

**NOTICE AND DEMAND
TO CEASE AND DESIST**

TO: Mr. Stephen R. Monier
c/o Office of the U.S. Marshal
Warren B. Rudman U.S. Courthouse
55 Pleasant Street, Suite 207
Concord 03301
NEW HAMPSHIRE, USA

FROM: Paul Andrew Mitchell, B.A., M.S.
Private Attorney General, 18 U.S.C. 1964(a), Rotella v. Wood

DATE: June 15, 2007 A.D.

SUBJECT: Mr. Ed and Mrs. Elaine Brown

Greetings Mr. Monier:

This is to inform you formally and officially that my office legally represents the United States *ex rel.* in Tenth Circuit appeal #07-2017.

In that case, extensive verified evidence has already been admitted into that Court's record, proving conclusively that there is no *Statute at Large* creating a specific liability for income taxes imposed by subtitle A of the Internal Revenue Code ("IRC").

The alleged "liability" was fabricated by the Internal Revenue Service, but there is no corresponding Act of Congress creating that specific liability for any income taxes imposed by IRC subtitle A.

Accordingly, even if the IRS were a *de jure* service, bureau, office or other subdivision of the U.S. Department of the Treasury (which they are NOT), they would still not have any authority to create a tax liability by means of regulations published in the *Federal Register*. See 31 U.S.C. 333; *Commissioner v. Acker*, 361 U.S. 87 (1959).

Moreover, you are hereby served with formal NOTICE that the constitutionality of IRC subtitle A, the federal Jury Selection and Service Act and the Act of June 25, 1948, has now been properly and formally challenged in that Tenth Circuit Appeal.

In the first instance, it is now the position of the United States *ex rel.* that the Jury Selection and Service Act is unconstitutional because it expressly discriminates against State Citizens by requiring that all jury candidates be federal citizens. The U.S. Supreme Court has already held that such "class discrimination" in jury selection is unconstitutional. There are two (2) classes of citizens in America.

Therefore, the Browns were never "indicted" by a lawfully convened federal grand jury, and they were never "convicted" by a lawfully convened federal trial jury. Both panels of federal citizens were not lawfully convened federal juries, in the first instance.

My office has not yet had an opportunity to review any of the court pleadings filed in the Browns' case. Nevertheless, our 17 years of experience in State and federal litigation inform us that the U.S. Department of Justice routinely institutes criminal proceedings on behalf of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA. However, the latter entity incorporated twice in Delaware, and both of those foreign corporations have now been revoked by the Delaware Secretary of State.

To make matters much worse, the long-standing rule in all federal litigation is that statutes conferring original jurisdiction on Federal District Courts must be strictly construed. The Article IV United States District Court has no criminal jurisdiction *whatsoever*. The general grant of criminal jurisdiction at 18 U.S.C. 3231 confers original jurisdiction upon the Article III District Courts of the United States, not on the Article IV United States District Courts.

We have enclosed a few key documents to substantiate every statement above, and full details are readily available from supporting links and related resources in the *Supreme Law Library* on the Internet here:

<http://www.supremelaw.org/cc/williamson2/appeal/>

DEMAND TO CEASE AND DESIST

Accordingly, formal demand is hereby made of you and all of your associates, accomplices and accessories of whatever description, to **cease and desist immediately from any further attempts to apprehend the Browns or to trespass upon their fundamental Rights or private property** in any manner whatsoever.

NOTICE OF INTENT

If you willfully violate this lawful NOTICE AND DEMAND TO CEASE AND DESIST, this is our formal NOTICE to you of our intent to lodge a VERIFIED CRIMINAL COMPLAINT, ON INFORMATION specifically naming you as a principal in a conspiracy to engage in a pattern of racketeering activities in connection with the Browns and in connection with any *other* attempts by your office to enforce a non-existent liability for IRC subtitle A "income taxes", in violation of 18 U.S.C. 1962.

Notice to agents is notice to principals.
Notice to principals is notice to agents.

Thank you for your immediate cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

/s/ Paul Andrew Mitchell

Paul Andrew Mitchell, B.A., M.S.
Private Attorney General, Criminal Investigator and
Federal Witness: 18 U.S.C. 1510, 1512-13, 1964(a)
<http://www.supremelaw.org/decs/agency/private.attorney.general.htm>