CONFORMED COPY
ORIGINAL FILED
Superior Court of California
County of Los Angeles Corey Eib 1 c/o 16045 Sherman Way #H-63 2 Van Nuys, California Non-Domestic JUN 6 2016 20 Email: EibvCHP@gmail.com 3 Sherri R. Carter, Executive Office/Clerk In Pro Per 4 Deputy 5 6 7 8 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 9 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES 10 Case No.: CJ 56370 11 The People of the State of California, NOTICE OF DEMURRER AND DEMURRER. 12 Plaintiff. MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES, AND REQUEST FOR 13 VS. DISMISSAL WITHOUT LEAVE TO AMEND (Penal Code § 1004, 1008) 14 Corey Eib. Date: June 7, 2016 15 Defendant Time: 8:30 AM Dept: 102 16 17 BI NOTICE OF DEMURRER 19 20 TO THE COMMISSIONER, THE COURT, and to the PEOPLE OF THE 21 STATE OF CALIFORNIA AND/OR THEIR REPRESENTATIVE(s) in this 22 case: PLEASE TAKE NOTICE THAT On June 7 at 8:30 am or as 23 soon thereafter as the Court shall allow, Defendant Corey 24 Eib will and hereby does move the Court for an Order 25 sustaining a Demurrer to the Complaint, and for dismissal 26 without leave to amend. 27

3

4 5

7

6

9

8

11

10

13

14

16

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

27

28

This Demurrer is brought pursuant to CA Penal Code 1004 subdivisions 2, 4, and 5 to dismiss the charges brought against the Defendant on the following grounds:

- 1. The People have failed to plead the elements of the charged offenses with sufficient certainty to require the Defendant to be held to answer for the charged offenses.
- There is no conduct that would constitute a public offense
- 3. The charges contain matter which, if true, would constitute a legal justification or excuse of the offense charged, or other legal bar to the prosecution.

This Demurrer is based on this pleading, the accompanying points and authorities, and all papers, records, evidence, and oral testimony that may be presented at the hearing for this Demurrer

#### MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

- I. The only pleading on the part of the defendant is either a demurrer or a plea. (CA PC 1002)
- II. Both the demurrer and plea must be put in, in open court, either at the time of the arraignment or at

à

- III. The Defendant may demur to the accusatory pleading at any time prior to the entry of a plea, when it appears upon the face thereof either:
  - a. That the facts stated do not constitute a public offense. (CA PC 1004(4))
  - b. That it contains matter which, if true, would constitute a legal justification or excuse of the offense charged, or other legal bar to the prosecution. (CA PC 1004(5))
- IV. Due process of law requires that the accused be advised of the charges against him in order that he may have a reasonable opportunity to prepare and present his defense and not be taken by surprise by evidence offered at his trial. (In re Hess (1955) 45 Cal.2d 171,175: See also People v Bright (1966) 12<sup>th</sup> Cal.4th 652 [Complaint must afford notice to the accused of the offense charged, so that he or she may have reasonable opportunity to prepare and present defense])
- V. Defendant is not an employee of this State, or an employee of the United States and was not in the

- VI. The right of a citizen of the several states to use the public roads and highways is secured. Travel, by privately owned modern conveyance of the day, upon the public highways is one of the privileges and immunities protected and secured in Article 4 Section 2 Clause 1, and among other areas of the Federal Constitution. At all times during contact with Mr. Bemiller, Defendant was within the boundaries of his domicile as stated in the 1849 California Constitution.
- VII. The automobile Defendant was driving at the time he was arrested is not of the type that requires registration with the CA DMV, it is the private personal property of Defendant.
- VIII. The charging document does not comply with
  California Rules of Court Rule 4.103. Form TR-130 #CJ
  56370 does not comply with the requirements set forth
  in the current version of the California Judicial
  Council's instructions, and contains evidence of
  willful presentation to the court of incorrect
  mandatory information, subscribed under penalty of
  perjury that it was correct. Defendant's name is not

Defendant's use of the term 'United States' herein this Demurrer is the same as the term is used in CA Commercial Code § 9307(h) "The United States is located in the District of Columbia."

in the specific sequence of FIRST/MIDDLE/LAST and does not correspond with any DMV issued driver license or identification card. The mailing address on the complaint is not a correct address, and despite Defendant advising Bemiller the information was incorrect, Bemiller persisted in arresting defendant and subscribing to the charging document as true and correct.

9

#### 10

## 11

12

13 14 15 16

17

18

# STATEMENT OF THE CHARGES

The charging document is by way of CA Judicial Council form TR-130 #CJ 56370. The portions of the charging document that specify CA Vehicle Code violations are not legible on Defendant's copy.

Mr. Bemiller is the CHP Employee who signed the charging document under penalty of perjury as true and correct. Defendant unambiguously notified Mr. Bemiller that the required mailing address on the citation was not valid, Mr. Bemiller however, insisted on using incorrect information in required sections of the citation and willfully presented a false charging document to the court with incorrect mandatory information (see CA Judicial Council TR-INST revised June 26, 2015 rules 6.060, 6.070, and 6.240; CA Penal Code 115(a))

28

25

26

Evidence of the charges against Defendant consists solely of CA Judicial Council Form #TR-130 containing Mr. Bemiller's signature under penalty of perjury that all information on the charging document is true and correct, a statement Mr. Bemiller could not have reasonably believed to be true at the time he arrested Defendant and subscribed to the complaint as true and correct.

The charges of this case are brought and prosecuted by employees and of CA State for violations of CA State Statute against a citizen of the several states which on its face denies Defendant's constitutional right to domicile within the boundaries as stated in the 1849 Constitution of the State of California and self government, as well as numerous statutory and constitutional provisions secured to Defendant.

The same CA State employees just referenced have also conspired, under Color of Law, 2 to deny Defendant the right to the use and enjoyment of his property, and the right to a republican form of government lawfully admitted into the Union by authority of 31st Congress of the United States of America and identified as the State of California.

<sup>26</sup> Law' at https://www.justice.gov/crt/deprivation-rights-under-color-law
27 Law' at https://www.justice.gov/crt/deprivation-rights-under-color-law

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> See Defendant's Declaration dated April 29<sup>th</sup> 2016 and filed May 11 2015; See also Defendant's identification document #CBE-06211969-CSC attached as page 3 of Exhibit

## 2

# 3

5

7

9

10

11

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

ARGUMENT IN SUPPORT OF DEMURRER

All counts of vehicle code violations against Defendant must be dismissed or removed to Federal Court as the Defendant is not a resident of this state, nor is the Defendant employed by this state, or any state of the United States or the United States. There is a diversity of citizenship between Defendant and this State contemplated in Article III of the Federal Constitution.

CA Vehicle Code Section 21052 states "The provisions of this code applicable to drivers of vehicles upon the highways apply to the drivers of all vehicles while engaged in the course of employment by this State, any political subdivision thereof, any municipal corporation, or any district, including authorized emergency vehicles subject to those exemptions granted such authorized emergency vehicles in this code."

CA Vehicle Code Section 12505(a)(1) states: For the purposes of this division only and notwithstanding Section 516, residency shall be determined as a person's state of

<sup>1</sup> of the Prosecution's OPPOSITION TO MOTION TO COMPEL DISCLOSURE OF REQUESTED

DISCOVERY dated May 5th 2016 and filed into this record.

<sup>&#</sup>x27;CA VC Section 516. "Resident" means any person who manifests an intent to live or be located in this state on more than a temporary or transient basis. Presence in the state for six months or more in any 12-month period gives rise to a rebuttable presumption of residency.

domicile. "State of domicile" means the state where a person has his or her true, fixed, and permanent home and principle residence and to which he or she has manifested the intention of returning whenever he or she is absent."

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

2

The prosecution, without any substantiating or supporting evidence, and while simultaneously opposing the disclosure of exculpatory evidence, alleges via the complaint (CA Judicial Council Form TR-130 # CJ 56370) that Defendant is either employed by this state, is a resident of this state, or is subject to the authority of United States jurisdiction via the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment, or other lawful Federal authority. All of which is false.

14

15

16

17

18

Defendant, as he did prior to his arrest by Mr. Bemiller, again rebuts the presumption of residency in this state and rebuts the presumption of driving during the course of employment by this State or the United States. (See

19

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

The following are evidence of residency for purposes of vehicle registration:

- (a) Address where registered to vote.
- (b) Location of employment or place of business.
- (c) Payment of resident tuition at a public institution of higher education.
  - (d) Attendance of dependents at a primary or secondary school.
  - (e) Filing a homeowner's property tax exemption.
  - (f) Renting or leasing a home for use as a residence.
- (g) Declaration of residency to obtain a license or any other privilege or benefit not ordinarily extended to a nonresident.
  - (h) Possession of a California driver's license.
- (1) Other acts, occurrences, or events that indicate presence in the state is more than temporary or transient.

THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, IDENTIFIED BY IT'S CONSTITUTION OF 1849, IS PART OF AN INDISSOLUBLE UNION GUARANTEED A REPUBLICAN FORM OF GOVERNMENT

7 8

Texas v White 47 U.S. 700 discusses the term state in the opening paragraphs of the syllabus;

- "1. The word "State" sometimes describes a people or community or individuals united more or less closely in political relations, inhabiting temporarily or permanently the same country; often it denotes only the country, or territorial region, inhabited by such a community; not unfrequently, it is applied to the government under which the people live; at other times, it represents the combined idea of people, territory and government.

2. In the Constitution the term 'State' most frequently expresses the combined idea, just noticed, of people, territory, and government. A State, in the ordinary sense of the Constitution, is a political community of free citizens, occupying a territory of defined boundaries and organized under a government sanctioned and limited by a written constitution, and established by consent of the governed.

- 3. But the term is also used to express the idea of a people or political community, as distinguished from the government. In this sense, it is used in the clause which provides that the United States shall guarantee to every State in the Union a republican form of government, and shall protect each of them against invasion.
- 4. The Union of States never was a purely artificial and arbitrary relation. It began among the Colonies, and grew out of common origin, mutual sympathies, kindred principles, similar interests, and geographical relations. It was confirmed and strengthened by the necessities of war, and received definite form and character and sanction from the Articles of Confederation. By these, the Union was solemnly declared to 'be perpetual.' And, when these Articles were found to be inadequate to the exigencies of the country, the Constitution was ordained 'to form a more perfect Union.'
- 5. But the perpetuity and indissolubility of the Union by no means implies the loss of distinct and individual existence, or of the right of self-government by the State. On the contrary, it may be not unreasonably said that the preservation of the States and the maintenance of their governments are as much within the design and care of the Constitution as the preservation of the Union and the maintenance of the National Government. The Constitution, in all its provisions, looks to an indestructible Union composed of indestructible States." (emphasis added)

Defendant has exercised his secured political right to domicile in a state that is foreign to the jurisdiction of this State. Defendant's domicile is within the borders as stated in the 1849 Constitution of the State of California.

5 6

This State, identified by its Constitution of 1879, is a State of the United States, has many locations and has debt. The Executive offices of this State are located at 444 North Capitol St NW, Washington, District of Columbia 20001 (See CA Commercial Code 9307 et al.)

17.

CA State exists by authority of the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment; entered the Union by executive authority of the President; and is comprised of a People and Government but lacks defined boundaries and is limited in authority to the jurisdiction of the United States as it operates within all the several states (See 1879 California Constitution Article 3 Section 2; Constitution of the United States of America, 10<sup>th</sup> Amendment and various other provisions).

### A. There is a Diversity of Citizenship

This court lacks in-personam jurisdiction as Defendant is a citizen of a state that is a foreign jurisdiction to this State and the United States. Defendant is a citizen of California identified by its Constitution ordained in 1849 and is without the United States.

Defendant's state was admitted into the Union by act of Congress, (See Compromise of 1850) is guaranteed a republican form of government (See Article IV Section IV Constitution of the United States of America), is presumed to exist and is presumed to have citizens of its own (See Texas v White 74 U.S. 700).

B

The codes Defendant is alleged to have violated are applicable to residents and employees of this State. The prosecution has not provided evidence of employment or residency in this state and the only evidence the Prosecution has provided is a defective CA Judicial Council form which contains incorrect information.

CA State, identified by its constitution adopted in 1879, is located in the District of Columbia, is a foreign jurisdiction to the Defendant's State (as the term 'state' is primarily used in the Federal Constitution) and is a foreign authority to Defendant's Domicile.

#### CONCLUSION

This court lacks jurisdiction, the facts stated do not constitute a public offense, and the citation presented to the court does not comply with the rules set forth by the Judicial Council of California.

28 >>

The court should sustain defendant's demurrer and dismiss all charges without leave to amend. Respectfully submitted, Dated this 6th day of June, 2016