Lyle Hartford Van Dyke, Jr.
P. O. Box 3100
Battle Ground, Washington 98604
Telephone: (360) 574-1767

PUBLIC NOTICE

Regarding:
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Ex Rel (Accusers Unknown), Plaintiffs,
Vs. John Nolan and Lyle Hartford Van Dyke, Jr., Defendants

CR No. 02-390-JO (Jones)

AFFIDAVIT OF INSURRECTION, REBELLION, AND TREASON COMMITTED AGAINST THIS NATION AND ITS CONSTITUTION

(Against The United States of America, and
Against The Constitution for the United States of America)
COMMITTED BY: U. S. Judge Robert E. Jones, U. S. Attorney Michael Mosman, Assistant U. S. Atty. Allan M. Garten, Assistant U. S. Atty. Scott Kerin, et al
(Constitutional Violations: Amendment 6, Amendment 14 Sect. 3, Article 3 Sect. 3)
COMMITTED TO: maintain the Federal Reserve Corporation's control over the United States Government.

State of Oregon, County of Multnomah) ss.
I, (Lyle) Hartford Van Dyke, (Jr.), depose and say as follows:

The title on the top of the United States street currency is "Federal Reserve Note". Money talks. This title openly declares to the commercial world that the Federal Reserve Corporation is the operating Government of the United States of America. In the early years of the twentieth century, the U. S. Congress sold the United States of America to the Federal Reserve Corporation. In exchange for the collateral property of the United States of America, the Congress was granted unlimited power (credit) to borrow, at interest, non-backed green-seal Federal Reserve Notes from the Federal Reserve Corporation. Also, The United States, Inc., had to embezzle the securities and red-seal United States Notes from the Treasury of the United States of America and put them under the "protective custody" of the Federal Reserve Corporation in its vaults. President John F. Kennedy discovered this plot, and issued Executive Order #11110, to put non-interest-bearing red-seal United States Notes back into the pockets of the American public. In a speech at Columbia University, 10 days before his assassination, he said, "The high office of President has been used to foment a plot to destroy the Americans' freedom, and before I leave office I must inform the citizen of his plight." President Lyndon B. Johnson's first act as the President of the United States was to stop the presses that were being used to print red-seal United States Notes

I have spent five years putting the equivalent of 5 Billion dollars worth of lawful red-seal United States Notes on the street to rebate tax money to the American people.
Now I stand trial for it.

All persons have the natural right of survival, guaranteed by the Ninth Amendment, which includes the right of self-preservation, to collect money owed to them, or to aid others in the collection of their debts by commercial contract processes.
The government cannot demand Jurisdiction over Debt Collection Option Drafts or over Debt Collection Option Notes, without raising the question as to whether or not the operators of the U. S. government are attempting to operate the U. S. government as an Absconding Debtor.
The U. S. government cannot merely label a Debt Collection Process to be a Crime in order to escape the payment of its own debts.

If the operators of a government do not immediately exercise, "in hot pursuit", the opportunity to arrest a person to minimize the purported commission of a purported crime, then they lose the capacity to accuse that person for the purported commission of that type of purported crime on the same terms as the conditions, which first existed.
Criminal cannot follow Civil except in hot pursuit of something new.
The Constitutional Criminal protection process precedes the Civil protection process as a protection against the awesome prosecution power of government.

The government has known about the Notes of my Private Bank for about 5 ½ years.
The government has known about the Drafts of Nolan's Private bank for about 4 years.
The government has known about the Notes of Nolan's Private bank for about 2 ½ years.

No one has found specific fault with the content of any of these commercial instruments.
No one has complained by Affidavit against any of these commercial instruments.
There are no Affidavits of Accusation against either Nolan or me arising from our Notes.
The U. S. Government has not exercised hot pursuit with respect to these Debt Collection Option Drafts or Debt Collection Option Notes.

The Internal Revenue Service, being the debt collection arm of the current unlawful owner and operator of the United States Government, the Federal Reserve Corporation, might refuse to honor the payment of taxes in any foreign currency, or a currency not issued by the Federal Reserve Corporation, but that corporation's monopolistic boycott of a foreign currency does not in itself establish that the foreign currency is fictitious, fraudulent, invalid, bogus, unlawful, illegal, null and void, defective or otherwise a piece of junk money. In international commerce, money is valued by its truth and its backing.
My Debt Collection Option Notes, and Nolan's Debt Collection Option Drafts or Debt Collection Option Notes cannot be unlawful just because the Federal Reserve Corporation does not like them, hence refuses to accept them. But since the Federal Reserve Corporation owns the Courts, the Police, the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, however unlawfully, it just naturally does what it wants to do with its Courts, Police, etc..

JURISDICTION – LOST BY ESTOPPEL – NO HOT PURSUIT (NO DUE DILIGENCE MEANS NO CRIMINAL CASE)

Event -- 2001

In the summer of the year 2001, the basics of the matter cited in the heading of this brief was brought by John S. Nolan, hereinafter "Nolan", before Judge Robert E. Jones, hereinafter "Judge Jones", in the United States District Court as a Removal from the Oregon State Courts, and was designated by the U. S. District Court as U. S. Civil No. 01- 967-JO [Jones].
The case file in U. S. Civil Case No, 01-967-JO is about one-hundred fifty (150) pages, with exhibits of Nolan's commercial debt collection Drafts and Notes, drawn against Jackson National Life insurance, a wholly owned subsidiary of Prudential plc of London, England (not the American Prudential).
Judge Jones rendered a Judgment in U. S. Civil Case No. 01-967-JO, which was signed and filed by Judge Jones on August 31, 2001.
Judge Jones rendered an Order in U. S. Civil Case No. 01-967-JO, which was signed and filed by Judge Jones on October 30, 2001.
See the attached copies of the Judgment and Order.
Judge Jones opposed Nolan's removal of the case to the jurisdiction of the U. S. Court. He deemed Nolan's Drafts and Notes to be frivolous and remanded the matter back to the jurisdiction of the state court.

Event -- 2002 – September

Nolan and I were purportedly charged September 19, 2002, by the U. S. Grand Jury with committing several monetary instrument crimes recognizable under the laws of the United States, resulting in our arrests on September 23, 2000, and causing the basics in U. S. Civil Case No. 01-967-JO to be brought back into Judge Jones U. S. District Court as U. S. Criminal Case Number No. CR 02-390-JO.

Several times since the arrests, Nolan and I have been ordered into the U. S. District Court before U. S. Judges on the record, or ordered into conferences "in camera" on the record, meaning that the conferences were held in the Judge's Chambers on the record. In the proceedings on November 8, 2002, in an "in camera" (in chambers) conference on the Court Record, Judge Jones said,
"So I volunteered to take over this case. I know nothing about you gentlemen or the case, but – nor did she [Judge Anna Brown] fill me in with anything specific. So we're starting from scratch.", a quotation from the transcript of the conference at page 3 lines 16-19.

Comparing Judge Jones' statement with the foregoing information, one must come to the conclusion that this Senior Judge cannot be ignorant of a 150 page currency case in his courthouse, which he himself handled. Judge Jones is lying. Why?

Constitutional Issues – 6th Amendment

The Sixth Amendment to the Constitution for the united States of America guarantees to Nolan and me, among other guarantees:
"In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right ...
>(1) to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation:
>(2) to be confronted with the witnesses against him:
>(3) to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor.

With respect to the purported criminal charges against us, Nolan and I have repeatedly complained, on the record in U. S. District Court and "in camera", that the government's case is not set "Ex Rel", Ex Relatione, to declare that the matter has arisen out of a story or allegation brought by and related by, an identified accuser, to the government prosecutor.

I have asked the U. S. Judges, several times on the record in U. S. District Court and "in camera", to provide to me, charging affidavits from each and every accusing party with respect to each and every charge or accusation against me.

No such Charging Affidavits have been provided by the government.
The 6th Amendment demands that the Charging Affidavits are part of the basic information on the Nature and Cause of the Accusation, which must be provided as soon as possible after the accusation occurs.

On November 8, 2002, Judge Jones promised that he would get the Charging Affidavits for me. Judge Jones has failed to keep his word on this matter.

At the November 22, 2002, pre-trial hearing, before Judge Jones, I asked for the Charging Affidavits again on the record in open court, but Judge Jones did not produce either the name of any accuser, or any Charging Affidavits.

Again, comparing Judge Jones' statements with his actions, and with the foregoing information, one must come to the conclusion that when Judge Jones said that he would provide the Charging Affidavit(s), he was again intentionally lying. **Why?**

He has two strikes against his credibility:
>(1) He is deliberately lying about his foreknowledge of this case and his prejudice.
>(2) He is deliberately controlling a criminal prosecution in a manner which is in violation of the Constitution for the United States of America.

The Indictment, Generally -- And The Unsealed Indictment, a.k.a., The Libel

An "Indictment" is information or propaganda brought before the Grand Jury by a prosecuting officer of the government, and laid as an accusation before the Grand Jury, to obtain permission from the Grand Jury for government operators to impose judicial force upon and against the accused person, and ultimately to justify the Arrest of the accused person, and to justify the Prosecution of that person. An Arrest is a Distress.

An "Unsealed Indictment" is an Indictment, which has been made public or published. An Unsealed Indictment, a published Indictment, can contribute to the effect of portraying an accused person in public as a criminal, and can potentially reduce that person's level of earning for the whole duration of his or her life.
It can cause a person to lose immediate gainful employment, which he or she needs in order to finance his or her defense in a court case.
THEREFORE, An Unsealed Indictment is known in law as a Libel.

IN COMMERCIAL TERMS, an Unsealed Indictment, like a Debt Collection Note, or a Citation Currency Note, or a Letter of Marque and Reprisal, can cause the financial embarrassment of the party against whom it is applied, hence it is a Negotiable Instrument subject to all of the laws governing Negotiable Instruments as to being honorable, containing truthful full disclosure, having substantial backing, and, being worthy of respect, being dishonored only for a cause given by Affidavit.

[Note: A "Presentment" is an accusation made by a Grand Jury.
An "Unsealed Presentment" is a Presentment, which has been made public or published.
A "Unsealed Presentment" is also a type of a Libel (a noun)].

Liability

A natural person, on one's own personal liability, can accuse another person of a criminal act or criminal omission, but governments, corporations, and other legal fictions must be bonded to bring a criminal accusation or criminal charge against a person in the name of the corporation or legal fiction (including a government), and, even then, the officer of the corporation who brings forth the criminal accusation or criminal charge against a person, is also personally liable for making the criminal accusation or criminal charge.

When an accusation by Indictment is made public, published, or "unsealed", then the Government, the government prosecutor, and the Grand Jurors become severally and jointly commercially liable, for its potential libel content.
Specifically, an Unsealed Indictment or Libel must be bonded against the potential libel damages that could arise from its use by the government, prosecutor, judge, and media.

An Arrest of a natural person named in an Accusation is a First Taking or Original Distress.
An Arrest of a natural person is not a Retaking in the sense of a common law Replevin.
Commercial bonding companies do not generally offer Bonds for Original Distresses because such processes deliver much political power, and can be severely misused, causing very large bond claims payments.

Summary – Indictments and Indictment Bonds

In dealing with a commercial process, a member of a Grand Jury cannot be classified as an accuser, if he or she is not identified and will not present a Charging Affidavit on his or her own Oath Of Personal Liability. A company will not Bond if it cannot Collect.

Without the Charging Affidavits from each and every accusing party, with respect to each and every Accusation or Charge, no realistic company will Bond the Criminal Process.
Without the Affidavit of Criminal Complaint there can be no Bond on the Indictment.
Without the Bond on the Indictment, the Prosecutor, the Judge, and the Grand Jurors are personally liable for the effect of a defective Indictment on the accused.

The Indictment In This Case

The Indictment in this case is a fabrication for the following reasons:

Part 1: The Parties, and the corresponding part, Part 6: The Certification

Part 1: The Parties

Input Parties / Legislative and Adjudicative Liability:
The Grand Juror Parties are not named or otherwise identified.
Output Parties / Certification – Executive Liability:
The signature of the Grand Jury Foreperson is not legible nor subscribed in print.

Part 6: The Certification

The Indictment ends with the non-negotiable sentence fragment ["A True Bill"].
The Indictment is not sworn to be true and correct, so it is not a Declaration.
The Indictment is not sworn to be true, correct, and complete, so it is not an Affidavit.
The Indictment is not backed in any other way with any proof that any person is accepting any liability for portraying the purportedly accused person as a criminal.
No person has accepted commercial responsibility for any libel content of the Indictment.
This non-identified, non-authorized, and non-signed Indictment, is also not Bonded.
A Judge who acts judicially on a non-unauthorized (no author or non-identified author), non-bonded, and unsealed indictment, acts at his own peril.
Sub-Summary -- The Indictment is void for lack of a stated author and lack of a Bond.

Part 2: The Allegation/Claim, and the corresponding part, Part 5: The Exhibits

Part 2: The Allegation/Claim

The Prosecutor did not provide the definitions of the elementary terms used in the Indictment specifically enough to convert his words of opinion into objects of design, that is, he did not prove the truth of the labels, which he attached to the actions of the accused.

For example, he said that an instrument was "fictitious", but he did not define and explain what constituted a "non-fictitious instrument" or a "real instrument", and how the "fictitious instrument" differed from it.

The descriptions of the acts referred to in the body of the Indictment are vague. [...]

Sub-Summary -- The Indictment is void:
>(1) for lack of authority, i.e., for lack of a stated author,
>(2) for vagueness of content, and
>(3) for lack of a Bond.

Part 5: The Exhibits of Law/Principles and of Fact/Events

The Principles of Law governing the function and operation of the Grand Jury

The Grand Jury is engaging and authorizing the spending of public taxes to investigate and prosecute the commission of crimes, and therefore must be accurately informed.
The Grand Jury is going to make a decision, which might embarrass ($) the accused.
The Grand Jurors are liable for wrongful damage, which they lend their power to create.

The Events of this Case, which fail to meet the principles governing the Grand Jury

The accused was never offered or given an opportunity to appear before the Grand Jury.
Given the absence of the accused, no exhibit(s) from the Grand Jury prove that the Prosecutor made a diligent effort to fairly represent the accused before the Grand Jury.
The Prosecutor did not establish, beyond a reasonable doubt, that his motives were not arrogance, egoism, lust for power, revenge, subversion, vindictiveness, or malice.
For example, vindictive prosecution is grounds for not issuing an Indictment, or for withdrawing an Indictment, and grounds for terminating the prosecution of a crime.
The Prosecutor deceived the Grand Jury by presenting a vague and actually meaningless and unsubstantiated accusation; i.e., he used the Grand Jury for an undisclosed purpose, thereby placing each individual juror in jeopardy of being sued for malicious prosecution.

Summary of the Status of the Indictment -- The Indictment is void:
>(1) for lack of authority, i.e., for lack of a stated author accepting responsibility.
>(2) for vagueness of content, which sabotages making a defense by rebuttal.
>(3) forProsecutor's failure to protect the interests of the absent Accused,

>(4) for the Prosecutor's failure to protect the interests (personal integrity) of the Grand Jurors,
>(5) for the prosecutor's failure to prove that his motives for prosecution were honorable.
>(6) for lack of a Bond.

Part 3: The Ledger of Damages/ Relief and the corresponding part, Part 4: The Surety

Part 3: The Ledger of Damages/ Relief

My Citation Notes are based on U. S. Law, are financially valid, and have a real value.
The United States Government is the Debtor/Drawee party on my Notes, because a U. S. Judge deliberately breached his public constitutional contract, and the other government officers would not subject that Judge to a trial to remove him from his Public Office.
I made a claim against him in behalf of the Public. He treated the claim with contempt. It went into commercial default. It became an account receivable. I issued Money on it.
The public was the injured party by the Judge's general violation of its justice system.
My Citation Notes are a tax rebate to the American People, the American public, which means that part of it belongs to every natural person in America who makes a claim for it.
The current amount of this fund in Washington State is more than 15 Billion dollars.
I have disbursed 5 Billion of it in Washington State. Every State has a similar resource.
I cannot sell the Money/Notes because I am only the Trustee of the Money.
The United States Government owes the money to the public.

From the very beginning, the government's agents have not wanted to admit that my Citation Currency Notes have a real value based on the statutes of the United States.
Therefore, choosing to ridicule them, Government agents do not ask for information.
Government agents appear to find it more exciting to steal my Debt Collection Notes.
The Federal Reserve Corporation and the banking system, which the Federal Reserve Corporation controls, have been able to effectively boycott most of the use of my Notes and most of Nolan's use of his Drafts and Notes.
This is unlawful restraint of trade.

The Indictment, in this case, is an attempt on the part of the operators of the government to discredit a legitimate/lawful commercial debt collection process against the United States Government.

Part 4: The Surety

The Indictment is not Bonded.
Therefore, the property and rights to property of the parties, which have imposed the Indictment, are the Surety for the process.

Part 7: The Witness(es)/ Notary – none.

The Motion In Limine

The disclosed authors of the Motion In Limine, a preliminary motion to limit testimony, are:
>(1) Michael W. Mosman, U. S. Attorney for the District of Oregon,
>(2) Allan M. Garten (OSB 81236), Assistant U. S. Attorney, and
>(3) Scott Kerin (OSB 96512), Assistant U. S. Attorney.

Moreover, Judge Jones encouraged the U. S. Attorneys Office to produce a Motion In Limine to limit the testimony that I could give in my defense in court.

On November 18, 2002, the aforesaid three U. S. Attorneys submitted into the court record, a brief titled "GOVERNMENT'S MOTION IN LIMINE TO PROHIBIT DEFENDANTS FROM PRESENTING INADMISSIBLE EVIDENCE".
Judge Jones granted the Motion. (See a copy of this brief attached to this Affidavit.)

The U. S. Attorneys' Motion In Limine states that "The District Court is to serve as the sole source of law for the jury ...", not the Constitution for the United States of America, which is the supreme law of the land (Article 6 Section 1 Clause 2 of that Constitution).

Article 6 Section 1 Clause 2 of the Constitution for the United States of America states:
"This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof;
and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land;
and the judges in every state shall be bound thereby,
any thing in the constitution or laws of any state to the contrary notwithstanding."

The statement, "The District Court is to serve as the sole source of law for the jury ...", in the U. S. Attorneys' and the Court's (Jones') Motion In Limine is a violation of their oaths of office, and is a blatant declaration of their intent to hold office in insurrection and rebellion against the Constitution and the Nation, the two things which our soldiers have sworn an oath of allegiance to uphold, to fight for, to suffer for, to die for, and to defend against all enemies both foreign and domestic.

Therefore, Judge Jones cannot be trusted to conduct a fair trial.

Amendment 14 Section 3 of the Constitution for the United States of America states:
"No person shall be a senator or representative in Congress, or elector of President and Vice President, or hold any office, civil or military, under the United States, or under any state, who having previously taken an oath, as a member of Congress, or as an officer of the United States, or as a member of any state legislature, or as an executive or judicial officer of any state, to support the Constitution of the United States, shall have engaged in insurrection or rebellion against the same

[Constitution], or given aid and comfort to the enemies thereof." (The underline emphasis has been added.)
Article 3 Section 3 of the Constitution for the United States of America states: "Treason against the United States shall consist only in levying war against them, or in adhering to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort."

Every American who joins the military service takes an oath to "defend the United States of America and its Constitution against all enemies both foreign and domestic."

A U. S. Attorney is trained to be, and has the rank of a U. S. military JAG officer.
A U. S. Attorney commits treason when he or she introduces a Motion In Limine into any court of law, civil, criminal, or administrative, to limit the testimony of the defendant.
We state in the Constitution that we Americans believe that every natural flesh-and-blood person has a right of free speech and of self-defense, whether he is one of our people or a person from any other land, and these precious guaranteed provisions shall not be set aside by this nation's common people or officers with respect to any human being on the face of this Earth.

An Example Of The "Motion In Limine" –
The Court's Military "Silent Weapon for Quiet Wars"

The Public Wealth Rebate Note is a civilian economic "silent weapon" against the "quiet wars" (mixed wars) that governments wage every day, to gain and have absolute power over the life, liberty, property, and rights to property of the nation's common citizens.

In U.S. District Court Case No. CR96-500C, at Seattle, Washington, U. S. District Court Chief Judge John C. Coughenour issued a Court's Motion In Limine, to suppress "the right to keep and bear arms", against citizens of the State of Washington, who were acting under the lawful unorganized militia jurisdiction of the Governor's Office of the State of Washington.
Coughenour's Motion In Limine, which he gave orally in the U. S. District Court on the court record, barred Washington State citizens from raising the First, Ninth, and Second Amendments to the Constitution for the United States as a defense in that "right to keep and bear arms" case. The case was labeled as a "militia case" to make it easier for Judge Coughenour to publicly justify an application of martial law in the U. S. District Court.

Judges are doing this now on a daily basis all over the United States, and that is why the courthouses need metal detectors and weapons inspections at their doors.
The police, the attorneys, the judges, and the psychiatrists have become the Nation's terrorists, financed by the organized crime activities of the Federal Reserve Corporation, the currently "billed" (top billed on the currency) Government of the United States.

Hitler's suppression of the right to keep and bear arms disarmed the German Jews, which opened the door to the Holocaust. American Jews learned a lesson from Hitler's action.
In America, Jews for the Preservation of Firearms Ownership (JPFO) opposes the U. S. Government control of any weapons necessary for self-defense against government.

JPFO has helped American Jews prevent the international Jews (Israel), who operate the Federal Reserve Corporation, from seizing the guns and interests of American Jews.

I operate the National Association for Commercial Accountability and Jews and Christians for the Preservation of America (JCPA).

I have issued a "lawful tender" tax/labor-backed note, equivalent to a red seal United States Note, as a military economic weapon against Judge John C. Coughenour's Motion In Limine, and against the Federal Reserve Corporation's "legal tender" theft-backed note.

My Public Wealth Rebate Note uses United States Code Law to establish a rebate of U. S. Taxes, generated by the labor of the citizens of the State of Washington, back to all citizens of the State of Washington, to repair the damage caused by Judge Coughenour to Washington States-Rights and Washington State's Citizen's rights to keep and bear arms.

Quotations From The Motion In Limine In This Case

The bracketed parts have been added to the quotations to explain or clarify the meanings.

A -- 1.11 = Page 1 Line 11
[THE FEDERAL RESERVE CORPORATION'S]
[THE] GOVERNMENT'S MOTION IN LIMINE
TO PROHIBIT DEFENDANTS FROM
PRESENTING INADMISSIBLE EVIDENCE

B -- 3.10 = Page 3 Line 10
Evidence challenging the validity of Federal Reserve Notes as
legal tender or the monetary system of the United States is inadmissible.
[The "Evidence" referred to in the Motion In Limine, is any
"Evidence challenging the validity of Federal Reserve Notes as
legal tender or the monetary system of the United States."]

C -- 3.09
The defendants may claim that Federal Reserve Notes are not valid currency,
do not constitute legal tender, or are of less value than their Notes and Drafts.

D -- 4.15, 4.18
The defendants should not be allowed to narrate
their beliefs about the illegitimacy of the money system.

E -- 3.10, 1.14-1.18
Evidence challenging the validity of Federal Reserve Notes as
legal tender or the monetary system of the United States is inadmissible.
The United States [Inc.] [The Federal Reserve Corporation]
submits the following motion in limine

//

to preclude defendants from presenting "**evidence**" and arguments that are irrelevant and would confuse the jury and invade the province of the court in instructing the jury.

F -- 3.10, 1.18-1.21
Evidence challenging the validity of Federal Reserve Notes as legal tender or the monetary system of the United States is inadmissible.
The United States [Inc.] [The Federal Reserve Corporation]
further moves this Court
to instruct defendants and all witnesses called by defendants,
that the use of such **evidence**,
whether through pleadings or other documentary evidence, testimony,
remarks, questions or arguments, either directly or indirectly,
is prohibited.

G -- 3.01
The court, not the defendants, are the source of the law the jury is to follow ...
[The court is the source of the law the jury is to follow...]

H -- 3.03
The District Court is to serve as the sole source of law for the jury...
[The Court/Judge will be the legislature for the court and for the jury.]
[The Supreme Law of the Land, the Constitution for the united States of America,
will not be the source of the law for the court and for the jury.]

I -- 3.10, 3.15-3.16
Evidence challenging the validity of Federal Reserve Notes as legal tender or the monetary system of the United States is inadmissible.
Thus, **evidence** in conflict with the law [theCourt] on this issue should be excluded.

J -- 3.10, 2.14-2.15
Evidence challenging the validity of Federal Reserve Notes as legal tender or the monetary system of the United States is inadmissible.
The Jury should not be exposed to inadmissible **evidence**.
Evidence that is not relevant is not admissible.

K -- 3.10, 2.18-2.19
Evidence challenging the validity of Federal Reserve Notes as legal tender or the monetary system of the United States is inadmissible.
Even if the **evidence** is minimally relevant, the court [judge] should exclude **evidence**.
[If the Court/Judge says that **evidence** is not relevant, then it is not admissible.]

L -- 2.09-2.12
At their arraignments, the defendants have made statements which the government believes would be irrelevant if made at trial and would invade the province of the court [the discretionary power of the [judge] in instructing the jury.

M -- 3.02
The defendants' [sic] may seek to proclaim their view of what the law should be. This is be improper. [sic]

N -- 3.05-3.08
Should the defendants attempt to tell the jury what they believe the law is or should be, the Government would request that the Court instruct the jury at that time that the defendants' views are only their personal opinion and that the jury must follow the law that the court [the judge acting as a legislator] will instruct them on...

O -- 3.18-3.20, 4.03
Any attempt by the defendants to seek jury nullification, or conscience verdicts, by appealing to the jury to follow its own sense of justice and fairness and refuse to follow the law the court [the judge acting as a legislator] instructs them on, is improper. ... such comments, arguments, or testimony should be excluded.

P -- 3.10, 4.05-4.07
The Supreme Court held that the Sixth Amendment's guarantee of a right to assistance of counsel includes the right of the accused personally to manage or conduct his own defense in a criminal case.

Q – 3.10, 4.20-4.21
Evidence challenging the validity of Federal Reserve Notes as legal tender or the monetary system of the United States is inadmissible.
[However,] The government [the Federal Reserve Corporation] submits that in the trial where the defendants want to represent themselves, that pro se defendants cannot use their role as counsel to attempt to introduce **evidence** that would not be admissible [that would not be allowed by the Federal Reserve Corporation, via the judge].

R -- 3.10, 5.04-5.05
Evidence challenging the validity of Federal Reserve Notes as legal tender or the monetary system of the United States is inadmissible.
... (4) that the Court [the judge] will instruct the jury at the outset of the trial that anything that the defendants say in their lawyer role is not **evidence**;

S -- 5.05-5.06
... (5) that they [the defendants] must refrain from commenting on matters ... solely within their personal knowledge or belief [so what is left to say?].

T -- 5.01
... (2) that they [the defendants]shall refrain from speaking in the first person. [The defendants must be required to defend an abstraction, not themselves, so that the jury will not become personally involved in, and relate to, the defendants, and react because of empathy or conscience, or at heart with their own self-interest.]

U -- 3.10, 4.21, 5.02
Evidence challenging the validity of Federal Reserve Notes as legal tender or the monetary system of the United States is inadmissible.
...(1) that they will be held to the rules of law (the Judge) and **evidence**...
...(3) that the Court will instruct the jury that nothing the lawyers
[pro se defendants] have said is **evidence** in this case.

V – 3.10, 6.01-6.05
Conclusion
Evidence challenging the validity of Federal Reserve Notes as legal tender or the monetary system of the United States is inadmissible.
The United States respectfully requests
that this Court prohibit the defendants from introducing **evidence**
or making arguments about what they believe the law is or should be,
that Federal Reserve Notes or the United States monetary system is illegal or invalid,
and that the jury should ignore the law.

W -- 3.10, 6.02-6.03
Evidence challenging the validity of Federal Reserve Notes as legal tender or the monetary system of the United States is inadmissible.
The United States [the Federal Reserve Corporation] respectfully requests that this Court
[the Judge] prohibit the defendants from introducing **evidence**...

X -- 6.03
... or making arguments about what they believe the law is or should be, ...
["The court, not the defendants, are the source of the law the jury is to follow ..."]
[The court is the source of the law the jury is to follow...]
["The District Court is to serve as the sole source of law for the jury..."]
[The court/judge will be the legislature for the court and for the jury.]
[The Supreme Law of the Land, the Constitution for the united States of America,
will not be the source of the law for the court and for the jury.]

Y -- 3.10, 6.03-6.04
Evidence challenging the validity of Federal Reserve Notes as legal tender or the monetary system of the United States is inadmissible.
... that Federal Reserve Notes or the United States monetary system is illegal or invalid,...

Z -- 6.04-6.05
... and that the jury should ignore the law.
["The court is the source of the law the jury is to follow.
The District Court is to serve as the sole source of law for the jury..."]
[The court/judge will be the legislature for the court and for the jury.]
[The Supreme Law of the Land, the Constitution for the united States of America,

will not be the source of the law for the court and for the jury.] x

Certification
I, Lyle Hartford Van Dyke, Jr., certify and affirm on my own liability, that I have read the foregoing Affidavit and know the content thereof, and that, to the best of my knowledge and belief, it is true, correct, complete, and not misleading, the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. Dated this 2nd day of December, 2002.

> Lyle Hartford Van Dyke, Jr.
Lyle Hartford Van Dyke, Jr., Affiant, (author of this Affidavit)

Notary / Commercial Witness
State of Washington) ss.
County of Clark)

Subscribed and sworn to before me a Notary public for the State of Washington, County of Clark, this 2nd day of December, 2002. SEAL

> Gayle J. Donovan
Notary Public
My commission expires Oct. 02, 2004

Notary Public
State of Washington
GAYLE J. DONOVAN
My Appointment Expires Oct 2, 2004