

For Carlos et alia Regarding Mortgage Claims

By Anna Von Reitz



With regard to IRS and Mortgage claims ---

The presumptions of mortgage debts are invoked under the Internal Revenue Code --- (IRC) which has just been thrown out in its entirety by the U.S. Supreme Court in a case known as Virginia v. EPA that was heard last week and which reinforces the stare decisis Tennessee Supreme Court case, Norton v. Shelby County, which established the Public Law concerning this almost a hundred years ago.

The fact that mortgages are enforced under the IRS at all indicates that they apply only to federal employees and dependents ----who are the only ones in voluntary receipt of any "Federal Income".

The IRC Sections used to extract mortgages from people are: IRS 26 section 1091, section 408, and section 61, 108, and 751.

The new decision reiterates that these "Federal Agencies" have no legislative powers and their Administrative Codes have no power or effect on the Public, nor can Congress shuffle off its responsibilities by delegating any part of them to such Agencies.

The original stare decisis case from Tennessee clearly says, the rules and edicts and administrative codes adopted by such agencies "Have no more power than as if you or I wrote them." ---- that is, they have no representational capacity or force of law whatsoever and NEVER HAVE HAD any such authority.

So the IRC --- "Internal Revenue Code" --- is under the bus and six feet underwater with respect to any claims brought against anyone but Federal Employees. Now, according to the IRC, if one means to invoke Regulation Z to exempt oneself from a mortgage, one has to bring it up at closing. However, since this tome of bureaucratic flatulence never had any authority with respect to any member of the General Public to begin with, its restrictions on invoking Regulation Z are out the window, too.

This also brings up the Jerome Daly Credit River Decision, which similar to the Tennessee Supreme Court case referenced above, created stare decisis with respect to bank mortgage claims related to credit advanced to members of the General Public for the purpose of buying homes.

The Daly case found that the bank was in fact borrowing the assets from the purported Borrower, using them to generate seven to ten times more credit than needed to finance the transaction (fractional reserve banking) and then charging the victim for the use of his own credit.

Understandably, the jury found against the bank, and as every American should know, once a jury has spoken, the issue cannot be raised again absent new or substantially different information. And there is none.

For your convenience, I am attaching a photographic copy of the actual Daly case. I am recommending that you "fully inform" the judge, the clerk, and the prosecuting attorney and the law enforcement officers in your respective cases that all of this was already on the record of the courts concerning you as members of the General Public and that foreign laws pertaining to Federal Employees were misapplied to you and your property assets.

Address them in their personal capacity --- not at judges, clerks, or officers, but as men and women, and hold them 100% personally and commercially liable for any harm done to you, your reputation, or your assets. Remind them that they owe you the protections spelled out under Article IV of both The Constitution of the United States of America (Territorial) and The Constitution of the United States (Municipal) as a member of the General Public covered by these stare decisis cases and findings cited above.

You may also use this letter of reference and direct any questions they may have to me.

Anna Maria Riezinger, Fiduciary
The United States of America
In care of: Box 520994
Big Lake, Alaska 99652
avannavon@gmail.com
(907) 250-5087

See this article and over 3700 others on Anna's website here: www.annavonreitz.com

To support this work look for the Donate button on this website.