

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF ALASKA

Anna M. Riezinger-von Reitz
John E. Doe,
Mary F. Doe,
Petitioners,
v.
United States of America
United States of America, Inc., aka/dba
“US Corp” and “US Corporation”
Mark Begich
Lisa Murkowski
Don Young
Respondents.

Case No. _____

**MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION AND
PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS**

Request to file our Original Application for Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus was denied December 8, 2011. Failure to allow the Petitioners to file their Petition would be an obstruction of justice denying them the only Due Process recourse available to them. Petitioners therefore ask the Clerk of Appellate Courts and the Alaska Supreme Court, Inc., to reconsider the basis of their Petition and their claim of rights.

In *Brown v. Vasquez*, 952 F.2d 1164, 1166 (9th Cir. 1991), cert. denied, 112 S.Ct. 1778 (1992), the court observed that the Supreme Court has "recognized the fact that [t]he writ of habeas corpus is the fundamental instrument for safeguarding individual freedom against arbitrary and lawless state action." *Harris v. Nelson*, 394 U.S. 286, 290-91 (1969). Therefore, the writ must be "administered with the initiative and flexibility essential to insure that miscarriages of justice within its reach are surfaced and corrected." *Harris*, 394 U.S. at 291.

The Petitioners have correctly asserted their right to contract and to receive due process of law, among other rights guaranteed and secured by public contract with the State of Alaska, Inc., and by subrogation also guaranteed and secured by public contract with the “United States of America”, aka, the “US Corporation.” Petitioners have demonstrated that material harm will result and accrue to them personally if their rights are infringed or denied under the Patriot Act as Extended and/or the National Defense Authorization Act of 2012, as detainment under either Act of Congress would result in incalculable mental, physical, and material suffering demonstrated in loss of health, loss of mental and emotional stability and well-being, loss of income, loss of employment, loss of other properties, such as their

homes, and every other specific benefit of freedom. Petitioners have therefore demonstrated that both inherent rights and contractual rights stand subject to harm by these Acts of Congress, and the only requirements needed to establish standing have been met.

As the United States District Court has properly and always maintained, in matters alleging and disputing infringement of rights and immunities guaranteed to Alaska Inhabitants under the public contract known as "The Constitution of the United States of America", the only jurisdiction having the authority and obligation to act in favor of Alaska Inhabitants, including the Petitioners, is that of the Supreme Court of Alaska. Specifically, only the Alaska Supreme Court has the power to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus to protect the Inhabitants of Alaska from the threat of an unlawful Bill of Detainer resulting from either of two Acts of Congress.

We have demonstrated standing before the only court having jurisdiction and we assert our right to Due Process including the right to file the Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus presented herein.

Since 1789, the "(U)nited States of America" has existed by the right to contract, beginning with the inherent right of the Inhabitants to contract to create and inhabit those legal fictions known as "States", and from thence, enabling the States to contract to form, limit, and create the "United States of America" dba "US Corporation" and "Federal government" in itself another legal fiction deriving its existence and Authority to Act solely from the subrogated right of the Inhabitants to contract.

The Rights and Authorities of the Petitioners have been subrogated, but not annihilated nor extinguished. In the absence of performance under contract by the State of Alaska, Inc., or the US Corporation, Petitioners are fully enabled to recall and assert their subrogated rights.

Since 1933, both Federal and State levels of the American government have been incorporated, and the former public compact known as "The Constitution **for** the united States of America" has been translated to the public contract known as "The Constitution **of** the United States of America"; since 1938, per US Supreme Court decision in Erie Railroad v. Thompkins, all public commerce has existed **only** by contract, such that the only recourse to Due Process is by the exercise of contracts between both living and corporate persons.

Thus when living Inhabitants of a State seek protection of rights and immunities guaranteed under The Constitution of the United States we are disputing public contracts held under association by subrogation. The Officers of the State of Alaska owe the Petitioners, the Inhabitants of Alaska, the first duty to perform under contract, as the States asserted the Petitioners' delegated Authority as parties to the contract under dispute. While the Inhabitants retain their rights and all Authority under subrogation and do not currently hold the contract(s) creating these legal fictions fulfilled, the State of Alaska, Inc., and its Officers must be given both Notice and Opportunity to fulfill their obligations.

This Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus presented to the Alaska Supreme Court, Inc., gives the Alaska Supreme Court, Inc., and the Individual State Offices held by the Justices of the Alaska Supreme Court, Inc., opportunity to protect the interests of the Petitioners. Absent such opportunity to protect, assert, and enforce the contractually guaranteed rights and property interests of the Inhabitants of Alaska, the State of Alaska, Inc, is unable to fulfill its own contractual and fiduciary obligations.

If these public contracts are breached, all subrogated rights revert to the Inhabitants; all Authorities granted first to the State of Alaska, Inc., and secondarily to the US Corporation also revert to the Inhabitants. Both of these public contracts, The Constitution of the State of Alaska and The Constitution of the United States of America can be voided by Dereliction of Duty and Willful Failure to Perform, such that the State of Alaska, Inc., and the US Corporation, may lose granted Authority to Act if prompt and appropriate action is not taken to protect the property interests of the Petitioners.

Thus the Petitioners' right to be free from unlawful Bills of Detainer, and their receipt of a Writ of Habeas Corpus which preserves their most valuable property interest under contract in the face of infringing legislation, involves bedrock upon which the Petitioners, the State of Alaska, Inc., and the US Corporation all depend, and it is equally in the interest of all parties to preserve.

The Petitioners who are Natural born citizens of other Foreign States, meaning States having Statehood prior to 1933 or prior to 1861, and/or States asserting restored de jure status, and also those Petitioners who legally assumed "US citizenship" and claim "civil rights" under the 14th Amendment to The Constitution of the United States of America, and more generally, all Alaskans possessing "Non-Foreign" citizenship, are initially dependent on the State of Alaska, Inc., and its Officers to perform under contract and act in their behalf. The Petitioners, Inhabitants of Alaska, assert their retained Rights and Authorities held under subrogation and demand performance under contract. Failure to perform yields a contract in breach.

For governments as for individuals, failure to meet contractual obligations has consequences.

The Justices of the Alaska Supreme Court are uniquely empowered to act in behalf of the State of Alaska, Inc., and the Inhabitants thereof when a conflict arises between the Inhabitants of the State and the US Corporation and its Officers over infringing legislation. The Officers of the Alaska Supreme Court are the only ones empowered to grant **immediate** and **effective** relief to the Petitioners and other Inhabitants of Alaska who are threatened by unlawful Bills of Detainer.

Such conflict has arisen. The Officers of the US Corporation, including the Respondent members of Congress, have voted to ignore the provisions of the public contract under which the US Corporation operates and from which it proposes to derive its sole Authority to Act, The Constitution of the United States of America, by passing and enacting repugnant Acts of legislation, including the Patriot Act and the National Defense Authorization Act of 2012.

The State of Alaska, Inc., and its Officers have thus far failed to respond to these infringements and presumptions, such that the contracts governing our State and our Nation are left unenforced to such an degree that the Inhabitants of Alaska, including the Petitioners, are recklessly endangered, with life and property at risk, and none of the Petitioners' own granted Authority has been extended to protect them and their property interests.

The Petitioners have served Notice of Dereliction of Duty and Demand to Show Cause on Governor Parnell, Lieutenant Governor Mead Treadwell, and Alaska Attorney General John J. Burns, and have similarly served Notice on US Senator Lisa Murkowski and US Senator Mark Begich and US Congressman Don Young. Copies of both Federal and State Notices of Dereliction of Duty are attached.

Petitioners assert that "a law "beyond the power of Congress," for any reason, is "no law at all." *Nigro v. United States*, 276 U. S. 332, 341 (1928), and yet, any attempt to enact unlawful laws must be rebutted, or they will stand by presumption. Lack of rebuttal by the State of Alaska, Inc. and its Officers combined with gross presumption on the part of the US Corporation and its Officers, have led to the endangerment of the Petitioners, such that the Petitioners hold **both** public contracts, The Constitution of the State of Alaska and The Constitution of the United States of America, unfulfilled and potentially voided.

Petitioners have served a proper Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus on the Alaska Supreme Court, Inc., and had it denied for filing as an Original Application by Beth Adams, Chief Deputy Clerk, who said, "Does not comply with appellate rules. This is not a Writ of Habeas Corpus, or any other identifiable appellate matter."

In subsequent conversation with Beth, it appeared that she felt the Petition did not "comply with appellate rules" because it did not arise from a lower court ruling and the Petitioners are not currently under physical restraint.

Petitioners answer that a Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus has **no existence outside of appeals from other actions**, in this case, infringing legislation, and so is an "appellate matter" by definition. A Writ of Habeas Corpus is the proper opposition to a Bill of Detainer, and may be issued in response to **any** situation in which a person is detained or under warrant for detainment or being held subject to detainment or **threatened with detainment**. It does not have to arise from any pre-existing court case, nor does it require that the person(s) requesting protection actually be incarcerated. In this case the Petitioners are under threat of unlawful detainment as the result of contractual infringements already approved by the Officers of the US Corporation and clearly stated as Section 1021 and 1022 of the National Defense Authorization Act (2012) and are also being held subject to denial of their citizenship rights and similar detainment under the Patriot Act.

"Let it be known to all men and women of these United States that "Every person who, under color of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage, of any state or territory, subjects or

causes to be subject, any citizen of these United States or other person to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws, shall be liable to the party injured in an action at law, equity, or other proper proceeding for redress." (Civil Rights) 42 U.S.C. 1963.

"Let us, We the People be perfectly clear in our position on this issue. We the People rely on the ruling from the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals which has held that public officials/agents of the government do not have immunity simply because they operate in a discretionary manner. It indicated that public servants are to be held liable when they abused their discretion or acted in a way that was arbitrary, fanciful, or clearly unreasonable. (Civil law) Littleton v. Berbler, 468, F. 2d, 389 (1972).

"Downes v. Bidwell, 182 U.S. 244 (1901) quote Justice Marshall Harlan in dissent: "...two national governments, one to be maintained under the Constitution, with all its restrictions, the other to be maintained by Congress outside and independently of that instrument, by exercising such powers as other nations of the earth are accustomed to... a radical and mischievous change in our system of government will result... We will, in that event, pass from the era of constitutional liberty guarded and protected by a written constitution into an era of legislative absolutism... It will be an evil day for American liberty if the theory of a government outside the supreme law of the land finds lodgment in our constitutional jurisprudence."

We have indeed come to that day, wherein presumption has allowed the US Corporation to assert dominion far apart from the contractual limits and obligations that are owed to all Natural born Citizens and has served to allow them also to propose to arbitrarily alter the civil rights owed "US citizens" who are Inhabitants of the State of Alaska. The absence of due diligence on the part of the State of Alaska, Inc. evident in the absence of objection to these presumptions, and the failure to assert the contractual rights of the Inhabitants and the failure to defend the property interests of the Inhabitants of Alaska, as is due under contract from the Officers of the State of Alaska, Inc., has resulted in the threat and harm to the Inhabitants that is at the very heart the subject of the Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus being presented.

Better men than we would scoff and observe that we are asking help to guard the chickens from the foxes, and to the extent that the Officers of the State of Alaska, Inc., have thus far uniformly failed to assert the rights of the Inhabitants and failed to protect the property interests and immunities of the Inhabitants of Alaska from the endless contractual infringements imposed and proposed by the US Corporation and its Officers, they would be right. Nonetheless, the foxes are under contract to guard the chickens and being paid to do so, which obligates them under contract. The Petitioners must offer Notice and Opportunity to perform under contract to the Officers of the State of Alaska, Inc., and must demonstrate that we have acted in a timely and responsible manner to assert our subrogated Rights, to demand performance under contract from the Officers of the State of Alaska, Inc., and in the case of the Officers of the Alaska Supreme Court, Inc., to provide them with opportunity to act in our favor.

In conclusion, a Writ of Habeas Corpus belongs **only** to the jurisdiction of the Appellate Courts, and in this case, the Alaska Supreme Court is the **only** appellate court having both the jurisdiction and the obligation to provide the protection of a Writ of Habeas Corpus to the Inhabitants of Alaska when they are under threat from unlawful Bills of Detainer. The Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus is being offered as opportunity to act in favor of the Petitioners.

It is undoubtedly within the discretion of the Alaska Supreme Court, Inc., to refuse to act upon the Petitions it receives, and the Court may also choose to strike at its own basis for claiming Authority to Act, but as the Alaska Supreme Court holds the only proper jurisdiction, it is not, the Petitioners would argue, within the power of the Deputy Clerk of Appellate Courts to deny the Petitioners the right to file their Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus.

Petitioners have established standing, have properly identified the court having jurisdiction to grant the relief they seek, and they assert their right to file their Petition under Due Process

PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

I. General Information Pursuant to Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus

A. Place of confinement: State of Alaska

B. Petitioner's institutional address: 2366 Sopark Road, Big Lake, Alaska (99652)
and c/o Post Office Box 520994, Big Lake, Alaska (99652) and elsewhere.

II. SUBJECT OF THIS PETITION

A. Indicate the type of decision or action which you are challenging:

_____ Denial of parole

_____ Revocation of parole

_____ Disciplinary matter

_____ Revocation of good time credits

_____ Detainer

_____ Immigration or deportation order

_____ Other (described briefly the type of decision or action involved)

This petition for a writ of Habeas Corpus is presented seeking injunctive relief from the Patriot Act and the National Defense Authorization Act of 2012 (NDAA). These Acts of Congress conspire in such a way that the Petitioners and other Alaskans can now be (1) accused of undefined acts of "terrorism" and stripped of their citizenship and indefinitely detained under the Patriot Act and (2) subjected to indefinite detention without recourse to Due Process under the National Defense Authorization Act (2012), such that this Writ of Habeas Corpus and other means of relief would no longer be available to Petitioner(s) if they were physically confined..

Under the Patriot Act an Alaskan can conceivably be "deemed" an "enemy combatant" for almost any infraction, stripped of their citizenship and detained indefinitely, because the subject

of the legislation, “terrorism”, is left to the interpretation of law enforcement agencies. The National Defense Authorization Act further allows the military to indefinitely detain Alaskans merely under suspicion and does not require them to provide Due Process of Law.

An Alaskan thus accused of “terrorism” whatever “terrorism” is “deemed” to mean by whatever local authority may be asserted to make that determination, may be denied their right to contract, stripped of their citizenship and its protections under the Patriot Act, and arbitrarily and indefinitely detained, creating the possibility that an Alaskan could receive the administrative equivalent of a sentence of life imprisonment with no recourse to Due Process of Law.

Similarly, an Alaskan could become subject to unlawful indefinite detention without recourse to Due Process of Law under the National Defense Authorization Act of 2012.

The potential for abuse inherent in these combined Acts is enormous. Only the Alaska Supreme Court has the jurisdiction to provide relief and protection for Inhabitants of Alaska by issuing a Writ of Habeas Corpus.

B. Who made the decision or took the action? The United States as represented by various members of the United States Congress, including both members of the Alaska Senate US Delegation, Mark Begich and Lisa Murkowski, and US Congressman Don Young.

C. Date of decision or action? The Patriot Act has been enrolled since 2002, and was extended in 2011 for four more years. The National Defense Authorization Act (2012) has passed both Houses of Congress, with approval by Mark Begich, Lisa Murkowski, and Don Young, as of December 15, 2011.

D. Was there a hearing of any kind? Yes () No (X)

E. Were you represented by counsel or a staff member at any hearing?
Yes () No (X)

F. Have you filed any previous lawsuit(s) related to your present claim?
Yes () No (X)

IV. GROUNDS FOR RELIEF

1. Ground One: Provisions in the Patriot Act and National Defense Authorization Act 2012 are in clear violation of rights and immunities that are contractually guaranteed to the States and by subrogation to the Petitioners by The Constitution of the United States of America.

While it is true that the use of this Writ is not common practice, neither is the threat to which Petitioners are exposed. It is entirely uncommon that the Inhabitants of Alaska en masse would be threatened with a Bill of Detainer absent recourse to Due Process, as such action is contractually forbidden to the US Corporation and its Officers by the 4th, 5th, 6th, and 8th Amendments of The Constitution of the United States of America; nonetheless, the Officers of

the US Corporation have presumed thus far to act in violation of their public contract and its limitations and have willfully subjected the Inhabitants of Alaska to Bills of Detainer under both the Patriot Act and the National Defense Authorization Act of 2012, Sections 1021 and 1022.

They have also presumed to deny the right to contract to Alaskans by revoking or otherwise denying the valid citizenship of Inhabitants of Alaska under offending provisions of the Patriot Act.

The Right to Contract and the Right to Due Process of Law are vital property interests belonging to the Petitioners and guaranteed to the Petitioners by The Constitution of the United States of America, yet the Respondents, Officers of the US Corporation, presume to ignore, deny, and abridge these rights via legislation.

Not only are these rights specifically and explicitly guaranteed to the States and by subrogation also to the Petitioners, but their abridgement and the Authority to abridge them, is just as specifically and explicitly denied to the Officers of the US Corporation.

The Respondents have ignored the plainly stated provisions of The Constitution of the United States of America and instead baldly offered to overturn the protections which are guaranteed to the Petitioners, and which are due and owed to them under public contract.

The Respondents also abundantly fail to recognize that their own Authority to Act fully depends on the existence and free exercise of the Petitioners' Right to Contract and upon the Due Process of Law, without which no granted Authority can exist.

There is a reason why The Constitution of the United States of America so carefully and repeatedly asserts and guarantees these rights of the Petitioners, and also why it repeatedly and carefully denies authority to Congress to meddle with these rights: **the powers of the government and all granted Authority to Act derive from these inherent rights of the Petitioners.**

Undermining these rights of the Petitioners unavoidably undermines the government established by the Petitioners via the exercise of precisely these same rights. Denying the Authority of the Petitioners denies the Authority of their representatives.

By passing the Patriot Act and the NDAA (2012), the Respondents are cutting off the legs of the stool on which they sit, assaulting the bedrock of American government and the basis of their own purported authority as well.

Both in just defense of the contractually guaranteed property interests of the Petitioners, and in just defense of their established government, protection from unlawful legislative error (a Writ of Habeas Corpus) must be provided and other prompt corrective action must be taken by the State of Alaska, Inc., and its Officers to enforce the provisions of The Constitution of the United States of America in favor of the Petitioners.

2. Ground Two: Petitioners and other Inhabitants of Alaska have already been harmed and infringed upon by the Patriot Act and the NDAA (2012).

The Petitioners are already being intimidated and confined under color of law and restrained in the exercise of their contractually guaranteed rights, including their right to Due Process of Law. Two out of three Petitioners have been intimidated to the extent that they appear under pseudonyms. They fear that they will be arrested under the Patriot Act or NDAA (2012), and defamed as “terrorists” because they oppose the incipient police state. The risk of indefinite detainment deters them from speaking up in public under their real names.

The Petitioners understand that equality under and before the law is paramount, and as such, they claim the right to use the protection of the requested Writ of Habeas Corpus under equal protection, to be interpreted and used as Writs of Habeas Corpus are used in both Pennsylvania and New York States, in all cases where an individual is confined or restrained in their liberty under any color of law or pretense whatsoever.

While the Petitioners are not at present in physical confinement in a prison, the restraint of freedom presented by the Bills of (Indefinite) Detainer in the Patriot Act and the NDAA (2012) makes it impossible to file this Writ and seek relief if once actually confined. Thus we must address the Catch-22 nature of this infringement and seek injunctive relief prior to its application. If we wait for any specific conflict to arise and entertain the enforcement of the Patriot Act or the NDAA of 2012, no means of recourse will be possible.

These realities compel the Petitioners to seek the protection of a Writ of Habeas Corpus **now**.

3. Ground Three: Petitioners and other Inhabitants of Alaska are at clear and present risk.

The very existence and nature of the National Defense Authorization Act of 2012 and the Patriot Act have forced this action in lawful defense of personal liberty and protection of the Petitioners’ lives and property

The urgent potential for these Acts being used to deprive Petitioners of natural or legally assumed citizenship and to unlawfully and indefinitely detain them without recourse to Due Process, and to otherwise subject them to cruel, unusual, punishments, makes it imperative for us to file this Petition and for the Alaska Supreme Court to act upon it.

The harm these Acts presume to do to Alaskan Inhabitants is extreme, arbitrary, and not allowed under the provisions of our public contracts. Such consequences as being stripped of one’s citizenship, subjected to indefinite detainment without recourse to Due Process of Law merely on the basis of suspicion, and torture under interrogation, are terrible known and ongoing punishments that these Acts arbitrarily presume to enact against Alaskans.

The Petitioners, Inhabitants of Alaska, are under dire threat, and the State of Alaska, Inc., and the US Corporation are under demand to perform under contract. The issuance of a protective Writ

of Habeas Corpus by the Alaska Supreme Court would be evidence in favor of the State of Alaska's willingness to meet its contractual and fiduciary responsibility owed Petitioners.

4. Ground Four: "The Acts" known as the Patriot Act and the National Defense Authorization Act of (2012) presume and depend upon Authority that was never granted.

Under different guises and via different trains of reasoning the US Corporation and its Officers have asserted the authority to indefinitely detain the Petitioners, Inhabitants of Alaska, to strip them of their citizenship under the Patriot Act and indefinitely detain them without Due Process of Law. Such authority was never granted to the US Corporation or its Officers by any public contract the Petitioners are subject to.

Any claim to the contrary stands staunchly denied by the Petitioners, who have never knowingly, willingly, and under conditions of full disclosure claimed "US citizenship" or otherwise compromised or renounced their Natural born Foreign State citizenship status. Any claim that the Petitioners are by any means or overriding contract **not** owed due diligence, good faith, and full performance under contract to The Constitution of the United States of America deserves neither credit nor toleration, and must be subjected to public record, examination, and rebuttal.

The National Defense Authorization Act (2012) likewise presumes powers and Authority never granted the US Corporation or its Officers, in clear violation of the provisions of The Constitution of the United States of America.

The Respondents do not have the granted Authority to detain the Petitioners or other Alaska Inhabitants indefinitely without recourse to Due Process, nor do they have the Authority to deny the citizenship of the Petitioners nor the underlying right of the Petitioners to Contract. Absent Authority to Act, the Act itself is null and void.

Such claims by the US Corporation and its Officers are entirely unsupported by any contractual agreement or provision in The Constitution of the United States of America and would serve to violently and without recourse deny the Petitioners' natural fundamental and contractually guaranteed Right to Contract and Right to receive Due Process of Law.

These Acts, the Patriot Act and NDAA (2012), are on their very face so repugnant to the spirit of Justice that although given the form and name of "law" they cannot be law, nor even a contractually conforming statute.

These Acts of Congress approved by the named Respondent Officers of the US Corporation, serve to step by step **defraud by presumption** the Petitioners, the Inhabitants of Alaska, of their contractually and necessarily guaranteed rights, and they further attempt to claim new and unheard of authorities that do not exist under the "The Constitution of the United States of America" and which are repugnant to it and which conspire against it.

This conspiring against the limitations of their contract on the part of the Respondents and other Officers of the US Corporation is unavoidably apparent in these, their public Acts. The unjustifiable presumptions inherent to these Acts must stand fully rebutted and opposed by the

State of Alaska, Inc, and its Officers if they wish to meet their fiduciary responsibility owed to the Petitioners, and to maintain their own contract and claim of granted Authority to Act.

The nature and manifest purpose of these Acts of Congress is to deprive Petitioners first of their citizenship protections and then to systematically deny them access to the courts, to destroy the presumption of innocence, and to remove all other aspects, rules, remedies, and relief currently available under Due Process of Law, all the while subjecting them to unlawful detainment and exacting both cruel and unusual punishments on those merely accused of being “terrorists”.

These Acts of Congress intolerably violated the existing contract between the 50 States and by subrogation with the Petitioners on the day these Acts were passed.

These unwarranted and unjustifiable presumptions of Authority on the part of the US Corporation and its Officers have resulted in duress and intimidation under color of law to such an extent that they constrain the freedom of the Petitioners to walk down the street secure in the protections of their Natural born or legally assumed citizenship. These severe infringements have been enacted against them without granted Authority and have deprived them of the security of knowing that **any** of their rights will be respected and stand above arbitrary violation by the Officers of the US Corporation, including their right to Life.

The Officers of the US Corporation, the named Respondents and Others, have merely presumed granted Authority to which they have no reasonable or material claim, which has resulted in direct harm and threat to the Petitioners and others relying on the respect of contractual obligations that are public and fully in evidence.

Not content with merely trying to wheedle extra or additional Authority by presumption, the Respondents and other Officers of the US Corporation have attempted to claim contractually **forbidden** Authority to Act for themselves, in that they have conspired against the 4th, 5th, 6th, and 8th Amendments of the Constitution of the United States of America and have sought to undermine the limits of The Constitution of the United States of America and have acted against the contractually guaranteed rights and immunities of the State of Alaska, Inc., and by subrogation, the rights and immunities of the Petitioners and other Inhabitants of Alaska.

The right to life itself stands infringed, so long as liberty is threatened and Due Process denied by any Act(s) of Congress, whether such Acts openly assert authority to destroy Due Process of Law in a single Act, or conspire to do so under cover of several Acts working together to accomplish the same end result.

The State of Alaska, Inc., and its Officers have thus far failed to protect the property interests of the Petitioners and have not offered to rebut these repugnant presumptions of the US Corporation and its Officers in the Petitioners’ behalf, even though the State of Alaska, Inc., owes full fiduciary responsibility as party to The Constitution of the United State of America under the Petitioner’s subrogated Authority.

This has further compelled the Petitioners to fear for their property and their safety and to invoke their subrogated rights and demand performance under contract from the State of Alaska, Inc.,

and to offer this Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus in lawful defense of their own property interests under contract. Petitioners pray that the Alaska Supreme Court will act in their favor and provide the protection of the Writ.

5. Ground Five. The Officers of the US Corporation have acted outside the confines and provisions of their public contract with the 50 States and under subrogation with the Inhabitants of Alaska, so as to radically endanger the property rights of the Petitioners and render the existence of a reliable public contract with the US Corporation in doubt.

Since 1933 Petitioners and other Americans have contracted for services with each of the 50 States, and by extending their Authority to the 50 States, have contracted with the US Corporation to provide services stipulated by “The Constitution of the United States of America”, and since 1938 (US Supreme Court case *Erie Railroad v. Thompkins*) all entities legal and natural have functioned **only by contract in public commerce**. There is no recourse to assert any de jure status for any of the 50 States between 1933 and 2009.

There is, as a result, no doubt whatsoever that the public contracts established between the Inhabitants and the 50 States and between the 50 States and the US Corporation are fully operational commercial contracts, meant to be legally binding and enforced.

A great deal of “Mission Creep” has been allowed the US Corporation and its Officers by the indulgent Officers of the 50 States over the past 78 years, which has resulted in the enactment of vast quantities of legislation outside the strict confines of the only actual contractual agreement between the 50 States and the US Corporation, The Constitution of the United States of America.

The US Corporation and its Officers have been allowed (by the Officers of the 50 States who are primarily responsible for enforcement) to simply presume the Authority to pass legislation very far afield from the confines and provisions of The Constitution. This lax unto non-existent enforcement of The Constitution of the United State of America by the Officers of the 50 States has led to this vital contract being disregarded, bypassed, and except for a lip-service ritual or two now and then, largely ignored.

The Officers of the US Corporation have been allowed to “rule by presumption” by the Officers of the 50 States, who have sat mum about enforcement issues in exchange for political favors and pork barrel rewards. It is not, therefore, at all surprising that the members of Congress have now presumed against the Petitioners’ most basic rights, and equally not surprising that the Officers of the State of Alaska are standing around shuffling their feet and considering all their usual priorities and political axes to grind, instead of taking prompt action to rebut the presumptions inherent in the Patriot Act and the NDAA (2012)

They imagine that this is “business as usual” when it’s not.

The State of Alaska, Inc. is responsible for enforcing the contract provisions of The Constitution of the United States of America and owes a fiduciary responsibility under contract to the Inhabitants of Alaska to do so. The manifest failure (thus far) of the Officers of the State of Alaska to perform this duty of enforcement in favor of the Petitioners and to perform it

responsibly and promptly, has now caused the Petitioners to invoke their Rights and Authorities under subrogation, and caused them to demand performance under contract from the State of Alaska, Inc.

The Executive Officers of the State of Alaska have been duly given Notice of Dereliction of Duty and the Judicial Officers are being given the opportunity to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus in protection of the Petitioners' property interests. Continued inaction and endangerment of the Petitioners will lead to Notice of Willful Failure to Perform, followed by Notice of Breach of Contract, followed by Notice of Full Estoppel and Denial of Authority to Act.

There is no doubt that the Inhabitants of Alaska have been and are being recklessly endangered and subjected to duress and expense as a direct result of the continuing lapse of the Officers of the State of Alaska to require enforcement of The Constitution of the United States of America in favor of the Petitioners. There is no doubt that the State of Alaska, Inc., is obligated to enforce each and every commercial contract it enters into in behalf of the Petitioners under their granted Authority and that the State of Alaska, Inc., owes absolute fiduciary responsibility to the Petitioners to do so.

This Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus is just a small part of the remedy being sought by the Petitioners. It happens to be the portion lying directly in the jurisdiction of the Alaska Supreme Court.

As there has been no public process of Amendment granting the Officers of the US Corporation any new Authority, the Alaska Supreme Court must in the absence of other evidence duly tested, submitted for rebuttal, and presented in public record, accept that the public contract known as "The Constitution of the United States of America" **remains in effect** and that the US Corporation and all Officers of the US Corporation are bound by this contract to abide in **Good Faith and Full Service** to its provisions.

Also, in the absence of other evidence duly tested, submitted for rebuttal, and entered into public record, the Alaska Supreme Court, Inc., must accept that there is no new or valid "emergency" means to amend or override the provisions of The Constitution of the United States of America, such that the contract **is what it is**, and while it may be subject to interpretation by the US Supreme Court, **is not subject to revision by Acts of Congress.**

Further, in the absence of other evidence duly vetted and entered as evidence in response to this Petition, the Alaska Supreme Court must accept that the Respondents took their Oath of Office in full cognizance of its meaning and the responsibility they bear to act in Good Faith and Full Service under contract to The Constitution of the United States of America. The Alaska Supreme Court must accept that any public or private act conspiring to overthrow the limits and deny the protections of The Constitution of the United States of America or conspiring to use a process of presumption to arbitrarily amend the provisions of this contract so as to defraud the Petitioners of their rights, which are property interests necessary to maintain the existence of our government, are by definition Acts of Treason.

This long slow slide into police state tyranny by a process of acquiescence, presumption, and fraud, has come to an end. We now face issues of Life and Death. The Petitioners invoke their Rights and Authority under subrogation and move the Officers of the State of Alaska, Inc., to perform under contract to procure enforcement of The Constitution of the United States of America and to protect the most vital property interests of the Petitioners—their liberty and their lives---- by issuing a Writ of Habeas Corpus.

6. Gound Six. These Acts of Congress, the Patriot Act and NDAA (2012) presume to impose cruel and unusual punishments on the Petitioners and other Inhabitants of Alaska, and are also Void for Vagueness.

Insomuch as these Acts propose cruel and unusual punishment for undefined acts described as “terrorism”, the punishments authorized under the Patriot Act (denial of citizenship and Right to Contract followed by indefinite detainment) and under the National Defense Authorization of 2012, (indefinite detention without Due Process of Law) are in no sense “usual” and in their presentation and their effect, are cruel and unusual, such that Inhabitants of Alaska could, via the presumptions inherent in either Act, receive an “administrative sentence” of Life Imprisonment merely on the basis of “suspicion” of “terrorism”.

It is abhorrent that we should see, hear, or smell any such Acts proposed by Members of Congress. The Respondents have themselves presented the greatest threat to America, and to Alaskans, by proposing these Acts and by disrespecting their contractual obligations and by presuming Authority that was never granted to them. They have served unlawful ends, seeking to overthrow the very basis of our just government.

It is a standing requirement of all Law and valid statutes that they must be constructed in a way that is not confusing or obscure in meaning, so as to leave average people without the means to understand and apply the law or statute they are meant to obey. The repeated and apparently purposeful and unusual refusal of the Members of Congress, the Officers of the US Corporation, including the Respondents, to fully and exactly and legally define “terrorism” in these Acts which are purportedly devoted to the subject of “terrorism” is prima facie evidence that Congress intended to leave the nature of the crime undefined so as to promote lax and uncertain standards and to allow almost any interpretation of what “terrorism” might mean and what acts might be construed as “acts of terrorism”.

Indeed, the Acts that are the main subject of this Petition leave the meaning of “terrorism” so abundantly vague as to render the Patriot Act and the NDAA (2012) Void for Vagueness, even if no other objection could be found. Like the Income Tax statutes that fail to define “income”, these Acts of Congress refuse to define the very subject and substance of the acts being considered---- “terrorism”----in any practical way that would serve members of the public and our law enforcement officers as an operational definition.

Petitioners possess and insist upon the contractually guaranteed right to be free of duress and free of the threat of the cruel and unusual punishment presented by Patriot Act and the National Defense Authorization Act, and insist that in the absence of clear and appropriate legal definition of “terrorism” these Acts of Congress are Void for Vagueness, such that average members of the

Public and of the law enforcement community would be unable to reliably discern the difference between an “act of terrorism” and an “act of arson” for example, or to reliably and fairly apply the statutes resulting from these Acts in a uniform and constructive way.

These Acts present two powerful unlawful Bills of Detainer. They threaten the Petitioners with administratively enforced Life Imprisonment, but they neglect to define the crime. Perhaps no other circumstance so clearly illustrates the police state intimidation being practiced against the Inhabitants of Alaska, including the Petitioners, or more loudly calls upon the Alaska Supreme Court to extend the protection of a Writ of Habeas Corpus.

7. Ground Seven. Arbitrarily depriving Petitioners of their citizenship (Patriot Act) and thereby denying their Right to Contract is logically fatal to any claim of granted Authority being possessed by either the State of Alaska or the US corporate government.

The Petitioners’ Right to Contract is the basis for the existence of the United States of America, the US Corp, and also the State of Alaska. The Officers of the US Corp are thus striking at the very basis of the same Authority they claim to invoke when they attack or abridge the Petitioners’ Right to Contract. On one hand, they are pretending to be the recipients of granted Authority derived from the States and their Inhabitants by contract, and on the other hand, then attempting to deny that these very same Inhabitants have the Right to Contract at all, such that the contract formed by their Natural-born or legally assumed citizenship may be nullified by fiat by the same US Corporation----a legal fiction that would not exist apart from the Inhabitant’s Right to Contract. .

Petitioners assert that the rights and authorities of any lawful American government derive always and only from those governed, and that the natural right of the Inhabitants to contract is the **only** basis for the existence of legal fictions such as the State of Alaska, the United States of America, and the US Corporation.

As water flows downhill, the delegation of Authority proceeds from the Inhabitants by valid public contract to the States and from the States by valid public contract to the United States of America, not the other way around. Any presumption that these legal fictions may infringe on the natural rights of the Inhabitants, and especially and particularly the natural right of the Inhabitants to contract, is suicidal on the face of it for all levels of government in America and completely destructive to their claim to possess any granted Authority to Act whatsoever.

The American form of government requires the protection of the Petitioners’ right to contract and asserts the Petitioners’ ultimate Authority, because without those two elements, the government itself is reduced to the status of a legal fiction with no granted Authority to Act.

That the Officers of the US Corporation no longer recognize the source of their own Authority to Act, as demonstrated and conclusively proven by the offending provisions of the Patriot Act, is truly alarming. Either by ignorance or by guile, the presence of legislation that denies the rights and inherent Authority of the Petitioners signals a violent departure from the American form of government, and suggests that the Officers of the US Corporation may be attempting to assume dictatorial power over the people they are supposed to represent.

The Petitioners see the Patriot Act's attack on the right of the Inhabitants to contract, which is the only valid source of Authority for our government, as more evidence that both the Petitioners and the legitimate government are at risk, further underlining the need for the protection of a Writ of Habeas Corpus. A conscious effort to undermine the basis of Authority for our government implies that the Petitioners, especially the Named Petitioner, are at mortal risk for offering opposition. A Writ of Habeas Corpus protecting those who seek to preserve the traditional American government is sorely needed and duly sought.

8. Ground Eight. There is no evidence of a valid "War on Terror" and no evidence that "terrorists" can or should be distinguished from common criminals.

It is now and it has always been apparent that "terror" is a tactic of guerrilla warfare used by virtually every nation on earth, **including** the United States of America. Terrorism has clearly not been outlawed by the US Corporation. Terrorism as a tactic has long been a prima facie part of public policy. As one example, the US Corporation has freely chosen to load artillery shells with "depleted" nuclear waste from nuclear power plants and has been happily exploding them throughout the Mideast in any country deemed to be an "enemy combatant" for over a decade.

Petitioners can think of nothing more terrifying than the prospect of having the soil and water of an entire nation polluted with nuclear waste, nor can they think of any greater threat than slow death and genetic destruction of an entire civilian population carried out over the course of the next 6,000 years.

Terrorism is clearly not something the US Corporation is fighting against nor even refraining from. Petitioners assume that any real "War on Terror" involves not practicing terrorism.

Throughout all the excuses proposed to justify the gross infringements against liberty that the Patriot Act and the NDAA of 2012 represent, there has been a very strained attempt to define "terrorism" as an act of war, instead of a crime.

If "terrorism" is an "act of war" then those detained under the Patriot Act and the NDAA (2012) are covered by the Geneva Convention, and owed all the provisions agreed upon.

If "terrorism" is a crime carried out by individuals, we already have other names for it---murder, arson, vandalism----and an endlessly complex criminal justice system ready to deal with it.

The facts do not support any claim of emergency or "wartime" powers needed to deal with terrorists or terrorism. The Petitioners, Inhabitants of Alaska, are subjected to dire threat by the Patriot Act and the National Defense Authorization Act of 2012, such that their lives and their property stand at risk, but there is no credible justification for it.

The Respondents have allowed and promoted and nurtured and steadily advanced a police state to the point where the Petitioners are in very real danger---not from "terrorists" wearing turbans and brandishing swords 9,000 miles away---but from the Respondents and their public Acts.

The Respondents have ignored the meaning and vital importance of the public contracts under which they are obligated to function and to which they owe constant and faithful allegiance, with the result that the Petitioners are living in the shadow and threat of indefinite detention without recourse to Due Process, and seeing their local police force transformed into the American KGB.

These realities are well-known and can be extensively documented at the Court's request. They fully justify the issuance of a Writ of Habeas Corpus to protect the Petitioners. [How the Feds Fueled the Militarization of Police](#) / obrag.org [How the War on Terror Has Militarized the Police](#)

www.theatlantic.com

9. Ground Nine. The offending provisions of the Patriot Act and the National Defense Authorization Act (2012) undermine Public Trust on a global scale and suppress the American economy, creating further undeserved harm to the Petitioners reputation, property interests and commercial well-being.

If the Petitioners, parties to The Constitution of the United States of America under subrogation, have their property rights attacked by the US Corporation, no other sentient being on the planet can feel confident in their business dealings with the US Corporation.

If the US Corporation and its Officers refuse to honor the one obvious, simple, all-important contract, how can anyone trust them to honor any other contract? When the Officers of the US Corporation fail to honor The Constitution of the United States of America and the States fail to enforce it, red flags go up from Greenland to Thailand, and rightly so.

By dishonoring The Constitution of the United States of the America at home, the US Corporation reaps commercial disaster abroad, as other nations flee from contracts that may similarly be dishonored.

All this again harms the Petitioners who depend to a greater or lesser extent on willing trading partners to preserve and maintain their business enterprises and quality of life. A Writ of Habeas Corpus cannot provide direct relief against this result, but it can protect the Petitioners while they seek repeal of these dangerous and ill-considered Acts of legislation.

V. REQUEST FOR RELIEF

With this Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus the Petitioners seek injunctive relief against the potential for arbitrary loss of citizenship, denial of right to contract, and threat of lawless detention provided by the Patriot Act and the National Defense Authorization Act (2012).

Specifically, Petitioners ask and seek that the Alaska Supreme Court issue a protective Writ of Habeas Corpus to preserve their property interests against the material and prima facie harm threatened against them by the Patriot Act and the National Defense Authorization Act of 2012.

Petitioners seek compensation for filing fees, certified mailing fees, time and duress.

Petitioners seek and ask that the Alaska Supreme Court recognize that the 50 States incorporate, including the State of Alaska, Inc., have contracted with the US Corporation, that the provisions of that contract are public, and that they are clearly stated as “The Constitution of the United States of America” and also to recognize that the Officers of the US Corporation have a duty owing their authority to respect and not undermine the provisions of the contract that enables their Authority, and to also recognize that in the absence of Due Diligence, Good Faith, and Full Service, the public contract known as “The Constitution of the United States of America” can fall into dereliction, and be declared void, when those responsible for its enforcement and preservation willfully fail to perform under contract.

Petitioners ask and seek that the Alaska Supreme Court accept that the provisions of the contract known as “The Constitution of the United States of America” are in full force and effect, and that these provisions demand performance in Due Diligence, Good Faith and Full Service, as demonstrated by acts in support of the contractual provisions and not against them.

Petitioners ask and seek that the Alaska Supreme Court, Inc., recognize that they have respected their obligations and are acting with full Honor, seeking lawful protection for their property interests via remedies allowed to them under Common Law, International Law of Commerce, and The Constitution of the United States of America.

Petitioners ask and seek that the Alaska Supreme Court recognize their status as a living entities who have never knowingly and willingly and under conditions of full disclosure acted or signed contracts in the capacity of corporate “persons” represented as themselves, nor have they voluntarily and under conditions of full disclosure extinguished or delegated their Right to Contract or their Right to Due Process to any entity foreign or domestic, including the US Corporation and its Officers apart from their participation in The Constitution of the State of Alaska and The Constitution of the United States of America, by subrogation. Petitioners ask and seek that the Alaska Supreme Court will recognize their International Right of Self-Declaration and their Natural born citizenship as Americans and their status as Alaska Inhabitants.

Petitioners seek and ask that the Alaska Supreme Court recognize the inherent harm to Justice and Due Process and the Right to Contract embodied by these Acts of Congress and to also recognize the dangerous open potential these Acts provide for the abuse of natural and civil rights.

Petitioners ask and seek the Alaska Supreme Court in its capacity as an Office of State and as Officers of the State of Alaska to demand performance under contract from the US Corporation and its Officers, requiring respect of the explicit guaranteed rights of the Petitioners.

Petitioners specifically ask and seek that the Alaska Supreme Court (1) expose any and all presumptions against the Petitioners and require opportunity for rebuttal; (2) force all and any counterclaim of extra-contractual rights into the Public Record; and (3) prohibit enforcement of the offending provisions of the Patriot Act and the NDAA (2012) in Alaska.

Petitioners ask and seek that the Alaska Supreme Court recognize that no granted Authority exists to allow Officers of the US Corporation to inflict administrative sentences of Life Imprisonment on any American, and that they equally lack Authority to withhold Due Process of Law from anyone, regardless of what crimes they may stand accused of.

Petitioners ask and seek that the Alaska Supreme Court oppose the loose construction of these Acts of Congress and demand specific, clear, legal definitions of terms, including clear and responsible and reliable definition of the words “terrorist” and “terrorism”.

Petitioners further ask and seek that if the Alaska Supreme Court, Inc., should decline to grant the sought-for relief, the requested Writ of Habeas Corpus, that this Petition shall immediately and expeditiously be forwarded under signature by one or more of the Justices of the Alaska Supreme Court in token of their duty to perform under contract and in respect of the Petitioners’ subrogated rights, and to properly file this Petition for consideration by the US Supreme Court, and Petitioners further ask and seek that if the US Supreme Court should in turn decline to answer this Petition and fail to grant the sought- for relief, that one or more of the Justices of the US Supreme Court will similarly forward our Petition under their own signature in token of their duty to perform under contract and in respect of the Petitioners’ subrogated rights, and properly and promptly forward and file this Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus with the World Court, Hague, Netherlands.

In addition to the protective Writ of Habeas Corpus and any other injunctive relief the Alaska Supreme Court may devise, the Petitioner(s) request and seek that these contractual infringements be acted upon and referred to the US Department of Justice and the US Marshall’s Office with a request to criminally charge and prosecute those US Corporation Officers and employees who have so far attempted and conspired to infringe the plainly stated and contractually guaranteed property interests of Alaskans. The charges against the named parties are as follows; 1 Dereliction of duty, 2. Violation of Oath of Office. 3. Gross Negligence. 4. Conspiracy against rights (18 U.S.C. 241) 5. Conspiracy to deprive rights (Ury v Sanbtee (1969 DC Ill), 6. Attempted willful deprivation of civil rights (18 USC 242, Imbler v Pachtman, U.S. 47 L Ed 2nd 128, 96 S. Ct.), 7. Improperly claimed immunity from prosecution (Firemens Ins Co of Newark, N.J. v Washburn County. 2 Wisc 2d 214; 85 N.W. 2d 840 1957), 8. Failure to show due care (Radon v Rowen Memorial Hospital, Inc. 269 N.S. 1, 13, 152 SE 1 d 485, 493 1967. 9. Lack of Good Faith and due diligence under contract. 10. Conspiring against Due Process. 11. Conspiring to exact cruel and unusual punishments. 12. Conspiring against the Right to Contract. 13. Conspiring against The Constitution of the United States of America. 15. Unlawful presumption of Authority. 16. Acting under Color of Law. 17. Violation of public contract. 18. Reckless endangerment.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

As this Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus is to be granted in all cases where one is “confined or restrained of their freedom under any color (of law) or pretense whatsoever” it is both proper and necessary in the interests of justice that protective relief be granted the Petitioners. The Petitioners are under threat from Bills of Detainer issued as provisions of two separate Acts of

Congress, the Patriot Act and the National Defense Authorization Act of 2012. They have asked the Alaska Supreme Court to act in their favor and to provide an answering Opposition in the traditional form of a Writ of Habeas Corpus.

The Petitioners have been compelled to take the unusual, but by no means historically unique step of requesting a pre-emptive Writ of Habeas Corpus, because the Bills of Detainer express the clear intention of denying the Petitioners access to Due Process of Law if they are detained.

The Petitioners can find no evidence that the US Corporation or its Officers have any granted Authority under public contract that would allow them to administratively impose a sentence of up to Life Imprisonment on the basis of unproven allegation, nor can the Petitioners find any contractual basis suggesting that the Respondents have any granted Authority to deny any American access to Due Process of Law. Rather, the Officers of the US Corporation, the members of Congress, have presumed Authority that is explicitly **denied** to them by the written contract they are obligated and sworn to uphold: The Constitution of the United States of America.

They can only succeed in asserting such "Authority" if it is left without objection and rebuttal from those responsible for enforcing the contract, the Officers of the 50 States, and in this case, the Officers of the State of Alaska, Inc. Lax to non-existent enforcement of The Constitution's provisions by State Officers has allowed the members of Congress to "rule by presumption" for the better part of 80 years.

The underlying subrogated Authority of the Inhabitants has been virtually dormant for eight decades, but has never been extinguished. The Petitioners have invoked their Rights and Authority under subrogation and demanded performance under contract from the State of Alaska and its Officers.

Petitioners have provided Notice of Dereliction of Duty and Demand to Show Cause to the Executive Officers of the State of Alaska and the Respondents, Officers of the US Corporation, Alaska Congressional Delegation. Petitioners have also provided the Judicial Officers of the Alaska Supreme Court the opportunity to act in their favor by applying this Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus.

The offending Officers of the State of Alaska who have consistently failed to enforce the provisions of The Constitution of the United States of America in behalf of the Petitioners and the Officers of the US Corporation who have Dishonored their contract and presumed against the property interests of the Petitioners have been given 30 days (State of Alaska) and 15 days (US Corporation) to respond and take corrective action to cure their Deficiency.

Petitioners avow that the American form of government derives its only Authority from the consent of those governed, and without performance under contract including willing adherence to and enforcement of the provisions of The Constitution of the United States of America there can be no presumption of granted Authority.

They have presented the self-evident truth that both state and federal governments are legal fictions created by the Inhabitant's exercise of their inherent right to contract, and that any action undertaken by the state or federal government which seeks to overthrow, deny, or abridge the Inhabitant's inherent rights, also then serves to overthrow our legitimate government.

The property interests of the Petitioners and the future of any legitimate form of American government are inextricably connected and dependent on each other. The presumptions offered against the guaranteed rights of Americans by the Patriot Act and the NDAA (2012) strike at the very heart of our government---its claim to possess granted Authority to Act.

Without honoring the provisions of The Constitution of the United States of America, there is no "consent of the governed" that can be asserted or presumed, because the Authority of the Inhabitants is only granted when that contract is fulfilled.

The Officers of the 50 States who have failed to enforce the all-important contract with the US Corporation and allowed the abuse of the Inhabitants and their property interests, are fully liable. By serving as the middle men brokering the contract between the Inhabitants and the US Corporation, they have incurred the fiduciary responsibility for failure to enforce the provisions of The Constitution of the United States of America just as they bear fiduciary responsibility for enforcing contract provisions on timber sales or contracts impacting other resources.

The contractual basis for both levels of the American government, state and federal, is derelict and ripe to fall as the result of Willful Failure to Perform.

Our nation stands on a cliff and our legitimate government is all but overthrown by ignorance and neglect, guile, self-interest, and greed. A vicious police state has steadily grown along with the corruption of the American government. Those who oppose the corruption and who daily struggle to bring America back from the edge, are targeted by the criminal elements that have so far abased our nation, and are left easy prey under legislation like the Patriot Act and NDAA.

The Petitioners have claimed the fundamental right of protection from unlawful Bills of Detainer and have requested a Writ of Habeas Corpus from the Alaska Supreme Court. They propose to employ its full extent as it is used and applied in Pennsylvania and New York State, where Writs of Habeas Corpus are issued when the Inhabitants are restrained of freedom under any color of law or pretense. The Petitioners claim equal protection.

The Petitioners have invoked their Rights and Authority under subrogation, and have demanded performance under contract from the State of Alaska, Inc., and its Officers, and also from the US Corporation and its Officers, holding that both are in Dereliction of Duty owed to enforce and respect the provisions of the one public contract that earns them Authority to Act.

When the Officers of the US Corporation bring to a vote a question of individual rights which they have **no consent** to address and **no contractual right** to address, and presume to **vote away** the most precious rights, immunities, and other property interests of the Inhabitants they are supposed to represent with Good Faith and Full Service, that is the day that the contracts binding Inhabitants to States and States to the US Corporation stand subject to lawful prosecution. That is

the day that any reasonable basis for the presumption of granted Authority comes to a stop, and that day has come.

The inherent Rights, Freedoms, and Immunities of the Petitioners are not intangible pie-in-the-sky theoretical constructs. The Rights, Freedoms, and Immunities of the Petitioners are their most precious and literal property, property that our government was created to protect, property that forms the bedrock that our entire government is built upon----and which now stands at risk.

If this Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus fails, the Petitioners fear the next trial they see will be conducted on a drumhead and that they will be facing the white buses and FEMA Camps prepared by our own elected officials.

The Petitioners ask the Justices of the Alaska Supreme Court to take corrective action and issue the requested Writ of Habeas Corpus without delay.

VII. DECLARATION UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY

I, the undersigned, declare under penalty of perjury, that I am the Named Petitioner in the above action, that I have read the above petition and that the information contained therein is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief. 28 U.S.C. § 1746; 18 U.S.C. § 1621.

Signed this 19th day of December, 2011.

Signature of Petitioner Acting in Favor of All Inhabitants of Alaska, de jure and Incorporated

Notice to agents is notice to principals. Notice to principals is notice to agents.

Notary verification is offered in cognizance of public record, not intended to confer any jurisdiction.

Copies of this document have been faithfully delivered via Certified Mail to the Alaska Supreme Court, (US Senator) Lisa Murkowski, (US Senator) Mark Begich, Don Young (US Congressman), Ron Huen, US Marshall, Colonel Keith Mallard, Alaska State Troopers, Alaska Governor Sean Parnell, Alaska Lieutenant Governor Mead Treadwell, and Alaska Attorney General John J. Burns or Acting Attorney General of Alaska.

December 19, 2011
Big Lake, Alaska

Dear Clerk of the Appellate Courts,

On December 8, 2011, the Petitioners filed by US Mail a Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus with the Alaska Supreme Court. It was denied administratively by Deputy Clerk, Beth Adams. The Petitioners are submitting their Motion for Reconsideration along with the offered Petition accordingly.

Please find the required documents attached, together with a new Notary Acknowledgement and a confirmation of mailing form.

Thank you very much for your assistance and for adding this Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus to the Docket and filing it under Due Process. Please note that this letter is Page 24 of the enclosed Petition, and include it as part of the record.

Anna M. Riezinger-von Reitz, Petitioner