

PMA (PRIVATE CONTRACT AGREEMENT)

EMBASSY PROTECTION OF OUR COMMUNITY

ALL BUSINESSES & COMMUNITY relationships (people)

NOTICE OF FAIR WARNING

To REMOVE ALL Presuming, *ye* are one of your subjects (State Citizen, Resident, Person, Driver, *Nom de guerre* or Some Type of Commercial Corporate Legal Fiction.) Is hereby and herein disputed point by point, where any State-County-City (de facto) and their Courts- Deputies- Attorney(s) (at any level) and all parties involved have FAILED to properly document *ye*, name, *ye* proper status, *ye* rights and continues to force 'one people' under duress by coercion or kidnapping, where NO permission was granted for any and all acts are hereby repented and rescinded from and for the record. *ye* 'one people' have not, and do not, and did not agree to your 'Presumption' that *ye* are one of your subjects as listed above. This goes for ANYONE who wants to break our contract is liable in their personal capacity.

There has been "NO" Voluntary Act Of Identifying *myself or we* in a legal contractual setting without proper status, without a verified declaration with supporting documents, on and for the record and you still choose to continue your enslavement, entrapment, or unlawful claim of said unnamed party into the system. *ye*, "*one people*," are created by God (Not The De Facto = State of California nor the other 49 State(s)). *ye* Don't Believe We Were Ever Meant To Have Become The Fictions, Persons, And Entities That Are So Common Today.

ye have not provided "The Giving of a 'Name,' 'Birth Date,' 'Address,' and or 'SSN' all a form of a 'Legal Description' of a 'Legal Personality' and a 'Legal Fiction'. You have recreated into record, by use of Identify Fraud, court referenced Case number is actual "Securities Fraud," all identifiers that these "Deceitful Men," use to confirm *one* to be the property of "The Babylonian System." Which created and used those identifiers to mark its property." But the property you chose in this matter is created by "documented collaborative constructive fraud," and the party pursued removes your immunity, and your continued acts, are agreement to the "PMA-terms and service contract/COL/Circular No. 3591" issued and in place as of the 28th day of February 2012 **IN FACT:** a "Private PMA-contract," which has been issued to All Government Agents and employees for notice in advance in good faith, have accepted and acknowledged, liability. This Contract is also included with **ALL contracts, business transactions, treaties, every single process that deals with any form of relationship, service, action, communication, etc.** – SO, THERE IS NO confusions. EVERYTHING WE ARE APART OF. (**Note:** a PMA itself, forms a private membership association (one on one) and operates as a trust (secured on a private UCC 1 Contract Trust- Bonded), an un-incorporated association, where No state, No court, No law, and no other entity can make any laws impairing the obligations of said contract, you have been properly warned. Continued act REMOVES all immunity...) Liable for \$50K retainer up front, \$10K per hour until resolved (TRUE BILL will be issued for failure to comply; all claims will be issued to TIGTA/CID/Treasury for Securities Fraud investigation and for collection). Any action by "ANYONE inclusive of a peace officer/police officer, sheriff, deputies, officer of the court, public servant, attorney(s) or government official, FBI, CIA, *ye do not care, anyone/any entity*- to assert unlawful authority under the color of law will be construed as a direct and willful violation of *my* constitutionally protected inalienable rights, and prosecuted to the full extent of American law, in common law, including but not limited to [42 U.S.C. §1983; §2000d, and 15 U.S.C. §1611, 18 U.S.C. §241, and 18 U.S.C. §242, 28 U.S.C. §1606]. In violation of International Organizations Immunities Act (IOIA) is a United States federal law enacted in 1945. It "established a special group of foreign or international

organizations whose members could work in the U.S. and enjoy certain exemptions from US taxes and search and seizure laws." Where *our body* is undisputed an "international protected person/foreign national/an american/ citizen de jure/diplomats," and *ye* am the *owner/administrator/sole proprietor/de jure* of the "Named" entities (dead marks), violated by the named liable parties, of *ye* community and will pursue.

"Your deception of creating a 'Legal Fiction,' by kidnapping, identity theft, peonage, use of faulty declarations, failure to comply with "DO NOT STOP/DO NOT DETAIN," and failure to verify named parties, removes all "immunities." Where ANY form of ANY of these 50 Unite States: District Attorney, Deputy District Attorney, Public Defenders, Courts, Judges, Clerks of the Court, any Government Entity inclusive of Each COUNTY/CITY or official registered Entity of Said COUNTY/CITY or STATE especially the RIVERSIDE COUNTY Judicial Officers who have TAKEN AN OATH to the State of California, but use of ANY Declaration of the Deputy Officer on the record to pursue said claim is **FRAUD/CRMINIAL... fact**. The parties named have "NO," personal knowledge of the actual events and fail to document "Brady Material" into record, to innocent nationals, they pursue as an **EXAMPLE is Treason**. The knowledge of the actual events, any form of a Court Judge/Magistrate, Clerk of the Court, Public Defenders, The County Sheriffs and Deputies (in this matter the ENTIRE Riverside Sheriff Department), ANY - District Attorney, Deputy District Attorney, inclusive of ANY involved FBI agents, collaborative acts, will and is an act by an organized crime, is in violation of the 1979 International Convention against the Taking of Hostages= which provides that "any person who seizes or detains and threatens to kill, to injure, or to continue to detain another person in order to compel a third party, namely, a State, an international intergovernmental organization, a natural or juridical person [*sample: State of California or THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA where all are Counties are Charters ≡ THE ENTIRE RIVERSIDE COUNTY SHERIFF Departments and Deputies; THE RIVERSIDE HALL OF JUSTICE; THE RIVERSIDE SUPERIOR COURT; THE CORONA SUPERIOR COURT, THE EASTVALE SUPERIOR COURT, THE RIVERSIDE COUNTY BANNING CORRECTIONAL FACILITY INCLUSIVE OF ALL THE CORRECTIONAL FACILITYS IN RIVERSIDE/LA- CALIFORNIA AND PRISONS are ALLL liable; which are DISTRICTS... to enforce laws and statutes (California Constitution Penal Codes 1879 repealed) this is inclusive of the ENTIRE STATE OF CALIFORNIA (a registered corporation) and its Government Entities*] which removes their immunity, or a group of persons, to do or abstain from doing any act as an explicit or implicit condition for the release of the hostage commits the offence of taking of hostage within the meaning of this Convention." Herein documented as a "Terrorist Act" classified as a hostage/human trafficking a major **VIOLATION OF an American/citizen de jure/national of the united states America**, which is an international protected person outside the jurisdiction of a States, The UNITED STATES (corporations). **ANY ACTION AS OF the 28th day of February 2012** of our Embassy of Calafia County national/diplomat/citizen/staff/nobles who are NOT a United States Citizen, NOT a 14th Amendment Citizen, NEITHER= Black, Negro, African American, Colored, Slave, etc.... **but use of a DEAD MARK or surrendered names** ≡ fraud (constructive fraud) is a felony, a CRIME. ANY "Name(s)," used on the record that are REGISTERED entities are dead marks. Whereby the use of that information on record is False and EACH PARTY IS LIABLE in their personal capacity pursuant to our PMA contract agreement by acquiescence, and the any use of the BIRTH DATE and not the DATE OF CREATION renders all claims as Identity Theft. The owner of the dead marks is "the living man or [wo]man." Which has nothing to do with the Issue Of Jurisdiction. The matter of jurisdiction is where the "COURT" itself has NO JURISDICTION of an *internationally protected person*.

“Legal Fiction. a ‘Presumption’ of fact ‘Assumed’ by a court for convenience, consistency, or to achieve justice. There is an old adage: ‘fictions arise from the law, and not law from fictions.’”

From Oran's Dictionary Of The Law, 1999, This Definition Of Legal Fiction is found: “A legal fiction is an assumption that something that is (or may be) false or nonexistent is true or real. Legal Fictions are assumed or invented to help do justice.

Merriam-Webster's Dictionary Of Law, 1996, States: Legal Fiction: “Something assumed in law to be fact irrespective of the truth or accuracy of that assumption.”

The way *i* see it the ‘Legal Fiction’ creates a Jurisdiction Issue. For Example, The New Government Health Care Laws apply to ‘Legal Fictions’ only.

A flesh and blood [wo]man on the land is “NOT” a ‘Legal Fiction’ Person!

Detrimental Deceptions by the Government Employees/agents/as the liable parties listed above use of the 'Legal Fiction' is conflicting, arbitrary, the laws of Man that change on a Political Whim, All Presumptions, which entangled with Jurisdictions other than 'Standing' in The Kingdom Of God.

The use of a surrendered Driver’s License pursuant to [1508 United States government Code 18 USC sec 1028] is not used for ‘IDENTITY’ which the Driver’s License and California ID was surrendered due to faulty information whereby the Date of Creation of the Entity is January 02, 1970 NOT December 28th, 1969 which renders any form of use of said California Driver’s License or California ID is Identity Theft and liable for PMA charges \$50k Retainer and \$10k per hour due to the main FACT: the ID’s were properly surrendered due to **correction of records** and DOC: 01/02/1970 invalidates the use of these items as “evidence” on the 'Person' or named Legal Fiction Persons as noted above that are REGISTERED entities as ‘DEAD MARKS,’ this is called **identity theft** by any use, which truly invalidates a 'Presumption' of a 'Legal Fiction Person.'

Praise be to our Creator.

**U.S. SUPREME COURT AND OTHER HIGH COURT CITATIONS AND THE UNITED STATES government PROVING THAT NO DRIVERS LICENSE IS USED FOR IDENTITY IS NOT NECESSARY FOR NORMAL USE OF AN AUTOMOBILE ON COMMON WAYS
A ‘NATIONAL IDENTITY CARD’ IS VALID IDENTIFICATION**

**THE EMBASSY OF CALAFIA COUNTY
NATIONAL IDENTITY CARD IS A GLOBAL ID AND LIBERTY PASS
REGISTERED PRIVATELY WITH TSA/DMV/DOT AND OTHER PARTIES
under the Embassy umbrella of the California (de jure) Assembly**

**SO, IF YOU ENCOUNTERED ONE OF OUR INDIGENOUS DIPLOMATIC TRIBAL LAND TRUST NATIONALS WHO IS SECURED
WITHIN OUR UCC CONTRACT TRUST. REGISTERED WITHIN THE Embassy Of The California (de jure) Assembly, ON**

**SECURED EMBASSY OF OUR TRIBAL LAND TRUST NATION OF CALAFIA COUNTY, THEY ARE OUTSIDE THE JURISDICTION
OF THE UNITED STATES.**

DO NOT STOP DO NOT DETAIN

“The right of a native citizen/citizen de jure/citizen national or a true American... [NOT a United States Citizen, Nor a State Citizen] have a right to be movable and travel upon the public highways and to transport his/her property thereon, by horse drawn carriage, wagon, or automobile, is not a mere privilege which may be permitted or prohibited at will, but a common inalienable/alienable right which he/she has under his/her inalienable/alienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Under this constitutional guaranty one may, therefore, under normal conditions, travel at his/her inclination along the public highways or in public places, and while conducting himself/herself in an orderly and decent manner, neither interfering with nor disturbing another’s rights, he/she will be protected, not only in his/her living status, but in his/her safe conduct.”

FACT BY CASE LAW:

- [Thompson v. Smith, 154 SE 579, 11 American Jurisprudence, Constitutional Law, §329, pg 1135 “The right of the Citizen to travel upon the public highways and to transport his property thereon, in the ordinary course of life and business, is a common right which he has under the right to enjoy life and liberty, to acquire and possess property, and to pursue happiness and safety. It includes the right, in so doing, to use the ordinary and usual conveyances of the day, and under the existing modes of travel, includes the right to drive a horse drawn carriage or wagon thereon or to operate an automobile thereon, for the usual and ordinary purpose of life and business.”]
- [Thompson vs. Smith, supra.; Teche Lines vs. Danforth, Miss., 12 S.2d 784 “... the right of the citizen to drive on a public street with freedom from police interference... is a fundamental constitutional right” -White, 97 Cal.App.3d.141, 158 Cal.Rptr. 562, 566-67 (1979) “citizens have a right to drive upon the public streets of the District of Columbia or any other city absent a constitutionally sound reason for limiting their access.”]
- [Caneisha Mills v. D.C. 2009 “The use of the automobile as a necessary adjunct to the earning of a livelihood in modern life requires us in the interest of realism to conclude that the RIGHT to use an automobile on the public highways partakes of the nature of a liberty within the meaning of the Constitutional guarantees. . .”]
- [Berberian v. Lussier (1958) 139 A2d 869, 872, See also: Schecter v. Killingsworth, 380 P.2d 136, 140; 93 Ariz. 273 (1963). “The right to operate a motor vehicle [an automobile] upon the public streets and highways is not a mere privilege. It is a right of liberty, the enjoyment of which is protected by the guarantees of the federal and state constitutions.”]
- [Adams v. City of Pocatello, 416 P.2d 46, 48; 91 Idaho 99 (1966). “A traveler has an equal right to employ an automobile as a means of transportation and to occupy the public highways with other vehicles in common use.”]
- [Campbell v. Walker, 78 Atl. 601, 603, 2 Boyce (Del.) 41. “The owner of an automobile has the same right as the owner of other vehicles to use the highway,* * * A traveler on foot has the same right to the use of the public highways as an automobile or any other vehicle.”]
- [Simeone v. Lindsay, 65 Atl. 778, 779; Hannigan v. Wright, 63 Atl. 234, 236. “The RIGHT of the citizen to DRIVE on the public street with freedom from police interference, unless he is engaged in suspicious conduct associated in some manner with criminality is a FUNDAMENTAL CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT which must be protected by the courts.” People v. Horton 14 Cal. App. 3rd 667 (1971) “The right to make use of an automobile as a vehicle of travel along the highways of the state, is no longer an open question. The owners thereof have the same rights in the roads and streets as the drivers of horses or those riding a bicycle or traveling in some other vehicle.”]
- [House v. Cramer, 112 N.W. 3; 134 Iowa 374; Farnsworth v. Tampa Electric Co. 57 So. 233, 237, 62 Fla. 166. “The automobile may be used with safety to other users of the highway, and in its proper use upon the highways there is an equal right with the users of other vehicles properly upon the highways. The law recognizes such right of use upon general principles.]
- [Brinkman v Pacholike, 84 N.E. 762, 764, 41 Ind. App. 662, 666. “The law does not denounce motor carriages, as such, on public ways. They have an equal right with other vehicles in common use to occupy the streets and roads. It is improper to say that the driver of the horse has rights in the road’s superior to the driver of the automobile. Both have the right to use the easement.”]
- [Indiana Springs Co. v. Brown, 165 Ind. 465, 468. U.S. Supreme Court says No License Necessary To Drive Automobile On Public Highways/Streets No License Is Necessary Copy and Share Freely YHVH. name 2 2 “A highway is a public way open and free to anyone who has occasion to pass along it on foot or with any kind of vehicle.” Schlesinger v. City of Atlanta, 129 S.E. 861, 867, 161 Ga. 148, 159.]
- [Holland v. Shackelford, 137 S.E. 2d 298, 304, 220 Ga. 104; Stavola v. Palmer, 73 A.2d 831, 838, 136 Conn. 670 “There can be no question of the right of automobile owners to occupy and use the public streets of cities, or highways in the rural districts.” Liebrecht v. Crandall, 126 N.W. 69, 110 Minn. 454, 456 “The word ‘automobile’ connotes a pleasure vehicle designed for the transportation of persons on highways.”]

- [American Mutual Liability Ins. Co., vs. Chaput, 60 A.2d 118, 120; 95 NH 200 Motor Vehicle: 18 USC Part 1 Chapter 2 section 31 definitions: “(6) Motor vehicle. – The term “motor vehicle” means every description of carriage or other contrivance propelled or drawn by mechanical power and used for commercial purposes on the highways...” 10) The term “used for commercial purposes” means the carriage of persons or property for any fare, fee, rate, charge, or other consideration, or directly or indirectly in connection with any business, or other undertaking intended for profit. “A motor vehicle or automobile for hire is a motor vehicle, other than an automobile stage, used for the transportation of persons for which remuneration is received.”]
- [International Motor Transit Co. vs. Seattle, 251 P. 120 The term ‘motor vehicle is different and broader than the word automobile.”]
- [City of Dayton vs. DeBrosse, 23 NE.2d 647, 650; 62 Ohio App. 232 “Thus self-driven vehicles are classified according to the use to which they are put rather than according to the means by which they are propelled” – Ex Parte Hoffert, 148 NW 20”]
- [The Supreme Court, in Arthur v. Morgan, 112 U.S. 495, 5 S.Ct. 241, 28 L.Ed. 825, held that carriages were properly classified as household effects, and we see no reason that automobiles should not be similarly disposed of.”]
- [Hillhouse v United States, 152 F. 163, 164 (2nd Cir. 1907). “...a citizen has the right to travel upon the public highways and to transport his property thereon...” State vs. Johnson, 243 P. 1073; Cummins vs. Homes, 155 P. 171; Packard vs. Banton, 44 S.Ct. 256; Hadfield vs. Lundin, 98 Wash 516, Willis vs. Buck, 263 P. 1982.]
- [Barney vs. Board of Railroad Commissioners, 17 P.2d 82 “The use of the highways for the purpose of travel and transportation is not a mere privilege, but a common and fundamental Right of which the public and the individual cannot be rightfully deprived.”]
- [Chicago Motor Coach vs. Chicago, 169 NE 22; Ligare vs. Chicago, 28 NE 934; Boon vs. Clark, 214 SSW 607; 25 Am.Jur. (1st) Highways Sect.163 “the right of the Citizen to travel upon the highway and to transport his property thereon in the ordinary course of life and business... is the usual and ordinary right of the Citizen, a right common to all.”]
- [Ex Parte Dickey, (Dickey vs. Davis), 85 SE 781 “Every Citizen has an unalienable RIGHT to make use of the public highways of the state; every Citizen has full freedom to travel from place to place in the enjoyment of life and liberty.” People v. Nothaus, 147 Colo. 210. “No State government entity has the power to allow or deny passage on the highways, byways, nor waterways, nor airways... transporting his vehicles and personal property for either recreation or business, but by being subject only to local regulation i.e., safety, caution, traffic lights, speed limits, etc. Travel is not a privilege requiring licensing, vehicle registration, or forced insurances.”]
- [Chicago Coach Co. v. City of Chicago, 337 Ill. 200, 169 N.E. 22. “Traffic infractions are not a crime.” People v. Battle “Persons faced with an unconstitutional licensing law which purports to require a license as a prerequisite to exercise of right... may ignore the law and engage with impunity in exercise of such right.”]
- [Shuttlesworth v. Birmingham 394 U.S. 147 (1969). U.S. Supreme Court says No License Necessary To Drive Automobile On Public Highways/Streets No License Is Necessary Copy and Share Freely YHVH.name 3 “The word ‘operator’ shall not include any person who solely transports his own property and who transports no persons or property for hire or compensation.”]
- [Statutes at Large California Chapter 412 p.83 “Highways are for the use of the traveling public, and all have the right to use them in a reasonable and proper manner; the use thereof is an inalienable right of every citizen.” Escobedo v. State 35 C2d 870 in 8 Cal Jur 3d p.27 “RIGHT — A legal RIGHT, a constitutional RIGHT means a RIGHT protected by the law, by the constitution, but government does not create the idea of RIGHT or original RIGHTS; it acknowledges them. . . “ Bouvier’s Law Dictionary, 1914, p. 2961. “Those who have the right to do something cannot be licensed for what they already have right to do as such license would be meaningless.”]
- [City of Chicago v Collins 51 NE 907, 910. “A license means leave to do a thing which the licensor could prevent.” Blatz Brewing Co. v. Collins, 160 P.2d 37, 39; 69 Cal. A. 2d 639. “The object of a license is to confer a right or power, which does not exist without it.”]
- [Payne v. Massey (19__) 196 SW 2nd 493, 145 Tex 273. “The court makes it clear that a license relates to qualifications to engage in profession, business, trade or calling; thus, when merely traveling without compensation or profit, outside of business enterprise or adventure with the corporate state, no license is required of the natural individual traveling for personal business, pleasure and transportation.”]
- [Wingfield v. Fielder 2d Ca. 3d 213 (1972). “If [state] officials construe a vague statute unconstitutionally, the citizen may take them at their word, and act on the assumption that the statute is void.”]
- [Shuttlesworth v. Birmingham 394 U.S. 147 (1969). “With regard particularly to the U.S. Constitution, it is elementary that a Right secured or protected by that document cannot be overthrown or impaired by any state police authority.” Donnolly vs. Union Sewer Pipe Co., 184 US 540; Lafarier vs. Grand Trunk R.R. Co., 24 A. 848; O’Neil vs. Providence Amusement Co., 108 A. 887. “The right to travel (called the right of free ingress to other states, and egress from them) is so fundamental that it appears in the Articles of Confederation, which governed our society before the Constitution.”]
- [(Paul v. Virginia). “[T]he right to travel freely from State to State ... is a right broadly assertable against private interference as well as governmental action. Like the right of association, it is a virtually unconditional personal right, guaranteed by the Constitution to us all.” (U.S. Supreme Court)]
- [Shapiro v. Thompson). EDGERTON, Chief Judge: “Iron curtains have no place in a free world. ...’Undoubtedly the right of locomotion, the right to remove from one place to another according to inclination, is an attribute of personal liberty, and the right, ordinarily, of free transit from or through the territory of any State is a right secured by the Constitution.”]
- [Williams v. Fears, 179 U.S. 270, 274, 21 S.Ct. 128, 45 L.Ed. 186. “Our nation has thrived on the principle that, outside areas of plainly harmful conduct, every American is left to shape his own life as he thinks best, do what he pleases, go where he pleases.” Id., at 197.]

- [Kent vs. Dulles see Vestal, Freedom of Movement, 41 Iowa L.Rev. 6, 13—14. “The validity of restrictions on the freedom of movement of particular individuals, both substantively and procedurally, is precisely the sort of matter that is the peculiar domain of the courts.” Comment, 61 Yale L.J. at page 187. “a person detained for an investigatory stop can be questioned but is “not obliged to answer, answers may not be compelled, and refusal to answer furnishes no basis for an arrest.”Justice White, Hiibel “Automobiles have the right to use the highways of the State on an equal footing with other vehicles.”]
- [Cumberland Telephone. & Telegraph Co. v Yeiser 141 Kentucky 15. “Each citizen has the absolute right to choose for himself the mode of conveyance he desires, whether it be by wagon or carriage, by horse, motor or electric car, or by bicycle, or astride of a horse, subject to the sole condition that he will observe all those requirements that are known as the law of the road.”]
- [Swift v City of Topeka, 43 U.S. Supreme Court says No License Necessary To Drive Automobile On Public Highways/Streets No License Is Necessary Copy and Share Freely YHVH.name 4 Kansas 671, 674. The Supreme Court said in U.S. v Mersky (1960) 361 U.S. 431: An administrative regulation, of course, is not a “statute.” A traveler on foot has the same right to use of the public highway as an automobile or any other vehicle.]
- [Cecchi v. Lindsay, 75 Atl. 376, 377, 1 Boyce (Del.) 185. Automotive vehicles are lawful means of conveyance and have equal rights upon the streets with horses and carriages.]
- [Chicago Coach Co. v. City of Chicago, 337 Ill. 200, 205; See also: Christy v. Elliot, 216 Ill. 31; Ward v. Meredith, 202 Ill. 66; Shinkle v. McCullough, 116 Ky. 960; Butler v. Cabe, 116 Ark. 26, 28-29. ...automobiles are lawful vehicles and have equal rights on the highways with horses and carriages. Daily v. Maxwell, 133 S.W. 351, 354.]
- [Matson v. Dawson, 178 N.W. 2d 588, 591. A farmer has the same right to the use of the highways of the state, whether on foot or in a motor vehicle, as any other citizen.]
- [Driffin v. Massey, 92 S.E.2d 38, 42. Persons may lawfully ride in automobiles, as they may lawfully ride on bicycles. Doherty v. Ayer, 83 N.E. 677, 197 Mass. 241, 246.]
- [Molway v. City of Chicago, 88 N.E. 485, 486, 239 Ill. 486; Smiley v. East St. Louis Ry. Co., 100 N.E. 157, 158. “A soldier’s personal automobile is part of his ‘household goods[.]’]
- [U.S. v Bomar, C.A.5(Tex.), 8 F.3d 226, 235” 19A Words and Phrases – Permanent Edition (West) pocket part 94. “[I]t is a jury question whether ... an automobile ... is a motor vehicle[.]”]
- [United States v Johnson, 718 F.2d 1317, 1324 (5th Cir. 1983). Other right to use an automobile case: -WARDS VS. CALIFORNIA, 314 U.S. 160 –TWINING VS NEW JERSEY, 211 U.S. 78 – WILLIAMS VS. FEARS, 179 U.S. 270, AT 274 – CRANDALL VS. NEVADA, 6 WALL. 35, AT 43-44 – THE PASSENGER CASES, 7 HOWARD 287, AT 492 – U.S. VS. GUEST, 383 U.S. 745, AT 757-758 (1966) – GRIFFIN VS. BRECKENRIDGE, 403 U.S. 88, AT 105-106 (1971) – CALIFANO VS. TORRES, 435 U.S. 1, AT 4, note 6 –SHAPIRO VS. THOMPSON, 394 U.S. 618 (1969) – CALIFANO VS. AZNAVORIAN, 439 U.S. 170, AT 176 (1978) Look the above citations up in American Jurisprudence. Some citations may be paraphrased.]