You’re Name\***Mario Anthony Sanfilippo: Plaintiff**

**(Tribunal-in-fact in the administration of estate trust MARIO ANTHONY SANFILIPPO said estate trust)**

**Company N/A**

Mailing Address\* **Superior Court California** **c/o Post Office Box 890181**

City\* **Temecula,**

State\* **California Republic**

Zip Code**\*[92589-0181]**

Phone **N/A**

Email\***sanfilippom80@yahoo.com**

Merchants' Bond Principal's Name**\* Amy Rasmussen County assessor, RES, AAS, FIAAO, Chief Deputy**

Bond or Policy Number\***41112697N**

**Claim Amount\* Total $ 1,296,000.00 Million Dollars; list of violations with iminium fines; see attachments as reference on the breach minimum fines;**

**1**. Oath of office **$ 250,000.00** **Title 18 USC SEC 3571;** **Art I Sec 10 Powers Denied States Cla 1 Proscribed Powers**; **(Bill of Attainder**; **without** a judicial trial) & **Article V & Title 18 U.S.C. Sec 241 & 242**

**2**.Conspiracy against rights **$ 10,000.00 Title 18 USC SEC 241;** **Included above;**

**3.** Deprivation of rights under color of law **$ 1,000.00** **Title 18 USC SEC 242; Included above;**

**4.** Rico / Racketeering **$ 25,000.00** **Title 18 USC SEC 1964(C); Included above; 70 yrs. Breach on people**

**5**. Defense **denied** evidence (records) **$ 250,000.00** **Title 18 USC SEC 3571;** & **SEC 1512b; & 2076 & 2071;**

**6**. Slavery (**Forced compliance to contract not held)** **$ 250,000.00** **Title 18 USC SEC 3571;** **20 yrs. breach**

**7.** Fraud statement of entries generally **$ 10,000.00** **Title 18 USC SEC 1001; this all amounts to Fraud;**

**8.** Denied provisions in the constitution **$ 250,000.00** **Title 18 USC SEC 3571; (Article V & Sec 8) & (Art I Sec 10 Powers Denied States Clause 1 Proscribed Powers); (Bill of Attainder; without a judicial trial)**

**9.** Treason **$ 250,000.00** **Title 18 USC SEC 3571; The Violations of the above are an attack on the people of the California republic which is treason. Breach in fiduciary duty, of the contract with the people, of California, Breach of Title 18 USC SEC 241 & 242 & 1964 & 3571 & 1512b & 2076 & 2071 & 1001;**

**Description of Claim: NOTICE IN LAW**

The S**uperior court has determined Amy Rasmussen Chief Assessor lead agent, of agency, county of** **riverside,** has a **fraudulent claim of a property tax for unjust enrichment** as there is no commercial contract with specific performance and full disclosure to substantiate the **property tax charge** on private property **pin 920072006** and the **superior court** does not believe that there is **sufficient evidence** to **satisfy all elements** of the **property tax charge** or a **plaintiff willing** to take the stand and **testify** to the **veracity** of the **property tax** charge. **Please review the two documents sent to her on 8/2/2023 &** **8/14/2023 both of these notices in law** have **a 7 day stipulation of a non-response silent acquiesces admission of guilt. The Superior court provided over 4 month as of now with no response.** **See above code breaches**. The **Superior Court** will provide the **proof** of all the breach, failures to faithfully protect the **people of California** republic committed by and under chief deputy **Amy Rasmussen** County **assessor riverside. While under her** committing **no less** than **treason, Rico,** **Slavery,** **conspiracy & deprivation of rights, denied evidence, denied constitutional** **provisions,** and **fraud property tax charges**, **perpetrated on to the people she swore an oath to protect.**

**The Superior Court will now take each of the violation breaches committed by and under Amy Rasmussen, and in detail illustrate all the breaches, illustrated above, in the list of rights violations with iminium fines, inflicted on to the plaintiff, beyond any contention, doubt, or controversy. The** **Superior Court** will start by **high lighting** **the Fifth** **Amendment**; **Amendment V;** , “nor be deprived of **life, liberty, or property”**, without “**due process of law”;** **nor** shall “**private property”** be **“taken”** for public use**, without just compensation”. Breaking it down** let’s beginwith “**nor be deprived of “life”, “liberty”**, or “**property”** let’s start with **“life, liberty”** **these** are **rights** which are **guaranteed** under the “**Constitution”** and **laws** of the “**United States”**. This clearly is **protected** under the constitution **by Article V** and laws of the United States by **Title 18 USC SEC 241; “**or District in the **free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege secured to him** by the **Constitution or** **laws of the United States**, or because **of his** having so **exercised** the same”; a **clear breach of oath and plaintiffs rights, & 242;**  “any **person in any State,** Territory, Commonwealth, Possession, or **District** to **the deprivation of any rights**, privileges, or **immunities** secured or **protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States” a clear breach of oath and plaintiffs rights.** The **Superior Court** would also **point out** that **the laws** of the “**United States”** are **not law** the **federal code**, **statutes**, are rules **guide-lines** government agencies are to follow. **Please review;** **“United States”** – **defined at Title 26 U.S.C. Sec 7701 (a) (9);** the term **“United States”** when used in a **geographical sense** includes only the “**States”** and the “**District of Columbia”.** The **State – defined at Title 26 U.S.C. Sec 7701 (a) (10);** the term **“State”** shall be **construed** to include the **District of Columbia**, where such **construction is necessary** to carry out **provisions of this title**.Both are **defined in Title 26 U.S.C. section 7806 (b) Arrangement and classification; No** **inference**, **implication,** or **presumption** of **legislative construction** shall be **drawn or made by reason** of the **location or grouping** of **any particular section** or **provision or portion** of this **title,** nor shall **any** table of contents, table of cross references, or similar outline, analysis, or **descriptive matter relating** to the **contents** of **this title** be **given any legal effect.** This definition **clearly disqualifies** **codes of the United States**, as being **laws, but are guide-lines codes, statutes, which cannot be breached. These breaches** however **still do not** undermine the **Constitution of the United States of America – 1787 Article V**; **nor does it in the 1849** **Constitution of the State or California; Article 1 Declaration of Rights Sec 8**. “Nor be deprived of **life**, **liberty,** or **property,** without **due “process of law”;** nor shall **private property** be taken for public use **without just compensation”**. We can see that **these rights are protected** by the **Constitution of the state** **of California** and that **for the United States of America.** The **Superior Court** would also **high light breach of “private property” be “taken”** for; “**or the taking may be constructive** **(also** called a **regulatory taking),** which means that **the government restricts the owner's rights”.** These **restricted rights** are **protected by** **both** the **Constitution of the state of California** and the **Constitution for the United States of America, these are clear braches of the oath of office, and the list of breaches illustrated within.** The **people** of the **California Republic also** have **law** as a **tool to protect their Rights**. The **Superior Court** will now define; **due “process of law “this “process of** law” **is common law** and this **tool** to protect the **peoples right** is found in a **court of record**. This **protection** is in the **California Constitution Article VI –** **Judicia**l **Section 1.** The **judicial power** of this **State is vested** in the **Supreme Court,** **courts of appeal**, and **superior courts**, all of which are **courts of record.** The **Superior Court** will now define a **court of record**. Please review**; a "court of record**" is a **judicial tribunal** having **attributes** and **exercising functions** **independently of the person of the magistrate** designated generally to hold it, **and proceeding** **according to the course of common law**, its acts and **proceedings** being enrolled for **a perpetual** **memorial. Jones v. Jones,** 188 Mo. App. 220, 175 S.W.; **Note:** that a **judge is a magistrate** and is **not** the **tribunal.** The **tribunal is either the sovereign (one of the people)** himself, or a **fully empowered jury** **(Not paid by the government).** The **Superior Court** will **now define** the **only judicial court** in California. Please review; the word **"court"** is often **employed in statutes** otherwise than in its **strict technical sense**, and is **applied to various** tribunals **not judicial** in their character, **State vs. Howat**, 107 kan. 423, 191 P 585, 589. The **criminal court** is an **inferior court** because it is operating **according to special rules (criminal code)** and not **according to the common law**. Even if its name is "Superior Court of ....." it is **still an inferior court** so long as it is **operating according** to some **code or statutes** rather than the **common law.** On the other hand, **a court of record** so long as it **meets** the **criteria,** is **a true superior court.** **The Superior Court** would **point** out that **a true superior court** is a **judicial court** and the **only way** to have a **judicial trial.** Which is **clearly** included into a **breach proof** as **described** in the **Unites States Constitution Article I Section 10 Powers Denied States** **Clause 1** Proscribed Powers; “pass any **Bill of Attainder”**, **A bill of attainder is legislation** **that imposes** **punishment** on a **specific “person”** or “**group of people” without a “judicial trial”**. The **Superior Court** would **high light this breach** Amy Rasmussen is committing on a “**group of people” being punished by the fraud property tax** this group **of people** would be the **people of the California republic. This is further protected in the California Government code 11120; “The people of this state do not yield their sovereignty to the agencies which serve them**”. **This** is a clear **breach** of the **oath of office** along with the other **breaches** on the list of **violations.** The **Superior Court** will **now discuss** the “**specific** **person”** the **“person” is defined in Title 26;** and refers to **a legal entity**. **An “entity”** refers to **a “person”** or organization **possessing separate** and **distinct legal** rights, such as an **individual, partnership**, or **corporation**. An **entity can,** among other things, **own property, engage in business**, enter into **contracts,** **pay taxes, sue** and **be sued**. An **entity** is capable of **operating legally,** suing and making decisions **through “agents”,** e.g. a **corporation,** a **state,** or an **association.** **The Superior Court** will now **close the door** on any **agencies agents’ public** or **private**, **Court, City,** **County**, **municipal** or **territorial Government,** and this also includes attorneys and **the BAR**, any administration, political party democrat, or republican, and the **A.P.A. act.** The **management** of this **venue by any agencies agents**, and the **legislative construction created** working through the **legal entity** for **any administration** of the respective **estate trusts** of the **people** of the **California republic**, **have been** “**prohibited” no! Means no!** **The Superior court** will provide the **evidence** in the **code** and **statutes** **to prove this statement**. The **Superior Court** will now discuss **particular provision** and **portions,** cross **references,** descriptive matter, **relating** to the contents, of **Title 26;** which provide **code and statutes** to **prove** the “**prohibition”** on **legislative construction** and the **administration of the estate trusts** by any **agencies agents public or private** as **illustrated previously above.**

**Please Review**: (1) **Person** - **defined** at **Title 26** USC §7701(a) (1) only referencing statutory legal fictions:

(2) **U.S. person** - **defined** at **Title 26** USC §7701(a) (30) only referencing statutory legal fictions:

(3) **Taxpayer** - **defined** at **Title 26** USC §7701(a) (14) references any 'person' subject to:

**United States citizen** – **defined** at **Title 26** USC Sec7701 (a) (30) (A); a **citizen or resident** of the United States**,** (All these provisions, portions, contents, and descriptive matter provide **no legislative authority)**

**United States** – **defined** at **Title 26** USC Sec 7701 (a) (9); the **term “United States”** when used in a geographical **sense** includes only the **States and the District of Columbia.**

**State –** **defined** at **Title 26** USC Sec 7701 (a) (10); the term **“State”** shall be **construed** to **include** the **District of Columbia**, where such **construction** is **necessary** to carry out **provisions** of this **title.**

**Title 26 U.S.C. Section 7806 Construction of title (legislative construction Prohibited)**

**(a) Cross references**; The **cross references** in this title to other portions of the title, or other provisions of law, where the word "see" is used, are made only for convenience, and **shall be given no legal effect**.

**(b) Arrangement and classification**; **No inference**, **implication,** or **presumption** of **legislative construction** **shall be drawn or made by reason** of **the location** or grouping of any **particular section** or **provision or portion** of this **title,** nor **shall any** table of **contents**, table of cross references, or similar outline, analysis, or **descriptive matter relating** to the **contents of this** **title be given any legal effect**. The preceding sentence also applies to the side notes and ancillary tables contained in the various prints of this **Act** before its enactment into law. **(Aug. 16, 1954, Ch. 736, 68A Stat. 917.) No! Means No!**

The **Superior Court will high light the date Aug, 16, 1954** this means there has been **no authority** for **Amy Rasmussen** in the agency county of riverside California for **over 70 years**. Also the superior court would point out that **any legislative construction created** in the **county of riverside agency** or in the **state of California**, or **in the United States**, using the **legal entity** “person” or taxpayer, “U.S. person”, or “United States Citizen”, is the **proof of the breach**, **oath of office**, **Title 18 USC SEC 3571; & 241, 242**, **1001, 1964(C), 3571**, **Treason, Slavery, denied evidence, denied Constitutional provisions,** clearly **No! Legislative construction** **Means No**. There is **no Authority provided** Amy Rasmussen in the **county of Riverside** for any property tax on any property in the **California republic** all land in California Republic is under **land patent**. Please Review: The **Land Patent** is the **only form** of perfect title to **land available in the United States.** Wilcox v. Jackson, 13 PET (U.S.) 498 10 L. Ed. 264**. The Land Patent is permanent and cannot be changed** by the **government after its issuance**. “Where the United States has parted with title by a patent legally issued and upon surveys made by itself and approved by the proper department, **the title so granted cannot be impaired by any subsequent survey made by the government for its own purposes.” Cage v. Danks, 13 LA.ANN 128. "The** State of California is an **inseparable part of the United States of America,** and the **United States Constitution** is the supreme **law** of the land." California Constitution, **Article 3, Sec. 1.**

**The Superior Court** is only **concerned** with the **county of** **riversides authority** to **tax property** and clearly that authority has been **prohibited** for Amy Rasmussen to use. The Superior Court and the plaintiff have the land Patent to the land in question which is allodial **beholden to no superior**, only **as sovereign freeholders** in the land. The Superior Court would also high light **an officer’s** of any agencies **duty** owed to the **plaintiff (Superior Court).**

Please review: **Title 28-JUDICIARY AND JUDICIAL PROCEDURE PART IV-JURISDICTION AND VENUE** **CHAPTER 85-DISTRICT COURTS**; **JURISDICTION** **§1361**. **Action to compel an officer of the United States to perform his duty**

The district courts shall have **original jurisdiction** of any **action** in the nature of **mandamus** to compel an **officer** or **employee** of the **United States** or **any agency** thereof to **perform a duty owed** to the **plaintiff.** (Added Pub. L. 87–748, §1(a), Oct. 5, 1962, 76 Stat. 744.) MANDAMUS, practice. The name of a writ, the principal word of which when the proceedings were in Latin, was mandamus, **we command.**

2. It is **a command** issuing in the name of the **sovereign authority** (**We the People**) from a **superior court** (**court of record**) **having jurisdiction**, and is directed to some **person,** corporation, or, **inferior court**, (County of riverside) within the **jurisdiction** of such **superior court**,(Plaintiffs) requiring them to do some **particular thing therein** specified,(Remedy) which appertains to their **office and duty,** and which the **superior court** has **previously determined**, or at **least supposes** to be **consonant to right** and **justice.** 20 Pick. 484; 21 Pick. 258; Dudley, 37; 4 Humph. 437.

The **Superior Court** will discuss **oath of justices and judges** in the **State of California**. **Please review: Title 28 U.S. Code § 453 - Oaths of justices and judges;** each justice or judge of the United States shall take the **following oath or affirmation** before performing the **duties of his office**:

**“I, \_\_\_ \_\_\_, do solemnly swear** (or affirm) that I will **administer justice** without respect to **"persons"**, and do **equal right to the poor and to the rich,** and that I will **faithfully and impartially discharge** and **perform all the duties** incumbent **upon me** as \_\_\_ **under the Constitution** and **laws of the "United** **States"** So help me God.”(June 25, 1948, ch. 646, 62 Stat. 907; Pub. L. 101–650, title IV, § 404, Dec. 1, 1990, 104 Stat. 5124.)

The **Superior Court will** further discuss the **practice of law by justices and judges**; Please review**: Title 28** U.S. Code § **454** - **Practice of law by justices and judges**; **Any justice or judge** appointed under the **authority** of the **United States** who engages in the **practice of law** is **guilty** of **a high (Treason) misdemeanor.** **(June 25, 1948, ch. 646, 62 Stat. 908.)**

The **superior court** will **inform you** that **LAW can only be practiced by the Plaintiff / Tribunal or a Special Master in his or her court of record. This is also how the founding father structured the system of law: Please review:**

The **Founding fathers Said Law** is **too important** to leave it to **the judges:** “i don’t remember who it was, but somebody said that **war is much too important to leave to generals**, well this is an acknowledgment **that law is too important to leave to the Judges**, it’s the **sovereigns** that make the **decision,** and the **founding fathers** had a lot more **confidence** in the **sovereigns of the country** than they **ever did** in the **judges of the country**”

The **Superior Court added the justices and judges background information** for a fair and balanced conclusion. The **Riverside County** Chief Assessor **Amy Rasmussen** could have **sought legal advice** from a **justice or a judge**. Which on the **surface** as you can see **provides no authority** because the **practice** of **law is a crime**, and their **oath is not to respect the “person”** which if that was so based on the breaches would include the **judges and justices. However the riverside county Chief Amy Rasmussen is the lead agent and responsible for her actions and the agency’s performance breaches committed. Which have violated her oath and the plaintiff’s rights. The superior court will also add these breaches illustrated herein have been active since Aug 17, 1954.**

**Please review: "Time cannot render valid an act void in its origin." – Maxim of Law**

**dolus vitiates omnia tangit; fraud vitiates everything it touches;**

**ubi jus ibi remedium; QUICK REFERENCE** [Latin: where there is a right there is a remedy] The principle that where one's right is invaded or destroyed, the law gives a remedy to protect it or damages for its loss. Further, where one's right is denied the law affords the remedy of an action for its enforcement. This right to a remedy therefore includes more than is usually meant in English law by the term **“remedy**”, **as it includes a right of action**;

The Superior court final thoughts this submission of this claim against the principals surety bond is a right of action for the plaintiff’s rights which were invaded and destroyed. The LAW provides remedy to protect it or damages for its loss. **(See claim amount) 70 years of breaches**

Mario Anthony Sanfilippo is the tribunal-in-fact and the plaintiff in this case. We have personal knowledge of the foregoing facts and are competent to the truth of these facts. We declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct, and that this declaration was executed in the county of Riverside, California republic, on \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ /\_\_\_\_ /\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Respectfully submitted**

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Mario Anthony Sanfilippo**

"There can be no sanction or penalty imposed upon one because of this exercise of constitutional rights." Sherer v. Cullen, 481 F 946.