UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	§	
Plaintiff,	§	
Vs.	§	Case: **3-08 CR 089 N**
	§	
WESLEY DAVID BOWDEN,	§	
Defendant.	§	

In the judicial district of the people of the country of Texas

Petition and challenge to jurisdiction

"Comes Now Wesley-David: family of Bowden, man, authorized agent [1] and owner of the private common-law copyright of the fictional artificial entity cited above as WESLEY DAVID BOWDEN the Defendant a title to a fictional private work owned by Wesley-David: family of Bowden, being used in place of Wesley-David: family of Bowden, in the above cited case number and, in the interest of justice, makes this timely Petition and make challenge to the jurisdiction and authority and demand proof of Status, Standing and agency with full description with proof by complete I.D. of each of the following entities including citizenship exact and certain:

1. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA;
2. UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS DALLAS DIVISION;
3. The Judge of UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS DALLAS DIVISION;
4. All prosecutors of and for UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS DALLAS DIVISION;
5. All arresting agents of UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS DALLAS DIVISION;
6. All Grand Juries UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS DALLAS DIVISION;,
7. All witnesses UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS DALLAS DIVISION;
8. All juries persons for and of that are to be used by UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS DALLAS DIVISION;
9. All court reporters of UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS DALLAS DIVISION;

specimen

10. All Bailiffs of UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS DALLAS DIVISION;
11. All Clerks of UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS DALLAS DIVISION;
12. WESLEY DAVID BOWDEN Defendant of UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS DALLAS DIVISION;
13. All attorneys of and for UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS DALLAS DIVISION;
14. Any and all other name person that is party to UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS DALLAS DIVISION.

There being no contract or verified claim in evidence, Jurisdiction is challenged of all of the foregoing entities by the authority of the following United States Courts ruling:

A derivative of a name is not the legal name.
Monroe Cattle Co. v. Becker, 147 U. S. 47 (1893)

"Jurisdiction, once challenged, cannot be assumed and must be decided."
Maine v Thiboutot, 100 S. Ct. 250

"The law requires proof of jurisdiction to appear on the record of the administrative agency and all administrative proceedings."
Hagans v Lavine, 415 U. S. 533

Though not specifically alleged, defendant's challenge to subject matter jurisdiction implicitly raised claim that default judgment against him was void and relief should be granted under Rule 60(b)(4).
Honneus v. Donovan, 93 F.R.D. 433, 436-37 (1982), affd, 691 F.2d 1 (1st Cir. 1982)

"The law provides that once State and Federal Jurisdiction has been challenged, it must be proven."
100 S. Ct. 2502 (1980)

"Jurisdiction can be challenged at any time."
Basso v. Utah Power & Light Co., 495 F.2d 906, 910

"Defense of lack of jurisdiction over the subject matter may be raised at any time, even on appeal."
Hill Top Developers v. Holiday Pines Service Corp., 478 So. 2d. 368 (Fla 2nd DCA 1985)

"Court must prove on the record, all jurisdiction facts related to the jurisdiction asserted."
Lantana v. Hopper, 102 F. 2d 188; Chicago v. New York, 37 F. Supp. 150

specimen

"Once challenged, jurisdiction cannot be assumed, it must be proved to exist."
Stuck v. Medical Examiners, 94 Ca 2d 751. 211 P2d 389

"Courts are constituted by authority and they cannot go beyond that power delegated to them. If they act beyond that authority, and certainly in contravention of it, their judgments and orders are regarded as nullities ; they are not voidable, but simply void, and this even prior to reversal."
WILLIAMSON v. BERRY, 8 HOW. 945, 540 12 L.Ed. 1170, 1189 (1850)

"Once jurisdiction is challenged, the court cannot proceed when it clearly appears that the court lacks jurisdiction, the court has no authority to reach merits, but rather should dismiss the action."
Melo v. U.S., 505 F.2d 1026

"There is no discretion to ignore lack of jurisdiction."
Joyce v. U.S., 474 2D 215

"The burden shifts to the court to prove jurisdiction."
Rosemond v. Lambert, 469 F.2d 416

"Court must prove on the record, all jurisdiction facts related to the jurisdiction asserted."
Latana v. Hopper, 102 F.2d 188; Chicago v. New York 37 F. Supp. 150

Elk v. Wilkins is a 14th Amendment case, the concept is true concerning all federal citizens. In other words, all federal citizens must be, by their very definition, a person who is "completely subject" to the jurisdiction of the federal government (such as a citizen of Washington DC). Virtually any legal concept stated by the courts concerning a 14th Amendment citizen is operative upon all federal citizens.

"The persons declared to be citizens are, "All persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof." The evident meaning of these last words is not merely subject in some respect or degree to the jurisdiction of the United States, but completely subject..."
Elk v. Wilkins, 112 US 94, 101, 102 (1884)

"The privileges and immunities clause of the 14th Amendment protects very few rights because it neither incorporates the Bill of Rights nor protects all rights of individual citizens. (See Slaughter House cases, 83 US (16 Wall.) 36, 21 L. Ed. 394 (1873)). Instead this provision protects only those rights peculiar to being a citizen of the federal government; it does not protect those rights which relate to state citizenship."
Jones v. Temmer, 839 F. Supp. 1226

"...the first eight amendments have uniformly been held not to be protected from state action by the privilege and immunities clause [of the 14th Amendment]."
Hague v. CIO, 307 US 496, 520

Volume 20 of Corpus Juris Secundum at 1758: "The United States Government is a foreign corporation with respect to a state." NY vs. re Merriam, 36N.E. 505; 141 N.Y. 479; affirmed 16 S.Ct. 1073; 41 L.Ed. 287.

specimen

"There are, then, under our republican form of government, two classes of citizens, one of the United States and one of the state".
Gardina v. Board of Registrars of Jefferson County, 160 Ala. 155; 48 So. 788 (1909)

"The governments of the United States and of each state of the several states are distinct from one another. The rights of a citizen under one may be quite different from those which he has under the other".
Colgate v. Harvey, 296 U.S. 404; 56 S.Ct. 252 (1935)

"...rights of national citizenship as distinct from the fundamental or natural rights inherent in state citizenship".
Madden v. Kentucky, 309 U.S. 83: 84 L.Ed. 590 (1940)

"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".
Slaughter-House Cases, 83 U.S. (16 Wall.) 36; 21 L.Ed. 394 (1873)

"We have in our political system a government of the United States and a government of each of the several States. Each one of these governments is distinct from the others, and each has citizens of it's own..."
United States v. Cruikshank, 92 U.S. 542 (1875)

"There is a difference between privileges and immunities belonging to the citizens of the United States as such, and those belonging to the citizens of each state as such".
Ruhstrat v. People, 57 N.E. 41 (1900)

Against the peace and dignity of the people in the judicial district of the country of Texas.

_____
Wesley-David: family of Bowden
Christian man, Ambassador,
Kingdom of Heaven

///
///
///
///
///
///
///
///
///
///
///
///
///
///

specimen

Certificate of Service

I, Wesley-David: family of Bowden, authorized private owner of the common-law copyright of the fictional artificial entity WESLEY DAVID BOWDEN the above cited Defendant, declare that on July____, 2008, I recorded an original and a copy of the foregoing in UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS DALLAS DIVISION.

_____
Wesley-David: family of Bowden
authorized title holder

In the Judicial District of the people

Raised seal:

///
///
///
///
///
///
///
///
///
///
///
///
///
///
///
///
///
///
///
///
///
///
///
///
///
///
///
///
///
///
///
///
///
///
///
///
///
///
///
///
///
///
///
///
///
///

specimen