

INIRE: CIV-99-1914-C

MEMORANDUM / SUPPLEMENT I



Hard to keep track of those little yellow notes?

Hotmail leepwil@hotmail.com

Home Hotmail Search Shopping Money People &amp; Chat

Passport  
Sign Out

Inbox

Compose

Addresses

Folders

Options

Help

Folder: Inbox

From: Sherman Skolnick <skolnick@ameritech.net> Save Address Block SenderTo: leepwil@hotmail.com Save Address

Subject: Who is Leo Wanta?

Date: Fri, 21 Jan 2000 02:33:51 -0600

Reply

Reply All

Forward

Delete

Previous

Next

Close

<http://www.aci.net/kalliste/wanta.htm>

TOM: YOU MIGHT FIND THIS INTERESTING. Skolnick

[\[Email Reply\]](#)

## Who is Leo Wanta?

by J. Orlin Grabbe

### "Bill Clinton's Short-Term Notes"

#### Asian-European, the CIA, and Mochtar Riady

Meet Leo Emil Wanta. At one point Wanta had bank accounts at Metishe Bank in Moscow, Avenue Bank on the Champs-Elysee in Paris, Credito Italiano in Milan, Anker Bank in Geneva, Swiss Bank Corporation in Geneva, the Allgemeine Spaar in Brussels, the Zentralsparkasse und Kommerzbank in Vienna, Creditanstalt Bankverein in Vienna, and--the perennial favorite of money launderers--Citibank in Milan, New York, and Los Angeles.

Meet Leo Emil Wanta, a man accused of, or praised for, crashing the Russian ruble over 1990-1. There is no doubt that he was a currency trader, placing orders for 100 billion rubles at a time. Then there is the matter of gold--Russian gold.

One of the orders faxed around the world from his New Republic/USA Financial Group Ltd. (2101 North Edgewood Avenue, Appleton, WI 54914, Tele/Fax: (414) 738-7007), dated Feb. 4, 1991, is an offer to buy/sell/effect 2000 metric tons of gold bullion, with rollovers under London good delivery. At the time of this offer, Wanta was in constant phone contact with Roberto Coppola in Rome, where Coppola served as Ambassador of the Russian Republic. Was it Russian gold Wanta was selling?

Was Wanta just another trader specializing in illiquid currencies and flight capital in the form of bullion? Was he a big time money launderer? Either would explain the 14 percent commissions at

which he dealt. Or was neither the case? Let's look closer. Because something doesn't add up.

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL (NSC/NSA) GENERAL V. WALTERS  
Wanta, an erstwhile travelling companion of Vernon Walters and supplier of machine guns to Bill Casey, was arrested by Swiss authorities on July 7, 1993, in Geneva, Switzerland. He was held for four months, then extradited to Wisconsin to stand trial for state taxes owed for the years 1982 and 1988. The grand total of taxes owed--\$14,000.

Curious that. Extradited for \$14,000? In taxes? From Switzerland? The story gets weirder.

Wanta was sentenced to 22 years in prison. (Better he had killed a few people than that he owed taxes.) Afterward, on Sept. 21, 1996, Wanta wrote a mysterious letter to Hillary Rodham Clinton, referring to "U.S. President Bill Clinton's Short Term Notes and IMF Sale of Bullion." In the letter Wanta referred to his own "de-stabilization of the Soviet Union Rubles (SUR)" and noted that he "prevented the Soviet & Italian Mafiosa from the Soviet Funds in favour of our U.S. Treasury & Metals Accounts in excess of US\$ 150 billion".

Wanta then threatened: "Until by legal release from the un-constitutional/ false incarceration in Wisconsin--as a diplomat & non-resident--I am legally interested in the corporate placement of short-term notes & I.M.F. gold bullion/troy ounce delivery contract. Thank you for your kind assistance in this timely situation."

Wanta's letter (or letters) got results. On Jan. 10, 1997, Wanta received a reply from Erskine Bowles at the White House.

Mr. Leo E. Wanta  
c/o Kettle Moraine  
Correctional Institute  
P.O. Box 31  
Plymouth, WI 53073

Dear Mr. Wanta:

Thank you for your  
letter. I appreciate  
hearing from you.

To give your concerns the  
proper attention, I have  
forwarded your letter to  
the Office of Agency  
Liaison within the White  
House. You can be certain  
that your concerns will  
be carefully reviewed.

Again, thank you for  
writing.

Sincerely,

Erskine B. Bowles

On February 1, 1997, after Bowles had checked with W.H. Agency Relations, Leo Wanta was released on \$90,000 bail.

CIA/USA SPECIAL OPERATIONS



So here's what we know about Wanta so far: Extradited from Switzerland on a triviality. Sentenced to 22 years on the same triviality. But then sprung after references to "Bill Clinton's short-term notes" and the White House checks with Agency Liaison

Then there's the Russian currency/gold issue. Wanta was dealing in billions of dollars. Where did the financing come from? Another question comes to mind: How did Wanta get to be Ambassador from Somalia?

Claire Sterling's not-so-reliable book Thieves World contains a good bit of information (and mis-information) on Leo Wanta. (Sources include a mysterious Mr. X, an "investment banker", and an unnamed FBI agent. Sterling's credits, however, may identify the latter source: she gives special mention to "Jim Moody of the FBI"--the man who headed up the FBI's organized crime division.

Wanta himself identifies Sterling's "Mr. X" as Treasury Special Agent Philip Wainwright.

Depending on your point of view, Wanta is a con artist or a hero: bilking the crumbling Soviet empire of its currency and resources, helping pushing the wounded bear over the cliff. Wanta's operation has been called the Great Ruble Scam. That is, one of the few ruble scams not engineered by the Russian central bank/Russian government itself. NOT TRUE [USSR] CENTRAL BANQUE Gold Bullion WENT TO U.S. TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Wanta presented his credentials in Moscow in October 1990. He was a member of Reagan's "President's Club" (meaning he had given \$50,000 to the campaign). He also headed the "New Republic Financial Group" located in Appleton, WI, and registered in Vienna, Austria (New Republic/USA Financial Group, GES.m.b.H., Kartnerstrasse 28/15, Telefon: 513-4235, A-1010 Wien). New Republic had declared capital [REDACTED] according to Sterling. On this basis, Wanta wanted to swap \$5 billion for 140 billion rubles, rising over five years to \$50 billion for 300 billion rubles. [per Title 18, USC Section 6 / US Gold Proprietary Corporation ETAL]

You never make money unless you think big, right? The proposal (one of three similar ones from seemingly disparate sources) was to be a mini-Marshall plan to import into Russia consumer goods like frozen chickens and Tampax. Or that was the story. Boris Yeltsin approved the deal, but it fell through, NOT TRUE, according to Sterling, when the State Department reported that Wanta "had major debts and some credit card problems". (Wanta denies that the State Department ever issued such a statement. Much of Sterling's information, in fact, seems to come from a Soviet investigator looking to smear Wanta as a SEE BANNYSE BANK TRANSFER!! common criminal.)

To Sterling's "Mr. X", who worked with Wanta, the objective was quite different: "I knew there would be a possibility of a Western privately orchestrated economic Jihad that could help crush the communist ruling powers by destroying their unstable ruble. Unilaterally and privately, I decided to play a catalytic role to crash the ruble."

During the previous year Wanta's group bought sold and traded rubles. Many of the orders/offers appear to [REDACTED] calculated to cause a run on the ruble, per Rogers - Houston Memorandum & U.S. PRESIDENTIAL EXECUTIVE ORDER ...

And--coming forward to October 1990--Wanta's deal of \$5 billion for 140 billion rubles, or 28 rubles to the dollar, would have been transacted at roughly double the value of the dollar relative to its black market rate which was closer to 14 rubles to the dollar. AS If executed, the plan would have effectively given Wanta a free 70 billion rubles with which to help himself to the natural resources of a crumbling



1845c #6

empire. Not bad. Who was Wanta representing? Himself? Or the U.S. government?

Moving forward to Jan./Feb. 1991, we find Wanta in the process of moving two thousand tons of gold - during a time period when coincidentally two thousand tons of Soviet gold mysteriously disappeared from the Central Bank. OK

By December 1991 Wanta and his partner Kok Howe Kwong had set up a food for petroleum joint venture in Moscow. Accounts in dollars and rubles were opened at Status Credit Bank in Singapore by the two through Asian-Europa Development Pte Ltd. Asian-Europa proceeded to export Soviet petroleum and import Western goods at an exchange rate (oil for goods) very favorable to Asian-Europa. Asian-Europa appears to be a U.S. government/CIA proprietary company set up under USCA Title 18, Sec. 6, Line 11. And it appears to have had a relationship with Mochtar Riady's Lippo Group.

Without a doubt, Wanta dealt the fading Soviet apparatus a body slam or two. Does that make Leo Wanta an American hero? And if so, why was he incarcerated? Was it just to keep him off the streets because of what he knew (a standard maneuver in the intelligence community)? Does that explain Wanta's bogus extradition from Switzerland? Or was Wanta just a clever con artist who could somehow come up with the contacts and billions of dollars necessary to deceive a crumbling superpower, not to mention the CIA and the U.S. Treasury? Either way, Wanta ain't your average used-car salesman. Wanta may be a victim railroaded by the government he served, AS COORDINATED WITH U.S. DEPT. OF THE TREASURY / U.S. CUSTOMS SERVICE: @ FRANK B. DUJRAH (FBI / SA32NY, and @ RICK REYNOLDS (SA233 HS / SECTOR IV WITH RAC W.H. LECATES, SMALL, HAD BULLDOZER, et al... Leo Wanta was appointed Ambassador of Somalia for Switzerland and Canada in March 1993. In July, Wanta had been in Switzerland to make \$250,000,000 available for the Children's Defense Fund at the request of Deputy White House Counsel Vince Foster. Children's Defense Fund? Whose idea was that? What was going on there? [SEE AUER TRUST (SUSS) SOCIETY, AUER TRUST CORPORATION, et al]

FALSE

Shortly after Wanta's arrest, and following his daughter's birthday on July 20, 1993, the Superintendent for the Swiss prison where Wanta was being held came by and told Wanta that Wanta's friend Foster had been murdered.

[W.C.D.S. #714]

Wanta used to visit FBI Director William Sessions at his office through a secret entry known as the "back of stage". There he would nearly always meet with a Mr. Gonzalez and a Mr. Jim Moody, who were the FBI enforcers for RICO and organized crime issues. Moody was the head of the FBI's organized crime section.

SA32-NY  
SA233MS  
S-31-ITANO

Can any of this shed some light on the death of Vince Foster? Clearly Foster was engaged in some major financial dealings--including the \$250,000,000 for the Children's Fund that Wanta discusses. Foster's financial dealings may not explain why he was killed. But they could very well explain why there was no investigation.

What does Wanta think?

August 26, 1997

Web Page: <http://www.aci.net/kalliste/>

Reply

Reply All

Forward

Delete

Previous

Next

Close

Move To: (Move to Selected Folder) ▼



11/11 copy

DIPLOMATIC MAIL / SENSITIVE

Sigint: Still point

14 APR 01

CONTACT: Atty. PATRICIA CAMERON  
949.831.7517

THE HONOURABLE, George Bush  
THE HONOURABLE, Dick Cheney  
THE HONOURABLE, John Ashcroft

PLS NOTE: TV MEDIA TALK  
Show scheduled  
For Mon., 3/4/01

DEAR GENTLEPERSONS:

REFERENCING TITLE 18 USC 84 — MISPRISION OF FELONY — CONCEALMENT OF A FELONY COMMITTED BY ANOTHER

REFERENCING TITLE 18 USC 2382 — MISPRISION OF TREASON — CRIME COMMITTED WHEN ONE HARBORS THE BARE KNOWLEDGE OF AN ACT OF TREASON OR A TREASONABLE PLOT AND FAILS TO DISCLOSE IT TO THE APPROPRIATE OFFICIALS

IN BOTH CASES // THE KNOWLEDGABLE PARTY BECOMES A "PRINCIPAL." [See White House EXHIBITS, CORRESPONDENCE AND DOCUMENTATION, AS TO: USG BETRAYAL, CONSPIRACY, DIVERSION OF U.S. TREASURY TRUST FUNDS, INTER ALIA — PRESENTLY IN U.S. DISTRICT COURT, CASE NO 99-CV-1914-C AND CIV-99-1914-C (99-CV-1914)]



INSTEAD OF ATTEMPTING TO CORRECT THE STATE  
OF WISCONSIN (USA) PERJURED TESTIMONY OF STATE  
GOVERNMENT WITNESSES — EXPOSING THIS TO THE  
NON-SUBJECT MATTER JURY WITHOUT JURISDICTION —  
THE COUNTY JUDGE AND STATE PROSECUTORS  
CONCEALED ANY AND ALL TOTAL TRUTH !!  
THANK GOD, THAT CERTAIN FOREIGN NATIONS  
HAVE NOW ENTERED <sup>INTO</sup> MY FALSE ARREST, WRONGFUL  
INCARCERATION BY SWISSE KIDNAPPING TO  
UNDO A REAL TRAVESTY OF AMERICAN JUSTICE !!!  
SIMPLY CONTACT, ATTORNEY CAMERON FOR THE  
EXPLOSIVE FOREIGN GOVERNMENT AFFIDAVITS, ETC..

SIMPLY SPEAKING, WHERE DOES ANYONE GET THE  
POWER TO HOLD HIMSELF ABOVE THE LAW OR THE  
UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION? WERE THEIR  
INDIVIDUAL OATHS A TRAGIC CHARADE? RESULTING  
IN AN INNOCENT AMERICAN CITIZEN, A FOREIGN  
DIPLOMATE — AND — U.S. INTEL OPERATIVE  
TO BE LAWFLESSLY HELD BY AN "INVISIBLE  
GOVERNMENT," — AND NOW — THE BUSH/CHENEY ADMINISTRATION.

GOVERNMENTS ARE INSTITUTED FOR THE SOLE  
PURPOSE OF PROTECTING THE RIGHTS OF INDIVIDUAL  
MEMBERS OF OUR AMERICAN SOCIETY !!

[See Dutch Journalistic Report enclosed]



"IN THE BEGINNING OF A CHANGE, THE AMERICAN PATRIOT IS A SCARCE MAN AND BRAVE, HATED AND SCORNE. When his cause succeeds; However, the timid join him, for then IT COSTS NOTHING TO BE AN AMERICAN PATRIOT."

IF WE HAVE GENUINELY LEARNED ANYTHING FROM THE CLINTON/GORE ADMINISTRATION OF OUR ONCE GREAT NATION, we should IMMEDIATELY REPEAL EVERY LAW CRIMINALIZING ACTIVITIES THAT HAVE NO VICTIMS!! We are long overdue for RETHINKING our newly formed Activist government!!

THE STATE OF WISCONSIN (USA) displays REMARKABLE ETHICAL ENTROPY, INDIFFERENCE TO TRUTHFUL FACTS, AN AGGRESSIVE WILLINGNESS TO MUCK AROUND IN THE GUTTER, AND A SANCTIMONIOUS SELF-JUSTIFICATION THAT IS ALMOST, WELL — CULT-LIKE — KNOWING ALL ALONG THAT I RESIDED IN WIEN, AUSTRIA — AND — NOT THE BANANA REPUBLIC OF WISCONSIN. SINCE 1988 ON U.S. GOVERNMENT SERVICE (See title 18 USC §6 — U.S. GOV. PROPRIETARY CORPORATIONS, INTER ALIA) — See LATEST AUSTRIAN GOVERNMENT AFFIDAVITS ... INTER ALIA.



FEAR IS AN AMAZING AND POWERFUL CREATURE.  
IT CAN CRIPPLE THE HUMAN MIND AND CAUSE  
UTTER INEFFECTIVENESS. AND FEAR CAN ALSO BE  
THE MOST STRIDENT ALLY WE HAVE TODAY. WHEN  
FEAR IS USED AS FUEL, IT IS TRANSFORMED  
INTO COURAGE, FAITH AND AMERICAN STRENGTH —  
THE BIRTHRIGHT AND HERITAGE OF AMERICA ITSELF.

My Freedom and Liberty is NOT "FOR SALE, AND  
IS NOT NEGOTIABLE". My TOTAL Freedom AND  
Individual Liberty is MINE AND MINE ALONE,  
AND I PERSONALLY WILL LIVE THE BALANCE  
OF MY LIFE FREE — OR — I WILL  
DIE A HONOURABLE DEATH — DEFENDING  
IT KNOWING THAT I AM SACRIFICING MY  
AGING LIFE (DOB 11.6.48) FOR AMERICAN  
LIBERTY AND FREEDOM ITSELF WITH RESPECT  
AND HONOUR FOR OUR GREAT NATION UNDER  
GOD.

HAVING SAID THAT, I CALL IT CRIMINAL  
CULPABILITY; INTENTIONAL CRIMINAL CULPABILITY  
FOR NON-DISCLOSURE OF MY TOTAL INNOCENCE,  
NOW A POLITICAL VICTIM ON THE STATE'S PART..  
THERE IS NOTHING GUSE — IN FACT, IT IS  
VERY CLOSE TO TREASON, BECAUSE THROUGH



THE State's Non-disclosure — THE SYNDICATED  
Media, IN COOPERATION AND IN PARTNERSHIP  
WITH THE State of Wisconsin (USA), WITH THE  
COMPLICITY OF State A/G James Doyle, et al,  
AND OUR COMPOSITE GOVERNMENT, THEY HAVE  
ALLOWED; THEY HAVE FACILITATED THE UNABATED  
OBFUSCATION OF OUR GREAT NATION'S WEALTH  
FROM THE RIGHTFUL OWNERS OF THIS VALUED  
God-given COUNTRY — YOU, MYSELF, ALL  
OF US, THE AMERICAN PEOPLE by BIRTHRIGHT.  
STATE AND FEDERAL PUBLIC TRUST FUNDS ARE BEING LAWLESSLY  
USED TO "COVER-UP," CONTINUING STATE CRIMINAL ACTIVITIES;  
IT IS NOW TIME TO ACT AND PROCLAIM,

" CLEAR AND SIMPLE DISCLOSURE OF THE  
TOTAL TRUTH IS YOUR ONLY ALTERNATIVE. "  
EVERYDAY, I AM FALSELY INCARCERATED IS A FEDERAL CRIME ...

THANK YOU FOR YOUR UNDERSTANDING & ACTION.

Faithfully yours,

~~AMBASSADOR~~ Leo W. Wanta (Leo G. Wanta)  
DIPLOMATIC PASSPORTS NO — 04362 & 12535  
MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

cc: FBI ASSISTANT DIRECTOR Donald Kerr, et al  
LEWIS (SCOTEL) LIBBY (S/END) AMB. EVA S. TELEK, et al

cc: Rights of Man Foundation

Diplomatic Mail

Attorney Patricia Cameron  
Ambassador Eva S. Teleki

U.S. President George W. Bush  
Office of the U.S. President

The Honourable, Dick Cheney  
Office of the U.S. Vice President

Dear Gentlemen:

Please note that 18 USC § 371 states the conspirators have had to commit a specific offense against the United States of America. Notice also that §§ 7203 & 7201 require the same such citing — and according to our Rule of Law, my alleged State of Wisconsin (USA) Complaint/Indictment contains no such citing.

The following is the Federal Criminal Rule for a proper Indictment: Title 18 USC, Rule 7, The Indictment and the Information (c) Nature and Contents. (1) In general, the indictment or the information shall be a plain, concise and definite written statement of the essential facts constituting the offense charged. It shall be signed by the attorney for the government. [Collection Agent D. Ullman is not a licensed attorney, but a Agent State Persecutor & State Perjurer]



IT NEED NOT CONTAIN A FORMAL COMMENCEMENT, A FORMAL CONCLUSION OR ANY OTHER MATTER NOT NECESSARY TO SUCH STATEMENT. ALLEGATIONS (EVEN FALSE) MADE IN ONE COUNT MAY BE INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE IN ANOTHER COUNT. IT MAY BE ALLEGED IN A SINGLE COUNT THAT THE MEANS BY WHICH THE DEFENDANT COMMITTED THE OFFENSE ARE UNKNOWN OR THAT THE DEFENDANT COMMITTED IT BY ONE OR MORE SPECIFIED MEANS. THE INDICTMENT OR INFORMATION SHALL STATE FOR EACH COUNT THE OFFICIAL OR CUSTOMARY CITATION OF THE STATUTE, RULE, REGULATION OR OTHER PROVISION OF LAW WHICH THE DEFENDANT IS ALLEGED THEREIN TO HAVE VIOLATED.

THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE (INJUSTICE), WITH THE COOPERATION OF OATH BREAKING FEDERAL JUDGES, HAS BEEN CHARGING AND CONVINCING IGNORANT JURIES TO CONVICT AMERICAN CITIZENS OF NON-CRIMES FOR YEARS, AND IT IS TIME THAT THESE TYRANNICAL PRACTICES BE LAWFULLY STOPPED.

IN AN "AMERICAN FREE SOCIETY," SOMEONE HAS TO BE INJURED BEFORE ANY CHARGES COULD BE BROUGHT. WE MUST STRIVE TO GET OUR BRAIN-WASHED AMERICAN CITIZENS TO UNDERSTAND THAT WE HAVE THE RIGHT UNDER OUR UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION

TO CONTRACT FREELY — AN INDIVIDUAL LIBERTY //

PURSUANT TO TREASURY Delegation Order No 92, THE IRS IS TRAINED UNDER THE DIRECTION OF THE DIVISION OF HUMAN RESOURCES (U.N.), AND THE COMMISSIONER (INTERNATIONAL), BY THE OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT.

See 22 USCA §278 (1979) — "THE UNITED NATIONS, Executive Order 10422. THE OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT IS UNDER THE DIRECTION OF THE SECRETARY OF THE UNITED NATIONS,"

PURSUANT TO THE TREASURY Delegation Order No 91, THE IRS ENTERED INTO A "SERVICE AGREEMENT" WITH THE U.S. TREASURY DEPARTMENT [See Public Law 94 564, Legislative History, pgs 5967 Reorganization (Bankruptcy) — Plan No 26] AND THE AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, THIS "AGENCY" IS AN INTERNATIONAL paramilitary operation, AND ACCORDING TO THE DEPARTMENT OF THE U.S. ARMY FIELD MANUAL (1969) 41 10, pgs. 14, See 1 7 (b) § 1 6. See 1 10 (7) (C)(1), AND 22 USCA §284, INCLUDES SUCH ACTIVITIES AS, "ASSUMPTION OF FULL OR PARTIAL EXECUTIVE, LEGISLATIVE, AND JUDICIAL AUTHORITY OVER A COUNTRY OR AREA."



THE IRS IS ALSO AN AGENCY / MEMBER OF A 169  
NATION PACT — CALLED THE INTERNATIONAL  
CRIMINAL POLICE ORGANIZATION [INTERPOL] —  
CITED AT 22 USCA § 263(a). THE MEMORANDUM  
OF UNDERSTANDING (MOU) — BETWEEN THE SECRETARY  
OF TREASURY, A/K/A — THE CORPORATE GOVERNOR OF  
"THE FUND" AND "THE BANK" (INTERNATIONAL MONETARY  
FUND / IMF), AND THE INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR  
RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT, INDICATED  
THAT THE U.S. ATTORNEY GENERAL AND HER ASSOCIATES  
ARE SOLICITING AND COLLECTING INFORMATIONAL DATA  
FOR FOREIGN PRINCIPALS; THE INTERNATIONAL  
ORGANIZATIONS, CORPORATIONS, AND ASSOCIATIONS —  
EXEMPLIFIED BY 22 USCA § 286(F).

ACCORDING TO THE 1994 U.S. GOVERNMENT MANUAL, 21  
PAGE 390, THE ATTORNEY GENERAL IS THE PERMANENT  
REPRESENTATIVE TO INTERPOL, AND THE SECRETARY OF  
TREASURY IS THE ALTERNATE MEMBER. UNDER ARTICLE 30  
OF THE INTERPOL CONSTITUTION, THESE INDIVIDUALS MUST  
EXPATRIATE THEIR CITIZENSHIP, THEY SERVE NO ALLEGIANCE  
TO OUR UNITED STATES OF AMERICA. THE IRS IS PAID BY  
"THE FUND" AND "THE BANK."

THUS IT APPEARS FROM THE DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE  
THAT THE INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE AGENTS ARE

"AGENTS OF A Foreign Principal" WITHIN THE MEANING AND INTENT OF THE "Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938" FOR PRIVATE GAIN — CERTAINLY NOT PUBLIC!!

THE IRS IS directed AND controlled by THE CORPORATE GOVERNOR OF THE "Fund" AND "THE Bank," THE Federal Reserve Bank AND THE IRS collection Agency ARE BOTH privately owned AND operated UNDER PRIVATE Statutes. THE IRS operates UNDER Public Policy, NOT CONSTITUTIONAL LAW, AND IN THE sole interest of our GREAT NATION'S "Foreign Creditors."

OUR CONSTITUTION ONLY PERMITS THE U.S. CONGRESS TO LAY AND collect TAXES. IT DOES NOT AUTHORIZE CONGRESS TO delegate THE tax collection power TO A private CORPORATION, WHICH collects OUR TAXES FOR A PRIVATE BANK, THE U.S. FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM, WHO THEN deposits IT INTO THE U.S. TREASURY OF THE INTERNATIONAL Monetary Fund (IMF).

THE IRS IS NOT ALLOWED TO STATE THAT THEY ONLY collect TAXES FOR THE United States TREASURY. THEY ONLY REFER TO "THE TREASURY."



PRIOR TO THE 20 JAN 2001, deadline —  
THE CLINTON / GORE ADMINISTRATION LAWYERS  
WERE PREPARING "PRESIDENTIAL EXECUTIVE  
ORDERS" TO CONNECT ALL PRIVATE BANK  
ACCOUNTS AND BANKING CARDS DIRECTLY  
TO THE IRS, TREASURY AND U.S. FEDERAL  
RESERVE SYSTEM COMPUTERS.

THANK YOU

Respectfully submitted,  
AMBASSADOR LEO S. WALTER  
CHAIRMAN - DESIGNATE  
SOMALI CENTRAL BANKING

Dated: 20 JAN 2001, A.D.,

P.S. PROTECTIVE PROVISIONS OF THE PRIVACY ACT  
WERE ALSO MALICIOUSLY VIOLATED, EVEN  
HAB AN AMERICAN EXPATRIATE; SINCE  
W.S. GOV'N ASSIGNMENTS IN EUROPE &  
S.E. ASIA, SINCE 1985.

ENCLOSURES: Six (6) pages

(HAND)  
COPY

23<sup>RD</sup> February 1994 - MADISON, DAY, N<sup>o</sup> 232

TO: Office of THE SECRETARY OF STATE

ATTN: THE HONORABLE, Secretary Doug LaFollette

200 WEST MIFFLIN STREET

MADISON, WISCONSIN, USA (S3708-0000)

cc/ DANE COUNTY COURTHOUSE, MADISON

ATTN: THE HON., H.N. NOWAKOWSKI

Circuit Court Judge, Branch N<sup>o</sup> 13

MADISON, Wisc, USA (S3709-0000)

IN THE MATTER OF: CASE N<sup>o</sup> 92CF683

DEAR SECRETARY LAFOLLETTE:

PURSUANT TO WISCONSIN STATUTES, CH 71.80(12)

(A) - SECRETARY OF STATE DEEMED LAWFUL ATTORNEY

FOR NON-RESIDENT (OR) IN THE ALTERNATIVE,

(12)(b) AS TO LEO EMIL WANTA, DIRECTEUR  
GENERAL OF NEW REPUBLIC / USA FINANCIAL GROUP

LTD. GES.M.B.H., A FOREIGN CORPORATION OF

WIEN / VIENNA, AUSTRIA - EUROPA RELATIVE TO

FALSE ALLEGATIONS AND FRAUD ON THE COURT BY

VIRTUE OF WISCONSIN STATUTES - CH 908.02 w/

CH 908.06; CH 939.03; CH 968.04(1)(b); CH 969.11

(1); CH 970.01; CH 971.19(1); CH 968.04(4);

CH 946.65(1); CH 939.23(1); CH 939.70; CH 946.01

(1)(b); CH 946.12(2); CH 946.12(3); CH 946.12(4);



CH 946.18; CH 946.31(1), (1A)(B)(C); CH 946.32.  
(1) A)(b) (2) REF - STATE v CALDWELL, 154 W (2d)  
683, 454 NW(2d) 13 (CT. APP. 1990); CH 971.31  
(1)(2)(5c); CH 939.31; CH 942.01; CH 946.65(1)(2);  
CH 946.72(1) AND CH 947.013(1M, b)(1R, A) AND  
LAMPKINS v. STATE 51 W(2d) 564, 187 NW(2d) 164,  
INTER ALIA, REQUIRES LEGAL REPRESENTATION.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR RAPID RESPONSE AND  
COOPERATION IN THIS CORPORATE MATTER,  
INVOLVING AUSTRIA & MISSISSIPPI CORPORATE  
OPERATING FUNDS VIA GERMAN PROMISSORY  
NOTE USDOLLAR CREDITS.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,  
NEW REPUBLIC / USA FINANCIAL GROUP, LTD GES.M.B.H

BY: AMB. LEO EMIL WANTA  
DIRECTOR GENERAL - LEO EMIL WANTA

cc/ CSIS FILINGS - (10), RCMP

03 FEBRUARY 1994 - MADISON

To: STATE OF WISCONSIN, ET AL ..

ATTN: THE HON, M N NOWAKOWSKI, ATTN: THE HON, TOMMY THOMPSON  
CIRCUIT COURT Judge - Branch No 13 EXECUTIVE OFFICES OF GOVERNOR  
DANE COUNTY COURTHOUSE ONE STATE CAPITOL Building  
MADISON, WIS, USA (53709-0000) MADISON, WISC, USA (53708-0000)

IN RE - CASE No 92 CF 683 (DANE CTY); CASE No 93 CV  
1342 & No 93 CV 1449 (OUTAGAMIE COUNTY)

DEAR GENTLE PERSONS :

MOTION FOR DISMISSAL, CONT'D (11-JAN-94)

I, SIMELEZ AMBASSADOR TO CANADA, LEO E. WANTA,  
PRAY TO THE STATE OF WISCONSIN COURTS, ET AL,  
FOR MOTION FOR DISMISSAL, UNDER THE FOLLOWING  
ADDITIONAL WISCONSIN STATUTES WHICH ARE  
DEFINITELY IN MY SOLE FAVOUR BASED  
ON THE ARREST WARRANT AS A FRAUD ON THE  
STATE AND FEDERAL COURTS, VIOLATION OF USA  
IMMIGRATION LAWS, VIENNA CONVENTION, CANADA,  
IMMIGRATION LAWS (AS 5 JULY 92 RESIDENT-LEGAL),  
U.S. CONSTITUTION 5, 8, 14TH AMENDMENTS, AND  
APPLICABLE WISCONSIN STATUTES, INTER ALIA -  
AND RELATIVE TO SEVEN (7) DAY EXTRADITION  
WAIVER CONTINGENT ON WISCONSIN SIGNATURE  
Bond Release & IMMEDIATE TRANSPORTATION TO



ATTEND THANKSGIVING HOLIDAY WITH FAMILY,  
AS TRANSPORTATION TOOK PLACE ILLEGALLY  
TO WISCONSIN ON 13 Dec 1993 WITHOUT  
LEGAL JURISDICTION AND PROBABLE CAUSE,  
INTER ALIA -

CH 908.02 - HEARSAY RULE w/ CH 908.06 -

ATTACKING AND SUPPORTING CREDIBILITY OF  
DECLARANTS - CIA OPERATIVE JACK ELLIS,  
DISABLED ATTORNEY FOR THEFT OF \$20,146  
IN NEW REPUBLIC CORPORATE FUNDS BY  
STATE OF CALIFORNIA - SUPREME COURT;  
CIA OPERATIVE (DISCHARGED CORP. SECY OF  
NEW REPUBLIC) MARLAN BAUCUM THEFT OF  
CORP. \$10,000. (REF: U.S. DISTRICT COURT -  
JACKSON, MISS. COURT ORDER)

CH 939.03 - JURISDICTION OF STATE OVER CRIME,  
AS NEW REPUBLIC / USA FINANCIAL GROUP, LTD  
IS ORGANIZED IN JACKSON, MISS TO PURCHASE  
SANTA FE RAILROAD TO MOBILIZE / TRANSPORT  
MX MOBILE MISSILES, INTER ALIA

CH 968.04(1)(b) - WARRANT OR SUMMONS COMPLAINT  
ALLEGED RESIDENT OF OUTAGAMIE COUNTY,  
THEREFORE ILLEGAL ARREST AS ARREST WARRANT  
ALLEGES OUTAGAMIE COUNTY CRIMES, INTER ALIA,  
AND TO BE RETURNABLE TO OUTAGAMIE COUNTY, ETC.

CH 969.11(1) - OUTAGAMIE COUNTY JURISDICTION UNDER FALSE ALLEGATIONS, INTER ALIA.

CH 970.01 - INITIAL APPEARANCE JURISDICTION IS EXCLUSIVELY OUTAGAMIE COUNTY VIA FALSE ARREST IN LAUSANNE, SWITZERLAND DUE TO FRAUD ON THE STATE & FEDERAL COURTS by ELIS, BAUCUM and WISCONSIN STATE OFFICIALS AND/OR AGENTS, AS A DIRECT LEGAL CHALLENGE OF COURT'S PERSONAL JURISDICTION, INTER ALIA.

CH 971.19(1) - PLACE OF TRIAL

CRIMINAL ACTIONS SHALL BE TRIED IN THE COUNTY WHERE THE CRIME WAS COMMITTED

CH 968.04(4) - SERVICE

ARRESTED IN LAUSANNE, SWITZERLAND UNDER FALSE & HEARSAY ALLEGATIONS & ILLEGALLY FORCED/EXPULSED TO USA TERRITORY, CONTRARY TO USA IMMIGRATION LAWS WITHOUT U.S.A. PASSPORT, CARRYING ONLY SOMALIZ DIPLOMATIC CREDENTIALS & PASSPORT, ETC.

CH 946.65(1) - OBSTRUCTING JUSTICE

RESULTANT FALSE ARREST & IMPRISONMENT COMPLICATES U.S. TREASURY/U.S. CUSTOMS/OFFICE OF SPECIAL INVESTIGATIONS OF F. B. INGRAM, SA 32 NV (EYEDENT & FBI) AS TO ALLEGATIONS OF TREASON INVESTIGATION AS TO



IRAN GOVERNMENT CONSPIRACY TO PURCHASE MOTOROLA  
SECTEL TELEPHONES VIA MALAYSIA MILITARY INTELLIGENCE,  
INTERALIA - AS WELL AS RED MERCURY 2020  
U.S.S.R. deliveries to Iraqi military, ETC.  
AND GORBACHEV 70 Billion Rouble Credits (BRANYSK  
BANK + ASIAN-EUROPA DEVELOPMENT GROUP, LTD (1991)), ETC.

CH 939.23(1) - CRIMINAL INTENT

ALL FUNDS ARE CORPORATE ASSETS, ETC.

CH 939.70 - PRESUMPTION OF INNOCENCE AND BURDEN  
OF PROOF - Ignored by False Arrest, ETC.

CH 946.01(1)(b) - TREASON

OBSTRUCTION OF U.S. TREASURY / CUSTOMS / O.S.I. FIELD  
INVESTIGATIONS OF SA 32NV / T.B. INGRAM, ETAL - by  
CONSPIRACY; CH 946.12(2) - MISCONDUCT IN PUBLIC  
OFFICE; CH 946.12(3); CH 946.12(4); CH 946.18;  
CH 946.31(1) - PERJURY AS TO (1)(A)(b)(c); CH 946.32 -  
FALSE SWEARING (1)(A)(b), (2), REFERENCING -

KNOWINGLY PROVIDING FALSE INFORMATION

WITH INTENT TO MISLEAD IS OBSTRUCTION AS  
MATTER OF LAW. STATE V CALDWELL, 154 W  
(2d) 683, 454 NW(2d) 13 (CT. APP. 1990)

WHEREFORE, I, AMB. LEO E. WANTA, PRAY TO THE COURT FOR THE  
IMMEDIATE DISMISSAL WITH PREJUDICE FORTHWITH.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED, UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY,  
AMB. LEO E. WANTA FOR SOMALIA TO CANADA  
CC/CSIS (CANADA SECURITY & INVESTIGATIVE SERVICES), ET AL



Amend. 13, §2

CONSTITUTION

S.D.R. / USGoud  
Diplomate Mail

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

53

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

61

62

63

64

65

66

67

68

69

70

71

72

73

74

75

76

77

78

79

80

81

82

83

84

85

86

87

88

89

90

91

92

93

94

95

96

97

98

99

100

101

102

103

104

105

106

107

108

109

110

111

112

113

114

115

116

117

118

119

120

121

122

123

124

125

126

127

128

129

130

131

132

133

134

135

136

137

138

139

140

141

142

143

144

145

146

147

148

149

150

151

152

153

154

155

156

157

158

159

160

161

162

163

164

165

166

167

168

169

170

171

172

173

174

175

176

177

178

179

180

181

182

183

184

185

186

187

188

189

190

191

192

193

194

195

196

197

198

199

200

201

202

203

204

205

206

207

208

209

210

211

212

213

214

215

216

217

218

219

220

221

222

223

224

225

226

227

228

229

230

231

232

233

234

235

236

237

238

239

240

241

242

243

244

245

246

247

248

249

250

251

252

253

254

255

256

257

258

259

260

261

262

263

264

265

266

267

268

269

270

271

272

273

274

275

276

277

278

279

280

281

282

283

284

285

286

287

288

289

290

291

292

293

294

295

296

297

298

299

300

301

302

303

304

305

306

307

308

309

310

311

312

313

314

315

316

317

318

319

320

321

322

323

324

325

326

327

328

329

330

331

332

333

334

335

336

337

338

339

340

341

342

343

344

345

346

347

348

349



Amend. 14, § 1  
Note 8

CONSTITUTION

Sing Hee, C.C.Or. 1888, 36 F. 437. See, also, *Ex parte Chin King*, C.C.Or. 1888, 35 F. 354.

The amendments did not confer the right of citizenship upon the Mongolian race, except such as are born within the United States. *State v. Ah Chew*, 1881, 16 Nev. 58.

9. — Corporations

Plaintiff corporate entities were "persons" within meaning of this amendment. *National Ass'n of Theatre Owners of Wis. Inc. v. Motion Picture Commission of City of Milwaukee*, D.C.Wis. 1971, 328 F.Supp. 6.

Citizens of the United States within the meaning of this clause must be natural and not artificial persons, and therefore a corporate body is not a citizen of the United States as that term is here used. *Insurance Co. v. New Orleans*, C.C.La. 1870, 1 Woods, U.S., 85, 13 Fed.Cas. No. 7,052.

Corporations are not "citizens" within this clause. *State ex rel. Borden Co. v. Dammann*, 1929, 224 N.W. 139, 198 Wis. 265. See, also, *Pilgrim Real Estate v. Superintendent of Police of Boston*, 1953, 112 N.E.2d 796, 330 Mass. 250.

10. — Indians

It rests with Congress to determine when and how the national guardianship shall be brought to an end, and whether the emancipation shall at first be complete or only partial. *U.S. v. Nice*, S.D. 1916, 36 S.Ct. 696, 241 U.S. 591, 60 L.Ed. 1192.

An Indian appears to be entitled to the benefit of and to be subject to the laws of the State in which he resides the moment he becomes a citizen of the United States. *Matter of Heff*, Kan. 1905, 25 S.Ct. 506, 197 U.S. 504, 49 L.Ed. 848.

The only adjudication that has been made by this court upon the meaning of the words, "and subject to the jurisdiction thereof," in this clause, is *Elk v. Wilkins*, 1884, 5 S.Ct. 41, 112 U.S. 94, 28 L.Ed. 643, in which it was decided that an Indian born a member of one of the Indian tribes within the United States, which still existed and was recognized as an Indian tribe by the United States, who had voluntarily separated himself from his tribe, and taken up his residence among the white citizens of a state, but who did not appear to have

been naturalized, or taxed, or in any way recognized or treated as a citizen, either by the United States or by the state, was not a citizen of the United States, as a person born in the United States, "and subject to the jurisdiction thereof," within the meaning of this clause. *U.S. v. Wong Kim Ark*, Cal. 1898, 18 S.Ct. 456, 169 U.S. 649, 42 L.Ed. 890.

An Indian born a member of one of the Indian tribes within the United States is not merely by reason of his birth within the United States, and of his afterwards voluntarily separating himself from his tribe and taking up his residence among white citizens, a citizen of the United States within the meaning of this clause. *Elk v. Wilkins*, Neb. 1884, 5 S.Ct. 41, 112 U.S. 99, 28 L.Ed. 643. See, also, *McKay v. Campbell*, D.C.Or. 1871, 2 Sawyer, U.S., 118, 16 Fed.Cas. No. 8,840; *Relation of Indians to Citizenship*, 1856, 7 Op.Atty.Gen. 746.

A person born off a reservation, whose father and mother were duly married, the father being a white man and a naturalized citizen of the United States, and the mother being an Indian, and who was reared and educated as the children of other citizens of the United States, is a citizen of the United States. *U.S. v. Hadley*, C.C.Wash. 1900, 99 F. 437.

Indians are specifically declared by 8 U.S.C.A. § 1401 to be citizens of the United States and, under this amendment, they are considered as well to be citizens of the state wherein the reservation is geographically located. *Wisconsin Potowatomies of Hannabille Indian Community v. Houston*, D.C.Mich. 1973, 393 F.Supp. 719.

Grant of citizenship to Indians did not change their tribal relations or in any manner modify their amenability to the authority of tribes and tribal courts. *Trom Crow v. Ogallala Sioux Tribe of Pine Ridge Reservation*, S.D., D.C.S.D. 1955, 129 F.Supp. 15, affirmed 231 F.2d 89.

Indians born of a tribe that no longer keeps up its tribal integrity, and who are liable to taxation in the state of their residence, are, under this amendment and the Civil Rights Bill of April 9, 1866, citizens of the United States and of such state, and entitled to vote in federal elections. *U.S. v. Elm*, D.C.N.Y. 1877, 25 Fed.Cas. No. 15,048.

542

CITIZENS OF UNITED STATES

Amend. 14, § 1  
Note 17

Indians not only have rights as citizens of state and of United States but also have additional rights, privileges and immunities vouchsafed them by contracts with United States and implementing federal legislation. *Makah Indian Tribe v. Clallam County*, 1968, 440 P.2d 442, 73 Wash.2d 677.

11. — Women

Women, if born of citizen parents within the jurisdiction of the United States, have always been considered citizens of the United States, as much so before the adoption of this amendment as since. *Minor v. Happersett*, Mo. 1875, 88 U.S. 165, 21 Wall. 165, 22 L.Ed. 627.

12. Source of citizenship—Generally

This section contemplates two sources of citizenship, and two only: birth and naturalization. *Elk v. Wilkins*, Neb. 1884, 5 S.Ct. 41, 112 U.S. 101, 28 L.Ed. 643. See, also, 1927, 35 Op.Atty.Gen. 351.

United States nationality depends primarily upon the place of birth and may also be acquired by naturalization and lost by expatriation. *Cabebe v. Acheson*, C.A.Hawaii 1950, 183 F.2d 795.

13. — Births

This clause overturns the *Dred Scott* decision by making all persons born within the United States, and subject to its jurisdiction, citizens of the United States. *Slughel-House Cases*, Ia. 1873, 83 U.S. 73, 16 Wall. 73, 21 L.Ed. 394.

Heirs of deceased aliens are not necessarily aliens, but if born in United States and subject to jurisdiction thereof are citizens of United States and of state in which they reside. *Butler v. Perin*, C.A. Tex. 1949, 171 F.2d 761, certiorari denied 69 S.Ct. 1164, 337 U.S. 926, 93 L.Ed. 1734, rehearing denied 69 S.Ct. 1522, 337 U.S. 962, 93 L.Ed. 1760.

Under this clause every person born within the United States, except in the case of children of ambassadors, etc., whether born of parents who are themselves citizens of the United States or of foreign parents, is a citizen of the United States. *Perkins v. Elg*, 1938, 99 F.2d 408, 69 App.D.C. 175, modified on other grounds 59 S.Ct. 884, 307 U.S. 325, 83 L.Ed. 1320.

Congress is without authority to restrict effect of birth in United States as making one citizen. *Ex parte Hing*, D.C.

543

Wash. 1927, 22 F.2d 554. See, also, *Terrada v. Dulles*, D.C.Hawaii 1954, 121 F.Supp. 6.

A person who is born in United States, regardless of citizenship of parents, becomes an American citizen, not by gift of Congress, but by force of this clause. *In re Gogal*, D.C.Pa. 1947, 75 F.Supp. 268.

14. — Conception

This amendment limits citizenship to persons born in the United States and does not extend citizenship to a person merely because he was conceived in the United States. *Montana v. Rogers*, C.A. Ill. 1960, 278 F.2d 68, affirmed 81 S.Ct. 1336, 366 U.S. 308, 6 L.Ed.2d 313.

15. — Naturalization

This amendment contemplates two sources of citizenship, and two only: birth and naturalization; citizenship by naturalization can only be acquired by naturalization under the authority and in the forms of law; citizenship by birth is established by the mere fact of birth under the circumstances defined in the Constitution; every person born in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, becomes at once a citizen of the United States, and needs no naturalization. *U.S. v. Wong Kim Ark*, Cal. 1898, 18 S.Ct. 456, 169 U.S. 702, 42 L.Ed. 890.

16. — Shipboard births

Child born of Chinese parents on American merchant vessel on high seas is not citizen. *Lam Mow v. Nagle*, C.C.A. Cal. 1928, 24 F.2d 316. See, also, *In re Lam Mow*, D.C.Cal. 1927, 19 F.2d 951.

Persons born on a public vessel of a foreign country, while within the waters of the United States, and consequently within their territorial jurisdiction, are also excepted; they are considered as born in the country to which the vessel belongs; in the sense of public law, they are not born within the jurisdiction of the United States. *In re Look Tin Sing*, C.C.Cal. 1884, 21 F. 905.

17. Rights of citizenship—Generally

Rights of citizenship of native-born and naturalized person are of same dignity and are coextensive. *Schneider v. Rusk*, Dist.Col. 1964, 84 S.Ct. 1187, 377 U.S. 163, 12 L.Ed.2d 218.

Although citizenship bestows upon the individual certain important political rights, the basic constitutional rights are



tion, shall not be questioned. But neither the United States nor any State shall assume or pay any debt or obligation incurred in aid of insurrection or rebellion against the United States, or any claim for the loss or emancipation of any slave; but all such debts, obligations and claims shall be held illegal and void.

**Section 5.** The Congress shall have power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article.

### HISTORICAL NOTES

#### Proposal and Ratification

This amendment was proposed to the legislatures of the several States by the Thirty-ninth Congress, on June 13, 1866. On July 21, 1868, Congress adopted and transmitted to the Department of State a concurrent resolution, declaring that "the legislatures of the States of Connecticut, Tennessee, New Jersey, Oregon, Vermont, New York, Ohio, Illinois, West Virginia, Kansas, Maine, Nevada, Missouri, Indiana, Minnesota, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Nebraska, Iowa, Arkansas, Florida, North Carolina, Alabama, South Carolina, and Louisiana, being three-fourths and more of the several States of the Union, have ratified the fourteenth article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States, duly proposed by two-thirds of each House of the Thirty-ninth Congress. Therefore, Resolved, That said fourteenth article is hereby declared to be a part of the Constitution of the United States, and it shall be duly promulgated as such by the Secretary of State." The Secretary of State accordingly issued a proclamation, dated July 28, 1868, declaring that the proposed fourteenth amendment had been ratified by the legislatures of thirty of the thirty-six States. The amendment was ratified by the State Legislatures on the following dates: Connecticut, June 25, 1866; New Hampshire, July 6, 1866; Tennessee, July 19, 1866; New Jersey, Sept. 11, 1866; Oregon, Sept. 19, 1866; Vermont, Oct. 30, 1866; Ohio, Jan. 4, 1867; New York, Jan. 10, 1867; Kansas, Jan. 11, 1867; Illinois, Jan. 15, 1867; West Virginia,

Jan. 16, 1867; Michigan, Jan. 16, 1867; Minnesota, Jan. 16, 1867; Maine, Jan. 19, 1867; Nevada, Jan. 22, 1867; Indiana, Jan. 23, 1867; Missouri, Jan. 25, 1867; Rhode Island, Feb. 7, 1867; Wisconsin, Feb. 7, 1867; Pennsylvania, Feb. 12, 1867; Massachusetts, Mar. 20, 1867; Nebraska, June 15, 1867; Iowa, Mar. 16, 1868; Arkansas, Apr. 6, 1868; Florida, June 9, 1868; North Carolina, July 4, 1868; Louisiana, July 9, 1868; South Carolina, July 9, 1868; Alabama, July 13, 1868; Georgia, July 21, 1868. Subsequent to the proclamation the following States ratified this amendment: Virginia, Oct. 8, 1869; Mississippi, Jan. 17, 1870; Texas, Feb. 18, 1870; Delaware, Feb. 12, 1901; Maryland, Apr. 4, 1939; California, May 6, 1939; and Kentucky, Mar. 18, 1976.

The Fourteenth Amendment originally was rejected by Delaware, Georgia, Louisiana, North Carolina, South Carolina, Texas and Virginia. However, the State Legislatures of the aforesaid States subsequently ratified the amendment on the dates set forth in the preceding paragraph. Kentucky and Maryland rejected this amendment on Jan. 10, 1867 and Mar. 23, 1867, respectively.

The States of New Jersey, Ohio and Oregon "withdrew" their consent to the ratification of this amendment on Mar. 24, 1868, Jan. 15, 1868, and Oct. 15, 1868, respectively.

The State of New Jersey expressed support for this amendment on Nov. 12, 1980.

### WESTLAW ELECTRONIC RESEARCH

WESTLAW supplements U.S.C.A. electronically and is useful for additional research. Enter a citation in INSTA-CITE for display of parallel citations and case history. Enter a constitution, statute or rule citation in a case law database for cases of interest.

Example query for INSTA-CITE: 790 F.2d 978

Example query for United States Constitution: (first + 6 amendment) + s religion

Example query for statute: "42 U.S.C." + 4 1983

Also, see the WESTLAW guide following the Explanation pages of this volume.

### Section 1. Citizens of United States

All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. \* \* \*

### LIBRARY REFERENCES

#### American Digest System

Citizens of the United States and of the several states, see Citizens §11.

#### Encyclopedias

Double citizenship in United States and state, see C.J.S. Citizens § 2.

#### Texts and Treatises

Congressional powers in foreign affairs: war, immigration, and citizenship, see Tribe, American Constitutional Law § 5-16.

Immigration and the acquisition of citizenship, see Rotunda, Nowak & Young, Treatise on Constitutional Law: Substance and Procedure § 22.3.

What individuals are protected by Constitutional guarantees?, see Rotunda, Nowak & Young, Treatise on Constitutional Law: Substance and Procedure § 14.5.

### WESTLAW ELECTRONIC RESEARCH

See WESTLAW guide following the Explanation pages of this volume.

### NOTES OF DECISIONS

Generally	3	Indians, persons or entities considered	
Births, source of citizenship	13	citizens	10
Blacks, persons or entities considered		Naturalization, source of citizenship	
citizens	7		15
Chinese, persons or entities considered		Persons or entities considered citizens	
citizens	8	Generally	6
Citizenship and residency distin-		Blacks	7
guished	25	Chinese	8
Conception, source of citizenship	14	Corporations	9
Construction with other Constitutional		Indians	10
provisions	1	Women	11
Corporations, persons or entities con-		Proof of citizenship	28
sidered citizens	9	Purpose	2
Dual nationality	21	Relinquishment of citizenship	20
Duties of citizenship	19	Repatriation	22
Expatriation	20	Residency and citizenship distin-	
Federal and state citizenship distin-		guished	25
guished	24		

(No legal Wisconsin residency per court adjudication, As of 30 June 1988)



# Amend. 14, § 1

## CONSTITUTION

### CITIZENS OF UNITED STATES

#### Amend. 14, § 1

Note 8

Rights of citizenship	Generally 17
Suffrage 18	
Self-enforcing nature of section 4	16
Shipboard births, source of citizenship	16
Source of citizenship	Generally 12
Births 13	
Conception 14	
Naturalization 15	
Shipboard births 16	
State and federal citizenship distinguished 24	
States within amendment 23	
Subject to jurisdiction 5	
Suffrage, rights of citizenship 18	
Temporary state residence 26	
Transfer of state citizenship 27	
Women, persons or entities considered citizens 11	

Sandford, Mo. 1857, 86 U.S. 393, 19 How. 393, 15 L.Ed. 691; Buckley v. McDonald, 1906, 84 P. 1114, 33 Mont. 483.

The main object of this clause was to settle the question, upon which there had been a difference of opinion throughout the country and in the courts, as to the citizenship of free negroes, and to put it beyond doubt that all persons, white or black, and whether formerly slaves or not, born or naturalized in the United States, and owing no allegiance to any alien power, should be citizens of the United States and of the state in which they reside. Elk v. Wilkins, Neb. 1884, 5 S.Ct. 41, 112 U.S. 101, 28 L.Ed. 643. See also, Slaughter-House Cases, La. 1873, 83 U.S. 73, 16 Wall. 73, 21 L.Ed. 394; Spencer v. Looney, 1914, 82 S.E. 745, 116 Va. 767; Van Valkenburg v. Brown, 1872, 43 Cal. 47.

1. Construction with other Constitutional provisions

The word "citizens" as used in privileges and immunities clause of Art. 4, § 2, cl. 1, must be given the same meaning as that given to "citizens" in this clause. Anderson v. Scholes, 1949, 83 F.Supp. 681, 12 Alaska 295.

#### 2. Purpose

This amendment was designed to, and does, protect every citizen against congressional forcible destruction of his citizenship, whatever his creed, color, or race. Afroyim v. Rusk, N.Y. 1967, 87 S.Ct. 1660, 387 U.S. 253, 18 L.Ed.2d 757.

As appears upon the face of this amendment, as well as from the history of the times, it was not intended to impose any new restrictions upon citizenship, or to prevent any persons from becoming citizens by the fact of birth within the United States, who would thereby have become citizens according to the law existing before its adoption.

"Its main purpose doubtless was, as has often been recognized by this court, to establish the citizenship of free negroes, which had been denied in the opinion delivered by Chief Justice Taney in the Dred Scott case, and to put it beyond doubt that all blacks, as well as whites, born or naturalized within the jurisdiction of the United States, are citizens of the United States." U.S. v. Wong Kim Ark, Cal. 1898, 18 S.Ct. 456, 169 U.S. 676, 42 L.Ed. 890. See, also, Dred Scott v.

The primary object of this amendment was to relieve the Negro race from the disabilities therein declared to be inherent in and inseparable from the African blood. Marshall v. Donovan, 1874, 10 Bush, Ky. 687.

#### 3. Generally

Citizenship in this Nation is a part of a cooperative affair; its citizenship is the country and the country is its citizenry. Afroyim v. Rusk, N.Y. 1967, 87 S.Ct. 1660, 387 U.S. 253, 18 L.Ed.2d 757.

American citizenship is a precious right expressly guaranteed by this amendment. Kennedy v. Mendoza-Martinez, Cal. & D.C. 1963, 83 S.Ct. 554, 372 U.S. 144, 9 L.Ed.2d 644.

The Constitution nowhere defines the meaning of the word "citizen," either by way of inclusion or exclusion, except in so far as this is done in this amendment by the affirmative declaration that "all persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United

540

States." U.S. v. Wong Kim Ark, Cal. 1898, 18 S.Ct. 456, 169 U.S. 654, 42 L.Ed. 890.

"Citizens", within this amendment, mean those who are entitled, upon terms prescribed by institutions of the state, to all the rights and privileges, conferred by those institutions upon the highest class of society, and, to be a "citizen", it is necessary that one should be entitled to enjoyment of those privileges and immunities upon same terms upon which they are conferred upon other citizens. Austin v. U.S., D.C. Ill. 1941, 40 F.Supp. 777.

#### 4. Self-enforcing nature of section

The instantaneous effect of this clause was to make all the persons described in the first section citizens alike of the United States and of the states wherein they lived; it required no legislation by Congress to perfect this right; the amendment itself, of its own force, achieved the object. U.S. v. Laakey, D.C. Ky. 1900, 99 F. 952.

#### 5. Subject to jurisdiction

The real object of this amendment in qualifying the words "All persons born in the United States," by the addition, "and subject to the jurisdiction thereof," would appear to have been to exclude, by the fewest and fittest words, besides children of members of the Indian tribes, standing in a peculiar relation to the national government, unknown to the common law, the two classes of cases—children born of alien enemies in hostile occupation, and children of diplomatic representatives of a foreign state—both of which as has already been shown, by the law of England, and by our own law, from the time of the first settlement of the English colonies in America, had been recognized exceptions to the fundamental rule of citizenship by birth within the country. U.S. v. Wong Kim Ark, Cal. 1898, 18 S.Ct. 456, 169 U.S. 682, 42 L.Ed. 890.

The phrase "subject to its jurisdiction" was intended to exclude from its operation children of ministers, consuls, and citizens or subjects of foreign states born within the United States. Slaughter-House Cases, La. 1873, 83 U.S. 73, 16 Wall. 73, 21 L.Ed. 394. See also, Hough v. Societe Electrique Westinghouse de Russie, D.C. N.Y. 1916, 231 F. 341.

541

They alone are subject to the jurisdiction of the United States who are within their dominions and under the protection of their laws and with the consequent obligation to obey them when obedience can be rendered; and only those thus subject by their birth or naturalization are within the terms of this amendment. In re Look Tin Sing, C.C. Cal. 1884, 21 F. 905.

Aliens, among whom are persons born here and naturalized abroad, dwelling or being in this country, are subject to the jurisdiction of the United States only to a limited extent. Expatriation—Foreign Domicile—Citizenship, 1873, 14 Op. Att'y Gen. 300.

#### 6. Persons or entities considered citizens—Generally

Under this amendment only those born or naturalized in the United States and subject to jurisdiction thereof are citizens. Ly Shaw v. Aheson, D.C. Cal. 1953, 110 F.Supp. 50.

#### 7. Blacks

The Constitution of United States was applicable to defendant despite claim that, because he was black, his ancestors had citizenship forced upon them by this amendment. Williams v. State, 1974, 312 N.E.2d 526, 160 Ind.App. 549.

#### 8. Chinese

A child born in the United States of parents of Chinese descent, who at the time of his birth are subjects of the emperor of China, but have a domicile and residence in the United States, and are there carrying on business, and are not employed in any diplomatic or official capacity under the emperor of China, becomes at the time of his birth a citizen of the United States. U.S. v. Wong Kim Ark, Cal. 1898, 18 S.Ct. 456, 169 U.S. 653, 42 L.Ed. 890. See, also, U.S. v. Chin Hing, D.C. Me. 1915, 225 F. 794; U.S. v. Lee Huen, D.C. N.Y. 1902, 118 F. 442; In re Wy Shing, C.C. Cal. 1888, 36 F. 553; In re Look Tin Sing, C.C. Cal. 1884, 21 F. 905.

A person born in the United States of Chinese parents is, by the rule of the common law, and by force of this amendment, a citizen of the United States, and in restraint of his or her liberty or locomotion therein, may be delivered therefrom by habeas corpus by the proper national court. In re Yung

See U.S. Census Act as to where "You sleep," like Austria  
See five (5) year residence lease.



# Amend. 14, § 1

Note 17

possessed by citizens and resident non-citizens alike. Iron Crow v. Ogallala Sioux Tribe of Pine Ridge Reservation S.D., D.C.S.D.1955, 129 F.Supp. 15, affirmed 231 F.2d 89.

## 18. — Suffrage

A person does not have to be a voter to be a citizen of the United States or of the state. *Crosby v. Board of Suprs of Elections of Baltimore City*, 1966, 221 A.2d 431, 243 Md. 555.

Women are not given the right to vote by provision of this clause that all persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens thereof. *Gougar v. Timberlake*, 1897, 46 N.E. 339, 148 Ind. 38, 62 Am.St.Rep. 487, 37 L.R.A. 644.

In Alabama it has been held, construing Const. Ala.1901, § 177 and Code Ala. 1907, § 290, 291, 312 together, that foreigners who have merely filed a declaration of intention to become citizens of the United States, have not, since the ratification of the constitution of 1901, perfected their naturalization so as to be entitled to register and vote, and are not citizens of this state within this amendment, so as to entitle them to register and vote. *Gardina v. Board of Registrars*, 1909, 48 So. 788, 160 Ala. 155.

To make a person a citizen is not to make him or her a voter; all that has been accomplished by this amendment was to advance such persons to full citizenship, and clothe them with the capacity to become voters. *Spencer v. Board of Registration*, 1873, 1 MacArthur, D.C., 169.

## 19. Duties of citizenship

While this amendment confirms citizenship rights and is silent about permissibility of involuntary forfeiture thereof, there are imperative obligations of citizenship, performance of which Congress in exercise of its powers may constitutionally exact, and one of the most important of those obligations is to serve the country in time of war and national emergency. *Kennedy v. Mendoza-Martinez*, Cal. & D.C.1963, 83 S.Ct. 554, 372 U.S. 144, 9 L.Ed.2d 644.

Since this clause makes one a citizen of state wherein he resides, fact of residence creates universally recognized reciprocal duties of protection by state and of allegiance and support by citizen,

544

# CONSTITUTION

But not a corporate entity which support includes a duty to pay taxes. *Miller Bros. Co. v. State of Md.*, Md.1954, 74 S.Ct. 355, 347 U.S. 340, 98 L.Ed. 744, rehearing denied 74 S.Ct. 708, 347 U.S. 964, 98 L.Ed. 1106.

## 20. Relinquishment of citizenship

Requirement of 8 U.S.C.A. § 1481 that government prove expatriation only by a preponderance of the evidence does not violate this clause or the due process clause of Amend. 5. *Vance v. Terrazas*, 1980, 100 S.Ct. 340, 444 U.S. 252, 62 L.Ed.2d 461, rehearing denied 100 S.Ct. 1285, 445 U.S. 920, 63 L.Ed.2d 606, on remand 494 F.Supp. 1017.

Citizen has right under this amendment to remain a citizen in a free country unless he voluntarily relinquishes that citizenship. *Afroyim v. Rusk*, N.Y. 1967, 87 S.Ct. 1660, 387 U.S. 253, 18 L.Ed.2d 757. See, also, *Baker v. Rusk*, D.C.Cal.1969, 296 F.Supp. 1244.

There is nothing in the terms, the context, the history or the manifest purpose of this clause to warrant drawing from it a restriction upon the power otherwise possessed by Congress to withdraw citizenship. *Perez v. Brownell*, Cal.1958, 78 S.Ct. 568, 356 U.S. 44, 2 L.Ed.2d 603. *Act Cal. Mar. 2, 1907, c. 2534, § 3960, 34 Stat. 1228* which provided "that any American woman who marries a foreigner shall take the nationality of her husband" was valid even as to a woman who, after marriage with a foreigner, remains a resident of this country. *MacKenzie v. Hare*, Cal.1915, 36 S.Ct. 106, 239 U.S. 299, 60 L.Ed. 297, Ann.Cas. 1916E, 645.

In proceeding to establish expatriation of a native-born citizen, government must establish its case by clear, unequivocal, and convincing evidence. *Acheson v. Maenza*, 1953, 202 F.2d 453, 92 U.S.App.D.C. 85.

Congress may provide that marriage to an alien shall effect expatriation, as was provided by 8 U.S.C.A. former § 9, *Ex parte Hing*, D.C.Wash.1927, 22 F.2d 554.

This amendment does not prevent citizenship acquired by birth or naturalization from being lost by expatriation. *Reynolds v. Haskins*, C.C.A.Kan.1925, 8 F.2d 473.

This clause was designed to except from citizenship persons who, though born or naturalized in the United States,

# CITIZENS OF UNITED STATES

have renounced their allegiance to our government, and thus dissolved their political connection with the country; the United States recognizes the right of every one to expatriate himself and choose another country. In *re Look Tin Sing*, C.C.Cal.1884, 21 F. 905. See, also, *MacKenzie v. Hare*, 1913, 134 P. 713, 165 Cal. 776, Ann.Cas.1915B, 261, L.R.A.1916D, 127, affirmed 36 S.Ct. 106, 239 U.S. 299, 60 L.Ed. 297.

The right of American citizenship conferred by this clause should not be extinguished except pursuant to clear statutory mandate. *Takano v. Dulles*, D.C.Hawaii 1953, 116 F.Supp. 307.

## 21. Dual nationality

Under international law and municipal law of the United States and of Italy, one who was born in the United States of alien Italian parents possessed a dual nationality as United States citizen by virtue of nativity and as subject of King of Italy because of his Italian parentage. *Acheson v. Maenza*, 1953, 202 F.2d 453, 92 U.S.App.D.C. 85.

## 22. Reputation

This amendment does not restore citizenship lost by expatriation when the person resumes his residence in this country. *Reynolds v. Haskins*, C.C.A.Kan.1925, 8 F.2d 473.

## 23. States within amendment

District of Columbia is not a "State" within meaning of this amendment, and neither the District nor its officers are subject to its restrictions. *District of Columbia v. Carter*, Dist.Col.1973, 93 S.Ct. 602, 409 U.S. 418, 34 L.Ed.2d 613, rehearing denied 93 S.Ct. 1411, 410 U.S. 959, 35 L.Ed.2d 694.

## 24. Federal and state citizenship distinguished

Not only may a man be a citizen of the United States without being a citizen of a state, but an important element is necessary to convert the former into the latter. We must reside within the state to make him a citizen of it, but it is only necessary that he should be born or naturalized in the United States to be a citizen of the Union; it is quite clear then, that there is a citizenship of the United States, and a citizenship of a state, which are distinct from each other, and which depend upon different characteristics or circumstances in the individual.

545

# Amend. 14, § 1

Note 24

vidual. *Slaughter-House Cases*, 1873, 83 U.S. 73, 16 Wall. 73, 21 L.Ed. 394.

A citizen of the United States is, under this amendment, prima facie a citizen of the state wherein he resides, and cannot arbitrarily be excluded therefrom by such state, but he does not become a citizen of the state against his will, and contrary to his purpose and intention to retain an already acquired citizenship elsewhere. *Sharon v. Hill*, C.C.Cal.1885, 26 F. 337.

In order to be citizen of state, one must first be citizen of United States. *Factor v. Pennington Press, Inc.*, D.C.Ill. 1963, 230 F.Supp. 906.

The same person may be at same time a citizen of United States and citizen of a state. *U.S. v. Krause*, D.C.La.1950, 92 F.Supp. 756.

An individual citizen of a state is also a "citizen of the United States", and as such has right without interference on part of any state to transact business anywhere in United States. *Western Mut. Fire Ins. Co. v. Lanson Bros. & Co.*, D.C.Iowa 1941, 42 F.Supp. 1007.

Every person born in the United States or naturalized is declared to be a citizen of the United States and of the state wherein he resides. *U.S. v. Anthony*, C.C.N.Y.1873, 11 Blachf., U.S., 200, 24 Fed.Cas. No. 14459.

Citizenship in the United States is made independent of citizenship in a state, and citizenship in a state is a result of citizenship in the United States; so that a person born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to its jurisdiction, is without reference to state constitutions or laws, entitled to all the privileges and immunities secured by the Constitution of the United States to citizens thereof. *U.S. v. Hall*, C.C.Ala.1871, 3 Chicago Leg.N. 260, 26 Fed.Cas. No. 15,282.

Requirements for citizenship of a state depend upon context in which "citizen" is used in statute or Constitution where United States citizenship has no reasonable relationship to the subject matter and purpose of the legislation in question. *Crosby v. Board of Suprs of Elections of Baltimore City*, 1966, 221 A.2d 431, 243 Md. 555.

Alien head of family residing on homestead within state was not entitled to tax exemption provided by Const. Fla.

No Was cons. in Residency



# Amend. 14, § 1 Note 24

Art. 10, § 7, as amended in 1934 for homestead as person who is "citizen of and resides in the State of Florida," such phrase being limited to those who, under this amendment, would be entitled to claim citizenship in state, in addition to residing therein. *Stewart v. State ex rel. Dolcinascio*, 1935, 161 So. 378, 119 Fla. 117.

## 25. Residency and citizenship distinguished

Residence and citizenship are wholly different things within the meaning of the Constitution and the laws defining and regulating the jurisdiction of the Circuit Court of the United States. *Steigler v. McQueen*, Wash. 1905, 25 S.Ct. 616, 198 U.S. 143, 49 L.Ed. 986.

## 26. Temporary state residence

Although this clause declares that citizens of the United States are citizens of the states in which they reside, there may be a temporary residence in one state, with intent to return to another, which will not create citizenship in the former. *Bradwell v. Illinois*, 111, 1873, 83 U.S. 130, 16 Wall. 130, 21 L.Ed. 442. See also, *State v. Stevens*, N.H. 1916, 99 A. 723, 78 N.H. 268, L.R.A. 1917C, 528. One may reside temporarily in a state with the fixed intent of retaining an es-

# CONSTITUTION PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES

established domicile in another state and returning to that state without thereby acquiring citizenship in state of temporary residence despite language of this clause. *Valentine v. Powers*, D.C.Neb. 1948, 85 F.Supp. 732.

## 27. Transfer of state citizenship

A citizen of Texas was at liberty to transfer her citizenship to Arkansas instantly, without necessity and, simply from choice, on moving from Texas to Arkansas, and had right to select her domicile for any reason that seemed sufficient to her. *Paudler v. Paudler*, C.A. Tex. 1951, 185 F.2d 901, certiorari denied 71 S.Ct. 742, 341 U.S. 920, 95 L.Ed. 1354.

## 28. Proof of citizenship

There is nothing in this clause which requires and justifies a rule that the bare averment of the residence of the parties is sufficient, prima facie, to show jurisdiction when the jurisdiction turns upon the citizenship of the parties. *Robertson v. Cease*, Tex. 1878, 97 U.S. 650, 7 Otto 650, 24 L.Ed. 1057.

It is within the power of a state legislature to require a different degree of proof of citizenship from naturalized and natural-born citizens. *State v. Superior Ct.*, 1920, 193 P. 226, 113 Wash. 54.

## Section 1. Privileges and Immunities

\* \* \* No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; \* \* \*

### CROSS REFERENCES

Entitlement of citizens of each state to privileges and immunities of citizens in other states, see section 2, clause 1, of Art. 4.

### LIBRARY REFERENCES

**Administrative Law**  
Landlords, see *West's Federal Practice Manual* § 14145.  
**American Digest System**  
Class legislation, see *Constitutional Law* § 208(1).  
**Encyclopedias**  
Class legislation as abridgment of privileges and immunities, see C.J.S. *Constitutional Law* § 682.  
Denials of privileges or immunities protected against, see C.J.S. *Constitutional Law* 667 to 681.  
Guaranty against denial of privileges and immunities, see C.J.S. *Constitutional Law* § 651.  
**Law Reviews**  
Rights, privileges, and immunities of the American people: A disjunctive theory of selective incorporation of the Bill of Rights. *Arnold T. Guminski*, 7 *Whittier L.Rev.* 765 (1985).

546

## PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES

## Amend. 14, § 1

State constitutions and the protection of individual rights. *William J. Brennan*, 90 *Harvard L.Rev.* 489 (1977).

The new liberty under the fourteenth amendment. *Charles Warren*, 39 *Harvard L.Rev.* 431 (1926).

The puzzle of prior restraint. *Stephen R. Barnett*, 29 *Stan.L.Rev.* 539 (1977).

**Texts and Treatises**  
Corporation as citizen, see *Wright & Miller*, *Federal Practice and Procedure*: Civil § 1066.

Direct protection of individuals and groups: beyond the separation and division of power, see *Tribe*, *American Constitutional Law* § 7-1 et seq.  
Privileges and/or Immunities Clause, see *Rotunda*, *Nowak & Young*, *Treatise on Constitutional Law: Substance and Procedure* § 14.3.  
State taxation and this clause, see *Rotunda*, *Nowak & Young*, *Treatise on Constitutional Law: Substance and Procedure* § 13.8.

### WESTLAW ELECTRONIC RESEARCH

See WESTLAW guide following the Explanation pages of this volume.

### NOTES OF DECISIONS

Access to courts, rights protected	24	Business and trade—Cont'd	
Adoption	62	Peddling and solicitation	80
Advertising	70	Sunday blue laws	68
Agriculture	96	Theaters	81
Alcoholic beverages	63	Candidates, voting and elections	139
Aliens, citizens or entities protected	6	Choice of law, civil procedure	36
Animals		Citizens or entities protected	
Generally	64	Generally	4
Grazing of sheep	65	Aliens	6
Appeal or review	50	Banks	7
Civil procedure	58	Corporations	8
Criminal procedure	58	District of Columbia residents	9
Architects and landscapers	111	Indians	10
Assembly, press, religion and speech, rights protected	25	Municipalities	19
Assistance of counsel, criminal procedure	53	Natural persons	5
Attachment, civil procedure	40	Nonresidents	11
Auctions	71	Orientals	12
Ball, criminal procedure	54	Prisoners	13
Ball bonds, business and trade	72	Puerto Ricans	14
Banks and banking		States	18
Generally	66	Unincorporated associations	15
Citizens or entities protected	7	Unions	16
Barbershops	73	United States	17
Burden of proof, civil procedure	45	Civil procedure	
Business and trade		Generally	35
Advertising	67	Appeal or review	50
Auctions	71	Attachment	40
Ball bonds	72	Burden of proof	45
Barbershops	73	Choice of law	36
Employment agencies	74	Contribution	48
Fortune tellers	75	Defenses	41
Gambling	76	Evidentiary privileges	46
Labels	69	Jurisdiction	37
Laundries, cleaners, and dyers	77	Limitations period	42
Lenders	78	Presumptions	44
Pawnshops	79	Service of process	39
		Stipulations	43
		Venue	38

547



# Amend. 14, § 1

## CONSTITUTION

Civil procedure—Cont'd	
Verdict, judgment, or execution	49
Witnesses	47
Clubs and fraternal organizations	82
Collection of taxes	124
Commitment of mentally ill or retarded persons	61
Confrontation with witnesses, rights protected	26
Construction with Constitutional provisions	1
Contribution, civil procedure	48
Corporations	
Generally	83
Citizens or entities protected	8
Credits, taxation	123
Crimes	
Generally	84
Larceny	85
Prostitution	86
Criminal procedure	
Generally	51
Appeal or review	58
Assistance of counsel	53
Bail	54
Indictment or information	55
Jury	56
Police misconduct	52
Sentence and punishment	57
Cruel or unusual punishment, rights protected	27
Custody or support	87
Defenses, civil procedure	41
Dentists	112
Deportation	99
District of Columbia residents, citizens or entities protected	9
Divorce	88
Double jeopardy, rights protected	28
Driver's licenses	134
Drugs	89
Due process, rights protected	29
Education, schools, and students	90
Employment domain	91
Employment	92
Employment agencies, business and trade	74
Environmental protection	93
Equality of treatment	3
Estates	
Generally	147
Taxes	127
Evidentiary privileges, civil procedure	46
Federal or state elections	138
Firearms	94
Fishing	98
Flags	95
Food and agriculture	96
Forced labor	102
Fortune tellers	75
Fraternal organizations	82
Fuel taxes	128
Gambling	76
Grazing of sheep	65
Highways, roads, or streets	97
Hours of labor	103
Housing	105
Hunting and fishing	98
Identification of voters	145
Immigration	99
Income taxes	129
Indians, citizens or entities protected	10
Indictment or information, criminal procedure	55
Insurance	100
Jurisdiction, civil procedure	37
Jury, criminal procedure	56
Jury trial, rights protected	30
Juvenile proceedings	60
Labels, business and trade	69
Labor relations	
Generally	101
Forced labor	102
Hours of labor	103
Wages	104
Landlords, tenants, or housing	105
Larceny	85
Laundries, cleaners, and dyers	77
Legal profession	113
Lenders	78
License or occupation taxes	130
Limitations period, civil procedure	42
Literacy requirements for voters	142
Manner of tax assessment	122
Marriage	106
Medical profession	114
Method of voting	146
Mining	107
Miscellaneous subjects of regulation	150
Motor vehicles	134
Municipal corporations, citizens or entities protected	19
National or state citizenship rights, rights protected	23
Natural persons, citizens or entities protected	5
Natural resources	107
Nonresidents, citizens or entities protected	11
Oriental, citizens or entities protected	12
Patents	108
Pawnshops	79
Peddling and solicitation	80
Persons entitled to vote	141
Pharmacists	115

## PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES

# Amend. 14, § 1

Note 1

Photographers	116
Police misconduct, criminal procedure	52
Political subdivisions	109
Poll taxes	144
Presumptions, civil procedure	44
Primates	140
Prisons and prisoners	
Generally	59
Citizens or entities protected	13
Professions	
Generally	110
Architects and landscapers	111
Dentists	112
Legal profession	113
Medical profession	114
Pharmacists	115
Photographers	116
Prostitution	86
Public welfare	119
Puerto Ricans, citizens or entities protected	14
Purpose	2
Railroads and railways	117
Real property	118
Refunds, taxation	126
Remission of tax debts	125
Residency requirements for voters	143
Retrospective effect of legislation	21
Rights protected	
Generally	22
Access to courts	24
Assembly, press, religion, and speech	25
Confrontation with witnesses	26
Cruel or unusual punishment	27
Double jeopardy	28
Due process	29
Jury trial	30
Miscellaneous rights protected	34
National or state citizenship rights	23
Search and seizure	31
Self-incrimination	32
Travel	33
Roads or streets	97
Schools and students	90
Search and seizure, rights protected	31
Self-incrimination, rights protected	32
Sentence and punishment, criminal procedure	57
Service of process, civil procedure	39
State action	20
State aid or public welfare	119
States, entities protected	18
Stipulations, civil procedure	43
Streets	97
Students	90
Sunday blue laws	68
Support	87
Sureties	120
Taxation	
Generally	121
Collection of taxes	124
Credits	123
Estate taxes	127
Fuel taxes	128
Income taxes	129
License or occupation taxes	130
Manner of assessment	122
Miscellaneous taxes	132
Refunds	126
Remission of tax debts	125
Transfer taxes	131
Theaters	81
Transfer taxes	131
Transportation	
Generally	133
Motor vehicles	134
Travel, rights protected	33
Trusts and estates	147
Unemployment compensation	135
Unincorporated associations, citizens or entities protected	15
Unions, citizens or entities protected	16
United States, citizens or entities protected	17
Utilities	136
Venue, civil procedure	38
Verdict, judgment, or execution, civil procedure	49
Voting and elections	
Generally	137
Candidates	139
Federal or state elections	138
Identification of voters	145
Literacy requirements for voters	142
Method of voting	146
Persons entitled to vote	141
Poll taxes	144
Primates	140
Residency requirements for voters	143
Wages, labor relations	104
Wills, trusts, and estates	147
Witnesses, civil procedure	47
Worker's compensation	148
Zoning	149

1. Construction with Constitutional provisions

This amendment does not have the effect of extending the operation of Amendments 4 and 5 to the states; it does not add to the privileges and immunities of a



Amend. 14, § 1

Note 1

citizen but it simply furnishes an additional guaranty for the protection of such as was already had. *U.S. v. Cruikshank*, 1876, 92 U.S. 542, 23 L.Ed. 588. See, also, *Consolidated Rendering Co. v. Vermont*, 1907, 28 S.Ct. 178, 207 U.S. 541, 52 L.Ed. 327, 12 Ann.Cas. 658.

2. Purpose

Purposes of this amendment and of the civil rights statute, 42 U.S.C.A. § 1983, are to preserve and enforce, against state action, those rights, privileges and immunities secured by the Constitution and laws. *Golden v. Biscayne Bay Yacht Club*, C.A.Fla. 1976, 530 F.2d 16, certiorari denied 97 S.Ct. 186, 429 U.S. 872, 50 L.Ed.2d 152.

The adoption of this amendment implied that there are matters of fundamental justice that the citizens consider so essentially an ingredient of human rights as to require restraint on action on behalf of any state that appears to ignore them. *Orleans Parish School Bd. v. Bush*, C.A.La. 1957, 242 F.2d 156, certiorari denied 77 S.Ct. 1380, 354 U.S. 921, 1 L.Ed.2d 1436.

This amendment was designed to bar state from denying to some groups, on account of their race or color, any rights, privileges and opportunities accorded to other groups. *Constance v. Southwestern Louisiana Institute*, D.C. La. 1954, 120 F.Supp. 417.

Amend. 5 and this clause are designed to protect the individual from invasion of his rights, privileges, and immunities by the federal and state governments respectively. *Schutte v. International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Emp. & Moving Picture Operators of U.S. and Canada*, D.C.Cal. 1947, 70 F.Supp. 1008, affirmed 165 F.2d 216, certiorari denied 68 S.Ct. 1018, 334 U.S. 812, 92 L.Ed. 1743.

3. Equality of treatment

Reasonable inequalities are permitted under this clause. *Skahill v. Capital Airlines, Inc.*, D.C.N.Y. 1964, 234 F.Supp. 906.

Classification created by I.C.A. § 426.3 must provide for a basis which will effectually single into a separate class the persons or objects with which purpose of legislature is concerned and there must be a reasonable relationship between purpose of legislation and basis of classification in order for statute to be

EXPATRIATE, conditions 550

CONSTITUTION

valid. *Borden v. Seiden*, 1966, 146 N.W.2d 306, 259 Iowa 808.

Classification by city ordinance, to be valid, must embrace and uniformly affect all who are similarly situated, and distinctions which separate those who are included from those who are excluded must, on some reasonable view of facts, be genuine and substantial so as to provide reasonable basis for imposition of special legislative regulations as distinguished from merely capricious and arbitrary. *Construction, and General Laborers Union Local 563, A.F.L.-C.I.O. v. City of St. Paul*, 1965, 134 N.W.2d 26, 270 Minn. 427.

4. Citizens or entities protected—Generally

State cannot abridge privileges of a citizen of the United States, even though he is resident of state which undertakes to do so. *Colgate v. Harvey*, 1935, 56 S.Ct. 252, 296 U.S. 404, 80 L.Ed. 299.

In the Constitution and laws of the United States the word "citizen" is generally, if not always, used in a political sense, to designate one who has the rights and privileges of a citizen of a state or of the United States, and it is so used in this clause. *Baldwin v. Franks*, Cal. 1887, 7 S.Ct. 656, 120 U.S. 690, 30 L.Ed. 766.

It is only the privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States which are placed by this clause under the protection of the Constitution. *Slaughter-House Cases*, 1873, 83 U.S. 74, 16 Wall. 74, 21 L.Ed. 394. See, also, *Maxwell v. Bugbee*, 1919, 40 S.Ct. 2, 250 U.S. 525, 64 L.Ed. 1124; *Gully v. Baltimore, etc., R. Co.*, D.C.Md. 1876, 1 Hughes, U.S. 536, 6 Fed.Cas.No.3,466; *Landowners Consideration Ass'n v. Montana Power Co.*, D.C.Mont. 1969, 300 F.Supp. 54, appeal dismissed 439 F.2d 722; *U.S. v. Anthony*, C.C.N.Y. 1873, 11 Blatchf. U.S. 200, 24 Fed.Cas.No.14,459; *Live Stock Dealers, etc., Assoc. v. Crescent City Live Stock Landing, etc., Co.*, C.C.La. 1870, 1 Abb. U.S. 388, 15 Fed. Cas.No.8,408; *Hopkins v. Richmond*, 1915, 86 S.E. 139, 117 Va. 692, Ann.Cas. 1917D, 1114.

Property owners, electors, citizens and taxpayers were not subject to same limitations as municipalities and could challenge constitutionality of W.S.A. 76.28 apportioning utility tax receipts among

NEW REPUBLIC / USA FINANCIAL GROUP, LTD (AUSTRIA) DOES NOT PAY DIVIDENDS IN BE DO "US RESIDENTS" / EXPATRIATES, 551

PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES

municipalities. *City of Marshfield v. Towns of Cameron*, 1964, 127 N.W.2d 809, 24 Wis.2d 56.

This clause prohibits state from denying or abridging privileges or rights of citizens of United States. *State v. Johnston*, 1969, 456 P.2d 805, 51 Haw. 195, 259, appeal dismissed 90 S.Ct. 1152, 397 U.S. 336, 25 L.Ed.2d 352.

Privileges and immunities protected by this clause are only those that belong to citizens of United States as distinguished from citizens of state, and arise from Constitution and laws of United States as contrasted with those that spring from other sources. *Addison v. Addison*, 1965, 399 P.2d 897, 62 C.2d 558, 43 Cal.Rptr. 97.

5. — Natural persons

Natural persons and they alone, are entitled to privileges and immunities which this clause secures to citizens of the United States. *Hague v. Committee for Industrial Organization*, N.J. 1939, 59 S.Ct. 954, 307 U.S. 496, 83 L.Ed. 1423. See, also, *Mickey v. Kansas City, Mo., D.C.Mo.* 1942, 43 F.Supp. 739; *International Union of Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers v. Tennessee Copper Co.*, D.C. Tenn. 1940, 31 F.Supp. 1015.

6. — Aliens

Applicant for citizenship, who was incarcerated for civil contempt for failure to testify before a grand jury after a grant of immunity, had as much right to privileges and immunities under this clause as if he were "to the manor born" or had already been anointed with citizenship; the only exceptions were electoral franchise, standing for election and traveling abroad. *In re Reilly*, 1973, 344 N.Y.S.2d 531, 73 Misc.2d 1073.

7. — Banks

To the rule that a corporation is not a citizen within the meaning of this clause, there is no exception in favor of national banks. *Howey v. Hurd*, 1960, 47 A-404, 22 VT. 124, 82 Am.St.Rep. 922, 52 L.R.A. 195.

8. — Corporations

A corporation is not a citizen within the meaning of this clause, and hence has not "privileges and immunities" secured to "citizens" against state legislation. *Orient Ins. Co. v. Dages*, 1899, 19 S.Ct. 281, 172 U.S. 561, 43 L.Ed. 552. See, also, *Asbury Hospital v. Cass County*, 1917D, 1114.

Amend. 14, § 1

Note 8

*Iv. N.D.*, N.D. 1945, 66 S.Ct. 61, 326 U.S. 207, 90 L.Ed. 6; *Grosjean v. American Press Co.*, 1936, 56 S.Ct. 444, 297 U.S. 233, 80 L.Ed. 660; *Liberty Warehouse Co. v. Burley Tobacco Growers' Co-Op. Marketing Ass'n*, Ky. 1928, 48 S.Ct. 291, 276 U.S. 71, 72 L.Ed. 473; *Selover v. Walsh*, Minn. 1912, 33 S.Ct. 69, 226 U.S. 112, 57 L.Ed. 146; *Western Turf Assoc. v. Greenberg*, Cal. 1907, 27 S.Ct. 384, 204 U.S. 359, 51 L.Ed. 520; *Ward Baking Co. v. City of Ferdinand*, Fla., D.C.Fla. 1928, 29 F.2d 789; *Steel Hill Development, Inc. v. Town of Sanborn*, D.C.N.H. 1971, 335 F.Supp. 947; *Honolulu Lunber Co. v. American Factors, Limited*, D.C.Hawaii 1966, 265 F.Supp. 578; *Gorrun v. Oklahoma Liquefied Petroleum Gas Bd.*, D.C.Okla. 1964, 235 F.Supp. 406, appeal dismissed 85 S.Ct. 932, 380 U.S. 928, 13 L.Ed.2d 817; *D.D.B. Realty Corp. v. Merrill*, D.C.Vt. 1964, 232 F.Supp. 629.

Though corporation is not a "citizen" within meaning of this clause, it is a "person" within the meaning of the equal protection and due process clauses of this amendment. *Fulton Market Cold Storage Co. v. Cullerton*, C.A.Ill. 1978, 582 F.2d 1071, certiorari denied 99 S.Ct. 1033, 439 U.S. 1211, 59 L.Ed.2d 82. See, also, *Buda v. Saxbe*, D.C.Tenn. 1975, 406 F.Supp. 399; *Gentry v. Howard*, D.C.La. 1973, 365 F.Supp. 567; *First Nat. Bank of Boston v. Attorney General*, 1972, 290 N.E.2d 526, 362 Mass. 570.

A corporation could not maintain suit under 28 U.S.C.A. former § 41(14) [now covered by 28 U.S.C.A. § 1343] granting Federal district courts jurisdiction of suits authorized by law to be brought by any "person" to redress the deprivation of any right, privilege, or immunity secured by this amendment, nor could agents acting on corporations behalf maintain such action as agents, but such ruling would not debar agents the right to maintain the action in so far as their individual rights have been impinged upon. *Mickey v. Kansas City, D.C.Mo.* 1942, 43 F.Supp. 739. See, also, *Blass v. Weigel*, D.C.N.Y. 1949, 85 F.Supp. 775.

551

NEW REPUBLIC / USA FINANCIAL GROUP, LTD (AUSTRIA) DOES NOT PAY DIVIDENDS IN BE DO "US RESIDENTS" / EXPATRIATES, 551



# CONSTITUTION

## PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES

## Amend. 14, § 1

Note 20

**9. — District of Columbia residents**  
Federal protections afforded citizens of several states through this amendment, as it is construed today, have always been directly available to citizens of District of Columbia through operation of Bill of Rights. *Smith v. McDonald*, D.C.N.C.1983, 562 F.Supp. 829, affirmed 737 F.2d 427, affirmed 105 S.Ct. 2787, 472 U.S. 479, 86 L.Ed.2d 384.

This clause protects a citizen of District of Columbia against any state abridgement of his privileges and immunities as a citizen of the United States. *Feely v. Sidney S. Schnupper Interstate Hauling System*, D.C.Md.1947, 72 F.Supp. 663.

All of the guarantees of the Constitution respecting life, liberty, and property are equally for the benefit and protection of all citizens of the United States residing permanently or temporarily within the District of Columbia, as of those residing in the several states. *Lapin v. District of Columbia*, 1903, 22 App.D.C. 68. See, also, *Moses v. U.S.*, 16 App.D.C. 428; *Stoutenburgh v. Frazier*, 1900, 16 App.D.C. 229; *Curry v. District of Columbia*, 1899, 14 App.D.C. 423; *U.S. v. Ross*, 1885, 5 App.D.C. 241.

**10. — Indians**  
Indians not only have rights as citizens of state and of United States but also have additional rights, privileges and immunities vouchsafed them by contracts with United States and implementing federal legislation. *Makah Indian Tribe v. Clallam County*, 1968, 440 P.2d 442, 73 Wash.2d 677.

**11. — Nonresidents**  
Provision of this clause is not an absolute and it bars discrimination against citizens of other states where there is no substantial reason for discrimination beyond mere fact that they are citizens of other state but does not preclude disparity of treatment where there are valid, independent reasons for such treatment. *Borden v. Selden*, 1966, 146 N.W.2d 306, 259 Iowa 808.

In determining whether discrimination against nonresidents violates this clause, the inquiry is whether the degree of discrimination bears close relation to reasons which are apart from residence and which state Legislature may have had for enacting apparently discriminatory law. *Berry v. State Tax Commis-*

sion, 1964, 397 P.2d 780, 241 Or. 580, rehearing denied 399 P.2d 164, 241 Or. 580, certiorari dismissed 86 S.Ct. 57, 382 U.S. 16, 15 L.Ed.2d 12.

**12. — Orientals**  
Where object sought to be accomplished by Const. Cal. Art. 19, § 2 and statutory provisions in question was manifestly to restrict the right of the Chinese residents to labor, and thereby deprive them of the means of living, in order to drive out those now within the state, and prevent others from coming there, state constitution abridged their privileges and immunities. *In re Tiburcio Parrott*, C.C.Cal.1880, 1 F. 481.

**13. — Prisoners**  
With respect to seizure of evidence relative to new and independent criminal action, rights, privileges and immunities of parolee under Amend. 4 are to be accorded same recognition as any other person. *State v. Cullison*, Iowa 1970, 173 N.W.2d 533, certiorari denied 90 S.Ct. 1841, 398 U.S. 938, 26 L.Ed.2d 270.

**14. — Puerto Ricans**  
Voting rights of Puerto Rico citizens are constitutionally protected to the same extent as those of all other citizens of the United States, but the methods by which the people of Puerto Rico and their representatives have chosen to structure the Commonwealth's electoral system are entitled to substantial deference. *Rodriguez v. Popular Democratic Party*, Puerto Rico 1982, 102 S.Ct. 2194, 457 U.S. 1, 72 L.Ed.2d 628.

This amendment has no application to territories. *South Porto Rico Sugar Co. v. Busecaglia*, C.C.A.Puerto Rico 1946, 154 F.2d 96.

**15. — Unincorporated associations**  
Protection of this clause is confined to natural persons and does not cover an incorporated association. *Greater Hartford Free Bridge Ass'n v. Greater Hartford Bridge Authority*, D.C.Conn. 1958, 172 F.Supp. 244, affirmed 265 F.2d 656.

**16. — Unions**  
Trade union was not entitled to privileges and immunities of, and had no standing to complain of deprivation of civil rights guaranteed by this clause and Amend. 1 and action to enjoin state po-

lice from attending meeting of members of union would be dismissed as to the union but action would be allowed to stand as to individual members of union. *Local 309, United Furniture Workers of America, C.I.O. v. Gates*, D.C.Ind. 1948, 75 F.Supp. 620.

**17. — United States**  
United States is not a "person" nor "within the jurisdiction" of a state under the terms of this amendment, and only natural persons are entitled to the privileges and immunities of such amendment. *U.S. v. Bixio Municipal School Dist.*, D.C.Miss.1963, 219 F.Supp. 691, affirmed 326 F.2d 237, certiorari denied 85 S.Ct. 324, 379 U.S. 929, 13 L.Ed.2d 341.

**18. — States**  
The privileges and immunities tax clause protects people, not states. *Pennsylvania v. New Jersey*, 1976, 96 S.Ct. 2333, 426 U.S. 660, 49 L.Ed.2d 124.

**19. — Municipalities**  
Under doctrine of legislative supremacy over municipal corporation, municipal corporation does not have any "privileges and immunities" under this amendment which it may invoke against its creator, the state. *Supervisors of Boone County v. Village of Rainbow Gardens*, 1958, 153 N.E.2d 16, 14 Ill.2d 504.

Municipalities may not invoke privileges and immunities under this clause in opposition to will of state. *City of Marshallfield v. Towns of Cameron*, 1964, 127 N.W.2d 809, 24 Wis.2d 56.

**20. State action**  
See, also, *Notes of Decisions under Subdivision IV, "State Action" of the Due Process clause of section 1 of this amendment.*

This clause adds nothing to the rights of one citizen against another. It simply furnishes an additional guaranty against any encroachment by the states upon the fundamental rights which belong to every citizen as a member of society. *U.S. v. Cruikshank*, 1876, 92 U.S. 554, 2 Otto 554, 23 L.Ed. 588. See, also, *Barthemyer v. Iowa*, Iowa 1874, 85 U.S. 133, 18 Wall. 133, 21 L.Ed. 929; *Culp v. U.S.*, C.C.A.Ark.1942, 131 F.2d 93; *Claybrook v. Owensboro*, D.C.Ky.1883, 16 F. 297; *Henderson v. U.S.*, D.C.Md.1945, 63 F.Supp. 906; *State v. Brennan*, 1891, 50 N.W. 625, 2 S.D. 388; *Mangan v. State*, 1884, 76 Ala. 63.

This clause makes criminal the willful deprivation, under color of state authority, of any right, privilege or immunity secured or protected by the Constitution and brings within its sweep the willful deprivation, under color of state authority, of any right, privilege or immunity guaranteed by the Constitution but does not include wrongful acts of officers of the state or county solely in their personal pursuits. *Apodaca v. U.S.*, C.A.N.M. 1951, 188 F.2d 932.

This clause is not applicable to the District of Columbia. *Neild v. District of Columbia*, 1940, 110 F.2d 246, 71 App. D.C. 306.

This clause did not extend power of Congress to protect generally against conspiracies of individuals to destroy the privileges of immunities of citizens of the United States. *Powe v. U.S.*, C.C.A. Ala.1940, 109 F.2d 147, certiorari denied 60 S.Ct. 717, 309 U.S. 679, 84 L.Ed. 1023.

Guarantee of privileges and immunities of United States citizenship under this amendment only prevents state from establishing or enforcing law which abridges privileges and immunities of federal citizenship and it does not prohibit actions of private individuals who are not agents of state. *Avins v. Hannum*, D.C.Pa.1980, 497 F.Supp. 930.

This amendment's provision that no state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge privileges or immunities of citizens of United States, nor deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due process of law, nor deny equal protection of laws are limitations on power of the states. *Peoples Cab Co. v. Bloom*, D.C.Pa.1971, 330 F.Supp. 1235, affirmed 472 F.2d 163.

Judicial action in private disputes is a form of state action required for application of this clause prohibiting state from abridging the privileges and immunities of citizens. *Hosey v. Club Van Cortlandt*, D.C.N.Y.1969, 299 F.Supp. 501.

Amends. 1 to 8, or bill of rights, were intended as restrictions upon federal government, and this clause constitutes limitation upon the states. *Beauregard v. Wingard*, D.C.Cal.1964, 230 F.Supp. 167.

Where Court of Claims Act N.Y. § 8 was fair on its face, only basis on which claim, against state officials charged with determination of case thereunder



21 Jun. 01

Jerry — JUST AMAZING!!

Wisc. Parole Commission writes:

One (1) Month deferral to July 01, to  
consider Parole Release, if ANY? —  
Ignored previous CHAIRMAN's. Submit  
ORDER for 20 Jun. 01 Release  
per your EXHIBIT

And now —

See NOTE on "STATUS OF TAX ARREARS"  
by Parole Commission — State's NEW  
TAX COLLECTION DEPARTMENT.

→ PURE STATE CORRUPTION, LOOKING  
STATE TAX BOOKS & EXTORTION OF A FOREIGN  
GUEST & DIPLOMATE — A NON-RESIDENT  
SINCE 1985 MISSION TO CHINA (PRC,  
ETAL) ON U.S. GOVERNMENT SERVICE,  
INTER ALIA

? — Who REQUESTED Parole Commissioner TO  
CHECK ON STATE TAX ARREARS? NOT OWED !!

LS



## PAROLE COMMISSION ACTION

OFFENDER NAME <b>WANTA, LEO E</b>	DOC NUMBER <b>303787</b>	INSTITUTION <b>FLCI</b>	AGENT AREA NUMBER <b>50516</b>	DATE ACTION TAKEN <b>5-30-01</b>
RECOMMENDED ACTION TAKEN <b>D-1 info</b>	NEW PED <b>NC</b> MR <b>5-27-01</b>	ELIGIBLE ON OR AFTER <b>3-28-02</b>	PAROLE COMMISSION CHAIRPERSON <input type="checkbox"/>	DATE APPROVED <b>5-30-01</b>

### TIME

- ☐ Has served sufficient time so that release would not depreciate the seriousness of the offense  
☐ Not served sufficient time

Comments

### INSTITUTION CONDUCT

- ☐ Has been satisfactory  
☐ Marred by multiple minor reports of misconduct  
☐ Has been unsatisfactory noting major misconduct

Comments

### PARTICIPATION IN RECOMMENDED PROGRAM(S)

- ☐ Satisfactory ☒ Unsatisfactory

Comments

### PAROLE PLAN

- ☐ Workable, but will need Agent's verification  
☐ Vague - will need further development

Comments

### RISK TO THE COMMUNITY

- ☐ Unreasonable risk  
☐ No unreasonable risk

Comments

### RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS \ OR COMMENTS

*SW: Please check status of taxes in arrears.*

### REQUESTS

- |                                                   |                                                                            |
|---------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Pre-parole investigation | <input type="checkbox"/> Clinical Reports from Clinical Service            |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Interstate Compact       | <input type="checkbox"/> No-action/review by Parole Commission Chairperson |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Offense description      | <input type="checkbox"/> Other                                             |

☐ ECRB Evaluation

☒ FILE REVIEW ☐ PMR ☐ 980

SIGNATURE OF PAROLE COMMISSIONER

*Paul*

THERE IS NO ADMINISTRATIVE APPEAL OF THIS DECISION.

DISTRIBUTION: Copy - Institution; Copy - PC; Copy - CRU; Copy - Offender; Copy - Agent

*Rec'd 4:01 PM  
28 JUN 01  
KH*