

7-24-2012

# Terry-Lee v. Young Appellant's Reply Brief 2 Dckt. 38939

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.law.uidaho.edu/not\\_reported](https://digitalcommons.law.uidaho.edu/not_reported)

---

## Recommended Citation

"Terry-Lee v. Young Appellant's Reply Brief 2 Dckt. 38939" (2012). *Not Reported*. 390.  
[https://digitalcommons.law.uidaho.edu/not\\_reported/390](https://digitalcommons.law.uidaho.edu/not_reported/390)

This Court Document is brought to you for free and open access by the Idaho Supreme Court Records & Briefs at Digital Commons @ UIdaho Law. It has been accepted for inclusion in Not Reported by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ UIdaho Law. For more information, please contact [annablaine@uidaho.edu](mailto:annablaine@uidaho.edu).

**In the Supreme Court**

**of the State of Idaho**

**Terry-Lee, a de jure State Citizen**

**Appellant. Case: 38939-2011**

VS

**Nathan-David, (True Christian Name)**

**Respondent**

**Appellant's Brief - Reply**

**Appeal from the District Court**

**of the First Judicial District for**

**Bonner County, (3<sup>rd</sup> Judge ) John T. Mitchell**

**Appellant attends Specially, by**

**"In Solo Propria Natura" capacity,**

**and in the likeness to your 28 U.S.C. 1746-1**

**Appellant's location:**  
**Terry-Lee, a Sovereign Being**  
**c/o Box[1084], by Necessity**  
**Loon-Lake, non-domestic**  
**Washington, de jure, state**  
**509+994-3632, (no-zip-ever)**  
**" Last Known Address "**  
**Which has never changed**

**Respondent's Location:**  
**Nathan-David**  
**LUKINS AND ANNIS P.S.**  
**601 Front Avenue #502**  
**Couer d' Alene, Idaho**  
**208+667-0517**

FILED - COPY

JUL 24 2012

Supreme Court \_\_\_\_\_ Court of Appeals \_\_\_\_\_  
Entered on ATS by \_\_\_\_\_

**Table of Contents, Reply Brief (Corrected)**

1. Front Cover	1
2. Table of Contents	2
3. Table of Authorities	3
4. Sites to the Record	4
5. Statement of the Case	
A. Reply To Respondents Statement of the Case	5
B. Reply to Course of Proceedings	5-6
C. Reply to Statement of the Facts 1-14	7-13
6. Reply to Additional Issues Presented on Appeal	13
7. Reply to Attorney Fees	13-14
8. Reply to Argument	14-15
9. My Meritorious Defense A thru K	16-17
10. Conclusion -1-13	19-20
11. Exhibit	21-22
12. Certificate of Service	23

## Table of Authorities

### Cases:

Jones Vs Flowers et al, 547-U.S. 220 (2006)-----	18
Pomeroy Vs U.S., 864 F.2d.1191 (5 <sup>th</sup> cir.1989)-----	18
U.S. Vs LaSalle National Bank, 437 U.S. 298, 308; 98 s. ct. 2d 2357, 57 L. ED. 2d 221 (1978)-----	21-22

### Statutes:

26 – U.S.C. Sec. 6212 (b)-----	21-22
26 -- C.F.R. 1.1 –1-----	18
28 – U.S.C. 1746 – 1-----	5-9-20

### Rules:

I.A.R. 11 (a) (2) & 12 (a)-----	6
I.R.C.P. Rule 8 (d)-----	17
I.R.C.P. Rule 5 (b)-----	6-7

### U.S. Regulations:

Domestic Mail Ser. Regs, Sec. 122.32-----	18
Postal Reorganization Act , 39 U.S.C. 403-----	18
Public Law 91-375-----	21-22
Federal Register, Vol. 51, No. 53, March 19 <sup>th</sup> 1986-----	21-22

**Sites to The Record:**

R. Vol. 1, p. 117, 1.5-8-----	12
R. Vol. 1, p. 33-63-----	6-9-15
R. Vol. 1, p. 001-----	5
R. Vol. 1, p. 009,027,032,080,092,095,096-----	6
R. Vol. 1, p. 068, 077-----	6
R. Vol. 1, p. 099,-102-----	7
R. Vol. 1, p. 100-----	8
R. Vol. 1, p.103,-113-----	7
R. Vol. 1, p. 255 -268-----	6
R. Vol. 1, p. 527 -540-----	6
R. Vol. 3, p. 508 -522-----	6
Misc. Ex. p. 10 -106-----	5-8
Misc. Ex. p. 23 -28 & 46 -59-----	17
Misc. Ex. p. 7-9-----	7
Tr. Vol. 2, (by Foland) p. 20, L. 22-25-----	6
P. 36, l. 17 -25, p. 37, L. 1-24-----	6
R. Vol. 1, p. 74, L. 22-24-----	6
Ex. 3.2 -----	5
Const. Quotes: For Due Process of Law	
Idaho Const., Art. 1, Sec. 13-----	
U.S.A. Const., Amend. 14th, paragraph 1.-----	

## **Appellant Response, Reply Brief (Corrected)**

### **1. To – Statement Of The Case**

#### **A. To – His Statement of The Case**

The claim that I, Terry-Lee am appealing as a pro se litigant is untrue and an attempt to stigmatize me as a 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment U.S. citizen, when in fact I am always attending in this case as “In Solo Propria Natura” capacity and as reflected in Title 28 U.S.C. 1746-1 and always sui-juris.

#### **B. To- His Course of Proceedings**

I did in fact file my initial petition and summons on May 9<sup>th</sup> AD 2009 against my true partner the only entity I entered into a private Ecclesiastical contract with which was and still is “Nathan- David”, a sovereign man. Said true defendant, “Nathan- David”, nor any attorney on his behalf has to this day served me any notice of appearance, nor any counter claim to my True “ Last Known Address” as stated on the top of the first page of my Petition for Dissolution (R.Val.1 p. 001) and the Summons (EX.3-2) which were served on the true defendant on May 8<sup>th</sup> A.D. 2009 and again at his other address on June 12<sup>th</sup> A.D.2009, Ex. 21, and Ex. 22, As stated above I was not served any three day notice and I did not find out about the Order of Default signed by Judge Mitchell in his chambers (no hearing) on January 5<sup>th</sup> AD 2010, until I received a copy of the Default Judgment. I immediately went to Sandpoint Idaho to look at the case file. I ordered 80 pages from the records and paid the clerk \$80.00 for such. I filed replies to the claimed defendant’s entrees and the rest of the 80 pages on July 13<sup>th</sup> 2010. See Misc, (Ex. 10-106). I do not know why the clerk labeled these fillings as exhibits. My True Partner was informed by me from the first day I met him and his father (Buying Gold) of who I was, what I am, and what my Venue and Jurisdiction is, and still is.

He has always known how to spell my name and what my true address is. (R. Vol. 1, p. 255-268), I believe that he knowing such about me, informed his attorney's and they then conspired to overcome me by changing my name and address on their Briefs and certificates of service (R. Vol. 1, p. 009, p. 027, p. 032, p. 066, p. 080, p. 092, p. 094, p. 095, p. 096. ) The clerk followed their address for a trust instead of what was listed on the front page of my Petition and Summons (R. Vol. 1, p. 068, p. 077). All my evidence entered into this case reflects my said True Name and my correct " Last Known Address", my true partners name, Nathan-David , and no other names. (R. Vol. p. 001) I have no titles and no other names, just Terry- Lee and that is a matter of Res Judicata, (R., Vol. 1, p. 033-063).

Why is the claimed defendant (a trust) now using my true and correct Last Known Address and true Christian name for the last two months, but failed to follow your Rule 5(b) for the last two years and ten months. See Respondents brief on appeal at cover page, p. 5 and their certificate of services on the last paragraph of its response Brief at p.19.

Judge Mitchell had not made a final decision. ( Tr. Vol. 2, ( by reporter Foland), p. 20, L. 22-25, p. 36, L. 17-25, he said we'll schedule this for another hearing that will be held on April 12<sup>th</sup> 2011 at eleven o'clock, Tr. Vol. 2, p. 37, L. 1-24, p. 74, L. 17-19, L. 22-24.

When he made his final memorandum and order on May 7<sup>th</sup> 2011 he said there will be no more reconsideration's, that was his final order on the vacation of Judgment issue. (R. Vol. 3, p. 508-522). I then made my appeal timely and by your appeal Rules, (R. Vol. 1, p. 527-540 ; I.A.R. 11(a) (2)and 12 (a)).

### **C. To His Statement of Facts**

I, Terry- Lee entered into a private Ecclesiastical contract. I did not enter into any agreement with "NATHAN DAVID YOUNG" a trust. Our said private contract was not based on, and not under any Idaho partnership codes. Nathan attempted to make all the decisions and would not negotiate, so I tried to sell or trade my half interest off to others, but he blocked all the deals I put together. As required in your Rule 5 (b) I.C.R.P.. I can not respond to that which I have not been properly served.

A breach of my substantive due process Rights. I was not served any process at all until I received an envelope from the Clerk which had my True name and correct (Last Known Address) on its face.. The envelope contained the judgment against the Trust [ TERRY LEE ] filed June 2<sup>nd</sup> A.D.2010 ( R. ,Vol.1, p.099-102). Right after Judge John T. Mitchell signed the Default Judgment against the legally built trust "TERRY LEE" he put a little yellow sticky note on said Judgment, and gave it to the Clerk with instruction to send a True Copy to my correct "Last Known Address" which I received timely. I " immediately" responded within nine days of the filing of said Judgment with a note for a hearing, and Motion to Vacate the Default Judgment on June 11<sup>th</sup> 2011 ( R. Vol. 1, p. 103-113); misc. Ex. 7-9. I do not know why the Clerk labeled this filing as an exhibit. The wrongful dissociation was by Nathan, not me. After I started the case I went to the said 32 acre site and Nathan was moving off all of his equipment from the site and it is still off site today. I continued to negotiate with the city for more than a year and a half and did in fact eliminate the need for two sewer lift stations, which saved our partnership over \$400,000.00 dollars.



Nathan found out I was still negotiating with the City and had his attorney call and write them to demand that they (the City) cut all communication with me . The City cut off communication to me about October of A.D. 2010 and said project has sat there idle ever since.

2. The claimed defendant failed to serve me an answer and / or counter claim to this very day (no Rule 5 (b) service), so how can I respond to something I was not served? When I was served the Default Judgment (by the Clerk) ( little yellow sticky note) (R. , Vol.1, p-100 ), I immediately went to the Clerk and paid for 80 pages in the file, then immediately responded to all 80 pages. ( see M-Ex. Vol. E, p. 10-106). As of todays date my only True and correct partner ‘Nathan- David’ a sovereign man, has never appeared and has never responded to my original petition or summons. Said true partner is in default. Our original private Ecclesiastical contract did not allow and had no legally built Implied Trusts involved whatsoever. Our said contract can not be changed or altered without the consent of both parties. I have never agreed to any Trusts being involved in said contract.

3. I have never denied, nor refused any post or mail or process sent to my True name and/ or true ” Last Known Address”. No answer or counter claim has ever been sent to my True Name or true “Last Known Address’ by my true partner. The post master at the Loon Lake Washington post office has never sent any post or mail or process back to its sender with my True Name , and correct “Last Known Address on its face. I always receive and open all post, mail and process that has my True Name and True and correct “Last Known Address” on its face, Affirmed “ Under Pains and Penalties of Perjury”.

\_\_\_\_\_

There is no law that requires the use of WA, Zip-code or ID, Zip-code which are Federal FEMA Zones and /or districts. If any one makes use of said zip codes it is voluntary. I do not volunteer to use said codes. They are not part of my True and correct "Last Known Address". The claimed defendant and its attorney make claims that I wanted my name capitalized, which is untrue. My name is never spelled in all caps (never), it is improper English grammar. The U.S. Style Manual (see capitalization) says to never spell a proper noun name in all capital letters. I have no relationship with any Legally " Built " Trust known as "TERRY LEE" whatsoever, (R. Vol. 1, p. 33-63).

4. I have no titles attached to my True name. I am a sovereign dejure State Citizen of the Washington Republic. I firmly believe that my True Partner ( acting as a third Party Intervener) in concert with his attorney(s) conspired together to create this whole time consuming mess, just to discredit me. My True Partner has known my True Name and True Address from the beginning of our relationship. I have been in court a number of times where some guy is claiming he is a sovereign and the Judge said, (Look at his letters, are there zip codes on them? (yes, your Honor there is) Ok we have jurisdiction, your guilty, pay the fine. Zip codes in fact represent a particular venue and jurisdiction. When you make use of them you agree to be under that particular venue and jurisdiction ( you accept the benefit).

I, Terry- Lee, am a sovereign Citizen of the Washington Republic, one of the unity (several) States of the Union. I am reflected (Always) as stated in the Federal Title 28 U.S.C. 1746-1, Never a 14th Amendment citizen!!!

5. My True Name is Terry- Lee, not Lee and not Mr. Lee. The rest is true, I made those statements based on my Rights secured by the First Amendment to the Supreme Law of the Land A.D.1791.

6. I am a sovereign Being, just as was George Washington and the rest of the Presidents through Abraham Lincoln. My True Christian name is “never” spelled in all caps- (R. Vol. 1, p.33-63) I have never made the claim that I do not recognize state or federal law, because they do so exist as defacto at law entities. The real issue is which venue and which jurisdiction am I under, verses the claimed to be respondent? ( R. Vol. , 1 p. 33-63) My True Partner Nathan- David and his wife Susie have eight sons and daughters, all born at home by an unlicensed midwife and all eight sons and daughters have no Birth Certificates and no Social Security Number Contracts. What does that say about him as compared to what he (or it) is saying about me? True sovereign Citizens are not a threat to anyone, they are responsible people and any contrary claim by the F.B.I. of such is purely propaganda to discredit such. Prior to Abraham Lincoln, most State Citizens were sovereigns.

7. The Default Order and Default Judgment were not issued against the True Petitioner (Plaintiff) “Terry- Lee”, they were in fact issued against the state created Legally Built Implied Trust, “ TERRY LEE”. I did move to set aside the Judgment against said Trust. I have never refused to accept any post, mail or process sent to my True “ Last Known Address” See your Rule 5 (b). My name is not Mr. Lee.

8. My True and Correct “ Last Known Address” is on my original petition and summons that started this case. Why is it not being used exactly as it is. It wasn't for the first 34 months.

9. I have never changed my existing True and Correct Name nor my true “ Last Known Address” as is reflected on the original petition and original summons. This court should take note that the claimed defendant (respondent) is now using my True and Correct Name and my True and Correct “ Last Known Address” for the last two months. If they would have used both in the beginning, the last three years of wasted time would not have happened. A trial would have happened and a fair division of assets and capitol invested by both partners would have happened. I have never wanted a penny of my partner's 50% interest in our said project.

10. I have “ Never” rejected any dejure , nor any defacto government agency(s), but I have the Right to participate or be under such Venue and Jurisdiction I choose to. My True Partner “ Nathan- David” was and is fully aware of my True status, standing and capacity from the first day I met him and his father. He has a copy of many of my documents including (R. Vol. 1, p. 33-63 ) Accepting and opening some other entities post or mail, is mail fraud. A letter is not being sent to you unless it has your True Name and True Address on its face. If you open some other parties post, mail or process it is Mail Fraud.

11. I not open any post or mail or proress that does not have my True Name and correct Address on its face. I would be in breach of the United States Postal Codes. (Domestic Mail Ser. Regs, Sec. 122.32).

))

12. No one has the right to force me into servitude to any Legally Built Implied Constructive Trust that I have no contract with and or obligation to. That's a Breach of the 13<sup>th</sup> Amendment to the Supreme Laws of the Land, AD 1791. (No Forced Servitude), Also see the U.S. of A. Const. 14<sup>th</sup> Amend. Para. 1 , (Which is not relied upon by Terry-Lee at all).
13. When I sent process to LUKINS & ANNIS P.S. at their old address, they immediately sent a notice to the court that there was no service because I used the wrong address, so I immediately corrected how I addressed future process to them without question, I just did it! ( R. Vol., 1 p. 117, L-5-8). They in turn believe they have the right to alter or amend my True Name and True " Last Known Address" to whatever they wish. The Bonner County Bee's July 30<sup>th</sup> A.D. 2011 article is more propoganda to put down True sovereign State Citizens that are not willing to be good (Toby) slaves to the District of Columbia. Remember all Presidents thru Lincoln were sovereign State Citizens and every President after Lincoln has signed every extension of Lincoln's Emergency Marshal Law Executive order, to this day. Ohbama just signed said extention.
14. The respondents on going statements show there purposeful intentions and continued abuses of my secured substantive due process Rights to have the name of my choice and my True and Correct address which reflects my True and correct Venue and Jurisdiction, ( see constitutional references). Idaho Const., Art. 1, Sec. 13.
15. I have never refused any post, mail or process that was sent to my True Name and my True " Last Known Address". The respondent thru LUKINS and ANNIS P.S have failed to follow your Rule 5 (b) for the last two years and ten months. They just started two months ago of following your Rule 5 (b), why not from the beginning? I did give them due notice three years ago, many times.

**Additional Issues  
Presented on Appeal**

1. My answer to their question is answered in my 47 claimed errors and/or abuses of discretion in my original Appeal brief.

**Attorneys Fees on Appeal**

2. My True Partner Nathan- David is the one that breached our private Ecclesiastical contract multiple times for a whole year. I sent three written proposals to Nathan by certified mail and he refused to receive them, did not open them, and had the post office return them (Ex-list, ~ 41). I had no choice but to take action to dissolve the private partnership and divide the assets and capital(s) invested by each of us. There was no wrongful disassociation, nor wrongful dissolution by plaintiff, because I continued to work on said project for another one and a half years after I started the case to divide it. I saved our partnership two lift stations costs during that said time period.

This appeal was and is not frivolous and is not unreasonable and is with foundation because of the respondents continued failure to comply with your Rule 5 (b) and the fact that not one shred of evidence was or has been submitted to the record backing up the unsupported claims by the claimed defendant to achieve a \$370,000.00 dollar plus Judgment and the transfer of my one half (50%) interest over to a Legally Built Trust that has no interest in said project.

The proposed setting aside of this Default Judgment against the Legally Built Trust "TERRY LEE" is based upon all of my claimed errors and or abuse(s) of discretion in my Appeal brief, including all supporting documents (all of the Clerks record and all exhibits).

The claimed respondent and its attorneys conspired from the beginning to overcome the unrepresented litigant by willful and intentionally failing to follow your Rule 5 (b) to get the Order of Default and the Default Judgment without any supporting evidence whatsoever. (the record reflects no supporting evidence entered). No attorney fees should be granted to the claimed respondent. Costs should be granted to the Appellant.

#### **Argument**

- A. As stated in my appeal brief, all four Judges that touched this case erred and or abused their discretion in one way or another which caused breaches of my substantive due process Rights. (see my const. Quotes) All of the multiple times your Rule 5 (b) was breached willfully and intentionally and my said claimed errors and/or abuses of discretion caused me to be denied a trial. As of today's date only 50% of the known evidence has been entered into this case, there is a lot more to go. Absolutely (0) Zero evidence was or has been to date entered into the record supporting the claims that were used to acquire the Default Judgment against the Legally Built Trust called "TERRY LEE". On top of all that I have lost my home and a rental house to foreclosure. I have been without money(s) and work for the last three years because of the fraud, lies, misrepresentations and lack of full disclosure forced on me by the claimed defendant, and its attorneys.

### **Meritorious Defense**

I do have a meritorious defense based on the statements above. The claims by the respondent, its attorneys and the four Judges that each of them have the right to change, alter or amend my existing True Name and My True "Last Known Address", and that I have no say in it, is clearly error(s) and/or abuse(s) of their discretion. The term "Ideum Sonans" does not apply to my True existing Christian appellation (name) whatsoever. The case Ray Vs Swanson Reality mentioned by the claimed respondent does not apply to this case because it is about a woman who received service to her True Name at her True and correct "Last Known Address" Then she refused it and sent it back.

The same issue is in the Rodell Vs Nelson case, the process was sent to the correct name and the correct "Last Known Address" and was refused and sent back. Neither case above is the same situation as this case, and one of them is an unpublished case!!!



### **C. A Meritorious Defense**

- A. I entered into a private Ecclesiastical Contract with Nathan- David and not any other entity whatsoever.
- B. It was a productive and fruitful first two years project.
- C. Then in the third year, Nathan decided he was going to make all of the decisions whether I liked it or not.
- D. All of the documents related to the development project have my True Name on them as well as the name Nathan- David.
- E. I mailed and faxed True Copy's of the original petition and original summons to, two addresses of my True partner and the record reflects no rebuttal to the above stated facts.
- F. A third Party intervener joined into this said case and failed to properly follow your Rule 5 (b) and serve the True original petitioner and said petitioner at his True ' Last Known Address"
- G. On June 2<sup>nd</sup> AD 2010 Judge Mitchell placed a little yellow sticky note on the notice of service page of the Default Judgment he had signed ordering the Clerk of the courts to be sure and send a copy to my True and correct " Last Known Address", which the Clerk did and I did receive it timely, in three days. Once I received said Default Judgment I immediately headed for Sandpoint to review the case file that contained 80 pages of documents. I ask the clerk to make 80 copies and when I got home I immediately responded to and rebutted each of them. See (Ex. misc., p. 46-59 and p. 23-28).

- H. The record reflects that the Warranty Deed and the Deed of Trust and all other documents showing all correspondence with all governmental agencies for said development procedures are in fact in the True Names of the True Partners “ Terry- Lee” and Nathan- David, and no other parties and especially no Legally Built Trusts.
- I. I-R-C-P Rule 8 (d) does not apply when I was not served by due process of Law and/ or failure to comply with your Rule 5 (b).
- J. By way of the statements above my appeal has merit and I have standing to make this Appeal.

#### **D. Timely Appeal**

- 1. The Order of Default signed January 5<sup>th</sup> A.D. 2010 by Judge Mitchell in his chambers (no hearing) was purposely caused by the claimed defendant by no service to my true “Last Known Address” ( no yellow sticky note to the Clerk by said Judge), Judge Mitchell issued The Order of Default against a Legally Built Trust instead of the sovereign Being Terry- Lee. If Judge Mitchell would have made sure I received a copy of said Default, I would have responded immediately, as I did when he made certain I got a copy of the Default Judgment. Judge Mitchell’s Default Judgment was not final until he made his final Memorandum decision and order on May 7<sup>th</sup> A.D. 2011, because he had the right and authority to void said Judgment any time before he signed his final memorandum and order.

2. Substantive Due Process of Law was not followed to achieve said Default Judgment as was determined in the U.S. Supreme Court Case Jones Vs Flowers et al, 547 U.S. 220 (30060 04-1477).
  3. Where it said , when service of process is by Certified mail, that gets returned unclaimed, there should be additional steps to attempt to provide notice to the property owner before selling his property.( This applies to attorneys also because they are considered to be agents of the state).
- E. My 47 issues of Error and/ or Abuses of Discretion are based on the abuses levied on me by the claimed to be defendant thru his attorneys and all four Judges that touched this case.
- F. Use of the Zip Code is voluntary. (see domestic mail services regulations section 122-32. The U.S. Postal Service can not discriminate against non-use of the zip codes ( see Postal Reorganization Act) 39-U.S.C –403 (2012) also see 39 C.F.R Part 1 section 111.1 (2011) If you use zip codes it makes you subject to the municipal Laws of the District of Columbia, see the Federal Registry , Volume 51; number 53, Wednesday March 19<sup>th</sup> 1986 , and cf-26 C.F.R. 1.1-1 (c) . The attorney for the claimed defendant should have asked me what my Citizenship is, instead he intentionally attempted to force me into servitude to the District of Columbia. (see my annexed exhibit “ no Zip Codes), use of a WA, Zip Code address is presumed to create a “Federal Jurisdiction”, that overrides State jurisdictions. See U.S. Vs LaSalle National Bank, 437 U.S. 298 (1978).  
The I.R.S. has to use “Last Known Address”, see Pomeroy Vs U.S. 864 F. 2d, 1191 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1989).

### **Conclusion**

1. My mother named me Terry- Lee after the comic strip in the Sunday News Paper (Spokane paper) A.D. 1948 called “ Terry Lee and the Pirates”
2. I have had that name and used that name for 63 years (since A.D.1948)
3. My True Venue and Jurisdiction is as a sovereign State Citizen of The Washington Republic, which is a matter of Resjudicata.
4. Based on my Annexed Exhibit, my use of said zip codes would definitely change my Venue and Jurisdiction , which I definitely do not want to happen.
5. My True and correct “Last Known Address” is on the upper left had corner of the original petition and original summons and all of my briefs.
6. No one, but no one has the right to change my True name and/ or my True and correct “Last Known Address”.
7. I have never refused to receive any post, mail or process that has my True and correct name and True and correct location on its face, never.
8. The claimed defendant thru its attorney(s) have failed to follow your Rule 5 (b) from day one, except for the last two months.
9. The record reflects no denial and no rebuttal of the fact that my True partner Nathan- David, a sovereign man was in fact served the said summons and petition and the fact that said record reflects that my said True Partner has never appeared into this case to this very day.

10. From May 9<sup>th</sup> A.D. 2009 until June 5<sup>th</sup> A.D. 2010, I was not served any process whatsoever to my True name and True and correct location, "Last Known Address" until the clerk of the District Court in Sandpoint Idaho sent me a copy of the Default Judgment issued on June 2<sup>nd</sup> AD 2010 to my True and Correct "Last Known Address". (little yellow sticky note by said Judge to said Clerk).
11. This Appeal was timely filed after Judge Mitchell's Last and final Memorandum Decisions and Order issued on May 7<sup>th</sup> A.D.2011.
12. By my appeal brief and the statements above, I Terry- Lee have standing and a meritorious defense to file this appeal.
13. This Appellant requests the Idaho State Supreme Court to overturn the \$371,000.00 dollar plus Judgment which the record reflects zero evidence in support of. Return the 50% one half interest in said 32 acre project back to Terry- Lee a sovereign Being and order a trial to be scheduled to dissolve the partnership and divide the assets and capital invested by both partners in Bonner County Idaho an dissolve the private Ecclesiastical contract between the two original partners.

I do appreciate your time and energy in this matter.

Always In Solo Propria Natura and as your 28 U.S.C. 1746-1

Date: 07-17-A.D.2012

Autographed This Day Terry-Lee

Sui juris Terry-Lee

20

## No Zip Codes

Use Invokes Federal Jurisdiction

<http://www.amguard.net/NoZIP.htm>

(author unknown)

Use of the ZIP Code is voluntary. See Domestic Mail Services Regulations, Section 122.32. You should also know that the Postal service can not discriminate against the non-use of the ZIP Code. See "Postal Reorganization Act", Section 403, (Public Law 91-375). The federal government utilizes the ZIP code to prove that you reside in a "federal district of the District of Columbia". This is why the IRS and other government agencies (state and federal) require a ZIP Code when they assert jurisdiction by sending you a letter. They claim that this speeds the mail, but this is a sly and subtle TRICK. It is also prima facie evidence that you are a subject of Congress and a "citizen of the District of Columbia" who is "resident" in one of the several States.

The receipt of mail with a ZIP code is one of the requirements for the IRS to have jurisdiction to send you notices. The government cannot bill a Citizen of Illinois, because he is not within the purview of the MUNICIPAL LAWS of the District of Columbia. In fact, the Internal Revenue Service has adopted the ZIP code areas as Internal Revenue Districts. See the Federal Register, Volume 51, Number 53, Wednesday, March 19, 1986.

You must remember that the Postal Service is a private corporation, a quasi-governmental agency. It is no longer a full government agency. It is like the Federal Reserve System, the Internal Revenue Service, and the United States Marshall Service. They are all outside the restrictions of the Federal Constitution, as private corporations. They are all powerful in their respective areas of responsibility to enforce collection for the federal debt. So, if you are using a ZIP code, you are in effect saying openly and notoriously that you do not live in the State of Illinois, but, instead are a resident in the Illinois area of the District of Columbia (a federal district). There are some so-called Patriot groups that I consider to be patriots for money. They advocate the use of Title 42 suits (which are for federal citizens only), send mail to you with a ZIP Code, and ask you to do things that place you within the municipal jurisdiction of the District of Columbia.

Remember these individuals may be agents of the government or, even worse, are advocating a one-world government by the use of the Social Security number and the ZIP code.

So you must be aware of the movement towards a one-world government through annihilation or elimination of State Citizens by use of the so-called 14th Amendment and its related laws.

file://G:\Zip Code.htm

1/8/2008

Exhibit

21

It is this writer's opinion, both as a result of study, e.g. of page 11 of the National Area ZIP Code Directory; of 26 U.S.C. 7621; of Section 4 of the Federal Register, Volume 51, Number 53, of Wednesday, March 19, 1986, Notices at pages 9571 through 9573; of Treasury Delegation Order (TDO) 150-01; of the opinion in United States v. LaSalle National Bank, 437 U.S. 298, 308, 98 S.Ct.2d 2357, 57 L.Ed.2d 221 (1978); of 12 U.S.C. 222; of 31 U.S.C. 103; and as a result of my actual experience, that a ZIP Code address is presumed to create a "Federal jurisdiction" or "market venue" or "revenue districts" that override State boundaries, taking one who uses such modes of address outside of a State venue and its constitutional protections and into an international, commercial venue involving admiralty concerns of the "United States", which is a commercial corporation domiciled in Washington, D.C.

More specifically, looking at the map on page 11 of the National ZIP Code Directory, e.g. at a local post office, one will see that the first digit of a ZIP Code defines an area that includes more than one State. The first sentence of the explanatory paragraph begins:

"A ZIP Code is a numerical code that identifies areas within the United States and its territories for purposes of ..." [cf. 26 CFR 1.1-1(c)].

Note the singular possessive pronoun "its", not "their", therefore carrying the implication that it relates to the "United States" as a corporation domiciled in the District of Columbia (in the singular sense), not in the sense of being the 50 States of the Union (in the plural sense). The map shows all the States of the Union, but it also shows D.C., Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, making the explanatory statement literally correct.

Properly construed, ZIP Codes can only be applicable in Federal territories and enclaves that may be located within the 50 States of the Union, and to the "United States" and District of Columbia and its territories — cf. Piqua Bank v. Knoup, 6 Ohio 342, 404 (1856) and U.S. v. Butler, 297 U.S. 1, 63 (1936) to the effect that "In every state there are two governments; the state and the United States." Therefore, ZIP Code addresses are for the corporate "United States" and its agents (for example, a customs and duty collector at New York harbor, when they move out into the States of the Union to perform functions delegated to the "United States" by the National/Federal Constitution, or the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation, Bureau of Motor Vehicles, or a U.S. Congressman).

But, by propaganda, misleading information and seditious syntax, government has gotten nearly everyone in the 50 States of the Union to use ZIP Codes of address, and that creates a PRESUMPTION or a PREJUDICIAL ADMISSION that one is in such a Federal venue, or that one is such a government agent.

In general, it is well settled in law that Income Tax Statutes apply only to corporations and to their officers, agents, and employees acting in their official capacities, e.g. from Colonial Pipeline Co. v. Traigle, 421 U.S. 100, 44 L.Ed.2d 1, 95 S.Ct. 1538 (1975): "... However, all 'income tax statutes' apply only to state created creatures known as corporations no matter whether state, local, or federal." Since corporations act only through their officers, employees, etc., the income tax statutes reach out to them when acting in their official capacities, but not as individuals. This is the real purpose for Identifying Numbers — cf. 26 CFR 301.6109-1(d) & (g) and 26 U.S.C. 6331 (a) and 26 CFR 301.6331-1, Part 4.

Use of a ZIP Code address is tantamount to the admission of being a "citizen of the United States" who does not necessarily have the protections of the first eight Amendments to the Constitution (in the Bill of Rights) when proceeded against by Federal or State authority — Maxwell v. Dow, 176 U.S. 581, 20 S.Ct. 448 (1900), but, "All the provisions of the constitution look to an indestructible union of indestructible states", Texas v. White, 7 Wall. 700; U.S. v. Cathcart, 25 F. Case No. 14,756; In re Charge to Grand Jury, 30 F. Case No. 18,273 (65 C.J. Section 2) — not

Exhibit  
22

Certificate of Service  
Case # 38939-2011

I, Terry-Lee, hereby certify that  
on the 27<sup>th</sup> day of June AD 2012  
I caused to be served a true and  
correct copy of the foregoing document  
to be placed in the U.S. mail to  
the Party's Listed Below:

The Idaho Supreme Courthouse  
Box 83720  
Boise, Idaho State

near, 83720-0101

LUKINS & ANNIS P.S.,  
601 Front Ave. Suite 502  
Coeur d'Alene  
Idaho State

near, 83814

Always - In Solo Propria Natura

Date: 7-17-A.D.2012

Terry-Lee  
Sui-juris Terry-Lee