
NOTICE OF CLAIM OF RIGHT TO FREE TRAVEL:

NOTE TO ALL PUBLIC SERVANTS:

1) Failure to Disprove the claims (of rights and duties) herein, within the reasonable time limit given, and proper manner[*], amounts to 'tacit consent' by 'acquiescence', by 'failure to deny', according to U.S. and Arizona Civil Court Procedure Rule 8, 'the common law', Court Case Precedents, etc..

[*]= 'proper manner' of response, means an 'Affidavit' which is signed 'under penalty of perjury', reliant ONLY upon FACTS and actual, valid 'Law of the Land', to dispute any claims herein, and 'served' with proof of Receipt (i.e. by Certified or Registered mail, Process Server, etc.). All the same requirements as for THIS 'Notice of Claim'.

2) **All Public Office holders in the United States of America are REQUIRED by 'the supreme Law of the Land' (Art.6) to voluntarily swear an oath (and to sign a contract) 'to support' the Constitution (U.S. first, and then State Constitution(s) 2nd, subordinate to the U.S. Constitution and 'Laws made in Pursuance thereof') but NOT 'any Thing...to the Contrary'!. THEREFORE, ALL U.S. Public Servants are PERSONALLY Liable for even 'neglect to prevent' 'any Thing' they 'reasonably should know' IS 'to the Contrary' to the 'fundamental principles' of 'the supreme Law of the Land' in this document!**

[See US Codes 42-1983 & 1986, and 18-241 & 242, 'deprivation of rights under color of law', 'neglect to prevent', 'conspiracy to...', etc.]

'Sources of Authority' for this 'Notice of Claim'...

1) '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/>

2) 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/>

3) '**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, Sep 11, 1930); <https://casetext.com/case/thompson-v-smith-24>

4) " . . . [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>

5) "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)

6) **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>

BTW, 'Incident' means: "adjective

1. accompanying but not a major part of something.

synonyms: less important, of less importance, secondary, subsidiary, subordinate, ancillary, auxiliary;...

2. liable to happen as a consequence of (an activity)."; <http://googledictionary.freecollocation.com/meaning?word=incidental>

"This Constitution, and the Laws... made in Pursuance thereof... shall be the supreme Law of the Land; and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby, any Thing... to the Contrary notwithstanding. ...Senators and Representatives... 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...and...

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." -Article 6 & Amendment 14; <https://constitutionus.com/> ;

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

IN CONCLUSION: ANY PUBLIC SERVANT RECEIVING THIS NOTICE IS PERSONALLY LIABLE IF THEY 'MAKE OR ENFORCE' OR EVEN 'NEGLECT TO PREVENT' 'ANY THING' THEY 'REASONABLY SHOULD KNOW' IS 'TO THE CONTRARY' OF THE 'FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES' OF 'THE SUPREME LAW OF THE LAND' HEREIN!

IF SERVING NOTICE TO PUBLIC SERVANTS: Identify all public servants receiving this notice of claim, and whomever you require they forward this notice to, such as the top 'Executive Officer' of the State and City (or Cities) wherein you reside and travel through, and their subordinate Officers, such as:

State Governor (& their Legal Advisers), and City Mayor (& their Legal Advisers), State and City Lead Prosecutors and Police Chiefs, County Sheriff(s) (& their Legal Advisers), and all of their subordinate officers (& their Legal Advisers) who are in any way responsible for preventing any 'deprivation of rights under color of law' such as those described herein.

IF BEING PULLED OVER: Below, identify and describe which laws, duties and/or rights were violated, how and by whom. Include any individuals or agencies who may have violated their duty to protect equal human rights, above all, and how they acted 'to the Contrary' of these 'fundamental principles' herein. Include Names, Job Titles, Badge #'s, Time, Location, etc.).

Since it IS IN FACT a 'right' to 'travel' for common personal needs, 'in the conveyance of the day', on public roads, without any 'license', and to require a 'license' would convert a 'right' into a 'privilege', and be 'deprivation of rights under color of law', then the only way to 'infringe' ones 'right to free travel' and to 'privacy' is 'upon probable cause' to accuse them of an actual 'crime' against the equal 'individual rights' of another human being, otherwise even to stop or 'detain' a person is in fact an unlawful 'search [and/or] seizure'!

'regulations' such as 'speed limits' can only be imposed upon those who 'drive' 'people or property for hire' such as those required to have a 'CDL', or upon those committing an actual 'crime' such as 'reckless driving', causing actual or 'probable' harm to other Humans or their equal 'individual rights'!

To punish one of 'We the People' only for disobeying the orders or legislation (opinion or will) of their own hired public servants, is exactly the opposite of the purpose of 'law' and 'government' under the US Constitution! That is 'color of law abuse' and/or 'deprivation of rights under color of law', because 'this Constitution, and Laws made in Pursuance thereof, shall be the supreme Law of the Land, any Thing in the Constitution or Laws of any State to the Contrary notwithstanding', 'An unconstitutional act is not a law... It is in legal contemplation as inoperative as though it had never been passed., and 'No State shall make or enforce' 'any Thing...to the Contrary'!

IN WITNESS, WHEREOF, I solemnly affirm, this instrument is submitted upon good faith effort that is grounded in fact, warranted by existing law for the modification or reversal of existing law and submitted for proper purposes, and not to cause harassment, or unnecessary delay or costs, so help me God.

I hereby declare under penalty of perjury the foregoing statements and claims are true to the best of my knowledge.

_____,
(Signature, Printed Name, Date)

_____,
(State)

_____,
(County)

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: _____