

NOTICE OF CLAIM OF DEPRIVATION OF RIGHTS UNDER COLOR OF LAW,

Regarding: _____

[Write above a brief summary of type of rights violation. Below give full explanation in affidavit]

This Notice is Given to/Served Upon: _____

[Identify individual(s) and/or group(s) receiving this notice, location, date and time]

WARNING: FAILURE TO RESPOND PROPERLY AMOUNTS TO CONSENT/ADMISSION BY 'TACIT CONSENT'.[1]

NOTICE, "the supreme Law of the Land" states: "Every person" who causes any other person "to be subjected ...to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws", "under color of any statute", mandate, etc... "shall be liable to the party injured..."[2]. See "Sources of Authority" at end of Notice.

DECLARATION OF 'FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES' OF 'THE COMMON LAW' AND 'THE SUPREME LAW OF THE LAND':

"We the People" of "the United States of America", "ordain and establish" "the supreme Law of the Land", "in order to... establish Justice... and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity"[3,a], to protect and maintain equal individual Human rights, and "A frequent recurrence to fundamental principles is essential to the security of individual rights, and the perpetuity of free government."[4]

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all [Humans] are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness"[5], to own property[3,b], keep and bear arms[3,c], to free speech[3,d] and free travel[6], to fair exchanges[7], to carry on any common practice[8], and to "due process of law"[3,e] which requires for all "searches and seizures"[3,f] and "In all criminal prosecutions"[3,g] "probable" evidence[3,f] of an actual "crime"[9] against the equal "individual rights" of another Human being (aka 'Corpus Delicti'), caused by "intent or inexcusable neglect" of the accused suspect (aka 'Mens Rea'), and violation of valid[11], criminal, "Law of the Land"(aka 'Actus Reus')[9], and not just failure to "obey" "orders" or "legislation" from our hired Public Servants. Such "colorable laws" are a "deprivation of rights under color of law" which is an actual "crime" to "make or enforce" and a "civil offense" to even "neglect to prevent"[10].

"We the People"[3] also "hold these truths to be self-evident", "That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among [Human Beings], deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, --That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness"[5]; And "that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed."[5]

This means that all "Victimless Crimes" and harmless Civil "Offenses"[3,e,f,9], as well as "taxes" on property ownership (especially land)[3,b], any "fair exchange" such as compensation for labor[7], "licenses" for any "common practice" such as that of law or medicine[8], and to travel on public roads for personal needs "in the conveyances of the day"[6], are all "Contrary" to these "fundamental principles" of "the common law" and "the supreme Law of the Land", and are therefore "deprivation of rights under color of law"[10] for which people are "not entitled to immunity" when they "make or enforce" or even "neglect to prevent" when they "reasonably should know" and can prevent[10], as in after a Notice such as this one.

-[By Harley Davidson Borgais, www.Facebook.com/HarleyBorgais -- KEEP ON PERSON-LEGAL DOCUMENT: To take this away during arrest/jailing/etc. deprives the holder of 'due process', then 'court is deprived of jurisdiction'[Merritt v. Hunter], then to not dismiss 'would be Treason'[Cohens v. Virginia].

See other 'LawDocs' for more. Get a FREE Copy of these 'LawDocs' with Clickable Links @: www.GovernPublicServants.com & www.Facebook.com/GovernPublicServants/ (@Top, 'Pinned Post')]-

DESCRIBE HERE BELOW, how the above named recipient of this notice has violated these "fundamental principles" of "law" and the "individual rights" of this person named in this notice (below, with signature. Be sure to write in all necessary details possible, such as names, dates, locations, facts, evidence, relevant laws and accusations, etc.):

I hereby declare under penalty of perjury the foregoing is true to the best of my knowledge,

[Signature, Printed Name of Claimant, Date Signed]

NOTARY STAMP & SIGNATURE, ACKNOWLEDGMENT:

Subscribed and affirmed to before me, _____, a Notary Public, this _____ day of _____, _____, that the above-named man/woman did appear before me, and proved to be the man/woman executing this document.

_____, Notary Public My commission expires: _____

-[By Harley Davidson Borgais, www.Facebook.com/HarleyBorgais -- KEEP ON PERSON-LEGAL DOCUMENT: To take this away during arrest/jailing/etc. deprives the holder of 'due process', then 'court is deprived of jurisdiction'[Merritt v. Hunter], then to not dismiss 'would be Treason'[Cohens v. Virginia].

See other 'LawDocs' for more. Get a FREE Copy of these 'LawDocs' with Clickable Links @: www.GovernPublicServants.com & www.Facebook.com/GovernPublicServants/ (@Top, 'Pinned Post')]-

"SOURCES OF AUTHORITY":

[1] "Effect of Failing to Deny. An allegation—other than one relating to the amount of damages—is admitted if a responsive pleading is required and the allegation is not denied. If a responsive pleading is not required, an allegation is considered denied or avoided."

https://www.law.cornell.edu/rules/frcp/rule_8

[2] "42 U.S. Code § 1983. Civil action for deprivation of rights

Every person who, under color of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage, of any State or Territory or the District of Columbia, subjects, or causes to be subjected, any citizen of the United States or other person within the jurisdiction thereof to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws, shall be liable to the party injured in an action at law, suit in equity, or other proper proceeding for redress, except that in any action brought against a judicial officer for an act or omission taken in such officer's judicial capacity, injunctive relief shall not be granted unless a declaratory decree was violated or declaratory relief was unavailable. For the purposes of this section, any Act of Congress applicable exclusively to the District of Columbia shall be considered to be a statute of the District of Columbia."

<https://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/42/1983>

[3]= The "Constitution for the United States of America";

[a]= Preamble & Article 6:

"We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

...

Article. VI.

...

This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof; and all Treaties made, or which shall be made, under the Authority of the United States, shall be the supreme Law of the Land; and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby, any Thing in the Constitution or Laws of any State to the Contrary notwithstanding.

The Senators and Representatives before mentioned, and the Members of the several State Legislatures, and all executive and judicial Officers, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by Oath or Affirmation, to support this Constitution; but no religious Test shall ever be required as a Qualification to any Office or public Trust under the United States.

..."

[b]= Right to Own Property: See Amend.5, 14, and related U.S. Supreme Court Decisions.

[c]= Right to keep and bear arms: See Amend.2.

[d]= Right to free speech: See Amend.1, and related U.S. Supreme Court Decisions, includes offensive and insulting speech, right to solicit for donations for ones self;

[e]= Due Process of Law: See Amendments 4-7, esp. 5, 14, and related U.S. Supreme Court Decisions, such as: "The essential elements of due process of law are notice and opportunity to defend"

Simon v. Craft, 182 U.S. 427 (1901), U.S. Supreme Court. <https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/182/427/>

[f]= "probable cause": See Amend.4, and related U.S. Supreme Court Decisions.

[g]= "In all criminal prosecutions": See Amend.6.

"...

Amendment I

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

Amendment II

A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed.

...

Amendment IV

The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no Warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by Oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.

Amendment V

No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a Grand Jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the Militia, when in actual service in time of War or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offence to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.

Amendment VI

In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the Assistance of Counsel for his defence.

Amendment VII

In Suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed twenty dollars, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved, and no fact tried by a jury, shall be otherwise re-examined in any Court of the United States, than according to the rules of the common law.

...

AMENDMENT XIV

Passed by Congress June 13, 1866. Ratified July 9, 1868.

Note: Article I, section 2, of the Constitution was modified by section 2 of the 14th amendment.

Section 1.

All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; 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.

..."

U.S. Constitution:

<https://www.archives.gov/founding-docs/constitution-transcript>

<https://www.archives.gov/founding-docs/bill-of-rights-transcript>

<https://www.archives.gov/founding-docs/amendments-11-27>

<https://www.archives.gov/founding-docs/constitution>

<https://www.archives.gov/files/founding-docs/>

https://www.archives.gov/files/founding-docs/constitution_1_of_4_630.jpg

<https://usconstitution.net/const.html>

[4]="Arizona Constitution ...

ARTICLE II. DECLARATION OF RIGHTS

1. Fundamental principles; recurrence to

Section 1. A frequent recurrence to fundamental principles is essential to the security of individual rights and the perpetuity of free government.

2. Political power; purpose of government

Section 2. All political power is inherent in the people, and governments derive their just powers from the consent of the

governed, and are established to protect and maintain individual rights.

..."

https://www.azleg.gov/const/arizona_constitution.pdf

Also see: ARS 38-231. Officers and employees required to take loyalty oath; form; classification; definition.

<https://www.azleg.gov/ars/38/00231.htm>

[5]=From the Declaration of Independence.:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.--That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, --That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness. Prudence, indeed, will dictate that Governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes; and accordingly all experience hath shewn, that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed. But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same Object evinces a design to reduce them under absolute Despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such Government, and to provide new Guards for their future security.--Such has been the patient sufferance of these Colonies; and such is now the necessity which constrains them to alter their former Systems of Government. The history of the present King of Great Britain is a history of repeated injuries and usurpations, all having in direct object the establishment of an absolute Tyranny over these States. To prove this, let Facts be submitted to a candid world.

..."

Declaration of Independence:

<https://www.archives.gov/founding-docs/declaration>

<https://www.archives.gov/founding-docs/declaration-transcript>

[6]= Free Travel:

[a]= 'Held... The right to travel is a part of the "liberty" of which a citizen cannot be deprived without due process of law under the Fifth Amendment. ...emerging at least as early as early as the Magna Carta.' (Kent v. Dulles, 357 U.S. 116, 1958, U.S. Supreme Court!); <https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/357/116/>

[b]= Such "A law... is unconstitutional, and a person faced with such a law may ignore it and exercise his First Amendment rights." (Shuttlesworth v. City of Birmingham, 394 U.S. 147, 1969);

<https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/394/147/>

[c]= 'The right of a citizen to travel upon the public highways... is a common right...to use the ordinary and usual conveyances of the day...to operate an automobile thereon... It is not a mere privilege, like... moving a house... or transporting persons or property for hire along the street, which a city may permit or prohibit at will.' (THOMPSON v. SMITH, Supreme Court of Virginia, Sept. 11, 1930); <https://casetext.com/case/thompson-v-smith-24>

[d]= ". . . [T]he right finds no explicit mention in the Constitution.... freedom to travel throughout the United States has long been recognized as a basic right under the Constitution." (Shapiro v. Thompson, 394 U.S. 618, 1969);

<https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/394/618/>; Other source online:

<http://courts.mrsc.org/washreports/098WashReport/098WashReport0657.htm>

[e]= "These cases, though involving regulatory statutes or ordinances, all recognize and are based upon the fundamental ground that the sovereign state has plenary control of the streets and highways, and, in the exercise of its police power, may absolutely prohibit the use of the streets as a place for the prosecution of a private business for gain. They all recognise the fundamental distinction between

the ordinary right of a citizen to use the streets in the usual way and the use of the streets as a place of business or main instrumentality of a business for private gain. The former is a common right, the latter an extraordinary use. ... Since the use of the streets by a common carrier in the prosecution of its business as such is not a right, but a mere license or privilege, it follows that the Legislature may prohibit such use entirely without impinging any provision either of the state or federal Constitution. "; Hadfield vs. Lundin, 98 Wash 657, 168 P. 516 (Washington Supreme Ct, Nov. 8, 1917).

<https://tinyurl.com/y46qe7ck> (Shortened link to LexisNexis pg);

<http://courts.mrsc.org/washreports/098WashReport/098WashReport0657.htm> ;

<https://www.facebook.com/groups/Freeornottobe.info/permalink/1656372481294875/> (FB pg where I saved links to

this case)

[f]= All persons, in the absence of legislative edict, are vested with the right to the use of the streets and highways for travel from one place to another in connection with their business when such use is incidental to that business. This is an ordinary use of the streets and highways and is frequently characterized as an inherent or natural right. No person has an inherent or natural right, however, to make the streets or highways his place of business. Such a use is generally characterized as an extraordinary use. (Green v. City of San Antonio, 178 S.W. (Tex.) 6; Hadfield v. [Lundin],98 Wn. 657; LeBlanc v. City of New Orleans, 138 La. 243; Ex parte Dickey, 85 S.E. (W.Va.) 781; Desser v. City of Wichita, 96 Kan. 820; Melconian v. City of Grand Rapids,218 Mich. 397.) The use of the streets for purely private gain may not be given, even by legislative authority, unless there be also in such use a public service."

Supreme Court of Illinois.-337 Ill. 200 (Ill. 1929) CHICAGO COACH CO. V. CITY OF CHICAGO;

<https://casetext.com/case/chicago-coach-co-v-city-of-chicago>

[7]= Fair Exchanges: See relevant Court Cases, "precedents", "doctrine", "the common law", validity of "Income Tax" amendment and definition of "Income" -"profits or gains", not "fair exchange" which is a "right" thus unlawful to "tax" or "license";

[8]= Common Practices: An inherent natural "right" thus unlawful to "tax" or "license";

[9]= Three Elements to a 'Crime': Actual or "probable" harm or threat of harm to another Humans equal individual rights, caused by intent or inexcusable neglect, and in violation of valid criminal "Law of the Land";

[a]= "The "case or controversy" requirement of Art. III of the Constitution defines with respect to the Judicial Branch the idea of separation of powers on which the Federal Government is founded, and the Art. III doctrine of "standing" has a core constitutional component that a plaintiff must allege personal injury fairly traceable to the defendant's allegedly unlawful conduct and likely to be redressed by the requested relief." Allen v. Wright, 468 U.S. 737 (1984), U.S. Supreme Court. [www.supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/468/737/case.html] ;

[b]= 'Body of Evidence' of a 'Crime'... "Corpus delicti consists of a showing of 1) the occurrence of the specific kind of injury and 2) someone's criminal act as the cause of the injury." Johnson v. State, 653 N.E.2d 478, 479 (1995), Supreme Court of Indiana. [www.leagle.com/decision/19951131653NE2d478_11117.xml]/JOHNSON%20v.%20STATE] ;

[c]= "the State must produce corroborating evidence of "corpus delicti," showing that injury or harm constituting crime occurred and that injury or harm was caused by someone's criminal activity." Jorgensen v. State, 567 N.E.2d 113, 121 (1991), Court of Appeals of Indiana, 4th District. [www.leagle.com/decision/1991680567NE2d113_1672.xml]/JORGENSEN %20v.%20STATE] ;

[d]= "To establish the corpus delicti, independent evidence must be presented showing the occurrence of a specific kind of injury and that a criminal act was the cause of the injury." Porter v. State, 391 N.E.2d 801, 808-809 (1979), Supreme Court of Indiana. [www.leagle.com/decision/19791192391NE2d801_11166.xml]/PORTER%20v.%20STATE] ;

[e]= "the duty of this Court, as of every judicial tribunal, is limited to determining rights of persons or of property, which are actually controverted in the particular case before it." Tyler v. Judges of Court of Registration, 179 U.S. 405 (1900), and California v. San Pablo & Tulare R. Co., 149 U.S. 308 (1893), U.S. Supreme Court. [

www.supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/179/405/case.html ;

www.supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/149/308/case.html]

[10]= Deprivation of Rights Under Color of Law:

18 U.S. Code § 241 - Conspiracy against rights, <https://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/18/241>;

18 U.S. Code § 242 - Deprivation of rights under color of law, <https://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/18/242>;

U.S. Code Title 42. THE PUBLIC HEALTH AND WELFARE Chapter 21. CIVIL RIGHTS

<https://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/42/chapter-21/subchapter-I>

42 U.S. Code § 1983 - Civil action for deprivation of rights, <https://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/42/1983>;

42 U.S. Code § 1985 - Conspiracy to interfere with civil rights, <https://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/42/1985>;

42 U.S. Code § 1986 - Action for neglect to prevent, <https://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/42/1986>;

42 U.S. Code § 1988 - Proceedings in vindication of civil rights, <https://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/42/1988>;

"An unconstitutional act is not a law; it confers no rights; it imposes no duties; it affords no protection; it creates no office; it is in legal contemplation as inoperative as though it had never been passed."

Norton v. Shelby County, 118 U.S. 425 (1886), U.S. Supreme Court.

<https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/118/425/>

1964 Civil Rights Act Transcript - <https://www.ourdocuments.gov/doc.php?flash=false&doc=97&page=transcript>

[11]= "Valid" "Law of the Land", "Void for vagueness doctrine", U.S. Supreme Court: Any Legislation or Order people of avg. intelligence cannot comprehend for themselves, what it requires or prohibits of them, violates the essential elements of due process of law[a] which are notice and opportunity to defend ones-self, and is therefore "Void for Vagueness", not enforceable; The U.S. Constitution and only those "Laws made in Pursuance thereof" but not "any Thing... to the Contrary" "shall be the supreme Law of the Land", and "No State shall make or enforce... any Thing... to the Contrary"; "An unconstitutional act is not a law... It is in legal contemplation as inoperative as though it had never been passed." US.Const., U.S.Supreme Court;

[a]= Simon v. Craft, 182 U.S. 427 (1901), U.S. Supreme Court: "The essential elements of due process of law are notice and opportunity to defend". <https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/182/427/>;

Norton v. Shelby County, 118 U.S. 425 (1886), U.S. Supreme Court: "An unconstitutional act is not a law; it confers no rights; it imposes no duties; it affords no protection; it creates no office; it is in legal contemplation as inoperative as though it had never been passed."

<https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/118/425/>;

U.S. Constitution:

<https://www.archives.gov/files/founding-docs/>

https://www.archives.gov/files/founding-docs/constitution_1_of_4_630.jpg

<https://usconstitution.net/const.html>

Declaration of Independence:

<https://www.archives.gov/founding-docs/declaration>

<https://www.archives.gov/founding-docs/declaration-transcript>

AND SOME OTHER RELEVANT US CODES/LAWS/DEFINITIONS:

Need to add three elements to a crime/ corpus delicti cases, right to free travel cases, also no income tax cases, right to solicit for donations (az v boehler, etc.), 'void for vagueness doctrine' cases....what else?????

Also I think I/We will need some definitions of some words I've been hearing in recent discussions about this stuff....

"Section 1. A frequent recurrence to fundamental principles is essential to the security of individual rights and the perpetuity of free government." Arizona State Constitution, Article 2, Section 1, Fundamental principles; recurrence to. <https://www.azleg.gov/constitution/?article=2>

ARS 38-231. Officers and employees required to take loyalty oath; form; classification; definition.

<https://www.azleg.gov/ars/38/00231.htm>

BARRATRY | Definition of BARRATRY by Oxford Dictionary

noun · 1 archaic Fraud or gross negligence of a ship's master or crew at the expense of its owners or users. · 2 Law · 3 historical Trade in the sale of Church or state ...

<https://www.lexico.com/en/definition/barratry>

barratry - definition and meaning

barratry: The act or practice of bringing a groundless lawsuit or lawsuits.

<https://www.wordnik.com/words/barratry>

...

Peonage | servitude | Britannica

Peonage, form of involuntary servitude,

<https://www.britannica.com/topic/peonage>

"REMEDY", "FEE SCHEDULE":

COST FOR TIME DETAINED UNLAWFULLY: \$1,000 per minute of unlawful detainment, from a 1984 court case where a lawyer was awarded \$25,000 for 23 minutes of unlawful detention:

<https://casetext.com/case/trezevant-v-city-of-tampa>

<https://law.resource.org/pub/us/case/reporter/F2/741/741.F2d.336.83-3038.83-3370.html>

<https://freedom-school.com/case-741-f2d-336-trezevant-v-city-of-tampa.pdf>

COST PER RIGHT VIOLATED: I once saw a limit of \$10,000 per right violated on one of the US Codes below, but that was changed years ago so there is no limit now, so I was planning to use that # as a "precedent" when making my claims. This looks useful here:

"A Primer on the Law of Attorney's Fees

Under § 1988

...The plaintiff (Blanchard) recovered compensatory and punitive damages totaling \$10,000 on his § 1983 claim. The district court awarded \$7,500 in attorney's fees and \$886.92 for costs and expenses under § 1988. ..."

[https://www.prisonlegalnews.org/media/publications/A%20Primer%20on%20the%20Law%20of%20Attorneys%20Fees%2C%20Urban%20Lawyer%20\(Brown\)%2C%202005.pdf](https://www.prisonlegalnews.org/media/publications/A%20Primer%20on%20the%20Law%20of%20Attorneys%20Fees%2C%20Urban%20Lawyer%20(Brown)%2C%202005.pdf)

42 U.S. Code § 1988 - Proceedings in vindication of civil rights

<https://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/42/1988>

ATTORNEYS FEES, COST PER HOUR WHEN 'REPRESENTING' SELF OR HIRING 'REPRESENTATION'/'ATTORNEY'/'LAWYER'

(\$300-\$400/hr+): "On average, hiring a lawyer costs approximately \$243 an hour. However, some clients might pay less than \$100 an hour or as high as roughly \$300 to \$450 an hour. ..."

<https://www.thumbtack.com/p/attorney-feeshttps://thervo.com/costs/attorney-fees>

AND FOR "PUNITIVE DAMAGES": IT SHOULD BE ENOUGH TO MAKE IT TOO EXPENSIVE FOR THE GOVT. AGENT/AGENCY OR INDIVIDUAL (OR OTHER GROUP) TO REPEAT THE OFFENSE/RIGHTS VIOLATION, SUCH AS A PERCENTAGE OF THE ANNUAL BUDGET OR TOTAL ASSETS, maybe 1% of the annual budget of the City of Tempe in one of my cases I'm preparing, after I look at the info....

<https://www.tempe.gov/home/showdocument?id=644>

<https://www.tempe.gov/government/sustainable-tempe/annual-report>

<https://www.tempe.gov/government/city-manager-s-office/budget>

<https://www.tempe.gov/government/city-manager-s-office/budget/operating-and-capital-budget-planning>

<https://www.tempe.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/15042/637510723379470000>

<https://www.tempe.gov/government/internal-services/finance/open-book>

<https://www.tempe.gov/government/internal-services/finance/accounting>

<https://www.tempe.gov/government/city-manager-s-office/budget/budget-related-reports>

-[By Harley Davidson Borgais, www.Facebook.com/HarleyBorgais -- KEEP ON PERSON-LEGAL DOCUMENT: To take this away during arrest/jailing/etc. deprives the holder of 'due process', then 'court is deprived of jurisdiction'[Merritt v. Hunter], then to not dismiss 'would be Treason'[Cohens v. Virginia].

See other 'LawDocs' for more. Get a FREE Copy of these 'LawDocs' with Clickable Links @: www.GovernPublicServants.com & www.Facebook.com/GovernPublicServants/ (@Top, 'Pinned Post')]-
