

Date: 9/10/99 >From the Informer

Hold on to your hats people. I am going to tell you what every lawyer (and this includes judges who are lawyers) knows and are taught in law schools.

STANDING: Standing is the prime consideration in federal Courts and also in state courts.

Plaintiff must establish a personal stake in the outcome.

1. You must satisfy the Constitutional standard. This derives from case and controversy from Article III and it has two components they are;

a. The Plaintiff must establish injury in fact. This is generally economic injury but can also be esthetic, environmental, but the injury must arise from the [governmental] conduct being complained. A court is very liberal in this item.

b. Redress ability. The relief sought must eliminate the harm alleged. A court is very strict in this item.

Now we come to the doctrine of prudential limitations. This is self imposed by the Court. This is where the constitutional standard has to have been satisfied; there are certain instances where the court will still deny standing. The two instances that come up the most often are:

1. Cases involving third party standing. The Plaintiff may only advance his or her own constitutional rights. Exceptions are allowed in this situation. Third party standing is generally denied but if you can show two factors exist then the court will often allow third party standing.

These are:

#1 - A close relationship or nexus between the Plaintiff and the third party, and

#2 - you must show a special need to adjudicate.

2. Cases involving abstract or generalized grievances. Citizen standing is generally denied. A private citizen has no standing to challenge what an officer of the government does in his office because the interest is too remote. Got that people -- too remote.

Now we get to the meat of this standing and that is "taxpayer standing."

A State taxpayer has standing to challenge measurable expenditures. The key is measurable expenditures. An example would be bussing children to religious schools. The bussing is a measurable expenditure. The [a] State taxpayer has no standing if it is other than financial --such as Bible reading in public schools.

Now to federal standing -- since about 1924 it has been decreed that federal taxpayers HAVE NO STANDING, PERIOD -- BECAUSE, THEIR INTEREST IS TOO REMOTE. 99 percent of the cases are summarily denied. YOUR INTEREST IS 'TOO REMOTE'. Remember that and now you know why you lose.

There is only one narrow exception, people, and I doubt it fits your situation. So why don't the courts say from the outset of your case that you have no standing? Simply to generate more money for their Bar buddies in litigating your case. This is called Barratry. Barratry, flat out pure

and simple Barratry! (And it can also be a form of embezzlement of public funds and most certainly of public trust.)

What are those exceptions that allows you standing as a federal taxpayer?

Here they are:

#1 - Under Flast v Cohen, 392 U.S. 83 (1968) [Google it] a federal taxpayer has standing to make an establishment clause challenge, and

#2 - To challenge of an expenditure enacted under the taxing and spending power clause of the constitution.

Now we gather from the above that a “citizen” has no standing. So why are a lot of people claiming citizenship of this miserable low life corporation called the United States and its members in Union? Beats me -- I want nothing to do with their damn corporation and I certainly am not a State or United States citizen of higher class (Citizen) or lower class (citizen).

Now the citizen again has no standing as a federal taxpayer because he/she is so remote that the courts will not entertain a suit. People, this is ‘etched in stone’ what I say and can be proven without any shadow of doubt. There you have it. Short sweet and to the point. Every man and woman who is a Lawyer that had to pass the Multi State Exam (MSE) to get into the Bar KNOWS this and they cannot deny it one bit. If they failed the MSE test they could not be a lawyer. To pass the test proves they KNOW what I have just said is ‘etched in stone’.

Why have not the ‘patriot’ lawyers stated this before to all the people they say they are trying to protect?

The answer: Guess -- because I will not put words in your mouth. What has Montgomery stated about the King’s esquires that emanated from the Inner and Middle Temples of the Crown of England and came to America to protect the interests of the Holy Trinity? (*see*, www.freedom-school.com/the-state-of-texas.pdf) Now the courts of lawyers “hide the key of knowledge,” as stated by my MASTER, the Lord Almighty, when they say it is a political question and they will not entertain a suit.

Now you know why this class of “VERMIN”, as Paul Harvey espoused, were the only class that the Lord wished WOE upon. They have climbed out of the sewer from whence they started. Maybe a few have advanced to the gutter level but that’s about all. The ones that have seen the light and advanced to a used car salesman are the ones that quit the profession because of conscience.

Have a happy day ☺ !

Sincerely, *the Informer*

Discover “standing” for yourself – do a Google search, look in a law dictionary, ask a lawyer.
Do the necessities and discover who you are – and who ‘they’ want you to be.
Explore sovereignty!

Ripped from www.freedom-school.com/
click to and learn something!