead, but who was in fact alive at the time of the appointment, was void, and that persons claiming land of his under a sale by such administrator under order of the court, followed by long possession, could not hold the land against his heirs; and, speaking by Chief Justice Manning, said:

"The title of Hotchkiss as administrator is null, because he had no authority to make it, and the prescription pleaded does not validate it. It was not a sale, the informalities of which are cured by a certain lapse to time, and which becomes perfect through prescription; but it was void, because the court was without authority to order it. . . . It is urged on the part of the defendants that the decree of the court ordering the sale of the succession property should protect them, and as the court which thus ordered the sale had jurisdiction of successions, it was not for them to look beyond it. But that is assuming as true that which we know was not true. The owner was not dead. There was no succession."

And the court added that Chief Justice Marshall, in *Griffith v. Frazier,* above cited, disposed of that position. *Burns v. Van Loan* (1877), 29 La.Ann. 560, 563.
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The absolute nullity of administration granted upon the estate of a living person has been directly adjudged or distinctly recognized in the courts of many other states. *French v. Frazier* (1932), 7 J. J. Marsh. 425, 427; *State v. White* (1846), 7 Iredell 116; *Duncan v. Stewart* (1854), 25 Ala. 408; *Andrews v. Avory* (1858), 14 Gratt. 229, 236;
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*Moore v. Smith* (1858), 11 Richardson 569; *Morgan v. Dodge* (1862), 44 N.H. 255, 259; *Withers v. Patterson* (1864), 27 Tex. 491, 497; *Johnson v. Beazley* (1877), 65 Mo. 250, 264; *Melia v. Simmons* (1878), 45 Wis. 334; *D'Arusment v. Jones* (1880) 4 Lea 251; *Stevenson v. Superior Court* (1882), 62 Cal. 60; *Perry v. St. Joseph & Western Railroad* (1882), 29 Kan. 420, 423; *Thomas v. People* (1883), 107 Ill. 517, in which the subject is fully and ably treated.

The only judicial opinions cited at the bar (except the judgment below in the present case) which tend to support the validity of letters of administration upon the estate of a living person were delivered in the courts of New York and New Jersey within the last twenty years.

In *Roderigas v. East River Savings Institution,* 63 N.Y. 460, in 1875, a bare majority of the Court of Appeals of New York decided that payment of a deposit in a savings institution to an administrator under letters of administration issued in the lifetime of the depositor was a good defense to an action by an administrator appointed after his death, upon the ground that the statutes of the State of New York made it the duty of the surrogate, when applied to for administration on the estate of any person, to try and determine the question whether he was alive or dead, and therefore his determination of that question was conclusive. That decision was much criticized as soon as it appeared, notably by Chief Justice Redfield in 15 Amer.Law Reg. (N.S.) 212. And in a subsequent case between the same parties in 1879, the same court unanimously reached a different conclusion, because evidence was produced that the surrogate never in fact considered the question of death, or had any evidence thereof, thus making the validity of the letters of administration to depend
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not upon the question whether the man was dead, but upon the question whether the surrogate thought so. *Roderigas v. East River Savings Institution,* 76 N.Y. 316.

In *Plume v. Howard Savings Institution,* 46 N.J.L., 211, 230, in 1884, which was likewise an action to recover the amount of a deposit in a savings institution, the plaintiff had been appointed by the surrogate administrator of a man who, as the evidence tended to show, had neither drawn out any part of the deposit nor been heard from for more than twenty years; an inferior court certified to the Supreme Court of New Jersey the questions whether payment of the amount to the plaintiff would bar a recovery thereof by the depositor and whether the plaintiff was entitled to recover, and
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that court, in giving judgment for the plaintiff, observed, by way of distinguishing the case from the authorities cited for the defendant, that "in most if not all of such cases, it was affirmatively shown that the alleged decedent was actually alive at the time of the issuance of letters of administration, while in the present case there is no reason for even surmising such to have been the fact."

The grounds of the judgment of the Supreme Court of the State of Washington in the case at bar, as stated in its opinion, were that the equities of the case appeared to be with the defendants; that the court was inclined to follow the case of *Roderigas v. Institution,* 63 N.Y. 460, and that, under the laws of the territory, the probate court, on an application for letters of administration, had authority to find the fact as to the death of the intestate, the court saying:

"Our statutes only authorize administration of the estates of deceased persons, and before granting letters of administration, the court must be satisfied by proof of the death of the intestate. The proceeding is substantially *in rem,* and all parties must be held to have received notice of the institution and pendency of such proceedings where notice is given as required by law. Section 1299 of the 1881 Code gave the probate court exclusive original jurisdiction in such matters and authorized such court to summon parties and witnesses and examine them touching any matter in controversy before Page 154 U. S. 45

said court or in the exercise of its jurisdiction."

Such were the grounds upon which it was held that the plaintiff had not been deprived of his property without due process of law. 5 Wash. 309, 317-318.

After giving to the opinion of the supreme court of the state the respectful consideration to which it is entitled, we are unable to concur in its conclusion or in the reasons on which it is founded.

The Fourteenth Article of Amendment of the Constitution of the United States, after other provisions which do not touch this case, ordains:

"Nor shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due process of law, nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

These prohibitions extend to all acts of the state, whether through its legislative, its
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executive, or its judicial authorities. *Virginia v. Rives,* 100 U. S. 313, 100 U. S. 318-319; *Ex Parte Virginia,* 100 U. S. 339, 100 U. S. 346; *Neal v. Delaware,* 103 U. S. 370, 103 U. S. 397. And the first one, as said by Chief Justice Waite in *United States v. Cruikshank,* 92 U. S. 542, 92 U. S. 554, repeating the words of Mr. Justice Johnson in *Bank of Columbia v. Okely,* 4 Wheat. 235, 17 U. S. 244, was intended

"to secure the individual from the arbitrary exercise of the powers of government, unrestrained by the established principles of private rights and distributive justice."

Upon a writ of error to review the judgment of the highest court of a state upon the ground that the judgment was against a right claimed under the Constitution of the United States, this Court is no more bound by that court's construction of a statute of the territory or of the state, when the question is whether the statute provided for the notice required to constitute due process of law, than when the question is whether the statute created a contract which has been impaired by a subsequent law of the state, or whether the original liability created by the statute was such that a judgment upon it has not been given due faith and credit in the courts of another state. In every such case, this Court must decide for itself the true construction of the statute. *Huntington v. Attrill,* 146 U. S. 657, 146 U. S. 683-684; *Mobile & Ohio Railroad v. Tennessee,* 153 U. S. 486, 153 U. S. 492-495.
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No judgment of a court is due process of law if rendered without jurisdiction in the court or without notice to the party.

The words "due process of law," when applied to judicial proceedings, as was said by MR. JUSTICE FIELD, speaking for this Court,

"mean a course of legal proceedings according to those rules and principles which have been established in our systems of jurisprudence for the protection and enforcement of private rights. To give such proceedings any validity, there must be a tribunal competent by its Constitution -- that is, by the law of its creation -- to pass upon the subject matter of the suit, and if that involves merely a determination of the personal liability of the defendant, he must be brought within its jurisdiction by service of process within the state or his voluntary appearance."

*Pennoyer v. Neff,* 95 U. S. 714, 95 U. S. 733.

Scott v. McNeal (full text) :: 154 U.S. 34 (1894) :: Justia U.S. Supreme ... https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/154/34/case.html

11 of 16 4/23/17, 10:09 AM

Even a judgment in proceedings strictly *in rem* binds only those who could have made themselves parties to the proceedings, and who had notice, either actually or by the thing condemned being first seized into the custody of the court. *The Mary,* 9 Cranch 126, 13 U. S. 144; *Hollingsworth v. Barbour,* 4 Pet. 466, 29 U. S. 475; *Pennoyer v. Neff,* 95 U. S. 714, 95 U. S. 727. And such a judgment is wholly void if a fact essential to the jurisdiction of the court did not exist. The jurisdiction of a foreign court of admiralty, for instance, in some cases, as observed by Chief Justice Marshall,

"unquestionably depends as well on the state of the thing as on the constitution of the court. If by any means whatever a prize court should be induced to condemn, as prize of war, a vessel which was never captured, it could not be contended that this condemnation operated a change of property."

*Rose v. Himely,* 4 Cranch 241, 8 U. S. 269. Upon the same principle, a decree condemning a vessel for unlawfully taking clams, in violation of a statute which authorized proceedings for her forfeiture in the county in which the seizure was made, was held by this Court to be void, and not to protect the officer making the seizure from a suit by the owner of the vessel, in which it was proved that the seizure was not made in the same county, although the
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decree of condemnation recited that it was. *Thompson v. Whitman,* 18 Wall. 457.

The estate of a person supposed to be dead is not seized or taken into the custody of the court of probate upon the filing of a petition for administration, but only after and under the order granting that petition, and the adjudication of that court is not upon the question whether he is living or dead, but only upon the question whether and to whom letters of administration shall issue. *Mutual Benefit Ins. Co. v. Tisdale,* 91 U. S. 238, 91 U. S. 243.

The local law on the subject, contained in the Code of 1881 of the Territory of Washington, in force at the time of the proceedings now in question, and since continued in force by article 27, section 2, of the constitution of the state, does not appear to us to warrant the conclusion that the probate court is authorized to conclusively decide, as against a living person, that he is dead, and his estate therefore subject to be administered and disposed of by the probate court.

On the contrary, that law, in its very terms, appears to us to recognize and assume the
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death of the owner to be a fundamental condition and prerequisite to the exercise by the probate court of jurisdiction to grant letters testamentary or of administration upon his estate, or to license any one to sell his lands for the payment of his debts. By § 1, the common law of England, so far as not inconsistent with the Constitution and laws of the United States or with the local law, is made the rule of decision. In the light of the common law, the exclusive original jurisdiction conferred by § 1299 upon the probate court in the probate of wills and the granting of letters testamentary or of administration is limited to the estates of persons deceased, and the power conferred by that section to summon and examine on oath, as parties or witnesses, executors, and administrators or other persons entrusted with or accountable for the "estate of any deceased person," and "any person touching any matter of controversy before said court or in the exercise of its jurisdiction," is equally limited. By § 1340, wills are to be proved and letters testamentary or of administration are to be granted in the county of
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"which deceased was a resident," or in which "he may have died," or in which any part of his estate may be, "he having died out of the territory." By § 1388, administration of the estate of "a person dying intestate" is to be granted to relatives, next of kin, or creditors, in a certain order, with a proviso in case the person so entitled or interested neglect "for more than forty days after the death of the intestate" to apply for administration. By § 1389, an application for administration must "set forth the facts essential to giving the court jurisdiction of the case," and state "the names and places of residence of the heirs of the deceased, and that the deceased died without a will;" and, by § 1391, notice of such application is to be given by posting in three public places in the county where the court is held a notice "containing the name of the decedent," the name of the applicant, and the time of hearing. And, by §§ 1493 and 1494, a petition by an executor or administrator for the sale of real estate for the payment of debts must set forth

"the amount of the personal estate that has come to his hands, and how much, if any, remains undisposed of, a list and the amounts of the debts outstanding against the deceased, as far as the same can be ascertained, a description of all the real estate of which the testator or intestate died seized, the condition and value of the respective lots and portions, the names and ages of the devisees, if any, and of the heirs of the deceased,"

and must show that it is necessary to sell real estate "to pay the allowance to the family,
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the debts outstanding against the deceased, and the expenses of administration."

Under such a statute, according to the overwhelming weight of authority, as shown by the cases cited in the earlier part of this opinion, the jurisdiction of the court to which is committed the control and management of the estates of deceased persons, by whatever name it is called (ecclesiastical court, probate court, orphans' court, or court of the ordinary or the surrogate), does not exist or take effect before death. All proceedings of such courts in the probate of wills and the granting of administrations depend upon the fact that a person is dead, and are null and void if he is alive. Their jurisdiction
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in this respect being limited to the estates of deceased persons, they have no jurisdiction whatever to administer and dispose of the estates of living persons of full age and sound mind or to determine that a living man is dead and thereupon undertake to dispose of his estate.

A court of probate must indeed inquire into and be satisfied of the fact of the death of the person whose will is sought to be proved or whose estate is sought to be administered, because, without that fact, the court has no jurisdiction over his estate, and not because its decision upon the question, whether he is living or dead can in any wise bind or estop him or deprive him, while alive, of the title or control of his property.

As the jurisdiction to issue letters of administration upon his estate rests upon the fact of his death, so the notice given before issuing such letters assumes that fact, and is addressed not to him, but to those who after his death may be interested in his estate as next of kin, legatees, creditors, or otherwise. Notice to them cannot be notice to him, because all their interests are adverse to his. The whole thing, so far as he is concerned, is *res inter alios acta.*

Next of kin or legatees have no rights in the estate of a living person. His creditors indeed, may, upon proper proceedings, and due notice to him, in a court of law or of equity, have specific portions of his property applied in satisfaction of their debts. But neither creditors nor purchasers can acquire any rights in his property through the action of a court of probate, or of an administrator appointed by that court, dealing, without any notice to him, with his whole estate as if he were dead.

The appointment by the probate court of an administrator of the estate of a living person, without notice to him, being without jurisdiction and wholly void as against
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him, all acts of the administrator, whether approved by that court or not, are equally void. The receipt of money by the administrator is no discharge of a debt, and a conveyance of property by the administrator passes no title.

The fact that a person has been absent and not heard from
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for seven years may created such a presumption of his death as, if not overcome by other proof, is such *prima facie* evidence of his death that the probate court may assume him to be dead and appoint an administrator of his estate, and that such administrator may sue upon a debt due to him. But proof, under proper pleadings, even in a collateral suit, that he was alive at the time of the appointment of the administrator controls and overthrows the *prima facie* evidence of his death and establishes that the court had no jurisdiction and the administrator no authority, and he is not bound either by the order appointing the administrator or by a judgment in any suit brought by the administrator against a third person, because he was not a party to and had no notice of either.

In a case decided in the Circuit Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York in 1880, substantially like *Roderigas v. East River Savings Institution,* as reported in 63 N.Y. 460, above cited, Judge Choate, in a learned and able opinion, held that letters of administration upon the estate of a living man, issued by the surrogate after judicially determining that he was dead, were null and void as against him; that payment of a debt to an administrator so appointed was no defense to an action by him against the debtor, and that to hold such administration to be valid against him would deprive him of his property without due process of law within the meaning of the Fourteenth Amendment of the Constitution of the United States. This Court concurs in the proposition there announced

"that it is not competent for a state, by a law declaring a judicial determination that a man is dead, made in his absence and without any notice to or process issued against him, conclusive for the purpose of divesting him of his property and of vesting it in an administrator for the benefit of his creditors and next of kin, either absolutely or in favor of those only who innocently deal with such administrator. The immediate and necessary effect of such a law is to deprive him of his property without any process of law whatever as against him, although it is done by process of law against other people, his next of kin, to whom notice is given. Such a statutory declaration of estoppel
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by a judgment to which he is neither party nor privy, which has the immediate effect of divesting him of his property, is a direct violation of this constitutional guaranty." *Lavin v. Emigrant Industrial Savings Bank,* 1 F. 641.

The defendants did not rely upon any statute of limitations, nor upon any statute allowing them for improvements made in good faith, but their sole reliance was upon a deed from an administrator, acting under the orders of a court which had no jurisdiction to appoint him or to confer any authority upon him as against the plaintiff.

*Judgment reversed and case remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington for further proceedings not inconsistent with this opinion.*

**Disclaimer:** Official Supreme Court case law is only found in the print version of the United States Reports. Justia case law is provided for general informational purposes only, and may not reflect current legal developments, verdicts or settlements. We make no warranties or guarantees about the accuracy, completeness, or adequacy of the information contained on this site or information linked to from this site. Please check official sources.
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**[** Provided alwayes That if any person or [ person or] persons shall be evicted out of any Lands or Tenements by vertue of this Act, and afterwards if such person or persons upon whose life or lives such Estate or Estates depend shall returne againe from beyond the Seas, or shall on proofe in any Action to be brought for recovery of the same [ to] be made appeare to be liveing; or to have beene liveing at the time of the Eviction That then and from thenceforth the Tennant or Lessee who was outed of the same his or their Executors Administrators or Assignes shall or may reenter repossesse have hold and enjoy the said Lands or Tenements in his or their former Estate for and dureing the Life or Lives or soe long terme as the said person or persons upon whose Life or Lives the said Estate or Estates depend shall be liveing, and alsoe shall upon Action or Actions to be brought by him or them against the Lessors Reversioners or Tennants in possession or other persons respectively which since the time of the said Eviction received the Proffitts of the said Lands or Tenements recover for damages the full Proffitts of the said Lands or Tenements respectively with lawfull Interest for and from the time that he or they were outed of the said Lands or Tenements, and kepte or held out of the same by the said Lessors Reversioners Tennants or other persons who after the said Eviction received the Proffitts of the said Lands or Tenements or any of them respectively as well in the case when the said person or persons upon whose Life or Lives such Estate or Estates did depend are or shall be dead at the time of bringing of the said Action or Actions as if the said person or persons where then liveing.**]**

**X2**

**X3**

**Back to top**

© Crown copyright

**Annotations:**

**Amendments (Textual)**

S. III repealed by Statute Law Revision Act 1863 (c. 125)

**Annotations:**

**Editorial Information**

annexed to the Original Act in a separate Schedule

Variant reading of the text noted in *The Statutes of the Realm* as follows: *O.* omits [*O.* refers to a collection in the library of Trinity College, Cambridge]

All content is available under the Open Government Licence v3.0 except where otherwise stated

**X2 X3**

**X3**

**Previous Next**
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2 of 2 4/23/17, 11:06 AM When one is identified or recognized by the NAME, the PRESUMPTION is one is Dead, which is another way of saying one has ABANDONED their interests (Estate), putting the Estate of the one under the care, custody and control of the governors and tutors of this world (ie: CROWN and VATICAN) and the Estate shall be used as SURETY to underwrite any DEBT that accrues because of one's CHOICE to be governed: one's claim to one's Estate SUBROGATED

Subrogation: The substitution of one person in the place of another with reference to a lawful claim, demand, or right, so that he or she who is substituted succeeds to the rights of the other in relation to the debt or claim, and its rights, remedies, or Securities

... remember, the State of Infancy (being a child: not taking care of one's own Estate (interests)) is a PRIVILEDGE and with that PRIVILEDGE is a BURDEN; a TAX levied as a LIEN against the Estate of which one services as Servant to the Estate and its governors and tutors. For as long as one remain a child, he is no better than a servant, even if he be lord of the manor.

And since INFANCY is a privilege; a benefit, one can choose to REJECT the benefit for one is not bound to accept anything made for his benefit, and once one rejects the benefit, one can then EXPRESS the CESTUI QUE Trust to operate under New Testament and thus claim this Estate in the name if Jesus Christ and for the glory of God Almighty and SEGREGATE the Estate from the care, custody and control of the governors and tutors of this world.
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UNITED STATES
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PEWEE COAL CO., Inc.
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Mr. Burr Tracy Ansell, Washington, D.C., for respondent.

Mr. Justice BLACK delivered the judgment of the Court and an opinion in which Mr. Justice FRANKFURTER, Mr. Justice DOUGLAS, and Mr. Justice JACKSON joined.

1

Respondent, Pewee Coal Co., Inc., is a coal mine operator whose property was allegedly possessed and operated by the United States from May 1 to October 12, 1943, to avert a nation-wide strike of miners. Pewee brought this action in the Court of Claims to recover under the Fifth Amendment1 for the total operating losses sustained during that period. After considering the evidence, the court held that there had been a 'taking' entitling Pewee to compensation. It found the total operating loss to be $36,128.96, but rendered judgment for only.$2,241.26, this amount being the portion of the operating loss which the court found attributable to Government operation of the mine. 88 F.Supp. 426, 115 Ct.Cl. 626. Pewee did not seek review here. We granted the Government's petition for certiorari2 in which two questions are presented: (1) Was there such a taking of Powee's property as to justify compensation under the Fifth Amendment? (2) If there was, does the record support the award of.$2,241.26?

2

First. We agree with the Court of Claims that there was a 'taking' requiring the Government to pay Pewee. The facts upon which this conclusion rests are set out in the findings and opinion below and need not be repeated in detail here. See 88 F.Supp. 426, 115 Ct.Cl. 626. The following are sufficient to show the general picture: On May 1, 1943, the President issued Executive Order 9340, 8 Fed.Reg. 5695, directing the Secretary of Interior '\* \* \* to take immediate possession, so far as may be necessary or desirable, of any and all mines producing coal in which a strike or stoppage has occurred or is threatened, \* \* \* and to operate or arrange for the operation of such mines \* \* \*.' On the same day, the Secretary issued an 'Order for Taking Possession' of most of the Nation's mines, including Pewee's. 8 Fed.Reg. 5767. To convince the operators, miners and public that the United States was taking possession for the bona fide purpose of operating the mines, the Government formally and ceremoniously proclaimed that such was its intention. It required mine officials to agree to conduct operations as agents for the Government; required the American flag to be flown at every mine; required placards reading 'United States Property!' to be posted on the premises; and appealed to the miners to dig coal for the United States as a public duty. Under these circumstances and in view of the other facts which were found, it should not and will not be assumed that the seizure of the mines was a mere sham or pretense to accomplish some unexpressed governmental purpose instead of being the proclaimed actual taking of possession and control. In United States v. United Mine Workers, 330 U.S. 258, 67 S.Ct. 677, 91 L.Ed. 884, there had been a government seizure of the mines under presidential and secretarial orders, which insofar as here material, were substantially the same as those issued in the present case. We rejected the contention of the mine workers that 'the Government's role in administering the bituminous coal mines (was) for the most part fictional and for the remainder nominal only.'3 We treated that seizure as making the mines governmental facilities 'in as complete a sense as if the Government held full title and ownership.' Id., 330 U.S. at pages 284—285, 67 S.Ct. at page 691. It follows almost as a matter of course from our holding in United Mine Workers that the Government here 'took' Pewee's property and became engaged in the mining business.4

3

Second. Having taken Pewee's property, the United States became liable under the Constitution to pay just compensation. Ordinarily, fair compensation for a temporary possession of a business enterprise is the reasonable value of the property's use. See Kimball Laundry Co. v. United States, 338 U.S. 1, 69 S.Ct. 1434, 93 L.Ed. 1765; United States v. General Motors Co., 323 U.S. 373, 65 S.Ct. 357, 89 L.Ed. 311. But in the present case, there is no need to consider the difficult problems inherent in fixing the value of the use of a going concern because Pewee neither claimed such compensation nor proved the amount. It proceeded on the ground that the Fifth Amendment requires the United States to bear operating losses incurred during the period the Government operates private property in the name of the public without the owner's consent. We believe that this contention expresses a correct general principle which under the circumstances of this case supports the judgment for.$2,241.26.

4

Like any private person or corporation, the United States normally is entitled to the profits from, and must bear the losses of, business operations which it conducts. When a private business is possessed and operated for public use, no reason appears to justify imposition of losses sustained on the person from whom the property was seized. This is conceptually distinct from the Government's obligation to pay fair compensation for property taken, although in cases raising the issue, the Government's profit and loss experience may well be one factor involved in computing reasonable compensation for a temporary taking. Of course, there might be an express or implied agreement between the parties that the Government should not receive operating profits nor bear the losses, in which event the general principle would be inapplicable. But the possibility that such an agreement existed in the present case may be disposed of quickly. Pewee's failure to seek review here makes it unnecessary to consider whether the company consented to bear the disallowed and major portion of the losses sustained during the period of governmental control. And there is no indication that Pewee expressly or impliedly agreed to assume the loss of.$2,241.26 which the court found mainly attributable to increased wage payments made to comply with a War Labor Board decision.

5

Where losses resulting from operation of property taken must be borne by the Government, it makes no difference that the losses are caused in whole or in part by compliance with administrative regulations requiring additional wages to be paid. With a without a War Labor Board order, when the Government increased the wages of the miners whom it employed, it thereby incurred the expense. Moreover, it is immaterial that governmental operation resulted in a smaller loss than Pewee would have sustained if there had been no seizure of the mines. Whatever might have been Pewee's losses had it been left free to exercise its own business judgment, the crucial fact is that the Government chose to intervene by taking possession and operating control. By doing so, it became the proprietor and, in the absence of contrary arrangements, was entitled to the benefits and subject to the liabilities which that status involves.

The judgment of the Court of Claims is affirmed.

The State of Birth took possession and operated control of the Birth Event by and through the creation of the INFANT without telling anyone, thus no one was left free to exercise their own business judgement, thus the State of Birth CHOOSE to intervene and by doing so, became proprietor entitled to the benefits and subject to the liabilities that STATUS affords (usufructuary: ALL revenues and debts accrue to the Treasury) .... unless, the STATE OF can get one into an ALTERNATIVE-AGREEMENT .... such as getting one to agree they are the DEAD-DUDE, thus without right nor claim to the Earth as a living soul = REJECT God almighty and Jesus Christ = DEAD to God almighty = accept Mark of Cain and/or Mark of the Beast

7

Affirmed.

8

Mr. Justice REED, concurring.

9

I agree that in this case there was a 'taking' by eminent domain that requires the Government to pay just compensation to the owner of the property for its use. However, it is impossible for me to accept the view that the 'taking' in this case requires the United States to bear all operating losses during the period it controls the property without the owner's consent or agreement. Such a view would lead to disastrous consequences where properties necessarily taken for the benefit of the Nation have a long record of operating losses, e.g., certain railroads, coal mines, or television broadcasting stations. The question of who bears such losses is not, I think, 'conceptually distinct' from the question of just compensation. Losses or profits on the temporary operation after the declaration or judgment of taking are factors to be taken into consideration in determining what is just compensation to the owner.

10

This is a temporary taking. The relatively new technique of temporary taking by eminent domain is a most useful administrative device: many properties, such as laundries, or coal mines, or railroads, may be subjected to public operation only for a short time to meet war or emergency needs, and can then be returned to their owners. However, the use of the temporary taking has spawned a host of difficult problems, e.g., United States v. General Motors Corp., 323 U.S. 373, 65 S.Ct. 357, 89 L.Ed. 311; United States v. Petty Motor Co., 327 U.S. 372, 66 S.Ct. 596, 90 L.Ed. 729; Kimball Laundry Co. v. United States, 338 U.S. 1, 69 S.Ct. 1434, 93 L.Ed. 1765, especially in the fixing of the just compensation. Market value, despite its difficulties, provides a fairly acceptable test for just compensation when the property is taken absolutely. See United States v. Miller, 317 U.S. 369, 63 S.Ct. 276, 87 L.Ed. 336; United States v. John F. Felin & Co., 334 U.S. 624, 68 S.Ct. 1238, 92 L.Ed. 1614; United States v. Toronto H. & B. Navigation Co., 338 U.S. 396, 70 S.Ct. 217, 94 L.Ed. 195; United States v. Commodities Trading Corp., 339 U.S. 121, 70 S.Ct. 547, 94 L.Ed. 707. But in the temporary taking of operating properties, e.g., Marion & Rye Valley R. Co. v. United States, 270 U.S. 280, 46 S.Ct. 253, 70 L.Ed. 585; United States v. United Mine Workers of America, 330 U.S. 258, 67 S.Ct. 677, 91 L.Ed. 884, market value is too uncertain a measure to have any practical significance. The rental value for a fully functioning railroad for an uncertain period is an unknowable quantity. This led to a government guarantee of earnings in the First World War, 40 Stat. 451. Cf. United States v. Westinghouse Electric & Mfg. Co., 339 U.S. 261, 70 S.Ct. 644, 94 L.Ed. 816. The most reasonable solution is to award compensation to the owner as determined by a court under all the circumstances of the particular case.

11

Temporary takings can assume various forms. There may be a taking in which the owners are ousted from operation, their business suspended, and the property devoted to new uses. United States v. General Motors Corp., 323 U.S. 373, 65 S.Ct. 357, 89 L.Ed. 311; United States v. Petty Motor Co., 327 U.S. 372, 66 S.Ct. 596, 90 L.Ed. 729; Kimball Laundry Co. v. United States, 338 U.S. 1, 69 S.Ct. 1434, 93 L.Ed. 1765. A second kind of taking is where, as here, the Government, for public safety or the protection of the public welfare, 'takes' the property in the sense of assuming the responsibility of its direction and employment for national purposes, leaving the actual operations in the hands of its owners as government officials appointed to conduct its affairs with the assets and equipment of the controlled company. Examples are the operation of railroads, motor carriers, or coal mines. Marion & Rye Valley R. Co. v. United States, 270 U.S. 280, 46 S.Ct. 253, 70 L.Ed. 585; United States v. United Mine Workers of America, 330 U.S. 258, 67 S.Ct. 667, 91 L.Ed. 884.

12

When, in a temporary taking, no agreement is reached with the owners, the courts must determine what payments the Government must make. Whatever the nature of the 'taking,' the test should be the constitutional requirement of 'just compensation.' However, there is no inflexible requirement that the same incidents must be used in each application of the test.

13

So far as the second kind of temporary 'taking' is concerned, the Government's supervision of a losing business for a temporary emergency ought not to place upon the Government the burden of the losses incurred during that supervision unless the losses were incurred by governmental acts, e.g., if the business would not have been conducted at all but for the Government, or if extra losses over what would have been otherwise sustained were occasioned by Government operations. Where the owner's losses are what they would have been without the 'taking,' the owner has suffered no loss or damage for which compensation is due. Cf. Marion & Rye Valley R. Co. v. United States, 270 U.S. 280, 46 S.Ct. 253, 70 L.Ed. 585. The measure of just compensation has always been the loss to the owner, not the loss or gain to the Government. Boston Chamber of Commerce v. Boston, 217 U.S. 189, 195, 30 S.Ct. 459, 460, 54 L.Ed. 725.

14

Here the Court of Claims has correctly applied these principles in a case of a losing operation in a temporary taking. It has found that a certain sum was expended without legal or business necessity so to do. This sum was the extra allowance paid at the direction of the United States under a certain War Labor Board recommendation that had no legal sanction. 50 U.S.C.App. § 1507, 50 U.S.C.A.Appendix, § 1507; E.O. 9017, 3 CFR Cum.Supp. 1075, 50 U.S.C.A.Appendix, § 1507 note. I would not overturn its finding in this case and would therefore affirm.

15

Mr. Justice BURTON, with whom THE CHIEF JUSTICE, Mr. Justice CLARK and Mr. Justice MINTON concur, dissenting.

16

I agree that there was a 'taking' of the mining property from May 1 to October 12, 1943, but I find no ground for allowing the respondent to recover the sum here sought as compensation for such taking.

17

This case is within the principle stated in Marion & Rye Valley R. Co. v. United States, 270 U.S. 280, 282, 46 S.Ct. 253, 254, 70 L.Ed. 585, as follows: '(E)ven if there was technically a taking, the judgment for defendant was right. Nothing was recoverable as just compensation, because nothing of value was taken from the company; and it was not subjected by the Government to pecuniary loss. Nominal damages are not recoverable in the Court of Claims.'

18

Here there is no showing by the company of any rental value due it as compensation for the Government's possession of its properties. There is no showing that anything of compensable value was taken by the Government from the company, or that the Government subjected the company to any pecuniary loss. The dissenting judge in the Court of Claims pointed out that—'This extra expense consisted of an increased vacation allowance to the plaintiff's workmen, and the refund to them of occupational charges like rentals on mine lamps. The court has not found that the plaintiff (company) could have operated its mine without making the concessions directed by the War Labor Board, nor has it found what the losses to the plaintiff would have been if the Government had not intervened and the strike had continued. I think that the court is not justified in awarding the plaintiff the amount of these expenditures when it does not and, I think, could not, find that the plaintiff was, in fact, financially harmed by the Government's acts.' 88 F.Supp. at page 431, 115 Ct.Cl. at pages 678—679.

19

Accordingly, I would reverse the judgment of the Court of Claims and allow no recovery by the respondent. 1

'\* \* \* nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.' U.S.Const., Amend. V.

2

340 U.S. 808, 71 S.Ct. 55.

3

Brief for United Mine Workers of America and John L. Lewis, p. 32, United States v. United Mine Workers, 330 U.S. 258, 67 S.Ct. 677, 91 L.Ed. 884.

4

The case of Marion & Rye Valley R. Co. v. United States, 270 U.S. 280, 46 S.Ct. 253, 254, 70 L.Ed. 585, is cited by the Government as supporting its view that there was no 'taking' here. In that case, however, the Court had 'no occasion to determine whether in law the President took possession and assumed control' of a railroad. Instead, it dealt with the problem on the assumption that there was a 'taking' and proceeded to decision on the finding that the railroad 'was not subjected by the Government to pecuniary loss.' This decision cannot be accepted as controlling the present case since whether there is a 'taking' must be determined in light of the particular facts and circumstances involved. CC∅ | Transformed by Public.Resource.Org
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Janice Holben, J.D., Alan J. Jacobs, J.D., Jack K. Levin, J.D., Eric C. Surette, J.D., Barbara J. Van Arsdale, J.D.

IX. Powers, Duties, and Rights, in General

C. Particular Powers and Duties; Requirements As to Performance Thereof

1. In General; Responsibilities to Government and Public; Ethical Duties

a. Overview

Topic Summary Correlation Table References

**§ 241. Generally; fiduciary nature of duties**

**West's Key Number Digest**

West's Key Number Digest, Officers and Public Employees 110 to 112

A public officer must act primarily for the benefit of the public;[FN1] by accepting a public office, one undertakes to perform all the duties of the office, and while he or she remains in such office the public has the right to demand that he or she perform such duties.[FN2] A public officer owes an undivided duty to the public whom he or she serves.[FN3] Public policy demands that an officeholder discharge his or her duties with undivided loyalty,[FN4] and that every public officer is bound to perform the duties of his or her office faithfully.[FN5] An officer's or public employee's duty of loyalty to the public and his or her superiors is similar to that of an agent of a private principal.[FN6]

As expressed otherwise, the powers delegated to a public officer are held in trust for the people and are to be exercised on behalf of the government or of all citizens who may need the intervention of the officer.[FN7] A public official is held in public trust.[FN8] That is, a public officer occupies a fiduciary relationship to the political entity on whose behalf he or she serves,[FN9] and stands in a fiduciary relationship to the citizens that he or she has been elected to serve.[FN10] Public officers are fiduciaries and, when dealing with public property, must act with the utmost good faith, fidelity, and integrity.[FN11]

The fiduciary duty is to the usufruct as trustees of the LORD: is one usufruct of the Tree of Life or usufruct of the Tree of Knowledge? God's or CEASAR'S? Kingdom of Heaven or Kingdom of Satan?

However, there is some authority to the effect that a public officer may not have a fiduciary duty to perform a specified act where there is no statute requiring as much.[FN12] Furthermore, election to public office does not make one the private servant of all inquiring citizens.[FN13] Neither does the Constitution require all public employees to intercede, outside their own bureaucratic hierarchies, on behalf of persons whose rights are in jeopardy.[FN14]