

COMMENT

06-5
⑥

On the twenty-second day of the ninth month in the Year of our Lord two thousand six

Addendum to Notice of Default, Objection and Notice of Lawful Protest

"Moreover if thy brother shall trespass against thee,
go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone;"
- MATTHEW 18:15

"But if he will not hear [thee, then] take with thee one or two more,
that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established."
- MATTHEW 18:16

RECEIVED
MAY 11 7 35
MAY 11 7 35

Tulsa county
Oklahoma
united States of America, Anno Domini 1776

PRIVATE INTERNATIONAL ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDY

Notice to Agent is Notice to Principal
Notice to Principal is Notice to Agent
- Exodus 20:15, 16

Applicable to all successors, transfers and assigns

File No. CFTC-20060922

Via USPS Form 3811 Certified Mailing Receipt #7002 1000 0004 7188 3816 to the following persons, hereinafter "Respondents", in each said person's official and individual capacity:

**TO: Chairperson
Commodity Futures Trading Commission, hereinafter "CFTC"
Three Lafayette Centre
1155 21st Street, NW
Washington, DC 20581**

**Eileen Donovan
Purported Acting Secretary
Three Lafayette Centre
1155 21st Street, NW
Washington, DC 20581**

**Jean A. Webb
Purported Secretary
CFTC
Three Lafayette Centre
1155 21st Street, NW
Washington, DC 20581**

**Barbara S. Gold
Purported Associate Director
Division of Clearing and Intermediary Oversight
CFTC
Three Lafayette Centre
1155 21st Street, NW
Washington, DC 20581**

**Peter B. Sanchez
Purported Staff Attorney
Division of Clearing and Intermediary Oversight
CFTC
Three Lafayette Centre
1155 21st Street, NW
Washington, DC 20581**

**R. Stephen Painter, Jr.
Purported Staff Attorney
Division of Clearing and Intermediary Oversight
CFTC
Three Lafayette Centre
1155 21st Street, NW
Washington, DC 20581**

Catherine D. Daniels
Purported Assistant Secretary to the Commission
CFTC
Three Lafayette Centre
1155 21st Street, NW
Washington, DC 20581

Purported J. Doe Commissioners
CFTC
Three Lafayette Centre
1155 21st Street, NW
Washington, DC 20581

Purported J. Doe Officers
CFTC
Three Lafayette Centre
1155 21st Street, NW
Washington, DC 20581

Purported J. Doe Attorneys
CFTC
Three Lafayette Centre
1155 21st Street, NW
Washington, DC 20581

CFTC
Three Lafayette Centre
1155 21st Street, NW
Washington, DC 20581

United States Government
Three Lafayette Centre
1155 21st Street, NW
Washington, DC 20581

And further to Respondents via the following email addresses:

secretary@cftc.gov
bgold@cftc.gov
spainter@cftc.gov
psanchez@cftc.gov

And further to Respondents via facsimile transmission to:

202-418-5528

via Notice to aforesaid Respondent and agent Chairman

FROM: Frank Anthony Taucher, hereinafter "Declarant"

Greetings;

Recently, it has come to Declarant's attention that the CFTC has proposed to alter regulations regarding commercial speech.

Declarant continues Declarant's Special Visitation.

Verification

Tulsa county)
(
the united States of America, Anno Domini 1776)
(
Oklahoma, one of the several States of the Perpetual Union, Anno Domini 1777)
(
The United States of America, Anno Domini 1778)
(
the United States of America, Anno Domini 1787)

I, Frank Anthony Taucher, unrepresented, *sui juris*, being competent in mind and body to testify, having first hand knowledge of the following facts, and knowing the penalty of bearing false witness, do declare, upon my full commercial liability, that the facts stated herein are true, correct, complete and not meant to mislead.

Declarant appears specially as a matter of Right, *sui juris*, *sui generis*, and in *ex rel* capacity on behalf of the people specified in **THERECORD**.

Over the last several years, Declarant has entered into various agreements with the CFTC and the officers and employees thereof.

The concurrently recorded, verified and memorialized written Public Record of such agreements, hereinafter "**THERECORD**", consists of, but is not limited to, each of the following:

Inquiry regarding 4 USC 72

Inquiry regarding 4 USC 72

File No. CFTC-FTAFF-001

File No. 2003001

File No. 2003002

File No. 2003003

File No. 2003004

File No. 2003005

The Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Legal Determinations rendered by Judge Ricardo Urbina in UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA in Civil Action No.: 97-1711 (RMU) styled as:

**FRANK TAUCHER (sic), et al.,
Plaintiffs,**

v.

**BROOKSLEY E. BORN, et al.,
Defendants**

Declarant incorporates herein, as if fully set forth, the entirety of **THERECORD** regarding said agreements and Reserves the Right to expand **THERECORD** as necessary.

Declarant further incorporates herein, as if fully set forth, the following fundamental documents and Reserves the Right to incorporate other documents as might become necessary.

Ten Commandments

12 Tables

Magna Charta, Anno Domini 1215

The Magna Carta, Anno Domini 1225

Confirmatio Cartarum, Anno Domini 1297

King James Bible, Anno Domini 1611

The English Bill of Rights

Declaration of Rights, Anno Domini 1774

Declaration of Independence, Anno Domini 1776

Articles of Confederation, Anno Domini 1778

Treaty of 1783

Northwest Ordinance, Anno Domini 1787

Constitution for the United States of America, Anno Domini 1787

Constitution of the United States, Anno Domini 1791

Constitution of the State of California, Anno Domini 1849

Constitution of the State of Oklahoma, Anno Domini 1907

Coronation of Queen Elizabeth, Anno Domini 1953

THERECORD has established and recorded that Respondents and Declarant are in agreement that Declarant is a Man Created in His Image; that Declarant's One and true Master is Jesus Christ; that Declarant is one of the People specified in the Preamble, Constitution for the United States of America, Anno Domini 1787; is one of the people specified in the Constitution of the State of California, Anno Domini 1849; is one of the people specified in the Constitution of the State of Oklahoma; is not a person for whom God has no respect; is not within the Respondents' regulatory venue; and is not a person subject to Respondents' regulatory judgment, among other agreements entered into by Respondents and Declarant.

Declarant has granted no authority for Respondents or anyone else to alter the findings, conclusions, stipulations, assents and agreements established and memorialized in **THERECORD**.

Declarant does not consent to any alteration in the findings, conclusions, stipulations, assents and agreements established and memorialized in **THERECORD**.

Declarant specifically OBJECTS to any claim that the any proposed rule change meant for the persons over who Respondents exercise regulatory authority might now, or ever, alter the findings, conclusions, stipulations, assents and agreements established and memorialized in **THERECORD**.

Declarant specifically DENIES that the Respondents, any combination of said Respondents, or anyone else, anywhere, might now, or ever, alter the findings, conclusions, stipulations, assents and agreements established and memorialized in **THERECORD**.

THERECORD records that if the Constitution of the United States, Anno Domini 1819 is no longer of authority, then no Constitutional Authority can exist with which to Create CFTC.

THERECORD records that if the Constitution of the United States, Anno Domini 1819 is no longer of authority, then no Constitutional Authority can exist with which to Delegate Authority to CFTC.

THERECORD records that if the Constitution of the United States, Anno Domini 1819 is no longer of authority, then no Constitutional Authority can exist with which to Delegate Authority to CFTC's officers.

THERECORD records that if the Constitution of the United States, Anno Domini 1819 is no longer of authority, then no Constitutional Authority can exist with which to Delegate Authority to CFTC's employees.

THERECORD records that if the Constitution of the United States, Anno Domini 1819 is no longer of authority, then the authority Respondents purport to exercise is *ultra vires* to the Constitutions.

THERECORD records that if the Constitution of the United States, Anno Domini 1819 is still the Law of the Land, that Respondents' regulatory purview is limited to the forts, enclaves, docks, buildings and States of the United States such as Guam, Puerto Rico, American Virgin Islands, Washington, DC and the like; and, further, to those persons created by Congress; and, further, to those vagabonds, peons, serfs, slaves, and subjects known by such terms as "citizen of the United States", "U.S. Person", "U.S. Trust", "Individual", "Business", "Employer", "Employee", "Resident", "Registered Voter", "person" and the like.

THERECORD records that if the Constitution of the United States, Anno Domini 1819 is still the Law of the Land, that Respondents' regulatory purview is non-existent in the several Union States.

THERECORD records that Declarant stands upon the Land in one of the united States of America, Anno Domini 1776, and one of the several Union States of The United States of America, Anno Domini 1778.

THERECORD records that the People did not Delegate Authority for Congress to regulate the Commerce of the People.

Other specific and detailed Facts Found and Law Concluded in **THERECORD** are Retained and Reserved by Declarant.

As a result of the Facts Found and Law Concluded in **THERECORD**, a few of which are herein identified, Respondents and Declarant have already agreed that the proposed regulatory changes do not apply to Declarant.

Regardless, Declarant Reserves Declarant's Duty to oversee the operations of those purporting to act on behalf of the People and reminds Respondents that **THERECORD** records that Declarant timely demanded a certified copy of each and every of Respondents' Oath of Office, Certificate of Appointment/Election, Personal Surety Bond, Authority Delegated to each and every Respondent, license to operate in the Union States known as California and Oklahoma, and license to practice law in the Union States known as California and Oklahoma.

Respondents failed/refused to provide the demanded documents.

THERECORD records that the acts of an unqualified officer are void ab initio.

As a result of the lack of bona fides of any of Respondents in **THERECORD**, **THERECORD** records that no authority existed for Respondents to certify the certifications specified in the November, 2005 proposed rule changes or the current proposed rule changes.

Further, **THERECORD** records that no notice of hearing, opportunity of hearing, opportunity to confront witnesses, opportunity to confront evidence, opportunity to confront testimony, or hearing was conducted that might have allowed for Facts to be Found and Law to be Concluded to allow the November, 2005 and present certifications to have been, or to be, determined and rendered.

Declarant again **OBJECTS** both in Declarant's own Right and in Declarant's *ex rel* capacity on behalf of the People to each and every of the aforespecified Constitutional violations and Due Process denials.

Declarant does not speak for those persons subject to Respondents' regulatory purview within the forts, enclaves, docks, buildings and States of the United States such as Guam, Puerto Rico, American Virgin Islands, Washington, DC and the like; or, further, to those persons created by Congress; or, further, to those vagabonds, peons, serfs, slaves, and subjects known by such terms as "citizen of the United States", "U.S. Person", "U.S. Trust", "Individual", "Business", "Employer", "Employee", "Resident", "Registered Voter", "Person" and the like.

Further, **THERECORD** records that there are no facts in evidence sworn to be true, correct, complete and not misleading by a competent witness based on personal first hand knowledge pursuant to penalty of perjury upon which Respondents relied to render said certifications.

CFTC's proposal, in fact, is outright silly in that it states that the Commission "believes" (page 3, II A). It is self-evident that a fiction is incapable of belief. Such attempt to breathe life into that which is null is outrageous and can only be seen as an attempt to "slip one past the folks" when done by those who purport to be experts at law.

Said illusion, whereby a fiction is cast as being able of "beliefs", is particularly odious on page 6 where the Commission again "believes that the Proposal is fully consistent with the First Amendment." What's next? That the Commission is capable of "emotions"? A little "love", maybe? Respondents next launch into an assault upon misleading commercial speech which purportedly misleading the public while posting a statement that well, misleads the public.

Where's the hearing that was conducted that allowed Respondents' to conclude the aforespecified belief?

Where are unqualified persons Authorized by the Constitution to render their own personal opinions and bind the People by said personal opinions and "beliefs"?

Where is the evidence of the factual setting in footnotes 18 and 19 that Respondents rely upon for the Commission's purported "beliefs"?

How is the factual setting in the cases cited relevant to the Commission's proposed rule change and Constitutional infringement?

Declarant thus again **OBJECTS** both in Declarant's own Right and in Declarant's *ex rel* capacity on behalf of the People to the aforesaid frivolous and vexatious determinations, each and every of which were rendered contrary to Constitutional requirements and in violation of substantive and procedural Due Process, and each of which are based upon the "belief" of an artificial, non-existent person and fiction incapable of belief.

Declarant **DENIES** that any of Respondents have been Constitutionally Authorized to make law based upon said persons' individual, or collective, beliefs.

Further, **THERECORD** records that there is no affidavit sworn by an injured competent witness to be true, correct, complete and not misleading based on personal first hand knowledge pursuant to penalty of perjury upon which Respondents relied to render said certifications.

It thus looks like Respondents are making stuff up and fabricating a record, hypothetical and speculative at best, in order to arrive at a preconceived conclusion.

Were not all concerns regarding the November, 2005 proposed rule changes flippantly disregarded with the exception of those of the New York City BAR Association "NYBAR"?

Did the Respondents not have notice that no evidence existed in the written record that any of the 22,000 NYBAR members were duly licensed to practice law?

Did the Respondents not have notice that no evidence existed in the written record that any of the 22,000 NYBAR members were duly licensed to practice law before the CFTC Commission?

Is there some special reason NYBAR members are exempt from prosecution for the unauthorized practice of law?

Did Respondents not have notice of the vested interest the NYBAR had in the outcome of the November, 2005 proposed rule change and the additional attorneys' fees the change would generate?

Did Respondents knowingly and with deliberate intent disregard requirements of law in order to ratify the NYBAR's request that speech be infringed?

Faced with such prejudice, bias, and outright lawlessness, is there any reason for anyone to even file a response to said proposed changes?

Has the outcome not already been predetermined?

As a result of the all the above, Respondents' proposed rule changes appear to be based on barratry, maintenance and champerty. Bouvier's states:

that barratry signifies robbery, deceit, and fraud and may be defined as the habitual moving, exciting, and maintaining suits and quarrels, either at law or otherwise. 1 Inst. 368; 1 Hawk. 243;

that maintenance is a malicious or officious interference in a suit in which the offender has no interest, to assist one of the parties to it against the other, with money or advice to prosecute or defend the action, without any authority of law. 1 Russ. Cr. 176.

that champerty is a bargain with a plaintiff or defendant, campum partire, to divide the land or other matter sued for between them, if they prevail at law, the champertor undertaking to carry on the suit at his own expense. 1 Pick. 416; 1 Ham. 132; 5 Monr. 416; 4 Litt. 117; 5 John. Ch. R. 44; 7 Port. R. 488.

Declarant thus again **OBJECTS** both in Declarant's own Right and in Declarant's *ex rel* capacity on behalf of the People to the aforesaid proposed rule changes, each and every of which were rendered

contrary to Constitutional requirements and in violation of substantive and procedural Due Process; without evidence of an injured party; and in absence of a bona fide complaint.

The proposed rule change is apparently patterned after actions by the Securities and Exchange Commission, National Futures Association, and Federal Trade Commission. However, there is no factual evidence in the written record that any of the aforespecified persons' regulatory scheme is constitutional or meant to apply to the People.

There is no evidence that the Securities and Exchange Commission, National Futures Association, and Federal Trade Commission schemes are Constitutionally Authorized to operate in the several Union States.

Declarant thus again **OBJECTS** both in Declarant's own Right and in Declarant's *ex rel* capacity on behalf of the People to the aforesaid proposed rule changes for reason that there is no evidence that the schemes Respondents propose are patterned after are Constitutionally Authorized; and for reason that said schemes do not appear to be Authorized by either the Constitution of the State of California, Anno Domini 1849 or the Constitution of the State of Oklahoma, Anno Domini 1907.

Respondents' own admission on page 4, in fact, establishes that such schemes are draconian.

"The Securities and Exchange Commission has promulgated a rule that declares any use of testimonials in advertising by investment advisers to be 'fraudulent, deceptive or manipulative act, practice or course of business within the meaning of the [Investment Advisers] Act.'"

In other words, Respondents intentionally and deliberately, seek to mislead the public into poor-performing advisers by erecting a prior restraint that prevents the public from finding out, through true and correct testimonials, who has done well.

Think about it.

Who would provide a testimonial for someone who had just wiped them out?

Poor performers simply have no testimonials to provide, or, if they do provide testimonials, the statements are easily established as false and fraudulent.

What Respondents' hair-brained idea seeks to do is to prevent, ala the SEC, all testimonials.

The public is thereby prevented from the witness of another.

Had Respondents conducted open and fair hearings before steamrolling ahead with Respondents' "beliefs", Respondents would be able to arrive at helpful determinations instead of those based on speculation, prior restraint and *mala prohibita* crimes such as the SEC rule above.

Declarant **DENIES** that the regulatory schemes of the Securities and Exchange Commission, National Futures Association, and Federal Trade Commission in any way authorize Respondents' rule changes.

Declarant **DENIES** that any factual evidence exists in the written record authorizing Respondents' regulatory scheme.

Declarant **DENIES** that Respondents' desire to imitate and be like the Securities and Exchange Commission, National Futures Association, and Federal Trade Commission authorizes Respondents' rule changes.

With respect to Respondents' conclusions regarding the impact of the Regulatory Flexibility Act, there are no facts in evidence upon which Respondents relied to conclude "that the Proposal will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities."

Declarant has received no inquiry regarding said question.

The written record contains no facts in evidence in support of Respondents' above certification.

Declarant has seen no certified document memorializing said certification and **DENIES** that any exists.

Declarant **OBJECTS** to Respondents' interpretation of the Regulatory Flexibility Act as relevant to the People.

Declarant **DENIES** that Respondents' interpretation of the Regulatory Flexibility Act applies to the People since the People are not "small" businesses and are not "small entities".

Declarant repeats the above discussion, objection, protest and denial of the Regulatory Flexibility Act with respect to Respondents' discussion of the Paperwork Reduction Act, Cost-Benefit Analysis and the five (5) requirements of Section 15(a).

Each determination rendered by the Commission is cast in what "should" happen and is therefore speculative. The Commission then states, "After considering these factors, the Commission has determined"

Declarant **OBJECTS** to Respondents' having concluded Respondents' determination based on speculation, opinion and belief.

Declarant **DENIES** that Respondents have shown any reason for said rule changes other than speculation, opinion and belief.

Declarant further adds a general comment and observation. As Declarant understands Respondents' proposed rule change, one subject to said rules could be placed in a situation where one has made a factually true statement, but could be held as having rendered a fraudulent statement for reason that the statement did not contain the right wording; was not placed in the specified location; did not use the right size font; and so on. Such tactics seem to constitute entrapment, and the violation that occurs seems fundamentally unjust and unfair. Such Orwellian schemes seem to be, in fact, why "they hate us". It is, in fact, why many in this country are coming to hate us. It is unfortunate that this is the direction the country is going. If this is the "democracy" we are spreading worldwide, who might want it?

The industry has survived for years without Big Brother's surveillance. It is a shame that the very Liberties many give their lives to preserve are so rapidly being taken away from us by some amongst us.

Declarant is thus in possession of no evidence, proof or claim, and believes none exists, that the purpose of Respondents' proposed rule changes is other than to create misery and, as Jefferson so eloquently stated in the Declaration of Independence, send "swarms" to "eat out the substance" of those regulated.

Declarant is further in no evidence, proof or claim, and believes none exists, that Respondents, in any and all combinations, are impartial and do not have a conflict of interest in sitting in judgement of Respondents' own proposed rule changes.

Declarant thus again OBJECTS both in Declarant's own Right and in Declarant's *ex rel* capacity on behalf of the People that the need for such rule changes is able to be adjudicated by other than a court established pursuant to Article III, Constitution for the United States of America, Anno Domini 1787.

Declarant thus again OBJECTS both in Declarant's own Right and in Declarant's *ex rel* capacity on behalf of the People that the need for such rule changes is able to be adjudicated by other than a court in possession of the Judicial Power specified in Article III, Constitution for the United States of America, Anno Domini 1787.

Declarant thus again OBJECTS both in Declarant's own Right and in Declarant's *ex rel* capacity on behalf of the People that the need for such rule changes is able to be heard in a forum by other than a non-BAR-member Judge whose witnessed and certified Oath of Office, as specified in Article VI, Constitution for the United States of America, Anno Domini 1787, Personal Surety Bond, and Certificate of Appointment/Certificate of Election are entered into the court file prior to proceedings.

Declarant thus again OBJECTS both in Declarant's own Right and in Declarant's *ex rel* capacity on behalf of the People that the need for such rule changes is able to be heard by other than Trial by Jury of Declarant's Peers, and not by a jury trial by Declarant's non-Peers, whose qualifications, witnessed and certified Oath of Office, as specified in Article VI, Constitution for the United States of America, Anno Domini 1787, Personal Surety Bond, and Certificate of Appointment/Certificate of Election are entered into the court file prior to proceedings.

THERECORD records that none of Respondents are qualified to render the certifications specified in the November, 2005 and current proposed rule changes.

The process by which Respondents propose rule changes appears fundamentally unconstitutional as applied to the People.

Declarant DENIES that the process by which Respondents propose rule changes is constitutional as applied to the People.

The persons conducting the aforesaid process appear unqualified for reason of lack of having filed the proper required documents required of a bona fide officer; for lack of Delegated Authority; and for conflict of interest, bias and prejudice.

Declarant DENIES that Respondent's proposed rules changes are other than void ab initio for reason that **THERECORD** records that Respondents have failed to qualify for the offices purportedly held.

Declarant **DENIES** that Respondent's proposed rules changes are other than void ab initio for reason that Respondents have not been Delegated Constitutional Authority to conduct the subject process.

Declarant **DENIES** that Respondent's proposed rules changes are other than void ab initio for reason that Respondents are biased, prejudiced, impartial, have a conflict of interest, and are disqualified from conducting said process for reason of said bias, prejudice, impartiality, and conflict of interest.

THERECORD records that Respondents have been noticed of said persons' lack of authority to proceed in the instant matters.

THERECORD records that Respondents have been noticed of said persons' lack of immunity, absolute, qualified or otherwise, in the instant matter.

THERECORD records that Respondents have been noticed of said persons' ministerial Duty to withdraw said November, 2005 rule change and the current proposed rule changes.

Declarant is in possession of no evidence, proof or claim, and believes none exists, that it is not well-settled and long-established in the Public Record that none of the People are required to obey Respondents' November, 2005 or Respondents' proposed rule changes:

"The general rule is that an unconstitutional statute, though having the form and name of law, is in reality no law, but is wholly void and ineffective for any purpose since unconstitutionality dates from the time of its enactment, and not merely from the date of the decision so branding it. An unconstitutional law, in legal contemplation, is as inoperative as if it had never been passed ... Since an unconstitutional law is void, the general principles follow that it imposes no duties, confers no rights, creates no office, bestows no power or authority on anyone, affords no protection and justifies no acts performed under it; No one is bound to obey an unconstitutional law and no courts are bound to enforce it." [16 Am Jur 2nd Section 177, late 2d, Section 256.]

THERECORD records that Congress has never funded or staffed the one supreme Court specified in Article III, Constitution for the United States of America, Anno Domini 1787.

THERECORD records that Declarant is Authorized, by necessity and by agreement with Respondents, to conduct Declarant's Court of Record in Tulsa, Oklahoma, regarding the instant, or any, matter, case or controversy; and that proper Venue and Jurisdiction regarding all Claims is in said Court of Record.

THERECORD records that Declarant is Authorized, by agreement with Respondents, without time limitation, to execute a Writ of Habeas Corpus, Writ of Mandamus and/or Writ of Praemunire to secure Declarant's Private Property, Liberty and Court of Record against Respondents *con parte* or *ex parte* until such time as the Restitution specified in **THERECORD**, or which becomes attributable to the **Facts and Law** established and recorded in **THERECORD**, and elsewhere, is paid in full.

Reservation of Rights and Claims

**Declarant Retains and Reserves all Rights and Claims at all times
and waives no Rights or Claims at any time.**

Caveat Actor

THERECORD has established and recorded that Declarant, and each and every Respondent, and each and every of Respondents' accomplices, agents, representatives, transfers, assigns and the like, have provided each other various notices over the last several years. All have been presented numerous opportunities to be heard; including the right to present evidence and authorities in support of any and all claims; and rebuttal of adverse claims.

Declarant has proceeded in the knowledge that Respondents' silence constitutes acquiescence to Declarant's claims and has relied, and does rely, on Respondents' silence as ratification. Said ratification has constituted, and does constitute, estoppel by silence and estoppel by acquiescence.

No claim has been raised that the process has been other than fair and just or that the Constitutions do not protect the People's Right to Reserve and Retain such operation of Law.

Respondents' interests are at stake. The Constitutions do not Delegate Authority for Respondents to proceed unconstitutionally.

Declarant provides Respondents 30 calendar days from September 22, 2006 to serve a point-by-point response certified to be true, correct, complete and not misleading by a competent witness in possession of first hand knowledge under penalty of perjury showing where Declarant is in error with respect to any of the above statements.

All uncontroverted statements are severable and, by the process of tacit procuration, shall forever be established as the true, complete, correct and not misleading facts of the instant dispute; and Declarant and Respondent shall forever be estopped from claiming otherwise.

Respondents have a Duty to prevent further injury to Declarant and to the People and to correct all injury incurred to date. If Respondents do not withdraw the two subject rule changes, or, in the alternative, controvert the aforespecified claims, or, in the alternative, clarify said rule changes in such manner as the People will be provided Notice of the People's Immunity from said rule changes, Declarant shall be authorized, by operation of Law, to proceed to identify Declarant's damages and issue Writs of Habeas Corpus, Prohibition, Praemunire, Error, Execution, Quo Warranto, and any and all other Writs and process Declarant deems necessary to protect Declarant's Rights, perform Declarant's *ex rel* Duty on behalf of the People, and secure the specified restitution due Declarant.

Further, Frank Anthony Taucher sayeth naught.

Signed and Sealed, under Authority and by Direct Act of my own hand, on the twenty-second day of September, in the Year of our Lord, Two thousand six, and the two hundred thirty-first year of our Independence, subject to receipt by email transmission to Frank Anthony Taucher by 05:00 pm Monday, September 25, 2006 with followup of written statement and proof of claim to the contrary.

Locus Sigilli (Private Seal)

Frank Anthony Taucher, *Sui Juris*, Unrepresented
Witness to and Victim of Criminal Activity.

Certificate of Service

I served on the above specified date this fifteen (15) page **Addendum and Notice** via email to the above four (4) email addresses pursuant to the delivery instructions stated on pages 49387-49391 of Federal Register Vol. 71, No. 163, August 23, 2006; and further delivered a certified copy of said notice to the aforespecified persons via the above specified USPS Form 3811 Certified Mail Receipt by placing said notice in an envelope with proper prepaid postage affixed thereon and delivering said envelope to the United States Post Office on the date specified on USPS delivery receipts.

Frank Anthony Taucher