542687155

FOR ADMINISTRATIVE USE ONLY
NOTICE UNDER DOCTRINE OF MERGER
United States Postal Service Registered Mail Bond No.
2310 0740 0000 2205 8323

Notice as to Declared intent or purpose of this tender of payment as a Special Deposit order of the Payor and Beneficiary and is to be credited to depositor's account as accord and satisfaction and payment in full and a discharge of any and all outstanding liabilities.

Patricia Ann Burkett

burkett, patricia ann
as donor, grantor, settlor
dba: PATRICIA ANN BURKETT
USPS Registered Bond No. **2310 0740 0000 2205 8323**

****

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF NOTARY

A notary public or other officer completing this certificate verifies only the identity of the individual who signed the document, to which this certificate is attached, and not the truthfulness, accuracy, or validity of that document.

On the 30th day of December 2016, before me Johnny Hakim Notary Public, personally stood burkett, patricia ann, who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence of identification, to be the natural person, living woman whose name is subscribed within instrument and acknowledged to me that she executed the same in her authorized capacity; and that by her signature on the instrument the person, or entity upon behalf of which the person acted, executed the instrument.

Witnessed by my hand and official seal,

Signature _____

My Commission Expires: July 06, 2020

OFFICIAL STAMP
JOHNNY HAKIM
NOTARY PUBLIC - OREGON
COMMISSION NO. 951919
MY COMMISSION EXPIRES JULY 06, 2020

This instrument created and prepared by:

Patricia Ann Burkett

burkett, patricia ann
as donor, grantor, settlor
dba: PATRICIA ANN BURKETT

542687155
01/09/17

542687155

542687155
01/09/17

Recording and Confirmation by and when completed return to:

patricia-ann: family of burkett, sui juris.

care of: 715 northwest hoyt street – unit 3442.

Portland, Oregon Republic. [97208]

Non-Domestic without the U.S.

i do Hereby Acknowledge and accept the oaths of office of all officers of the court,

and the UNITED STATES/United States/united states in full accord;

An Affidavit of LIMITED AND DURABLE POWER OF ATTORNEY GENERAL

WITH CERTIFICATES AND OTHER EQUITABLE TITLES ATTACHED HERETO

IT SHALL BE KNOWN TO ALL MEN/WOMEN, men/women, and or man/woman, MAN/WOMAN BY THESE PRESENTS:

burkett, patricia ann the sole owner of the **BURKETT, PATRICIA ANN** ESTATE to include any and all derivatives and or assumed names, marks, codes and or presumptions, herein reference to as PRINCIPAL, in the County of **Multnomah**, do appoint the PRINCIPAL, stands as a non-adverse, non-belligerent, and non-combatant party, and as true and lawful ATTORNEY GENERAL-in-fact. **i burkett, patricia ann as an native American disavow and reject any and all rights associated with the 14th Amendment Section 1; of the United States of America Constitution!**

Any and all powers of ATTORNEY GENERAL NON-ADVERSE, NON-BELLIGERENT, NON-COMBATANT PARTY does supersede former Attorney-in-Fact powers, and furthermore current Powers cures all previous signatures given by principal, as i revoke as well as rescind via disaffirmance any and all previous contracts and or Powers of Attorneys entered into during infancy. i **burkett, patricia ann** am the principal having attained the age of the Majority, acknowledging and accepting the certificate of title of Live Birth being the sole owner of the Instrument and the Holder in Due Course, do hereby exercise the RIGHT OF DISAFFIRMANCE.

542687155

Patricia Bennett

542687155

01/09/17

542687155

NOTICE OF LACK OF JURISDICTION
PRESENTATION

i **burkett, patricia ann** am not a UNITED STATES CITIZEN as defined in statute, i **burkett, patricia ann** am not a REGISTERED AND OR UNREGISTERED AND OR LICENSED AND OR UNLICENSED OWNER, DRIVER, PERSON as defined in statute. i **burkett, patricia ann** am not a SOVEREIGN AMERICAN CITIZEN as defined by statute. i **burkett, patricia ann** am a **woman** as defined by law, a non-tax payor as defined by statute, an native american. i **burkett, patricia ann** forever void and cancel-out any and all contracts with the quasi-governmental agencies as i **burkett, patricia ann** am not a DRIVER, nor a MOTOR VEHICLE OWNER, i **burkett, patricia ann** do not engage in COMMERCIAL BUSINESS ACTIVITIES, i **burkett, patricia ann** am a private citizen, and conduct all business and affairs in the private. i **burkett, patricia ann** am not a MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC, nor am i **burkett, patricia ann** an INSTRUMENTATALITY OF CONGRESS/THE LEGISLATURE!

18 U.S.C.S. § 31
(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 in the transportation of passengers, passengers and property, or property or cargo.
(10) Used for commercial purposes. —
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.
"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?1;
Ligare vs. Chicago, 28 NE 934;
Boon vs. Clark, 214 SSW 607;
25 Am.Jur. (1st) Highways Sect.163
and ...
"The Right of the Citizen to travel upon the public highways and to transport his property thereon, either by horse drawn carriage or by automobile, is not a mere privilege which a city can prohibit or permit at will, but a common Right which he has under the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."
Thompson vs. Smith, 154 SE 579
"... For while a Citizen has the Right to travel upon the public highways and to transport his property thereon, that Right does not extend to the use of the highways, either in whole or in part, as a place for private gain. For the latter purpose, no person has a vested right to use the highways of the state, but is a privilege or a license which the legislature may grant or withhold at its discretion."
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
"Heretofore the court has held, and we think correctly, that while a Citizen has the Right to travel upon the public highways and to transport his property thereon, that Right does not extend to the use of the highways, either in whole or in part, as a place of business for private gain."
Willis vs. Buck, 263 P. l 982;
Barney vs. Board of Railroad Commissioners, 17 P.2d 82

542687155

542687155

Patrick 01/09/17

1. That i am the Grantor, Settlor, Creator of the Trust (see: Trust Instrument; C.J.S. 90 § Trusts). 542687155
2. That my intentions as Creator is controlling, as my intent is "Law of the Trust" (C.J.S. 90 § 173 "Purpose of the Trust;" also 162, "Intention of Creator or Settlor").
3. That my mortgage is a "Real Estate Mortgage Investment Conduits" or REMIC" (see: 26 U.S.C. § 860). That the right of election has been confirmed (ibid) as defined by statute.
4. That i am also an adverse party as defined by Statute (26 U.S.C. § 672).
5. That as Grantor, Settlor, or Creator of the REMIC/Trust i am to be treated as a substantial "OWNER," (see: U.S.C. Title 26 § Subpart E), as defined by statute.
6. That the Trust associated with the REMIC is subject to taxation (see: Subpart IV of 26 U.S.C. § 860).
7. That as Grantor i have the power to control beneficial enjoyment (see: 26 U.S.C. § 674).
8. That as Grantor i elect to exercise Administrative Powers generally, without anyone's approval or consent (see: 26 U.S.C. § 675).
9. That the Trust/REMIC is revocable (see: U.S.C. 676).
10. That i have just become cognizant of my investment security, as the Trustee failed to give notice, and or accurate accounting (see: C.J.S. Book 90 § Trusts).
11. That the trustee has conspired with several agents to keep the disclosure of the investment conduit or REMIC shielded from my awareness, thereby causing or creating a breach of trust.
12. That i need to produce at my election, my promissory note, the associated deed of trust, alleged mortgage statements, and my corporation/Entity Employer Identification number, of which i stand ready to do.
13. That the Form 56 is notice of Trustee, fiduciary relationship, making the financial institution Trustee/fiduciary, and no longer beneficiary.
14. That i do hereby elect to assign beneficiary interest to myself, effective immediately.
15. That my attaching the 1099-A & 1099-MISC (IRS forms) to help with the processing of my statutory claim.
16. That a court of equity has jurisdiction of all questions related to Trusts (see: C.J.S. 90 § 454).
17. That i created the Trust – REMIC so as to benefit from its use as a Mortgage Backed Security (MBS).
18. That as Grantor, i am due the interest payments that derive from security investments (see: 26 U.S.C. § 675, 676 & 677 amongst others).
19. That i have the right, while acting in good faith, and clean hands to file my claim with the IRS via 1099-A and 1099-MISC.
20. That upon submittal of my claim i may reserve my rights, exercise my election, operate under corporate entity, similar to the described in 31 C.F.R. § .6, .10, .20, .22, .27, opting in or opting out as my right of election.
21. i have the right to give "NOTICE" (as is the case at present). That disclaim in the following fashion; i, **burkett, patricia ann,** ***do hereby acknowledge and declare, that these points are made with the actual belief, recollection, and knowledge as at this particular moment in time; with respects my awareness of my Trust property, my role as Owner and standard practices, that i am entitled to the beneficial interests made as a direct result of my investment, and to utilize such for my Corporate status (see: "The Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act of 1933," which clearly brings to light that i may act in several capacities, that of Entity, Instrumentality, Persona Ficto, Proper Persona, . . .) benefit.***

i am not the ESTATE but the sole owner and beneficiary of and over the ESTATE! This is MY MAXIM and it is irrevocable!

In the principal's name, and for the principal's use and benefit, said ATTORNEY GENERAL-in-fact has full and complete authorization for the facilitation by the conveyance through any communications in translation for assimilation in account science correction techniques in all facets of interstate, intrastate, domestic, and foreign commerce relations with full protection of Safe Harbour/HABOR and Sinking Funds Provisions for all accounts, proceeds, products, fixtures, and services such as:

(1) Sell, exchange, buy, invest, and / or reinvest any assets and / or property whether by possession and / or ownership, which may have income production or non-income production assets and property.

(2) In Special Deposit open, maintain, and / or close bank accounts: with express provisions for; demand deposit (checks, custodial, money orders, bills of exchange, draft's, et cetera...) accounts, term deposit (savings) accounts, and certificates of deposit, brokerage accounts, and other similar accounts with depository and repository and financial institutions in line with U.N.I.C.I.T.R.A.L. ***United Nations Commission on International Trade Law***.

542687155

542687155

01/09/17

Patrick

(a) Conduct any business with any depository institution, any repository institution, and all financial institution service providers in particular; all issue agents, all transfer agents, and all payout agents with respect to any of principal's accounts. With express provisions for creation of deposits and withdrawals, acquisition and procurement for all bank statements, passbooks, drafts, money orders, warrants, certificates, stocks, shares, bonds, mortgages, encumbrances, liens, financial obligations, promissory notes, bills of exchange, assigns, hardship claims, abandonment claims, salvage claims, quitclaims, and vouchers; either assignable to, assignable to the order of, payable to, pay to, pay to the order of, or payable to the order of, for the principal by any legal person, body corporate, body politic, body ecclesiastical, and any corporation sole..

(b) Perform any act necessary to deposit, negotiate, sell, transfer, or exchange any legal and / or lawful obligation in the style of a note, security, bond, stock, share, of the Treasury of the United States of America, and all Treasuries of every United Nations Member States and all Foreign Governments and their political subdivisions.

(c) Have access to any safe deposit box whether in possession and / or by ownership with the express provision for the contents.

(3) Take any and all legal/lawful steps necessary to collect any amount or debt due and/or past due, and/or to settle any claim, whether made against or from affirmation on behalf of principal against any other person or entity.

(4) Exercise all stock rights as proxy, with this express provisions for all rights, privileges, and powers with respect to stocks, bonds, debentures, and / or other investments.

(5) Maintain and/or operate any business, personal property, and ownership interests of, with, for, and by principal.

(6) Purchase and / or maintain insurance, re-insurance, and / or bond rights herein.

(7) Enter into legal and lawful bound contracts on behalf of principal.

(8) Employ professional and business assistance as may be appropriate.

(9) Sell, convey, lease, mortgage, manage, insure, improve, repair, or perform any other act with respect to any of principal's property whether as current ownership, possession holder, and / or as potential acquisition and procurements of ownership and / or possession placement, with the express provision for real estate, real estate rights, privileges, powers, without limit to the right to remove tenants and/or to recover possession and settlement. This express provision without limit is also for the right to sell and / or to encumber any current homestead possession and / or ownership and / or potential possession and / or ownership.

(10) Transfer any of principal's assets to the trustee of any style of c'est qui trust and / or foreign situs trust; whether it be deed of trust, express trust, irrevocable trust, revocable trust, and/or any other legal and/or lawful creation by principal, whether or not said such trust is in existence at the time of such transfer.

(11) Prepare, sign, and file documents with any governmental body or agency, with the express provision without limit as authorization to implement account science of units of exchange and units of account for all depository and repository events:

(a) Prepare, sign and file income and other tax returns with federal, state, local, and other governmental bodies.

(b) Obtain information and / or documents from any government and / or its agencies; and negotiate, compromise, and / or settle any matter with such government and / or agency for any/all lawful tax matters.

542687155

542687155
01/09/17

542687155

(c) Prepare applications, provide information, and perform any other act which is a reasonable request by any government and / or its agencies whom have either a sworn oath, sworn affirmation, sworn affidavit of appointment, and public bond, lawful insurance provider, and lawful re-insurance provider in connection with governmental benefits with the express provision for military benefits, social security benefits, health benefits.

(12) Make gifts from assets to members of family and to such other persons and / or charitable organizations with whom principal does establish a pattern to provide gifts. However, said ATTORNEY GENERAL NON-ADVERSE, NON-BELLIGERENT, NON-COMBATANT PARTY may not make gifts of principal's property to the said ATTORNEY GENERAL NON-ADVERSE, NON-BELLIGERENT, NON-COMBATANT PARTY. The Principal hereby appoints **burkett, patricia ann**, a non-adverse, non-belligerent, and non-combatant party; of Multnomah, Country of United States of America as substitute Authorization Representative and for the sole purpose to provide gifts of property to said ATTORNEY GENERAL NON-ADVERSE, NON-BELLIGERENT, NON-COMBATANT PARTY, as the event does deem to be appropriate.

(13) Disclaim any interest that might otherwise be a transfer or distribution to principal from any other person, estate, trust, and / or other entity, as may be appropriate.

Said ATTORNEY GENERAL-in-fact shall not be liable for any loss that results from a judgment error that was made in good faith. Wherein, said ATTORNEY GENERAL NON-ADVERSE, NON-BELLIGERENT, NON-COMBATANT PARTY is given grant for a HOLD HARMLESS and FULL INDEMNITY stance in law, in good faith performance of duty as active action through the authority of this Power of ATTORNEY GENERAL NON-ADVERSE, NON-BELLIGERENT, NON-COMBATANT PARTY.

Principal authorizes said ATTORNEY GENERAL NON-ADVERSE, NON-BELLIGERENT, NON-COMBATANT PARTY to further indemnify and hold harmless any third party who accepts and acts under good faith to uphold this document.

Herein given through gift and by grant to said ATTORNEY GENERAL NON-ADVERSE, NON-BELLIGERENT, NON-COMBATANT PARTY full power and authority to do all and every act and thing whatsoever requisite and necessary to be done relative to any of the current events and their continuation as fully to all intents and purposes as principal might or could do if personally present. i disavow any and all contracts made during infancy, as i am the owner of the birth certificate **#136** 52-027991 registered with the county of **Multnomah** on **September, 10, 1952**.

REGISTRATION FOR MEMORIAL AN
AFFIDAVIT BY THE OWNER OF CERTIFICATE OF LIVE BIRTH As per statute the following is being placed on the public record:

Birth Certificates: **The Registrar of Titles is authorized to receive for registration of memorials upon any outstanding certificate of title an official birth certificate pertaining to a registered owner named in said certificate of title showing the date of birth of said registered owner, providing there is attached to said birth certificate an affidavit of an affiant who states that he/she is familiar with the facts recited, stating that the party named in said birth certificate is the same party as one of the owners named in said certificate of title; and that thereafter the Registrar of Titles shall treat said registered owner as having attained the age of the majority at a date 18 years after the date of birth shown by said certificate.**

i **burkett, patricia ann** place on the record before this body my certificate of live birth, for registration and to serve as a memorial for and to all future generations. i am the official registered owner of the certificate of live birth attached hereto;

542687155

542687155

01/09/2017

542687155

As the affiant i **burkett, patricia ann** state that not only am i familiar with the facts as stated in the certificate;

1. That i was born on Saturday, September 6, 1952 at 11:39pm;
2. That my family followed a long tradition of naming a child on the day of child's birth;
3. That i was born in Theodore B. Wilcox Memorial Obstetrics Hospital and, that i, located at 1015 NW 22nd Ave Portland, Multnomah county of the state of Oregon.
4. That my mother's maiden name is searle, maxine louise;
5. My father's name is burkett, john calvus;
6. My mother was born in Iowa and my father was born in Tennessee;
7. The birth certificate was created a few days after the birth event on Wednesday, September 10, 1952, signed by my father, the treating Physician, and the local registrar recorded this event on September 25, 1952 as stated in the certificate of live birth;
8. The serial number for the certificate of live birth is **#136** 52-027991 registered with the county of Multnomah;
9. The Social Security numbers associated with this certificate of live birth which is evidence of an estate, are xxx-xx-7155;
10. The employee identification numbers associated with the estate, are as follows: xx-xxx7155;
11. The instrument carries the Great Seal of the State of Oregon, and an official notary stamp of certification as to authenticity of the certificate of live birth;

    a. According to the law of evidence in the United States self-authenticating documents are that which can be admitted into evidence at a trial without proof being submitted to support the claim that the document is what it appears to be. In short, these are documents those which do not require outside evidence of authenticity in order to be admitted in evidence.

    b. GOOD FAITH AND CREDIT CLAUSE: **The Full Faith and Credit Clause—Article IV, Section 1, of the U.S. Constitution—provides that the various states must recognize legislative acts, public records, and judicial decisions of the other states within the United States. It states that "Full Faith and Credit shall be given in each State to the public Acts, Records, and judicial Proceedings of every other State." The statute that implements the clause, 28 U.S.C.A. § 1738, further specifies that "a state's preclusion rules should control matters originally litigated in that state." The Full Faith and Credit Clause ensures that judicial decisions rendered by the courts in one state are recognized and honored in every other state.**

When i married my name changed to laprise and was returned to my maiden name burkett upon dissolution of said marriage.

12. i attest that not only am i familiar with the facts as stated in the certificate of live birth attached hereto, but i am the registered owner of said certificate of title, and the party named in said certificate of live birth, having attained the age of the majority on the 18th anniversary of my birth:

    a. **"... stating that the party named in said birth certificate is the same party as one of the owners named in said certificate of title; and that thereafter the Registrar of Titles shall treat said registered owner as having attained the age of the majority at a date 18 years after the date of birth shown by said certificate."**

Are corporations people? The U.S. Supreme Court says they are, at least for some purposes. And in the past four years, the high court has dramatically expanded corporate rights.

It ruled that corporations have the right to spend money in candidate elections, and that some for-profit corporations may, on religious grounds, refuse to comply with a federal mandate to cover birth control in their employee health plans.

These are personal rights accorded to corporations. To many, the concept of corporations as people seems odd, to say the least. But it is not new.

542687155

542687155
Patricia 01/09/17

The dictionary defines "corporation" as "a number of persons united in one body for a purpose." Corporate entities date back to medieval times, observes Columbia law professor John Coffee, an authority on corporate law. "You could think of the Catholic Church as probably the first entity that could buy and sell property in its own name," he says.

Indeed, having an artificial legal persona was especially important to churches, says Elizabeth Pollman, an associate professor at Loyola Law School in Los Angeles.

"Having a corporation would allow people to put property into a collective ownership that could be held with perpetual existence," she says. "So it wouldn't be tied to any one person's lifespan, or subject necessarily to laws regarding inheriting property."

In the United States and elsewhere, the advantages of incorporation were essential to efficient and secure economic development. Unlike partnerships, the corporation continued to exist even if a partner died; there was no unanimity required to do something; shareholders could not be sued individually, only the corporation as a whole, so investors only risked as much as they put into buying shares.

By the 1800s, the process of incorporating became relatively simple. But corporations aren't mentioned anywhere in the Constitution, leaving the courts to determine what rights corporations have — and which corporations have them. After all, Coca-Cola is a corporation, but so are the NAACP and the National Rifle Association, and so are small churches and local nonprofits.

"All these truly different types of organizations might come under the label 'corporation,' " Pollman observes. "And so the real difficulty is figuring out how to treat these different things under the Constitution."

In the early years of the republic, the only right given to corporations was the right to have their contracts respected by the government, according to legal historian Eben Moglen.

The great industrialization of the United States in the 1800s, however, intensified companies' need to raise money.

"With the invention of the railroad, you needed a great deal of capital to exploit its purpose, " Columbia professor Coffee says, "and only the corporate form offered limited liability, easy transferability of shares, and continued, perpetual existence."

In addition, the end of the Civil War and the adoption of the 14th Amendment provided an opportunity for corporations to seek further legal protection, says Moglen, also a Columbia University professor.

"From the moment the 14th Amendment was passed in 1868, lawyers for corporations — particularly railroad companies — wanted to use that 14th Amendment guarantee of equal protection to make sure that the states didn't unequally treat corporations," Moglen says.

Nobody was talking about extending to corporations the right of free speech back then. What the railroads sought was equal treatment under state tax laws and things like that.

Supreme Court extended that protection to corporations, and over time also extended some — but not all — of the rights guaranteed to individuals in the Bill of Rights. The court ruled that corporations don't have a right against self-incrimination, for instance, but are protected by the ban on warrantless search and seizure.

542687155

542687155

Patricia 01/09/17

Otherwise, as the Cato Institute's Ilya Shapiro puts it, "the police could storm down the doors of some company and take all their computers and their files."

But for 100 years, corporations were not given any constitutional right of political speech; in fact, quite the contrary. In 1907, following a corporate corruption scandal involving prior presidential campaigns, Congress passed a law banning corporate involvement in federal election campaigns. That wall held firm for 70 years.

The first crack came in a case that involved neither candidate elections nor federal law. In 1978 a sharply divided Supreme Court ruled for the first time that corporations have a First Amendment right to spend money on state ballot initiatives.

Still, for decades, candidate elections remained free of direct corporate influence under federal law. Only money from individuals and groups of individuals — political action committees — were permitted in federal elections.

Then came Citizens United, the Supreme Court's 5-4 First Amendment decision in 2010 that extended to corporations for the first-time full rights to spend money as they wish in candidate elections — federal, state and local. The decision reversed a century of legal understanding, unleashed a flood of campaign cash and created a crescendo of controversy that continues to build today.

"There's no reason to believe that the people involved — shareholders, employees, even the directors or managers — have come together for an expressive purpose related to anything other than really what the business is doing," she argues.

And shareholders and employees, Pollman observes, have no real recourse if they disagree with how corporate money is spent in campaigns.

And then there is the money-is-not-speech argument. The problem for First Amendment believers, Moglen says, arises not because they think corporations shouldn't have rights so much as they think money isn't equal to speech.

"And we are now winding up using constitutional rules to concentrate corporate power in a way that's dangerous to democracy," he says.

That, of course, is not how the Supreme Court majority sees its decision. The court has said that because speech is an essential mechanism of democracy, the First Amendment forbids discrimination against any class of speaker.

It matters not, the court said just this year, that some speakers, because of the money they spend on elections, may have undue influence on public policy; what is important is that the First Amendment protects both speech and speaker, and the ideas that flow from each.

II. "Because there exists the possibility and/or probability that there is a corporation named with a similar name to mine, i must have it differentiated on record. The way that i do this is by placing my name in all lowercase lettering/font/rendition so as to lessen confusion. Corporations are not individuals as defined in statute (see: 31 CFR 363.6).

542687155

542687155

Patrick 01/09/17

54268755

III. In the interest of justice, and that i might receive due process i know the court will understand that the caption must display my name as presented to the court, and should there be a failure to follow my wishes as stated herein, i place this on the record as a memorial of the distinction, and shall never be construed as being either an infant, and incompetent party, and or minor as i deny infancy, waive all rights associated with the 14th amendment section 1 of the United States of America Constitution, and disaffirm any and all contracts made during infancy."

IV. So that no sane person could say that this understanding is inaccurate, i attached the following 10 cases from the Supreme Court documenting that corporations are persons, capable of exercising constitutional rights. If that truly is the case i say under presumption of law that there exist a corporation by my same name, and i differentiate myself from such A 'Persona Ficto' by saying corporations are not individuals, they are not natural persons as myself. Here's some further evidence of the Supreme Court supporting this conclusion and fact in law:

Hobby Lobby ruling charted new legal territory by granting corporations the same religious rights as real people. A line of Supreme Court rulings stretching back 200 years has blurred the distinction between flesh-and-blood citizens and the businesses they own, laying the groundwork for Hobby Lobby and the equally contentious Citizens United ruling. Here's a timeline of the corporation's human evolution:

1809 (Bank of the United States v. Deveaux): In the early days of the republic, when state and federal courts were still working out their jurisdictions, the Bank of the United States—According to Burt Neuborne, a corporate law professor at New York University, Wall Street banks hated this decision because it restricted suits to state courts where judges were partial to the banks' local clients—typically Midwestern farmers.

1844 (Louisville, Cincinnati, and Charleston Railroad v. Letson): the Supreme Court ruling that corporations were "citizens" of the states where they incorporated.

1853 (Marshall v. Baltimore and Ohio Railroad): The Supreme Court later upheld the notion that corporations were citizens, but only for the purposes of court jurisdiction; they did not have the same constitutional rights as actual people. The court also ruled that, for litigation purposes, shareholders would be considered citizens of their company's home state. This made it easier for corporations to sue or be sued in federal court by eliminating jurisdictional conflicts.

1886 (County of Santa Clara v. Southern Pacific Railroad): Now that corporations were legally citizens, in a strange twist, the court reporter—a former railroad man—wrote in the published notes on the case that the 14th Amendment did, in fact, apply to the company. Even though this notion appeared nowhere in the high court's actual ruling, 11 years later the court declared it was "well settled" that "corporations are persons within the provisions of the Fourteenth Amendment," citing Santa Clara.

1898 (Smyth v. Ames): Building on the Santa Clara decision, the court voided a Nebraska railroad tax, ruling that it was akin to the government taking a corporation's property without due process—a violation of its 14th Amendment rights. (The decision was overturned in the 1944 Federal Power Commission v. Hope Natural Gas decision.)

1906 (Hale v. Henkel): Having blocked unlawful seizures of corporate property, the court went on to shield companies from other kinds of intrusion. Writing for the majority, Justice Henry Billings Brown found that corporations, like people, are protected from unreasonable searches and seizures under the Fourth Amendment (although the Fifth Amendment protection against self-incrimination did not apply).

542687155

542687155

01/09/17

542687155

1931 (Russian Volunteer Fleet v. United States): The high court sided with the company, ruling that even foreign corporations are protected from unlawful government seizures under the Fifth Amendment, which ensures fair treatment by the legal system.

1977 (United States v. Martin Linen Supply Co.): The Supreme Court ruled that a second trial violated the companies' rights to be tried only once, expanding the double jeopardy rule to include both humans and corporations.

2010 (Citizens United v. FEC): In the run up to the 2008 election, the Federal Elections Commission blocked the conservative nonprofit Citizens United. The organization sued, arguing that, because people's campaign donations are a protected form of speech (see Buckley v. Valeo) and corporations and people enjoy the same legal rights, the Supreme Court agreed. The Citizens United ruling may be the most sweeping expansion of corporate **personhood** to date.

2014 (Burwell v. Hobby Lobby): Corporations are legally people with the right to free speech, In 2012, Hobby Lobby, an Oklahoma-based craft store chain, sued the federal government, arguing that a provision in the Affordable Care Act requiring it to provide contraception coverage for employees violated shareholders' constitutional rights to freedom of religion. The Supreme Court sided with Hobby Lobby and found that corporations can assert the religious rights of their owners, greatly expanding the power of shareholders while creating a world of confusion for corporate attorneys.

So i do hereby bring forth my claim in my capacity as a natural person on behalf of myself and my lawful estate which carries my name brand.

References

01. "When Did Companies Become People? Excavating the Legal Evolution". NPR. 2014-07-28.

02. "Proposed Constitutional Amendments to U.S. Constitution-Reclaim Democracy.org". reclaimdemocracy.org

03. "The Saving American Democracy Amendment – Sanders.senate.gov. Bernie Sanders@sanders.senate.gov.

04. Smith, Bradley. "Corporations Are People, Too", NPR Retrieved 2011-01-19.

05. "United States of America, Plaintiff-appellant, v. S. Steve Sourapas and Crest Beverage Company, Defendants-appellees". Cases.justia.com. Retrieved 2011-01-19..

06. "Resolutions and Ordinances Abolishing Corporate Personhood", movetoamend.org

07. Citizens United v. Federal Elections Commission, Opinion of the Court)2010).

08. Citizens United v. Federal Elections Commission, Concurrence and Dissent in Part (John Paul Stevens) (2010)

09. Graham, Howard Jay (1968). Everyman's Constitution. Madison: State Historical Society of Wisconsin. See also Graham, Howard Jay (1938). "The Conspiracy Theory of the 14th Amendment". Yale Law Journal. 47(3):341-403. Doi: 10.2307/791947.

10. Providence Bank v. Billings, 29 U.S. 514 (1830).

11. Calvert, Clay (2006) "Freedom of Speech Extended to Corporations". In Finkelman, Paul. Encyclopedia of American civil liberties, Volume 1. CRC Press. P. 650. ISBN 978-0-415-94342-0.

542687155

542687155

01/09/17

54268715 5

12. Hartmann, Thom (2002). Unequal Protections: The Rise of Corporate Dominance and the Theft of Human Rights. New York: St. Martin's Press.

13. 118 U.S. 394 (1886) – Official Court Syllabus in the United States Reports.

14. Pembina Consolidated Silver Mining Co. v. Pennsylvania, 125 U.S. 394 (1886).

15. Mayer, Carl. "Personalizing the Impersonal: Corporations and the Bill of Rights", 41 Hastings Law Journal 577, (March 1990).

16. "United States Code: Title 1.1 Words denoting number, gender, and so forth I LII / Legal Information Institute". http://www.lawcornell.edu. 2010-04-07. Retrieved 2011-01-19.

17. http://www.thomhartmann.com/unequal-protection/excerpt-theft

18. Ralph Nader and Robert Weissmann. Letter to the Editor: Ralph Nader on Scalia's "originalism". The Harvard Law Record, Published: Thursday, November 13, 2008, Updated: Tuesday, September 29, 2009.

19. [1]

20. "Justice Rehnquist's Dissent in First National Bank of Boston v. Bellotti". Reclaimdemocracy.org.

21. http://www.slate.com/articles/news_and_politics/views_from_chicago/2013/12/personhood_for_corporations_and_chimpanzees_i is_an_essential_legal_fiction.html

22. http://www.law.virginia.edu/html/alumni/uvalawyer/f11/personhood.htm

23. http://www.npr.org/2011/10/24/141663195/what-is-the-basis-for-corporate-personhood

24. http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/wonkblog/wp/2014/03/25/a-liberal-case-for-why-corporations-are-people-too/

i do here and now disaffirm any and all contracts associated with infancy:

...We said in Western Lawrence County Road Improvement District v. Friedman-D'Oench Bond Co., 162 Ark. 362, 258 S.W. 378, 382: 'At section 537 of Page on Contracts (2d Ed.), it is said: 'One who has entered into a contract which he might avoid because of personal incapacity, such as an infant, an insane person, a drunkard, and the like, has the election to affirm such contract, or to disaffirm it, and when he has exercised his election, with full knowledge of the facts, such election is final....
...An infant's contracts relating to personal rights or personality may be disaffirmed by him while he is still an infant....
...Compare 43 C.J.S., Infants, § 78, pp. 190, 192....
...In 43 C.J.S. Infants § 75, p. 176, it is said: 'The general rule, which has been said to have its exceptions and limitations, is that the disaffirmance of a contract made by an infant nullifies it and renders it void ab initio, and that the rights of the parties are to be determined as though the contract had not been made, the parties being restored to the status quo as far as possible * * *....

54268 7155

54268 7155

Patrick 01/09/17

...An infant lacks capacity, except for those contracts authorized by statute, to make a firm and binding contract, and an infant may disaffirm contract during his minority or within a reasonable time after reaching his majority....
...[2] We take the position that an infant lacks capacity (except for those contracts authorized by statute) to make a firm and binding contract; in all such contracts lies the inherent weakness and condition that the infant may disaffirm the contract during his minority or within a reasonable time after reaching his majority....
...(Citations.) Similarly, it is held that an executed contract voidable on the ground of infancy is deemed to be ratified by the failure of the former infant to disaffirm it within a reasonable time after reaching majority (Citations.)'...
...211 Infants211III Contracts211 1073 k. Student and educational contracts....
...211 Infants211III Contracts211 1054 Requisites, Validity, Operation, and Effect of Contracts211 1055 k. In general,....
...211 Infants211III Contracts211 1054 Requisites, Validity, Operation, and Effect of Contracts211 1060 k. Effect of performance; executory contracts....
...[12][13] In 43 C.J.S. Infants § 75 b, at p. 171, the text states: 'The general rule is that the right of an infant to avoid or disaffirm his contract is a personal privilege of which no one can take advantage but the infant himself, if living, and under no mental or physical disability, or, in case of his death, his privies in blood or heirs, or, as considered in Executors and Administrators, § 189, his personal representative'....
...43 C.J.S. Infants § 76 c, at page 183, states: 'Bringing suit on a released claim is a disaffirmance of the release....
...Plaintiff refers the Court to 43 C.J.S. Infants § 75f, p. 176, which states as follows: 'The general rule, which has been said to have its exceptions and limitations, is that the disaffirmance of a contract made by an infant nullifies it and renders it void ab initio, and that the rights of the parties are to be determined as though the contract had not been made, the parties being restored to the status quo * * *....
...In 27 Am.Jur. Infants, § 11, p. 753, dealing with the early common law concerning agreements of infants, it is stated in part as follows: 'According to an ancient rule of the common law, the agreements of infants were divisible into three classes—absolutely void, voidable, and valid....
...In 27 Am.Jur., Infants, § 12, p. 756, it is stated in part: 'An executed voidable contract of an infant is valid until disaffirmed.'...
...Conventional contracts of an infant, except those for necessities and those authorized by statute, are voidable at election of infant and may be disaffirmed by infant during minority or within reasonable time after reaching majority....
...[1] The rule in North Carolina regarding a minor's contract liability is as follows: It is well settled that the conventional contracts of an infant, except those for necessities and those authorized by statute, are voidable at the election of the infant and may be disaffirmed by the infant during minority or within a reasonable time after reaching majority....
...Application of this rule often leads to an equitable result, particularly where the infant can be fairly said to have recognized and adopted as binding a contract under which the infant accepts the benefits of the contract to the prejudice of the other party....
...Privilege of disaffirmance may be lost where infant affirms or otherwise ratifies contract after reaching majority....

i do hereby present this my official disaffirmance timely done with respects any and all contracts made during infancy, this shall apply in each and every aspect and nullify any and all such contracts, and this is final!

542687155

542687155

01/09/17

Patrick

Sackett

54268715S

ASSUMED NAME RECORD (D.B.A.)

ASSUMED NAME RECORD (D.B.A.) CERTIFICATE OF OWNERSHIP FOR UNINCORPORATED BUSINESS OR PROFESSION.

NOTICE: THIS CERTIFICATE OF OWNERSHIP PROPERLY EXECUTED IS TO BE FILED AND RECORDED WITH THE COUNTY CLERK AS PROVIDED BY LAW.

NAME IN WHICH BUSINESS IS TO BE CONDUCTED: *burkett, patricia ann* AND ALL DERIVATIONS OF SAID BUSINESS NAME

BUSINESS TYPE: OTHER, GRANTEE, PRIVATE / PUBLIC / SIGNATURE

BUSINESS DESCRIPTION: COMMERCE, GRANTEE, PRIVATE / PUBLIC / SIGNATURE

STYLE: MAJUSCULE

I FORMALLY AND FOREVER STAKE MY CLAIM ON THE NAME BURKETT, PATRICIA ANN AS THE OWNER OF THE TRUE AND REAL NAME: Private Attorney in fact in Proper Persona, *burkett, patricia ann*

OWNER DESCRIPTION: Grantor / Returnee / Settlor / Beneficiary / Trustor / Signature

POST OFFICE PORTLAND MAIN: c/o 715 NW HOYT ST. – 3442 Portland, Oregon 97208

STYLE: Bicameral & Surname

NOTICE: i claim all Titles and Deeds and want all such paperwork related to said D.B.A. to be returned. i am claiming the Writ of Habeas Corpus to institute and maintain actions of any kind in the courts of this state. To take hold of and dispose of property either real, intangible or personal and exemptions from taxes or impositions. Under the form of creating a qualification or attaching a condition, the states cannot, in effect, inflict a punishment for a past act which was not punishable at the time the act was committed. i, the undersigned, am the owner of the above business and name and address given are true and correct and there are no other owners of said business.

COST SCHEDULE: 110% of assessed value of the total assessment and costs plus 40% interest at the time of accumulated engagement.

i attest by way of acknowledgement and carryout the acceptance of the certificate of live birth noted above and attached hereto

542687155

542687155

542687155

All that said ATTORNEY GENERAL in-fact a NON-ADVERSE, NON-BELLIGERENT, NON-COMBATANT PARTY shall lawfully do or cause to be done under the authority of this GENERAL power of ATTORNEY NON-ADVERSE, NON-BELLIGERENT, NON-COMBATANT PARTY is express emergency approval. ALL VALID BY THE PRESCRIPTION OF THE LAW OF NECCESITY AND THE DOCTRINES OF UNCONSCIONABILITY AND LA MORT SAISIT LE VIF IN ACCORDANCE WITH APPLICABLE LAWS, CARDINAL ORDERS, ORDINAL ORDERS, AND COMMERCIAL STANDARD; PROVIDES FOR FULL ABSOLUTION THROUGH REDEMPTION.

NON-ADVERSE PARTY PRINTED FULL NAME

Patricia Ann Burkett

Specimen signature of Attorney-in-Fact

burkett, patricia ann

a natural person/ individual

542687155

542687155

01/09/17

542687155

NOTICE

Using a notary on this document does not constitute any adhesion, nor does it in any manner alter any legal status of any of the parties hereto.

The purpose of a notary is verification and identification only and not for entrance into any foreign jurisdiction.

54268715S

54268715S
01/09/17
Patricia

54268 7155

State of Oregon
Secretary of State

APOSTILLE (Convention de La Haye du 5 octobre 1961)	
1. Country: Pays / Pais:	**United States of America**
This public document Le présent acte public / El presente documento público	
2. has been signed by a étté signé par ha sido firmado por	**JENNIFER A. WOODWARD**
3. acting in the capacity of agissant en qualité de quien actúa en calidad de	**State Registrar**
4. bears the seal / stamp of est revêtu du sceau / timbre de y está revestido del sello / timbre de	**Health Division**
Certified Attesté / Certificado	
5. at à / en **Salem, Oregon**	**6. the** le / el dia **August 18, 2015**
7. by par / por	**Secretary of State, State of Oregon**
8. N° sous n° bajo el número	**812X528R3**
9. Seal / Stamp Sceau / timbre: Sello / timbre:	**10. Signature:** Signature: Firma: *Jeanne P. Atkins*

This Apostille only certifies the authenticity of the signature and the capacity of the person who has signed the public document, and, where appropriate, the identity of the seal or stamp which the public document bears.

This Apostille does not certify the content of the document for which it was issued.

This Apostille is not valid for use anywhere within the United States of America, its territories or possessions.

To verify the issuance of this Apostille, call (503) 986-2200 or email corporation.division@state.or.us.

This certificate does not constitute an apostille under the Convention of 5 October 1961 Abolishing the Requirement of Legalisation for Foreign Public Documents for those countries that have neither ratified nor acceded to that Convention, and remains subject to additional applicable authentication requirements.

542687155

542687155
01/09/17

CERTIFICATION OF VITAL RECORD

PUBLIC HEALTH DIVISION
CENTER FOR HEALTH STATISTICS

STANDARD CERTIFICATE OF LIVE BIRTH

030554

STATE OF OREGON BIRTH No. 136 52-027991
BOARD OF HEALTH—PORTLAND
FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY—U. S. PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

LOCAL REGISTRAR'S NUMBER 8843

DATE RECEIVED SEP 25 1952

1. CHILD'S NAME (TYPE OR PRINT) a. (First) Patricia b. (Middle) Ann c. (Last) Burkett

2. PLACE OF BIRTH
A. COUNTY Multnomah
B. CITY OR TOWN (If outside corporate limits, write RURAL) Portland
C. FULL NAME OF HOSPITAL OR INSTITUTION (If NOT in hospital or institution, give street address or location) Wilcox Memorial Hospital

3. USUAL RESIDENCE OF MOTHER (Where does mother live?)
A. STATE Oregon B. COUNTY Multnomah
C. CITY OR TOWN (If outside corporate limits, write RURAL) Portland
D. STREET ADDRESS (If rural, give location) 8618 N.E.Alberta

4. SEX Female
5A. THIS BIRTH SINGLE [X] TWIN [ ] TRIPLET [ ]
5B. IF TWIN OR TRIPLET (This child born) 1ST [ ] 2ND [ ] 3RD [ ]
6. DATE OF BIRTH (Month) (Day) (Year) Sept.6,1952

FATHER OF CHILD

7. FULL NAME a. (First) John b. (Middle) Calvus c. (Last) Burkett
8. COLOR OR RACE white
9. AGE (At time of this birth) 46 YEARS
10. BIRTHPLACE (State or foreign country) Knoxville,Tenn
11A. USUAL OCCUPATION Brakeman
11B. KIND OF BUSINESS OR INDUSTRY U.P.RR

MOTHER OF CHILD

12. FULL MAIDEN NAME a. (First) Maxine b. (Middle) Louise c. (Last) Searle
13. COLOR OR RACE white
14. AGE (At time of this birth) 33 YEARS
15. BIRTHPLACE (State or foreign country) Mason City,Iowa

16. I, AS Father (Relationship to child) CERTIFY THAT THE INFORMATION ON THIS CERTIFICATE IS ENTIRELY CORRECT.
John C. Burkett (Signature of Informant)

I hereby certify that this child was born alive on the date stated above, at the hour of 11:39 PM m.

17A. ATTENDANT AT BIRTH (Signature) Walter F. Ackermann
B. M. D. [✓] D. O. [ ] OTHER (SPECIFY)
C. ADDRESS Portland, Oregon
D. DATE SIGNED 9-6-52

18. DATE REC'D BY LOCAL REG. SEP 10 1952
19. REGISTRAR'S SIGNATURE Thos. L. Meador M.D.
20. DATE ON WHICH GIVEN NAME ADDED BY (Registrar)

RESERVE THIS SPACE FOR REGISTRAR'S USE

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	EVIDENCE	DATE	SIGNATURE

I CERTIFY THAT THIS IS A TRUE, FULL AND CORRECT COPY OF THE ORIGINAL CERTIFICATE ON FILE OR THE VITAL RECORD FACTS ON FILE IN THE OREGON CENTER FOR HEALTH STATISTICS OR A DELEGATED LOCAL OFFICE.

DATE ISSUED: FEB 17 2012

Jennifer A. Woodward
JENNIFER A. WOODWARD, Ph.D.
STATE REGISTRAR

THIS COPY IS NOT VALID WITHOUT INTAGLIO STATE SEAL AND BORDER.

STATE OF OREGON 1859

OREGON HEALTH AUTHORITY PUBLIC HEALTH DIVISION

542687155

Notice as to Declared intent or purpose of this tender of payment as a Special Deposit order of the Payor and Beneficiary and is to be credited to depositor's account as accord and satisfaction and payment in full and a discharge of any and all outstanding liabilities.

Patricia Ann Burkett

patricia-ann: burkett
as: donor, grantor, settlor
dba: PATRICIA ANN BURKETT
USPS Registered Bond
No. 2310 0740 0000 2205 8323

I, certify as Document Holder that this is a true and correct copy of the Birth Certificate and Authentication on file.

Patricia Ann Burkett

patricia - ann: burkett

542687155
01-09-17

0 0 3 6 9 9 4 6 6

003699466

542687155

A notary public or other officer completing this certificate verifies only the identity of the individual who signed the document, to which this certificate is attached, and not the truthfulness, accuracy, or validity of that document.

STATE OF OREGON

COUNTY OF MULTNOMAH SS.

On December 30th, 2016, before me Johnny Hakim Notary Public,

personally, stood **burkett, patricia ann** who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person whose name is subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that she executed the same in her authorized capacity, and that by her signature on the instrument the person, or the entity upon behalf of which the person acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of Oregon that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

Witness my hand official seal.

SEAL

OFFICIAL STAMP
JOHNNY HAKIM
NOTARY PUBLIC - OREGON
COMMISSION NO. 951919
MY COMMISSION EXPIRES JULY 06, 2020

(Signature of Notary Public)

This instrument created and prepared by:

Patricia Ann Burkett

burkett, patricia ann

as donor, grantor, settlor

dba: PATRICIA ANN BURKETT

542687155

542687155
01/09/17
Patricia Burkett