

UNOFFICIAL COPY



NOTICE OF NON CORPORATE STATUS OF THE Man; Robert Polinski

Doc#: 1019348002 Fee: \$56.25
Eugene "Gene" Moore
Cook County Recorder of Deeds
Date: 07/12/2010 08:38 AM Pg: 1 of 10

Point 019(a). Affiant has no record or evidence that Affiant is, or ever has been, a corporation and denies any such corporate status or having ever been a "14th Amendment Enfranchised Person", or "a benefit acceptant Enfranchised Person under the 14th Amendment, liable for your share of the National Debt", as per EXHIBIT 019(a) - NOTICE OF NON-CORPORATE STATUS. [SEE points 078, 079]

ADMIT - Libellees listed in this document admit to the truth and guilt of "assumption and presumption" that Affiant is a corporation and subject to Libellees jurisdiction.

EXHIBIT 019(a) - NOTICE OF CORPORATE DENIAL AND NON-CORPORATE STATUS of Robert Polinski the man

With the knowledge of the fact that "Assumption" and "Presumption" may prevail unless rebutted, or explicitly denied, this Affiant plainly states that Affiant is in no way to be considered, termed as, or thought as, a person, legal entity, legal fiction, fictional character, or corporation of any form; with the knowledge that all such entities are not living, breathing, sentient men. Therefore, Affiant hereby makes express and explicit claim and affirmation to the living, whose Creator is Affiant's Heavenly Father; and, express and explicit claim that Affiant is not a "person" or any other form of corporation.

The word "person" is according to several references and: 22 USC Sec. 1621 -EXP-ITE- TITLE 22 CHAPTER 21 SUBCHAPTER I -HEAD- Sec. 1621. Definitions -STATUTE- For the purposes of this subchapter - (a) The term 'person' shall include an individual, partnership, corporation, or the Government of the United States.

Point 019(a) - A. The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Rule 52, applies in Civil and Criminal actions with equal force and effect because criminal is always civil in nature. No civil or criminal cause of action can arise lest there be a contract. See Eads v. Marks, 249 P. 2d 257, 260. There is always a presumption that a contract exists and that the responding party is a Corporation. Under Rule 52, which is the same in all states as in the Federal Rules, the Texas Court of appeals (5th Cir) has ruled of the finding of fact, by the Court, that "the failure of an adverse party to deny under oath the allegation that he is incorporated dispenses with the necessity of proof of the

UNOFFICIAL COPY

fact". Thus, a presumption becomes a finding of fact by the court unless rebutted before trial.

Point 019(a) - B. *Dr. Pepper Co. v. Crow*, 621 S. W.2d 464, 465 (Tex App.-Waco 1981, no Writ) "Plaintiff plead defendant was a corporation. Defendant did not deny by verified pleading pursuant to [TRCP] 52 and 83 ... that it was not a corporation; thus, such fact was established.

Point 019(a) - C. **Louisiana Revised Statutes Art. 429** - Corporation existence is presumed unless affidavit of denial is filed before trial.

Point 019(a) - D. A presumption is a rule of Law, Statutory or judicial, by which the finding of a basic fact gives rise to the existence of presumed fact until presumption is rebutted. See *Van Wart v. Cook*, 557 P. 2d 1161. In the Commercial Law of all States, a presumption means that the trier (the Judge) of fact, must find the existence of the fact presumed per FRCP 52, unless and until the evidence is introduced which would support a finding of its non-existence. Arizona Revised Statutes: Title 47 Section 1201 (31) Presumption" or "presumed" means that the trier of fact must find the existence of the fact presumed unless and until evidence is introduced which would support a finding of its nonexistence. Thus, the **Affidavit of Non Corporate Status is for the purpose of rebutting any presumption that the Affiant is the Corporation named in the alleged complaint.**

Point 019(a) - E. Federal Rules Evidence. R 301 Agreement by Acquiescence
Rule 301 of the Federal Rules of Evidence states; **"...a presumption imposes on the party against whom it is directed the burden of proof [see 556(d)] of going forward with evidence to rebut or meet the presumption."**

Point 019(a) - F. **When the complaint is lodged by the Government for a fine, fee or a tax, all of which are revenue, they are imposed only on Corporations.** See *Colonial Pipe Line Co. v. Triangle*, 421 US 100 (1975). Thus, this instant complaint, for the collection of some form of tax, must have been lodged against a Corporation whose name is similar to my name. **This Affiant rebuts the presumption that this Affiant is the Corporation named in the alleged complaint.**

Point 019(a) - G. **If Affiant is not a Corporation he cannot appear and plead.** See *West Union Tel. Co. v Eyser*, 2 Colo. 141; *Greenwood v. Railroad Co.*, 123 Mass. 32; *Foster v. white Cloud*, 32 Mo. 505; *Hobich v. Folger*, 20 Wall. 1; *Boyce v. M.E. Church*, 43 Md. 359; *Folsom v. Star Union Etc. Fright Line*, 54 Iowa 490.

Point 019(a) - H. **When brought into Court by its Corporate name, its existence as a Corporation is admitted.** See *Mud Creek Drain Co. v State*, 43 Ind. 157; *Johnson v. Gibson*, 73 Ind. 282; *Ewing v. Robeson*, 15 Ind. 26; *Callender v. Railroad Co*, 11 Ohio St. 516; *Com. Ins. Etc. Co. v Taylor*, 8 S.C. 107. Compare *Ware v. St. Louis Bagging and Rope Co.*, 47 Ala. 667.

Point 019(a) - I. Stating not facts, but a conclusion only, is insufficient. It has been held that where the representative of a railroad corporation is served with process, he may plead in abatement in his own name, that the Corporation is extinct. See *Kelly v. Railroad Co.*, 2 Flip C.C. 581; *Callender v. Plainsville Co.*, 11 Ohio St. 516; *Quarrier v. Peabody Co.*, 10 W. Va. 507;

UNOFFICIAL COPY

Evarts v. Killingworth Co., 20 Conn. 447; Stewart v. Dunn, 12 Mees. & W. 655; Stevenson v. Thorn, 13 Mees & W. 149. **Where the person is so served** with that he may, by plea, deny that he/she sustains any such relation to the Corporation that authorizes the service of process on him/her. See Kelly v. Railroad Co., 2 Flip C.C. 581. In 1886 the Supreme Court did not grant corporate-personhood to any State of the Union or Federal Government and that this doctrine derives from a mistaken interpretation of a Supreme Court reporter's notes. See Santa Clara County v Southern Pacific Railroad Company [118 U.S. 394 (1886)].

Point 019(a) - J. No laws were passed by Congress granting that corporations should be treated the same under the constitution as living, breathing human beings, and none have been passed since then. No court decisions, state or federal, held that corporations were "persons" instead of "artificial persons." The Supreme Court did not rule in Santa Clara County v Southern Pacific Railroad Company [118 U.S. 394] (1886) on the issue of corporate personhood. As railroad attorney Sanderson and his two colleagues watched, Chief Justice Morrison Remick Waite told Delmas and his two colleagues the attorneys for the opposing party that: "The court does not wish to hear argument on the question whether the provision in the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution, which forbids a state to deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws, applies to these corporations. We are of the opinion that it does. This written statement, that corporations were "persons" rather than "artificial persons", with an equal footing under the Bill of Rights as humans, was not a formal ruling of the court, but was reportedly a simple statement by its Chief Justice, recorded by the court recorder". See Vermont Supreme Court building. Volume 118 of United States Reports: Cases adjudged in the Supreme Court at October Term 1885 and October Terms 1886 published in New York in 1886 by Banks & Brothers Publishers, and written by J.C. Bancroft Davis, Supreme Court's Reporter.

Point 019(a) - K. Here is the often expressed understanding from the United States Supreme Court that "in common usage, statutes employing the terms person and corporation are ordinarily construed to exclude the Sovereign man." Wilson v. Omaha Tribe, 442 U.S. 653, 667 (1979) (quoting United States v. Cooper Corp., 312 U.S. 600, 604 (1941)). See also United States v. Mine Workers, 330 U.S. 258, 275 (1947).

Point 019(a) - L. US Supreme Court in Luther v Borden, 48 US1 12 Led 581: "...The government are but trustees acting under derived authority and have no power to delegate what is not delegated to them. But the people, as the original fountain, might take away what they have delegated and in trust to whom they please. ... The sovereignty in every state resides in the people of the state and they may alter and change their form of government at their own pleasure." US Supreme Court in Wilson v Omaha India Tribe 442 US 653, 667 (1979): "In common usage, the term 'person' does not include the sovereign, and statutes employing the word are ordinary construed to exclude it."

Point 019(a) - M. Affiant is NOT a "United States Person", "United States Resident", "U.S. Citizen", "U.S. Individual", "U.S. Corporation" or "citizen subjected to its jurisdiction", as such "words of art", corporation created under the laws of the United States or any state of the Union States, the District of Columbia, or any territory, commonwealth or possession of the United States or a foreign state or country, public or private.

UNOFFICIAL COPY

Point 019(a) - N. Affiant is NOT a “resident of”, “inhabitant of”, a “franchisee of”, “subject of”, “ward of”, property of”, “chattel of”, or “subject to the jurisdiction of” the State of the Forum of any United States, corporate State, corporate County, or corporate City, or Municipal body politics created under the primary authority of Art. I, Sec. 8, CI.17 and Art. IV, Sec. 3 CI. 2 of the Constitution for the united States of America and not subjected to any legislation created by or under the jurisdiction of any employees, officers, or agents deriving their authority thereof. Further, Affiant is NOT a subject of the Administrative and Legislative Article I Courts or bound by precedents of such courts created by the “United States”, as “Legislation enacted by Congress applicable to the inferior courts in the exercise of the power under Article III of the Constitution cannot be affected by legislation enacted by Congress under Art. I, Sec. 8, CI.17, of the Constitution.” D.C. Code, Title 11 at p. 13. an officer, agent, shareholder, franchise or fiduciary agent, surety, resident inhabitant or domiciled in any corporation.

Point 019(a) - O. Affiant declares, revokes and cancels all of Affiant's signatures on any and all forms which may be construed to give the Federal Government or any other agency or department of the United States Government, created under the authority of Article I, Sec. 8, CI. 17 and Article IV, Sec. 3, CI.2 of the Constitution for the United States, authority or jurisdiction over Affiant. Affiant also, revokes, rescinds and make void ab initio, all powers of attorney, in fact, in presumption, or otherwise, signed either by Affiant or anyone else, with or without Affiant's consent, as such power of attorney pertains to Affiant, by, but not limited to, any and all government/quasi/colorable, public, Government entities or corporations, on the grounds of constructive fraud, and non-disclosure of pertinent facts.

Point 019(a) - P. Affiant is NOT a vessel documented under Chapter 121 of Title 46, United States Code or a vessel numbered as provided in Chapter 123 of said Title.

Point 019(a) - Q. Affiant hereby, cancels any presumed election made by the United States Government or any agency or department, thereof, that Affiant is, or ever has been, a citizen, alien citizen or resident of any territory, possession, instrumentality or enclave, under the sovereignty or exclusive jurisdiction of the United States, as defined in the Constitution for the united States of America in Art. I, Sec.8 CI. 17 and Art. IV, Sec. 3, CI. 2. Affiant has no record or evidence that Affiant does not cancel any presumption that Affiant ever voluntarily elected to be treated as such a citizen or resident.

Point 019(a) - R. Affiant is NOT an enemy of the United States or any corporation created under the laws of the United States or any state of the Union States, the District of Columbia, or any territory, commonwealth or possession of the United States or a foreign state or country, public or private.

Point 019(a) - S. Affiant's name is a Possession of Affiant and is not given to any other, however, the Christian Appellation that Affiant answers to is; Robert Polinski: Community, with location of domicile where the living Man Stands, who may be NOTICED at 5417 W. Melrose Street [60641], and is particularly unique to this Affiant, although not affiliated with the “Corporate Body Politic” near the same location and is determined as complete, necessary and sufficient identification evidencing Affiant's neutral standing (15 USC 1681(h)).

UNOFFICIAL COPY

Point 019(a) - T. This Affidavit was NOT written for the purpose of debating the constitutionality or legality of the Communications Act of 1934, but rather to establish facts exposing the United States Government's lack of jurisdiction in this matter. Affiant is NOT a pirate, or affiliated with or an enemy of any public or private corporation, domestic or foreign, but is a neutral body. Any past or future reference to Affiant as such by any agency and its officer(s) will be considered "defamation of character" and will be litigated as such in the foreign jurisdiction where offenders, oppressors, and all Libellees will have no immunity, "**Within the Admiralty**". **28 USC 1333 or 1337, Bills of lading Act, The Public Vessel Act, Foreign Sovereign Immunity Act. False Claims Act, see 31 U.S.C. §3729(a)(7) and Federal Tort Claims Act.** Any of the facts or Laws presented herein are NOT contrary to the Communications Act of 1934, or Court decisions applicable to Affiant. All facts contained herein are based upon ruling case law and un-overruled decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States. None of these facts have been found to be "frivolous" by any court, when argued in their exact and proper context. These are technical facts that, under Commercial Law must be rebutted with "case law" or acquiesced to.

Point 019(a) - U. Any statements or claims in this Affidavit must be properly rebutted by facts of law, or overriding Article III Supreme Court rulings, and shall not prejudice the lawful validity of other claims not properly rebutted or invalidated by facts of law. Therefore, an Affidavit of Truth, under Commercial Law, can only be satisfied: (i) through a rebuttal Affidavit of Truth, point for point, (ii) by payment, (iii) by agreement, (iv) by resolution by a jury by the rules of Common Law.

Point 019(a) - V. For reasons explicitly defined within this Point, Affiant denies having, or ever having had, a "birthday"; but rather, Affiant DID have a "Nativity" upon the Soil and celebrates his day of Nativity as such.

Point 019(a) - W. Affiant makes it perfectly clear that Affiant is an Adverse Party denying under oath the allegation that Affiant is incorporated; as per: "*The failure of an adverse party to deny under oath the allegation that he is incorporated with the necessity of proof of the fact [it becomes part of the official record].*" Galleria Bank v. Southwest Properties, 498 Southwest 2nd

USE, MISUSE, AND ABUSE OF WORDS TO CHANGE THE MEANING.

Webster's 1828 Dictionary says this under "BIRTH": BIRTH, n. berth.

"Birth", "berth" and "born" all come from the same root of "to bear". When you look up "berth" you find out that every definition has to do with ships. Why am I not surprised? So our "berth-day" is the day we were given a place within the maritime/admiralty jurisdiction of the State. And we are taught from before we can remember to think of our berth-day as a joyous occasion.

Webster's New World Dictionary of the English Language - Third College Edition, copyright 1988, page 132, **berth n.** ...4 a position, place, **office**, job, etc. We perceive that this "berth" is the "office of person" aboard the SHIP OF STATE

UNOFFICIAL COPY

Misuse of words was started well before we were born, at least around the mid 1700's, which is why you must read the Dictionaries of the 1800's (Webster's 1828, Bouvier's 1856) in order to see what has happened.

A Living Soul has a date of Nativity; a Corporation Sole has a date of Birth/Berth. Don't let the fact that these two dates are the same, or near the same, confuse you. We have been trapped by words, and I can assure you that every time you apply the word "birth" to the living, you are bearing false witness.

There are only two birthday parties in the Scripture. In both cases a man lost his head. At Pharaoh's birthday party in Genesis the baker was hung and at Herod's birthday party in the Gospels John the Baptist was beheaded. So how did a "Christian" culture end up celebrating "Berth"-days as we do? Somebody had a plan, and that plan involved embedding a number (the number of the beast) into our consciousness at a very early age.

A possible third "birthday" was mentioned in the Holy Writ; note that the 666 talents of gold mentioned below did NOT include all that was brought by merchant means.

1 Kings 10:14 and 2 Chronicles 9:13, "*Now the weight of gold that came to Solomon in one year was six hundred threescore and six talents of gold;*"

It is easy to mistake the SSN as the number of the beast (due to the fact that Title 42 U.S.C., § 666 establishes and authorized the Social Security Numbering system), but just like everything else, the SSN traces back to the birth date as its point of origin; therefore, a DOB has to do with the anniversary of an insurance contract. I figure it along the lines of an occult triangulation, astrology, and vestigial (sign of something that once existed but exists or appears no more) sorcery.

Therefore, I inform the nice policeman, the bureaucrat, the "de facto" court system, and all other parties that may inquire, "I have no birthday," even backing that with, "No man can be compelled to incriminate himself."

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION TO CLARIFY MEANING OF "U.S. CITIZEN"

The term "Citizen of the United States", as found in the Qualifications Clauses, is properly constructed to mean a Citizen of **ONE OF** the States which are united by and under the U.S. Constitution. This construction -- **ONE OF** -- is reiterated in the following passage from Words and Phrases, to wit:

"Citizens of a state, within the removal act [18 Stat. 473, March 3, 1875] means citizens of one of the United States, and the suits contemplated are suits between citizens of one of the states of the Union on one side, and foreign states, or citizens or subjects on the other." citing Roberts v. Pacific & A. Ry. & Navigation Co., 121 F. 785, 789, 58 C.C.A. 61. (9th Cir. 1903)

UNOFFICIAL COPY

MEMORANDUM OF LAW AND POINTS OF AUTHORITY IN SUPPORT OF AFFIDAVIT OF NON CORPORATE STATUS

1. The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Rule 52, applies in Civil and Criminal actions with equal force and effect because criminal is always civil in nature. No civil or criminal cause of action can arise lest there be a contract. See Eads v. Marks, 249 P. 2d 257, 260. There is always a presumption that a contract exists and that the responding party is a Corporation. Under Rule 52, which is the same in all states as in the Federal Rules, the Texas Court of appeals (5th Cir ;) has ruled of the finding of fact, by the Court, that "the failure of an adverse party to deny under oath the allegation that he is incorporated dispenses with the necessity of proof of the fact". Thus, a presumption becomes a finding of fact by the court unless rebutted before trial.
2. Dr. Pepper Co. v. Crow, 621 S. W.2d 464, 465 (Tex App.-Waco 1981, no Writ) "Plaintiff plead defendant was a corporation. Defendant did not deny by verified pleading pursuant to [TRCP] 52 and 83 ... that it was not a corporation; thus, such fact was established.
3. Louisiana Revised Statutes Art. 429
Corporation existence presumed unless affidavit of denial filed before trial.
4. A presumption is a rule of Law, Statutory or judicial, by which the finding of a basic fact gives rise to the existence of presumed fact until presumption is rebutted. See Van Wart v. Cook, 557 P. 2d 1161. In the Commercial Law of all States, a presumption means that the trier (the Judge) of fact, must find the existence of the fact presumed per FRCP 52, unless and until the evidence is introduced which would support a finding of its non-existence. Arizona Revised Statutes: Title 47 Section 1201 (31) "Presumption" or "presumed" means that the trier of fact must find the existence of the fact presumed unless and until evidence is introduced which would support a finding of its nonexistence. Thus, the Affidavit of Non Corporate Status is for the purpose of rebutting any presumption that the Respondent is the Corporation named in the alleged complaint.
5. Federal Rules Evidence, R.301 Agreement by Acquiescence
" Rule 301 of the Federal Rules of Evidence states; "...a presumption imposes on the party against whom it is directed the burden of proof [see 556(d)] of going forward with evidence to rebut or meet the presumption
6. When the complaint is lodged by the Government for a fine, fee or a tax, all of which are revenue, they are imposed only on Corporations. See Colonial Pipe Line Co. v. Triagle, 421 US 100 (1975). Thus, this instant complaint, for the collection of some form of tax, must have been lodged

UNOFFICIAL COPY

against a Corporation whose name is similar to my name. This Respondent must rebut the presumption that this Respondent is the Corporation named in the alleged complaint.

7. **If Respondent is not a Corporation he cannot appear and plead.** See West Union Tel. Co. v Eysler, 2 Colo. 141; Greenwood v. Railroad Co., 123 Mass. 32; Foster v. white Cloud, 32 Mo. 505; Hobich v. Folger, 20 Wall. 1; Boyce v/ M.E. Church, 43 Md. 359; Folsom v. Star Union Etc. Fright Line, 54 Iowa 490.
8. **When brought into Court by its Corporate name, its existence as a Corporation is admitted.** See Mad Creek Drain Co. v State, 43 Ind. 157; Johnson v. Gibson, 73 Ind. 282; Ewing v. Robeson, 15 Ind. 26; Callender v. Railroad Co., 11 Ohio St. 516; Com. Ins. Etc. Co. v Taylor, 8 S.C. 107. Compare Ware v. St. Louis Bagging and Rope Co., 47 Ala. 667.
9. Stating not facts, but a conclusion only, is insufficient. It has been held that where the representative of a railroad corporation is served with process, **he may plead in abatement in his own name, that the Corporation is extinct.** See Kelly v. Railroad Co., 2 Flip C.C. 581; Callender v. Plainville Co., 11 Ohio St. 516; Quarrier v. Peabody Co., 10 W. Va. 507; Evarts v. Killingworth Co., 20 Conn. 447; Stewart v. Dunn, 12 Mees. & W. 655; Stevenson v. Thorn, 13 Mees & W. 149. **Where the person is so served with that he may, by plea, deny that he/she sustains any such relation to the Corporation as authorizes the service of process on him/her.** See Kelly v. Railroad Co., 2 Flip C.C. 581. **In 1886 the Supreme Court did not grant corporate-personhood, to any State of the Union or Federal Government and that this doctrine derives from a mistake interpretation of a Supreme Court reporter's notes.** See Santa Clara County v Southern Pacific Railroad Company [118 U.S. 394 (1886)].
10. **No laws were passed by Congress granting that corporations should be treated the same under the constitution as living, breathing human beings, and none have been passed since then.**
 No court decisions, state or federal, held that corporations were "persons" instead of "artificial persons." The Supreme Court did not rule in Santa Clara County v Southern Pacific Railroad Company [118 U.S. 394] (1886). In this case or any case, on the issue of corporate personhood. As railroad attorney Sanderson and his two colleagues watched, Chief Justice Morrison Remick Waite told Delmas and his two colleagues the attorneys for the opposing party that: "The court does not wish to hear argument on the question whether the provision in the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution, which forbids a state to deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws, applies to these corporations. We are of the opinion that it does. This written statement, that corporation were "persons" rather than "artificial persons" with an equal footing under the Bill of Rights as humans, was not a formal ruling of the court, but was reportedly a simple statement by its Chief Justice, recorded by the court recorder. See Vermont Supreme Court building. Volume 118 of United States Reports: Cases adjudged in the Supreme Court at October Term 1885 and October

UNOFFICIAL COPY

Terms 1886 published in New York in 1886 by banks & Brothers Publishers, and written by J.C. Bancroft Davis, Supreme Court's Reporter.

11. Here is the often-expressed understanding from the United States Supreme Court that "in common usage, the term Sovereign, statutes employing the person and corporation are ordinarily construed to exclude the Sovereign man or woman." Wilson v. Omaha Tribe, 442 U.S. 653, 667 (1979) (quoting United States v. Cooper Corp., 312 U.S. 600, 604 (1941). See also United States v. Mine Workers, 330 U.S. 258, 275 (1947).
12. US Supreme Court in Luther v Borden, 48 US1, 12 Led 581:
 "...The government are but trustees acting under derived authority and have no power to delegate what is not delegated to them. But the people, as the original fountain might take away what they have delegated and in trust to whom they please. ... The sovereign in every state resides in the people of the state and they may alter and change their form of government at their own pleasure."
 US Supreme Court in Wilson v. Omaha India Tribe 442 US 653, 667 (1979):
 "In common usage, the term 'person' does not include the sovereign, and statutes employing the word are ordinary construed to exclude it."
13. Rebuttable presumptions are in effect inferences that, in the absence of any controverting evidence, the jury is required to make and, in civil cases, to accept as established facts. [89. People v Wong Sang Lung, 3 CA 221, 84 P 843.]
14. BLACK'S LAW DICTIONARY, 6th Ed. (1990), p. 1267.
 Rebuttable presumption. In the law of evidence, a presumption which may be rebutted by evidence. Otherwise called a "disputable" presumption. A species of legal presumption which holds good until evidence contrary to it is introduced. Beck v. Kansas City Public Service Co., Mo. App., 48 S.W. 2d 213, 215. It shifts burden of proof. Heiner v. Donnan, 285 U.S. 312, 52 S. Ct. 351, 362, 76 L.Ed. 772. It gives particular effect to certain group of facts in absence of further evidence, and presumption provides prima facie case which shifts to defendant the burden to go forward with evidence to contradict or rebut fact presumed. Gulle v. Boggs, Fla., 174 So.2d 26, 28.
15. BLACK'S LAW DICTIONARY, 6th Ed. (1990), p. 1185
 Presumption. An inference in favor of a particular fact. A presumption is a rule of law, statutory or judicial, by which finding of a basic fact gives rise to existing of presumed fact, until presumption is rebutted. Van Wart v. Cook, Okl. App., 557 P2d 1161, 1163. A legal device which operates in the absence of other proof to require that certain inference be drawn from the available evidence. Port Terminal & Warehousing Co. v. John S. James Co., D. C. GA., 92 F.R. D. 100, 106.

UNOFFICIAL COPY

A presumption is an assumption of fact that the law requires to be made from another fact or group of facts found or otherwise established in the action. A presumption is not evidence. A presumption is either conclusive or rebuttable.

I, Robert Polinski Declare and Affirm that I am not nor have I ever been a Corporation, Fiction of Law, Fictitious Entity, Corporate Persona, Non-Entity, Legal Entity or as a Surety for any of the previously mentioned and that I further Declare and Affirm that I am a live man, American Sovereign as stated in the original Constitution for the united States of America, of which all public servants/public officials are sworn by their Oaths of Office to protect and defend, both State and National, in which is also enumerated the type and size of bonds required by both elected and appointed positions, in order to assure the Sovereign public that their trust and faith in those public servants/public officials are well founded and that their duties will be discharged in the most Honorable means until completion of their term of office.

Signature Robert Polinski
UCC 1 308, All Rights Reserved

JURAT

STATE OF: ILLINOIS, COUNTY OF COOK, Subscribed and sworn to before me, a Notary Public, the above man signed Robert Polinski

This 12th Day of July, 2013

[Signature]
Notary Public Signature

MY COMMISSION EXPIRES; 12-09-2013 Seal

