

PETITION FOR IMPEACHMENT
OF NAMED UNITED STATES FEDERAL JUDGES
FOR ACTS OF TREASON
AGAINST THE PEOPLE AND THE CONSTITUTION
OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

This Petition For Impeachment is presented by The People to the United States House of Representatives in Good Faith in accordance with the dictates of The Constitution of the United States, Article I Section 2 Clause 5, Article II Section 4, Article III Section 1, Article III Section 2 Clause 3, Article III Section 3 Clause 1, Article III Section 3 Clause 2 and Article VI Clause 3, and in accordance with the Opinion of the Supreme Court in the Case of Bradley v. Fisher 80 U.S. 335, 350 (1871):

"In this country the judges of the superior courts of record are only responsible to the people, or the authorities constituted by the people, from whom they receive their commissions, for the manner in which they discharge the great trusts of their office. If in the exercise of the powers with which they are clothed as ministers of justice, they act with partiality, or maliciously, or corruptly, or arbitrarily, or oppressively, they may be called to an account by impeachment and suspended or removed from office."

These Federal Judges of the United States, named below, are charged with Acts of Treason against The Constitution of the United States, for exercise of Powers beyond their Authority, to the detriment of the proper Form and operation of the Federal Government. These Judges have imposed a Relegislation of the Original Meaning and Intent of the Second Amendment

to The Constitution of the United States in a recent Reinterpretation thereof commonly referred to as "collective rights theory" which proclaims that The People as Individuals have NO RIGHTS WHATSOEVER secured unto them to keep and bear Arms, and that said Rights to keep and bear Arms are only conferred onto the States. This Action of Relegislating the Meaning of the Words in the Second Amendment is definitively a Tyrannical Violation of the Separation of Powers established in The Constitution for our Form of Government and specifically violates Article I Section 1, which states that ALL Legislative Powers are vested in the Congress, and Article V which states that only the Congress and the State Legislatures may Amend The Constitution and thereby alter its Meaning and Intent. This matter is confirmed in the Opinion of Chief Justice John Marshall of the United States Supreme Court in the Case of Cohens v. Virginia 19 U.S. 264, 404 (1821):

"Federal Courts have no more right to decline the exercise of jurisdiction which is given, than to usurp that which is not given. The one or the other would be treason to the Constitution."

These Treasonous Judicial Actions are currently chastised by Findings of the Congress with concurrence of the Executive Branch when they were Signed into Law by The President of the United States in the Protection Of Lawful Commerce In Arms Act of 2005, codified at Title 15 United States Code Section 7901(a)(7) and (a)(8), and said treason was firmly rebuked in Findings stated in Section 7901(a)(1) and (a)(2) which confirm the Original Meaning and Intent of the Second Amendment.

These Judges are also charged with Acts of Treason against The People of the United States of America through imposition of "collective rights theory" by Disarming The People of their Arms and their Fundamental Right to possess Arms under common law predating The Constitution, to provide for their own self-defense, the defense of their communities and States, and to Resist and throw off a Tyrannical Government such as was done in The

War For Independence to secure the Form of Government which The People are entitled by their own Law to enjoy right now. This Act of Disarming The People has served to Aid and Comfort all enemies both Foreign and Domestic by destroying the Fundamental source of Freedom and Liberty and Defense of the several States of The United States of America.

The imposition of "collective rights theory" has Aided and Comforted Domestic Terrorists and Subversives who have propagandized the psychosis of a "Gun Culture" to blame Criminal Acts of Individuals or groups on the availability of Arms or Guns. The attempted Disenfranchisement of the entire Nation of our People by the Federal Government, in violation of the Fundamental Law under which the Government is granted existence, in response to the Criminal Acts of a few individuals, is a subversive Act of imposing a trendy Socialist and Communist Agenda unlawful in this Republic. The Supreme Court confirms this matter in their Opinion in the Case of Cooper v. Aaron 358 U.S. 1, 16 (1958):

"...important as is the preservation of the public peace, this aim cannot be accomplished by laws or ordinances which deny rights created or protected by the federal Constitution. Buchanan v. Warley, 245 U.S. 60, 81, 38 S.Ct. 16, 20, 62 L. Ed. 149. Thus law and order are not here to be preserved by depriving the [People] of their constitutional rights."

The Supreme Court also confirms the Admissions of the Congress that Infringements upon the Second Amendment Rights of ALL The People are premised upon a response to the Criminal Acts of a few individuals, as written in their Opinion in the Case of Haynes v. U.S. 390 U.S. 85 (1968):

"Nonetheless, it is pertinent to note that the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, while reporting in 1959 on certain proposed amendments to the Act, stated that the "primary purpose of [the Firearms Act] was to make it more difficult for the gangster element to obtain certain types of weapons. The type of

weapons with which these provisions are concerned are the types it was thought would be used primarily by the gangster-type element."
HR Rep. No. 914, 86 Cong, 1st Sess, 2."

The Acts of Congress which contradict The Constitution are in fact NO LAWS AT ALL, and the Public Record is replete with confirmations of this fact, as written in the Opinion of the Supreme Court in the Case of Norton v. Shelby County 118 U.S. 425, 442 (1886):

"An unconstitutional act is not a law; it confers no rights; it imposes no duties; it affords no protection; it creates no office; it is, in legal contemplation, as inoperative as though it had never been passed."

Those Acts and Statutes of the States and the Federal Government which infringe upon the Second Amendment are Duty Bound to be overturned by the Federal Judiciary, and their failure to do so is a violation of their Oath of Office to uphold The Constitution, as ordained by The People. The Supreme Court confirms this fact in their Opinion in the Case of U.S. v. Butler 56 S.Ct. 312, 318 (1936):

"The Constitution is the supreme law of the land ordained and established by the people. All Legislation must conform to the principles it lays down."

"When an act of Congress is appropriately challenged in the courts as not conforming to the constitutional mandate, the judicial branch of the government has only one duty; to lay the article of the Constitution which is invoked beside the statute which is challenged and to decide whether the latter squares with the former. All the court does, or can do, is to announce its considered judgment upon the question. The only power it has, if such it may be called, is the power of judgment. This court neither approves nor condemns any legislative policy. Its delicate and difficult office is to ascertain and declare whether the legislation is in accordance with, or in contravention of, the provisions of the

Constitution; and having done that, its duty ends."

The Supreme Court also confirms this matter in their Opinion in the Case of Downs v. Bidwell 182 U.S. 244 (1901):

"No higher duty rests upon this Court than to exert its full authority to prevent all violations of the principles of the Constitution."

The Judges of the Federal Judiciary have concocted and advanced the "collective rights theory" through a series of willfully malicious errors and Abuse of Discretion amounting to outright FRAUD, and shared this Treason amongst themselves in their course of advancing this Treasonous Agenda, akin to the Opinion of Judge Frank Easterbrook in the Case of Coleman v. CIR 791 F. 2d 68, 69 (7th Cir. 1986):

"Some people believe with great fervor preposterous things that just happen to coincide with their self-interest."

While it is noted above that both the Legislative and Executive Branches have Duly Enacted Findings directly rebuking "collective rights theory", the U.S. Attorney General's Office under Attorney General John Ashcroft, exhaustively researched and documented the Original Meaning of the Second Amendment in a document dated August 24, 2004, entitled: WHETHER THE SECOND AMENDMENT SECURES AN INDIVIDUAL RIGHT. This document is signed by Steven G. Bradbury, Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Howard C. Nielson, Jr., Deputy Assistant Attorney General, and C. Kevin Marshall, Acting Deputy Assistant Attorney General. This document concluded:

"For the foregoing reasons, we conclude that the Second Amendment secures an individual right to keep and bear arms. Current case law leaves open and unsettled the question of whose right is secured by the Amendment. Although we do not address the scope of the right, our examination of the original meaning of the Amendment provides

extensive reasons to conclude that the Second Amendment secures an individual right, and no persuasive basis for either the collective-right or quasi-collective-right views. The text of the Amendment's operative clause, setting out a "right of the people to keep and bear Arms," is clear and is reinforced by the Constitution's structure. The Amendment's prefatory clause, properly understood, is fully consistent with this interpretation. The broader history of the Anglo-American right of individuals to have and use arms, from England's Revolution of 1688-1689 to the ratification of the Second Amendment a hundred years later, leads to the same conclusion. Finally, the first hundred years of interpretations of the Amendment, and especially the commentaries and case law in the pre-Civil War period closest to the Amendment's ratification, confirm what the text and history of the Second Amendment require."

The Supreme Court has Opined in the Case of
Cooper v. Aaron 358 U.S. 1, 18 (1958):

"Article VI of the Constitution makes the Constitution the 'supreme Law of the Land.' In 1803, Chief Justice Marshall, speaking for a unanimous Court, referring to the Constitution as 'the fundamental and paramount law of the nation,' declared in the notable case of Marbury v. Madison, 1 Cranch 137, 177, 2 L. Ed. 60, that 'It is emphatically the province and duty of the judicial department to say what the law is.' This decision declared the basic principle that the federal judiciary is supreme in the exposition of the law of the Constitution, and that principle has ever since been respected by this Court and the Country as a permanent and indispensable feature of our constitutional system."

This role of the Federal Judiciary does not grant license to distort or reinterpret the Original Meaning of the Constitution, nor distort the definitions of its Words or its Grammar. The Supreme Court confirms this fact in the Opinion in the Case of Gibbons v. Ogden 22 U.S. 1 (1824):

"As men, whose intentions require no concealment, generally employ the words which most directly and aptly express the ideas they intend

to convey, the enlightened patriots who framed our constitution, and the people who adopted it, must be understood to have employed words in their natural sense, and to have intended what they have said."

And in the Supreme Court's Opinion in the Case of

U.S. v. South-Eastern Underwriters Ass'n 322 U.S. 533, 539 (1944):

"[o]rdinarily courts do not construe words used in the Constitution so as to give them a meaning more narrow than one which they had in the common parlance of the times in which the Constitution was written."

And in the Supreme Court's Opinion in the Case of

Jacobsen v. Commonwealth of Massachusetts 197 U.S. 11 (1905):

"Undoubtedly, as observed Chief Justice Marshall, speaking for the court in Sturges v. Crownshield 4 Wheat. 122, 202, 4 L. ed. 529, 550, 'the spirit of an instrument, especially of a constitution, is to be respected not less than its letter; yet the spirit is to be collected chiefly from its words.'"

The Supreme Court acknowledges this same obligation is upon the Congress, in its Opinion in the Case of Cohens v. Virginia 19 U.S. 264, 382 (1821):

"...no other power is conferred on Congress than a conservative power to maintain the principles established in the constitution. The maintenance of these principles in their purity, is certainly among the great duties of the government."

The Supreme Court has NEVER issued an Opinion holding the the validity of "collective rights theory". The Opinion of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, as issued by Senior Judge Laurence H. Silberman in the Case of Parker v. District of Columbia 478 F. 3d 370 (2007), HELD that:

"The Second Amendment protects an individual right to keep and bear arms;"

and the same court further Opined at 478 F. 3d 383:

"The Second Amendment would be an inexplicable aberration if it were not read to protect individual rights..."

The U.S. Court of Appeals for the 5th Circuit has similarly renounced "collective rights theory" in their Opinion in the Case of U.S. v. Emerson 270 F. 3d 203 (2001):

"The plain meaning of the right of the people to keep and bear arms is that it is an individual, rather than a collective, right and is not limited to keeping arms while engaged in active military service or as a member of a select militia such as the National Guard."

There is no support or basis for creation or imposition of collective rights theory outside the very limited membership of certain elements of the inferior courts of the Federal Judiciary within the Federal Government, except that the U.S. Congress has made bountiful use of this Treasonously Fraudulent "theory" to advance their unconstitutional agenda of "gun control" entirely unfettered by the Truth or Honest Adherence to The Constitution ordained by The People. This "theory" is shown to affront the sensibilities of the Legislative and Executive Branches and the Supreme Court; it affronts the extensive historical jurisprudence and common law and the clearly expressed intent of the Founders of our Nation; it affronts the sensibilities of EVERY AMERICAN WHO CAN READ the operative phrase of the Second Amendment: "the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed."; it affronts the Honor and Memory of generations of Americans who have given their lives in defense of The Constitution in order to maintain these individual Rights and cornerstones of Freedom and Liberty for the people and their posterity; and it imperils the Fundamental Form of Defense of our Nation and our States, and The People's God given Right to Self-Defense and Self-Determination free from a tyrannical government.

The following named Federal Judges have issued Orders or Opinions in the Cases noted, which have denied the Lawful Meaning and Intent of the Second Amendment to The Constitution, in favor of the Fraud and Treason of "collective rights theory" and are sought herewith to be IMPEACHED for Acts of Treason:

Jimm Larry Hendren, U.S. District Court, Western Dist. of Arkansas
United States v. Hollis Wayne Fincher, 2007

Alice M. Batchelder, U.S. Court of Appeals for the 6th Circuit
United States v. Norman David Somerville, August 1, 2006

Eric L. Clay, U.S. Court of Appeals for the 6th Circuit
United States v. Norman David Somerville, August 1, 2006

John M. Rogers, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit
United States v. Norman David Somerville, August 1, 2006

Gerald E. Rosen, U.S. District Court, Eastern District of Michigan
United States v. Robert Bournes, July 18, 2000

Boyce F. Martin, Jr., U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit
United States v. Robert Bournes, July 11, 2003

Cornelia G. Kennedy, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit
United States v. Robert Bournes, July 11, 2003

Martha Craig Daughtrey, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit
United States v. Robert Bournes, July 11, 2003

Roslyn o. Silver, U.S. District Court, District of Arizona
United States v. Robert Wilson Stewart, 2000

Gordon J. Quist, U.S. District Court, Western District of Michigan
United States v. Norman David Somerville, March 24, 2005

Alex Kozinski, U.S. Court of Appeals for the 9th Circuit
United States v. Robert Wilson Stewart, June 30, 2006

Thomas G. Nelson, U.S. Court of Appeals for the 9th Circuit
United States v. Robert Wilson Stewart, June 30, 2006

Jane A. Restani, U.S. Court of Appeals for the 9th Circuit
United States v. Robert Wilson Stewart, June 30, 2006

William B. Shubb, U.S. District Court, Eastern District of California
Sean Silveira v. Bill Lockyer, 2000

Frank J. Magill, U.S. Court of Appeals for the 9th Circuit
Sean Silveira v. Bill Lockyer, December 5, 2002

Stephen Reinhardt, U.S. Court of Appeals for the 9th Circuit
Silveira v. Bill Lockyer, December 5, 2002

Raymond C. Fisher, U.S. Court of Appeals for the 9th Circuit Sean
Silveira v. Bill Lockyer, December 5, 2002

Anita B. Brody, U.S. District Court, Eastern District of Pennsylvania
Robert Potts v. City of Philadelphia, August 29, 2002

George Z. Singal, U.S. District Court, District of Maine
United States v. Troy Milheron, November 20, 2002

Norman A. Mordue, U.S. District Court, Northern District of New York
David D. Bach v. George E. Pataki, September 23, 2003

Juan R. Torruella, U.S. Court of Appeals for the First Circuit
Geoffrey W. Gardner v. Vincent Vespia, June 11, 2001

Conrad K. Cyr, U.S. Court of Appeals for the First Circuit
Geoffrey W. Gardner v. Vincent Vespia, June 11, 2001

Norman H. Stahl, U.S. Court of Appeals for the First Circuit
Geoffrey W. Gardner v. Vincent Vespia, June 11, 2001

James G. Carr, U.S. District Court, Northern District of Ohio
John B. Petrovski v. Federal Express Corp, May 24, 2002

These Judges have Abused the Power of their Offices to conduct these Treasonous Acts and have exploited the Doctrine of Judicial Immunity to do so with impunity. As these Judges and their predecessors are well educated in the Historical Truth, this Abuse of Discretion and casual disrespect for the Welfare of The People's Rights and their Fundamental Law amounts to an attitude very similar to "Let Them Eat Cake." In so doing, these Judges have destroyed Public Confidence in Judicial Proceedings, especially those involving Rights secured to The People by The Second Amendment.

As provided in The First Amendment to The Constitution of the United States, "Congress shall make no law...prohibiting... the right of the people...to petition the Government for a redress of grievances." As quoted above from Opinions of The Supreme Court, it is The Duty of the government to abide by The Constitution as ordained by The People. The Opinion of The Supreme Court in American Communications Ass'n v. Douds 339 U.S. 382, 442-43 (1950) provides this Fundamental Truth:

"Our Constitution relies on our electorate's complete ideological freedom to nourish independent and responsible intelligence and preserve our democracy from that submissiveness, timidity and herd-mindedness of the masses which would foster a tyranny of mediocrity. The priceless heritage of our society is the unrestricted constitutional right of each member to think as he will. Thought control is a copyright of totalitarianism, and we have no claim to it. It is not the function of our Government to keep the citizen from falling into error; it is the function of the citizen to keep the Government from falling into error."

Should the Congress fail in its Duty to Respect this Petition and should the Congress fail to vigorously prosecute these Impeachments, it is Presumptively understood by The People that the Federal Government is so Corrupt that it is no longer capable or willing to right itself despite its own Admissions that substantial Treasonous and Egregious Violations of The Constitution are occurring and even to such degree that The Congress itself Admits taking its own Protectionist Measures against these Treasonous Usurpations by The Judiciary as noted in Findings at Title 15 United States Code Section 7901(b)(6); it will be further understood by The People that by definition, the Federal Government has retained a Tyrannical Posture and Character towards The People and The Fundamental Law, which is the only source for the Federal Government's legitimate existence as a Governing Body.

The information provided herein is understood to be true and correct to the best of the undersigned's knowledge and belief.

Secretary for The People
