**NOTICE IN LAW**

The superior court will advise of the following adjustment in the **claim CA1199886** against Principal Amy Rasmussen **notary surety bond no.41112697N** please Review: **(last notice in law sent on 01/20/2024** **taken from page 8 of 8)**

“The superior court will advise this notice in law point in fact leaves no room for error it is to the letter of the law and California code it also illustrates the full scope and duties of the principal Amy Rasmussen in the county of riverside. This notice in law also provides the proof of the breach of the notary surety bond and the oath of office. Any further discussion of your narrow posture to defend what clearly is lost will further damage the rights of the plaintiff and will reflect an increase as illustrated below. **(Damages will increase by 3)”**

The **Merchants Bonding Company** under **Garen H. Kasparian** leadership has done nothing but continue **criminal piracy and privateering activity** in defense of the said **principals notary surety bond 41112697.** This notice in law as the previous two will leave no room for any defense and provide another nail in the **claim CA1199886** approval casket. The **superior court** has added **exhibit (1)** for review to visualize the presentment of legislative construction sent to the plaintiff on a monthly basis. This exhibit (1) is a yearly assessment of which will provide the **monthly charges**. The **superior court** would add the existence of that **document** **exhibit (1)** on its **face** is the **proof of all the breaches illustrated** in **both** of the **notices** **in** **law** and the **proof of claim** approval. Now you will notice on the **exhibit (1)** there are highlighted lower case letters **(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)** also the **correct spelling** of the plaintiffs name is **Mario Anthony Sanfilippo** any other spelling form in all capitals is the estate trust **“person”** legal entity as it states on the exhibit **(1)** **SANFILIPPO MARIO** it is referencing **the legal entity only** that is not the proper **(see above)** spelling in English. The superior court will now **define the lower case letters on exhibit (1)** beginning with **(a);**

**(a)** **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 (please **reference** these case’s we have added a **copy** of **land patent to the land at pin 92007006)** 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 marked 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**

**(b) PERSON** = STATUTORY **LEGAL ENTITY FICTION** / ESTATE TRUST; **Penhallow v. Doane’s** Administrators 3 U.S. 54; 1 L.Ed. 57; 3 Dall. 54; and, b. **"the contracts between them"** involve U.S. citizens, which are deemed **as Corporate Entities**: c. "Therefore, the U.S. citizens residing in **one of the states** of the union, are **classified as property** and franchises of the federal government as an **"individual 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**, suingand making decisions **through “agents”,** e.g**. a corporation**, **a state**, or an **association.** (**Note 7806)**

**(1) Person - defined at 26 USC §7701(a) (1) only referencing statutory legal fictions:** (**Sec 7806** of title **26** us code provides the **prohibition** on the use of this venue for **any legislative construction** verbal or in the reduced down to **written form**). **See Title 26 USC Sec 7806 (b) for review;**

**(c) The** Superior court will add **no legislative construction really means no authority granted** verbally or in a reduced **down to written form directed towards the legal entity “Person”** this would include any public forms like **presentments, like exhibit (1) constructed in the county of riverside (approved by principal Amy Rasmussen) sent, tickets, court orders, any communication** through to the **legal entity “Person” vessel** is prohibited, its much deeper and wider than this claim will define. However the superior court will for the simplicity of the issues raised in the case for this clam, state **“Plaintiffs rights, invaded and destroyed through breaches committed under a notary surety bond”** will define the damages. Please review: **No Legislative Construction**; Sec **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.** 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.) Title 26 U.S.C.;**

**(d)** The superior court finds it interesting that the **principal Amy Rasmussen** chief assessor of Riverside County **acts for and on behalf of** a governmental **entity.** This **duty** when appointed by the **sectary of** **state** is within **all duties required of a public notary**, when **appointed as an employee** of the **county** of riverside in California. This is defined in **California Government Code Sec 8202.5;** The Secretary of State may appoint and commission the number of state, city, **“county”,** and public school district employees as **notaries public to act for and on behalf of** the **“governmental entity”** for which appointed which the **Secretary of State** deems proper. The superior court will further define what the relationship in a county and the connection means to an **entity.** This is defined in **California Government Code Sec 7920.510; (a)** **(i) (j);** **(a) A county.** **(i)** **Another local public agency. (j)** **An “entity”** that is a **legislative body** of a local **agency pursuant to subdivision** (c) or (d) of **Section 54952.** ; The Superior court would further highlight **California Government Code sec 54952;** **(a); (c) (A); (a).** The governing body of a **local agency** or any other **local body created** by state or **federal statute**. (c) (A) Is created by the **elected legislative body** in order to **exercise authority** that may lawfully be delegated by the elected **governing body** to a private corporation**, limited liability company**, or other **entity.** The Superior court would add these **California government codes** as stated above **make the connection** between **the legal entities.** That of the **“Person” legal entity vessel** and the **local agency** county of riverside **“governmental entity”**. Which is a **duty of** the **principal Amy Rasmussen when she** acts for and on behalf of the **governmental entity.** This **clearly** means **it is within her duties among others** and **the breaches committed** illustrated in **both notices in law** sent **describe her breach violations** of the **oath of office** and her **notary surety bond**. As described in **section (c)** of this **notice in law**, **no legislative construction** **verbal or reduced to written** form according to **Sec 7806** of title 26 U.S. Code. The superior court would point out that among other duties of the county of riverside notary public. When appointed seem par for course if working at the **county of Riverside assessing tax on property.**  Through **presentment of legislative construction** created and sent to **estate trusts “persons” legal entities** in the California republic. This duty among other when requested of a notary is defined in the California **Government Code Sec 8205; (a)** It is the **duty of a notary public**, when requested: (1) To **demand acceptance and payment** of foreign and inland **bills of exchange**, or **promissory notes,** to **protest them** for **non-acceptance** and **nonpayment**, and, with regard only to the **non-acceptance** or **nonpayment** of **bills and notes,** to exercise **any** other **powers and duties** that by the **law of nations** and according to **commercial usages**, or by the **laws** of any other **state**, **government**, or **country**, may be performed by a **notary.** The superior court **finds it interesting** that this **duty** falls right in line with the **riverside county** **agency operations.** This description of the full scope of the principals duties outlined in this notice in law. **Clearly shows the wide scope** ofthe agency’s **operations and** the nexus **relationship of duties** and the **expectations set forth** by the sectary of state **upon** the principal **Amy Rasmussen. The assertions you continue to make are incorrect on many levels. First take a look at the exhibit (1) is there** a place for a signature, **or** is there a signature there**, No!** **There is no signature**, also did the plaintiff **want or ask** for any of those **products** from the county of riverside. **No!** Is there a commercial contract **with full specific** performance disclosure and agreement? **No! you have the two notices in law sent one 08/02/2023 and on 08/14/2023 both these notices discuss, this point of contractual agreement with 7 day stipulation non-response silent acquiesces admission of guilt.** Furthermoreyou mentioned that the documents correctness/legality is not the responsibility of the notary public and falls outside of her scope of duties. **Which I believe is correct however that would only apply if the plaintiff asked for her** **services** on a **document** to process some sort of **property line** or **disclosure** between two property owners or something of that nature. This case is **centered** on the **authority of the principal Amy Rasmussen** in the county of riverside, **creating property tax presentments**, bills of exchange, **bills and notes**, and **demanding acceptance** and **payment** and to protest for **non-acceptance and nonpayment** and to exercise **any powers** and **duties** that by the **law of nations,** **commercial usages,** and **law of any other** state, government, **or** country **that may be performed.** The **superior court** would add this is within the principals notary public **scope of duties** along with the others described herein. The principal does not work **at** the **UPS store,** she is not a **mobile notary public**, and she doesn’t work at a **private organization** providing **notary public services**, she works for the **county of riverside** and is the **chief assessor.** Over the agency’s operations and is there **by her appointment by the secretary of state,** and her **full scope** of **duties** are **described herein.** The superior courts **conclusions are biased o**n title U.S. codes **breaches** California government & civil codes, **breaches,** California Constitution Art, Sec **breaches** and the United States Constitution Art, Sec **breaches**. All of which leads this superior **court to conclude** the Principal **Amy Rasmussen** has breached her **oath of** **office** as described in the first **notice in law** (**original claim**) and her **notary surety bond** as described in the second **notice in law**, and again in this **notice in law.** The **sec 7806** of **title 26 U.S. code** is the **prohibition** on this **agency’s public operations.**

**Therefore there can be no other conclusion other than, she has committed the breaches. (The breaches described in both notices in law and this notice in law are true correct and to the letter of the law) To suggest anything else is piracy, privateering, fraud, sedition, treason. This is defined in CHAPTER 81—PIRACY AND PRIVATEERING;**

**(Without specific performance disclosure of vessel “Person” legal entity it is Piracy & Privateering)**

**Title 18 sec 1658; 1658. Plunder of distressed vessel;** (a) **Whoever** **plunders**, steals, or destroys any money, goods, merchandise, or other effects from or belonging to **any vessel in distress,** or wrecked, **lost,** stranded, or cast away, upon the sea, or upon any reef, shoal, bank, or rocks of the sea, or **in any** **other place within the admiralty and maritime jurisdiction of the United States**, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both.

**(b)** **Whoever willfully obstructs** the escape of **any person** endeavoring to **save his life** from **such vessel**, or the wreck thereof; **or** Whoever holds out **or shows any false light**, or **extinguishes any true light,** with intent to **bring any vessel sailing upon the sea into danger or distress** or shipwreck— Shall be **imprisoned not less** than **ten years** and may be imprisoned for life. (June 25, 1948, Ch. 645, 62 Stat. 775; Pub. L. 103–322, title XXXIII, §330016(1) (K), Sept. 13, 1994, 108 Stat.2147.)

**This puts an end to your non sense of outside the scope of her duties. This notice in law clearly defines the full scope of duties the principal Amy Rasmussen has an obligation/duty to the secretary of state to follow, to suggest anything else is piracy and privateering and a criminal act.**

**(e)** The superior court will now define **“vessel”**. This connection between the “**vessel”** and that of the “**governmental entity”** is **the legal entity “Person**” it’s the vehicle conduit **transmitting utility** which commercial traffic **(legislative construction, contractual agreements)** moves through. This operational system is in **an admiralty, equity, or maritime court jurisdiction** of the **United States**, hence **the vessel because** Vessel are named in **all capital letters,** or vehicle **either description** if it’s not **disclosed** in a **contractual agreement.** That’s not **full disclosure** and the vessel, is in distress and in danger of being **plundered,** as described in **sec 1658** of the above title; (a) **Whoever** plunders, steals, or destroys any money, goods, merchandise, or other effects from or belonging to **any vessel in distress**,; **or in any other** place within the **admiralty and maritime jurisdiction of the United States**. This definition clearly makes it critical for a **full disclosure specific performance commercial contract** **disclosure** to include **the “Person” legal entity vessel** and that of the **“agency’s”** **governmental entity.**

The superior court will now advise on the notary surety bond claim adjustments as described herein. Please review; Due to your continued piracy and privateering activity the superior court had no choice.

**THE SUPERIOR COURT IS VERY CONCERNED ABOUT THE RIGHTS VIOLATION DAMAGING THE PLANTIFF AND THE PEOPLE OF THE CALIFORNIA REPUBLIC**

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 $ 3,888,000.00 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; 1651; 1658; 1659; 1660; 1661;**

**The Superior courts expectation is a smooth error free transaction into settlement remedy and closure ASAP!**

**According to California Code of Regulations Title 10 - Investment Chapter 5 - Insurance Commissioner Sub-chapter 7.5 - Unfair or Deceptive Acts or Practices in the Business of Insurance Article 1 - Fair Claims Settlement Practices Regulations**

**Section 2695.10 - Additional Standards Applicable to Surety Insurance;**

**(a) No insurer shall base or vary its claims settlement practices, or its standard of scrutiny and review, upon the claimant's age, gender, income, religion, language, sexual orientation, ancestry, national origin, or physical disability, or upon the territory of the property or person insured; (b) As soon as possible,** **but in no event later than forty (40) calendar days after receipt by the insurer of proof of claim,**

**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 \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ /\_\_\_\_ /\_\_\_\_\_\_**

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ ( )

SUPERIOR COURT CASE/CLAIM:

REFERANCE NUMBER: CA1199886-3bepiracyfeb6onbond4111269N/now2/6/24approved388800000