**Constructive And Legal Notice Of Breach Of Your Oath Of Office**

**Pursuant to Federal Rules of Evidence (F.r.e.) 102, 104(b), 201(b)(d)(f), 402, 406**

**Where in your oath of office does it give you the authority to violate your oath to protect and defend the California and United States Constitutions? Where in your oath does it give you the authority to violate the people's rights under the 1st, 4th, 5th and 14th Amendments to the United States Constitution?**

"The people are the Masters of both Congress and Courts, NOT to overthrow the Constitution, but to overthrow the men who pervert it!" Abraham Lincoln.

**Date:** June\_\_, 2015 **Certified Mail No:** 00000000000000000000000

**Issued to:** Senator Hannah-Beth Jackson and Senators Pan, Allen, Beall, Block, De Leon, Hall, Hertzberg, Hill, Leno, McGuire, Mitchell, Stone, Wieckowski, Wolk and; Assembly Members Baker, Chiu, Cooper, Low, McCarty, Nazarian, Rendon, Stone, Gonzalez and Wood.

State Capitol, Room 2032

Sacramento, California 95814

**From:** The thousands of people living in Santa Barbara County and throughout the California Republic who oppose ***Bill SB277*** or any other similar Bill or Ordinance that is repugnant to The California and United States Constitutions.

We the people of California hereby give you Constructive and Legal Notice that in supporting ***Bill SB277*** you are in breach of your oath of office. You swore an oath to uphold, defend and support the California and United States Constitutions upon accepting your position in your public office.

We now give you timely Constructive and Legal NOTICE that:

1. This document EFFECTIVE upon receipt, serves notice of malfeasance to any public, executive, legislative or judicial representative of We the People concerning a primary requirement of public office. Breach of your Sworn Oath to Support and Defend Our Constitution[s] of the United States OR any American of We the People; Breaching your Voluntary Contract[s] and Mandatory Duty[ies] of Support and Defense to the California and United States Constitutions.  The act of promoting, enforcing, legislating, or judging anything contrary to the Constitution of the United States "The Supreme Law of the Land" AND/OR any State Constitution in our COMPOUND REPUBLIC {State & Federal Constitutions, "Federalist 51"} is an Act of **Insurrection** violating a requirement of public office, immediately suspending all authority granted by the people, punishable by impeachment, recall or **removal**.

**Insurrection is defined as "any" act or instance of...open resistance to established authority.**

We the people's unalienable rights are beyond the encroachment of mortal man and cannot be violated by mere acts of government.

2. We the people of California believe that Criminal Acts may or have taken place within your office and we have reserved the Fundamental Right to Be Heard, as Free Speech in a Court of Record to an impartial jury of our peers a REDRESS of GRIEVANCES.  Title 28 USC requires a record to be kept of hearings. It is, and always has been, the established fact that an unconstitutional law is null and void from its inception. ***SB277*** is wholly unconstitutional due to its violative cause and affect on the peoples’ rights as secured under the First, Fourth, Fifth, Tenth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution.

3. We the people of California are aware of certain ingredients put into these inoculations that have injured many children. Some of these ingredients include but are not limited to formaldehyde, mercury, aluminum, acetones and animal proteins. These are known to cause severe health reactions including but not limited to death in the individuals who take them. Due to these facts, we see these inoculations on our children as assaults against them, with intent to do severe mental and bodily harm which includes murder. Our bodies and that of our children are not your property to legislate or violate at will. Our bodies belong to us. We will defend our natural rights to not be assaulted by all means necessary, including but not limited to the filing of commercial liens against your real property in amounts of tens of millions of dollars.

You and all who support this bill must now be aware of the case currently pending in the state of Pennsylvania, case #2:10-cv-04374-cdj **UNITED STATES VS MERCK**. The Department of Justice is involved. Former virologists now whistleblowers allege that Merck falsified data with the MMR II vaccine in order to meet the 95% efficacy rate which is the benchmark required by the FDA to maintain its monopoly on the mumps vaccine which extends to the MMR II. This suggests ***vaccine failure and fraud***, not unvaccinated children, as the reason for the outbreaks. We charge you with knowledge of the law and facts as pointed out in this Constructive and Legal Notice. You cannot claim ignorance of law nor can you claim as a defense that you were not aware of these facts. It is your duty to know.

**Additionally, you are hereby put on Notice that:**

"A legislative act contrary to the Constitution is not law." *Carter* v. *Carter Coal Co.,* 298 U.S. 238.

"All laws which are repugnant to the Constitution are null and void." *Marbury* v. *Madison,* 5 U.S. 137,174,176.

"The claim and exercise of a Constitutional Right cannot be converted into a crime." *Miller* v. *Us.,* 230 F, 2d 286,489.

"The mere chilling of a Constitutional right by a penalty on its exercise is patently unconstitutional." *Shapiro* v. *Thompson,* 394 U.S. 618. A law that "impinges upon a fundamental right explicitly or implicitly secured by the Constitution is presumptively unconstitutional." *Mobile* v. *Bolden,* 446 US 55, 76; *Harris* v. *McRae,* 448 US 297,312.

A law that improperly infringes on Constitutional Rights is void from its inception and no person can be obligated to obey such a law. 16A ArnJur2d Constitutional Law, Section 203.

"Where rights secured by the Constitution are involved, there can be no rule-making or legislation which would abrogate them." *Miranda* v. *Arizona,* 384 U.S. 436.

You and your constituents have violated every rule of Human Rights known to the organized world of governments with this bill ***SB277***. See below.

**Nuremberg Principles:**

**Principle I states, "Any person who commits an act which constitutes a crime under international law is responsible therefore and liable to punishment."**

Principle III states, "The fact that a person who committed an act which constitutes a crime under international law acted as Head of State or responsible government official does not relieve him from responsibility under international law."

Principle IV states: "The fact that a person acted pursuant to order of his Government or of a superior does not relieve him from responsibility under international law, provided a moral choice was in fact possible to him".

Principle VII states, "Complicity in the commission of a crime against peace, a war crime, or a crime against humanity as set forth in Principle VI is a crime under international law."

**Nuremberg Code:**

5.) “No experiment should be conducted where there is a prior reason to believe that death or disabling injury will occur; except, perhaps, in those experiments where the experimental physicians also serve as subjects.”

6.) “The degree of risk to be taken should never exceed that determined by the humanitarian importance of the problem to be solved by the experiment.”

7.) “Proper preparations should be made and adequate facilities provided to protect the experimental subject against even remote possibilities of injury, disability, or death.”

10.) “During the course of the experiment the scientist in charge must be prepared to terminate the experiment at any stage, if he has probable cause to believe, in the exercise of the good faith, superior skill and careful judgment required of him that a continuation of the experiment is likely to result in injury, disability, or death to the experimental subject.”

**Declaration of Geneva:**

The health of my patient will be my first consideration.

I will practice my profession with conscience and dignity.

I will not use my medical knowledge to violate human rights and civil liberties, even under threat.

I will maintain the utmost respect for human life.

I will not permit considerations of age, disease or disability, creed, ethnic origin, gender, nationality, political affiliation, race, sexual orientation, social standing or any other factor to intervene between my duty and my patient.

**Declaration of Helsinki: Operational Principles**

Article 13: “…subject to independent ethical review and oversight by a properly convened committee.”

Article 17: “Studies should be discontinued if the available information indicates that the original considerations are no longer satisfied.”

Article 16: “Information regarding the study should be publicly available.”

Article 27: “Ethical publications extend to publication of the results and consideration of any potential conflict of interest.”

Article 30: “The interests of the subject after the study is completed should be part of the overall ethical assessment, including assuring their access to the best proven care International Treatise under the United Nations Universal Doctrine of Human Rights Convention on the Rights of the Child.”

Article 19: “….of the Convention states that state parties must take all appropriate legislative, administrative, social and educational measures to protect the child from all forms of physical or mental violence.”

**SB 277 may lead to parents demanding doctors be arrested for felony assault. Doctors and all public or private individuals who participate in forced vaccination of children will not escape the legal liability under the Hobbs Act.**

...Under federal sentencing guidelines, **a vaccine assault upon an individual without their consent** would be considered an "aggravated assault," part of the category of sentencing covering "offenses against the persons." Accordingly, you could be held liable for conspiracy to assault and commit physical and mental violence upon the victims. We the people of California are demanding your immediate resignation from office for your part in this seditious conspiracy and treasonous acts that are obviously in violation or our Natural and Inalienable rights.

4. Your liability extends beyond any purported 11th Amendment immunity you think you may have against your criminal acts. You and all others who have or are about to aid and abet your actions in supporting this ***SB277 Bill*** could be charged with conspiracy to commit a Hobbs Act violation including but not limited to Section[s] **2404. Hobbs Act -- Under Color Of Official Right.**

In addition to the "wrongful use of actual or threatened force, violence, or fear," the Hobbs Act (18 U.S.C. § 1951) defines extortion in terms of "the obtaining of property from another, with his consent . . . under color of official right." In fact, the under color of official right aspect of the Hobbs Act derives from the common law meaning of extortion. As the Supreme Court explained in a recent opinion regarding the Hobbs Act,

"[a]t common law, extortion was an offense committed by a public official who took 'by color of his office' money that was not due to him for the performance of his official duties. . . . Extortion by the public official was the rough equivalent of what we would now describe as 'taking a bribe.'" *Evans v. United States*, 504 U.S. 255 (1992).

**GENERAL RULE:** The usual fact situation for a Hobbs Act charge under color of official right is a public official trading his/her official actions in an area in which he/she has actual authority in exchange for the payment of money. Most courts have held that a Hobbs Act violation does not require that the public official be the recipient of the benefit of the extortion, and that a Hobbs Act case exists where the corpus of the corrupt payment went to a third party. However, consistent with the federal offenses of bribery and gratuities under 18 U.S.C. § 201 (see 9 U.S.A.M. §§ 85.101 through 85.105), where the corpus of the corrupt payment inures to the benefit of a person or entity other than the public official most courts have also required proof of a *quid* *pro* *quo* understanding between the private corrupter and the public official. *See* *United States v. Haimowitz*, 725 F.2d 1561, 1577 (11th Cir.), *cert. denied*, 469 U.S. 1072 (1984) ("a Hobbs Act prosecution is not defeated simply because the extorter transmitted the extorted money to a third party."); *United States v. Margiotta*, 688 F.2d 108 (2d Cir. 1982), *cert. denied*, 461 U.S. 913 (1983) (insurance agency made kickbacks to brokers selected by political leader of town); *United States v. Scacchetti*, 668 F.2d 643 (2d Cir.), *cert. denied*, 457 U.S. 1132 (1982);

**18 U.S.C. § 956 - Conspiracy Within The U.S. To Murder, Kidnap, Or Maim Persons Or To Damage Certain Property Overseas;**

**18 U.S. Code § 1951 - Interference with commerce by threats or violence.**

(a) Whoever in any way or degree obstructs, delays, or affects commerce or the movement of any article or commodity in commerce, by robbery or extortion or attempts or conspires so to do, or commits or threatens physical violence to any person or property in furtherance of a plan or purpose to do anything in violation of this section shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than twenty years, or both.

(b) As used in this section:

(1) The term “robbery” means the unlawful taking or obtaining of personal property from the person or in the presence of another, against his will, by means of actual or threatened force, **or violence, or fear of injury, immediate or future, to his person or property**, or property in his custody or possession, or the person or property of a relative or member of his family or of anyone in his company at the time of the taking or obtaining.

**(3)** The term “commerce” means commerce within the District of Columbia, or any Territory or Possession of the United States; all commerce between any point in a State, Territory, Possession, or the District of Columbia and any point outside thereof; all commerce between points within the same State through any place outside such State; and all other commerce over which the United States has jurisdiction.

5. Further, this Constructive and Legal Notice Demands that you show and prove that you and/or your office lack a fiduciary responsibility or liability to we the people of California by a written response within 10 (ten) days of receipt of this Notice. Should you decide not to respond to us on this issue, we will conclude that you **do** have such a lawful responsibility and liability to us/We the people of California and we will proceed against you with legal action on that basis.

Date: June\_\_, 2015

Sincerely, and with all rights reserved,

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

[Printed Name]

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

[signature]

123 Resistance Street

Anytown, California 93000