**MEMORANDUM OF LAW SOVEREIGNTY**

*Common Law Tribunal, Grand Jury Foreman*

The purpose of this Memorandum is to delineate sovereignty and make clear to our elected servants that the People are the sovereign and not the government. Government is a creature of the law with a clipped sovereignty sufficient only enough to exercise their vested powers. We the People, the children of nature’s God, receiving our sovereign authority, and unalienable rights, to create a government by consent, whose duty is to secure our rights,[[1]](#footnote-1) not deprive them![[2]](#footnote-2)

By the powers and authority vested in We the People via an unbreakable covenant made with God in 1776,[[3]](#footnote-3)

* We the People via Article I section 1 vested congress with well-defined legislative powers and prohibitions,
* We the People via Article II section 1 vested the executive with well-defined powers and prohibitions,
* We the People via Article III section 1 vested the judiciary with well-defined powers and prohibitions,
* We the People ordained and established the Bill of Rights that congress can ‘never alter,’
* We the People have sovereign immunity from ‘ALL’ positive law. a/k/a human law, regulations, codes, or statutes,
* We the People are the authority of all law.

The unalienable right of the sovereign People to self-governance was ordained by God, established in the Declaration of Independence and ordained by We the People who are the authority of all law. Any servant who resists these truths wars against the Constitution, Governor of the Universe and the People.

It is not government’s duty to govern the Peoples’ behavior. “At the Revolution, the sovereignty transferred to the people; and they are truly the sovereigns of the country, but they are sovereigns without subjects...with none to govern but ‘themselves’.”[[4]](#footnote-4) “The very meaning of ‘Sovereignty’ means that the decree of sovereign makes law, and foreign [statutory] courts cannot condemn influences persuading sovereign to make the decree.”[[5]](#footnote-5) “The people of this State, as the successors of its former sovereign, are entitled to all the rights which formerly belonged to the King by his prerogative.”[[6]](#footnote-6) “His (*God’s*) judges (*juries*) are the mirror by which the king's image (righteousness) is reflected.”[[7]](#footnote-7) “A consequence of this prerogative is the legal ubiquity of the king. His majesty (God) in the eye of the law is always present in all his courts, though he cannot personally distribute justice.”[[8]](#footnote-8) “His judges are the mirror by which the king's image is reflected.”[[9]](#footnote-9)

“Sovereignty itself is, of course, ‘not subject to law,’ for it is the author and source of law; but in our system, while ‘sovereign powers’ are delegated to the agencies of government, ‘sovereignty itself remains with the people,’ by whom and for whom all government exists and acts, and the law is the definition and limitation of power…”[[10]](#footnote-10)

“The words ‘sovereign state’ are cabalistic words (*having a secrete meaning*), not understood by the disciple of liberty, who has been instructed in our constitutional schools. It is our appropriate phrase when applied to an absolute despotism. The idea of sovereign power in the government of a republic is incompatible with the existence and foundation of civil liberty and the rights of property.”[[11]](#footnote-11)

“The sovereignty of a state does not reside in the persons who fill the different departments of its government, but in the People, from whom the government emanated; and they may change it at their discretion. Sovereignty then in this country, abides with the constituency, and not with the agent; and this remark is true, both in reference to the federal and state government.”[[12]](#footnote-12) “The doctrine of Sovereign Immunity is one of the Common Law immunities and defenses that are available to the Sovereign.”[[13]](#footnote-13) “In United States, sovereignty resides in people. Congress cannot invoke the sovereign power of the People to override their [the Peoples’] will.”[[14]](#footnote-14) “It will be admitted on all hands that with the exception of the powers granted to the states and the federal government through the Constitutions, the people of the several states are unconditionally sovereign within their respective states.”[[15]](#footnote-15)

State run courts, a/k/a ‘equity courts,’ are nisi prius[[16]](#footnote-16) courts presided over by judges (political servants) who rule according to regulations, statutes and codes or contracts, under American Jurisprudence. Law courts are presided over by juries (the People) who rule according to Natural Law, no judges, regulations, statutes, and codes permitted. Liberty is freedom from equity courts unless we agree. “The state cannot diminish rights of the people.”[[17]](#footnote-17) “No authority can, on any pretense whatsoever, be exercised over the citizens of this state, but such as is or shall be derived from and granted by the people of this state.”[[18]](#footnote-18) “The very meaning of ‘sovereignty’ is that the decree of the sovereign makes law.”[[19]](#footnote-19) “Where rights secured by the Constitution are involved, there can be no rule making or legislation which would abrogate them.”[[20]](#footnote-20)

**Sovereignty cannot be Contracted Away:** “It is the public policy of this state that public agencies exist to aid in the conduct of the people's business....The people of this state do not yield their sovereignty to the agencies which serve them. In enacting this chapter, the legislature finds and declares that the public commissions, boards and councils and the other public agencies in this state exist to aid in the conduct of the people's business.[[21]](#footnote-21) “To presume that a sovereign forever waives the right to exercise one of its powers, unless it expressly reserves the right to exercise that power in a commercial agreement, turns the concept of sovereignty on its head.”[[22]](#footnote-22)

We the People are free and independent sovereign People with the unalienable right of due process and have no contract with any administrative (foreign) court without our consent. Thereby, the People owe the State nothing and are under no obligation that would require the People to seek leave from any servant who has no jurisdiction or authority over them. We are not “subjects of the state” but the “masters thereof.”

“Under federal Law, which is applicable to all states, the U.S. Supreme Court stated that if a court is without authority, its judgments and orders are regarded as nullities. They are not voidable, but simply void, and form no bar to a recovery sought, even prior to a reversal in opposition to them. They constitute no justification and all persons concerned in executing such judgments or sentences are considered, in law, as trespassers.”[[23]](#footnote-23) “It is clear that Congress cannot by authorization or ratification give the slightest effect to a state law or constitution which is in conflict with the Constitution of the United States.”[[24]](#footnote-24)

**CONCLUSION:** The People are the sovereign and not the government. Government is a creature of the law with a clipped sovereignty sufficient only enough to exercise their vested powers. Sovereignty itself, ‘the People,’ is ‘not subject to law,’ for we are the author and source of law. The People received this sovereign authority from God and the People ordained and established government to secure these rights. We vested congress, the executive and the judiciary with well-defined legislative powers and prohibitions. We ordained and established the Bill of Rights and being the sovereign have sovereign immunity from ‘ALL’ human law, regulations, codes, or statutes.

The doctrine of Sovereign Immunity is one of the Common-Law immunities and defenses that are available to the Sovereign ‘alone,’ this is the great American experiment. A sovereign state is absolute despotism and is incompatible with the existence and foundation of civil liberty and the rights of property. Congress cannot invoke the sovereign power of the People to override their will.

State run equity courts are for bureaucrats and corporations. People run courts of law are for the people. All criminal cases must be tried in a court of law, a/k/a court of record. Public agencies exist to aid in the conduct of the people's business. It is not government’s duty to govern the Peoples’ behavior. To presume that a sovereign forever waives the right to exercise one of its powers unless it expressly reserves the right to exercise that power in a commercial agreement turns the concept of sovereignty on its head. Sovereignty is the power to do everything in a state without accountability.
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