

QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

1. Is the 1871 municipal corporation (12 Stat. 419) unconstitutional violation of Article 1 in Amendment because it comes from what is now the Vatican?
2. Is the Minor Estate (31 CFR 363.6) an unconstitutional violation of Article 1 in Amendment, because it was created by the Pope's Crown of England with the Cestui que vie Act of 1666, and was the cause of the War of Independence, as evidenced by the Declaration of Independence (1776) and the Causes and Necessity of Taking Up Arms issued by the Continental Congress in 1775, and brought into America with the Code of Law for the District of Columbia in 1901 at 31 Stat. 1432?
3. Is the National BAR Foundation and all of its subsidiaries in the various States an unconstitutional violation of Article 1 in Amendment because it is the Pope's private BAR Guild (British Accredited Regency) originating in the Pope's owned and operated City of London, claiming immunity under the International Organization Immunity Act of 1945?
4. Is it an unconstitutional violation of Article 1, Section 8, Clause 17, to use the Minor Estate (31 CFR 363.6) to convert the Petitioner's land from the land of Texas into the foreign District of Columbia?
5. Is it an unconstitutional violation of the equal protection clause Article IV, Section 2, Clause 1, for the Federal Bureau of Investigation to refuse to investigate felonies by the County of Montague municipal corporation to assault the Petitioner with the Minor Estate (31 CFR 363.6) to justify the theft of the Petitioner's land, to get fake money, in support of their communist agenda to eliminate private property rights, and because the Petitioner is a "targeted individual" as evidenced by the targetedjustice.com website?
6. Is a Judgment by the 97th District Court that makes the Petitioner a Minor

Estate (31 CFR 363.6) a Bill of Pains and Penalties?

7. Is a Judgment by the 97th District Court that makes the Petitioner a Minor Estate (31 CFR 363.6) a denial of due process under Article V in Amendment, by presuming incapacity without adjudication?
8. Is a Judgment by the Northern District of Texas that makes the Petitioner a Minor Estate (31 CFR 363.6) a Bill of Pains and Penalties?
9. Is a Judgment by the Northern District of Texas that makes the Petitioner a Minor Estate (31 CFR 363.6) a denial of due process under Article V in Amendment, by presuming incapacity without adjudication?
10. Is the refusal by the FBI to investigate the 78 criminal complaints a denial of due process under Article V in Amendment?
11. Is the refusal by the US Attorney to prosecute the 78 criminal complaints a denial of due process under Article V in Amendment?
12. Is it a violation of the equal protection clause Article IV, Section 2, Clause 1, for the US Attorney to refuse to prosecute felonies by the County of Montague municipal corporation to assault the Petitioner with the Minor Estate (31 CFR 363.6) to justify the theft of the Petitioner's land, and their extortion racket to get fake money, in support of their communist agenda to eliminate private property rights, and because the Petitioner is a "targeted individual" as evidenced by the targetedjustice.com website?
13. Is it an unconstitutional violation of the equal protection clause Article IV, Section 2, Clause 1, for the Comptroller of Texas to authorize the County of Montague municipal corporation to assault the Petitioner with the Minor Estate (31 CFR 363.6) and render by force the Petitioner's land, for taxation, to justify the theft of the Petitioner's land, to get fake money in support of their communist agenda to eliminate private property rights, and because the Petitioner is a "targeted individual" as evidenced by the targetedjustice.com

website?

14. Is it an unconstitutional violation of the equal protection clause Article IV, Section 2, Clause 1, for the Secretary of the Treasury to refuse to dissolve and liquidate the Pope's Minor Estate (31 CFR 363.6) in spite of the fact that the Petitioner said he failed to care what they did with the fake money – “they can put it up their rectal orifice” because it was created by fraud and deception and is satanic necromancy, and is being used to enslave the Petitioner.
15. Is the *Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge* which fails to be a “*findings of facts and conclusions of law*” a legislative usurpation of the bench because it is involving a fiction of law, (31 CFR 363.6) which fails to exist, under the Pope's ecclesiastical law penalizing the Petitioner (a named individual) with a non-judicial theft of land, and a Bill of Pains and Penalties violation of *Article I, Section 9, Clause 3*, and *Article I, Section 10, Clause 1*?
16. Is the *Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge* which fails to be a “*findings of facts and conclusions of law*” a denial of due process of law violation of *Article V in Amendment*?
17. Is the *Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge* which fails to be a “*findings of facts and conclusions of law*” violation of the equal protection clause Article IV, Section 2, Clause 1?
18. Is using the Pope's Minor Estate (31 CFR 363.6) and the commerce clause (Article 1, Section 8, clause 3) constitutional to violate Article 1, Section 8, Clause 17 “a maximum of ten miles square”?