Why are you asking?

FOIA – An act of Fraud!

You are the sovereign, courtesy of the CREATOR! And

Confirmed by the undisputed leader of the free world.

The Trump Doctrine 2017

And consider the lack of legitimacy with the criminal cabal members with whom he must play his role.

in search of a lawful government

It seems some Americans have been so thoroughly indoctrinated they have no idea as to their true lawful status in society. And even worse...they have become so naive, they take the word of the criminal impostors.

Along with being deceived and mislead, they have also parked their intellectual ability to think critically, while they acquiesced their sovereignty to criminal
impersonators, who were hired or elected to perform the work of the people.

Nowhere are there any laws, records, or notices, which have authorized our employees to commit treason against the American people. to the contrary, California, the legitimate legislature declared:

54950. In enacting this chapter, the Legislature finds and declares that the public commissions, boards and councils and the other public agencies in this State exist to aid in the conduct of the people's business. It is the intent of the law that their actions be taken openly and that their deliberations be conducted openly.

The people of this State do not yield their sovereignty to the agencies which serve them. The people, in delegating authority, do not give their public servants the right to decide what is good for the people to know and what is not good for them to know. The people insist on remaining informed so that they may retain control over the instruments they have created.
and just to compound their criminal behavior, the imposters have set about to demonstrate their criminally-inspired, creative-persuasiveness, in a form of compete lawless disregard for the truth in a very similar deceptive approach to the manner in which agenda 21 has been so successfully presented.

**California Brown Act – Open Meetings Act**

Below, please find the rules regarding how they are supposed to behave.

**Public Service is a Public Trust... Fiduciary Duty**

The point being made is that I believe the American people, were created as sovereigns by the UNIVERSAL CREATOR, in his image. However, what each American
believes, is up to them. Their truth, is unique to them and we are not obligated to agree.

But at the same time...when presented with the truth, I believe the American people will take the appropriate action for the appropriate reasons. And...

Further proof of this is demonstrated by the actions of the criminal impersonators pretending to be the members of our Congress. They pretended to make deceptive propaganda lawful. But such an act would be repugnant to the Constitution.

Government “Made” News – “Propaganda” Became Legal in 2013

And so how come we are in this position? We permit a small number of criminals to pretend they are in charge...

There are still some Americans who fail to recognize the critical nature of Mr. Trump’s declaration of sovereignty. Recognition by others
across the world, of one’s sovereignty is the most important factor in establishing a nation; wars are fought to gain “recognition,” and diplomatic recognition is the basis of respect and honor for nations to coexist in peace and harmony.

And in his address to the UN, Mr. Trump declared the sovereignty of the American people.

Mr. Trump had any choice of topics to present in this global forum. Consider that the Pope, and all other so-called world leaders have recently sought to give recognition to the New World Order and the justification to continue to impose tyranny under the sanctions of the “FAKE” UNITED NATIONS.
Say regardless of what you choose to believe about the actions of Mr. Trump in this matter, I strongly submit, to any reasonable intelligent citizen of the world, this declaration will come to be recognized as one of the most important of our time.

But on the flip side of this coin...

And out of an incredible degree of ignorance, the cavalier approach towards enforcing the sovereign status of the American people, recognized by Mr. Trump, will be the failure of the American people. For as the duly noted “only legitimate authority,”

We are the army for whom we have been waiting.
Sovereignty!

The CREATOR granted us the gift of life... But as Americans, sovereigns, the responsibility as to how we conduct ourselves is up to us.

Self-governance begins with each individual American. For as the sovereign Americans..., we are the only lawful and legitimate authority!
copy and pasted sections of statutes and constitution caused some confusion. I am familiar with attorneys who have a problem when it comes to perceiving the meaning of the public's servants who occupy the state house.

Please allow me another try at clarifying what the courts have ruled and has never been different (did you read the doc about Mr. Moomaw's law?). The Oregon Legislative Assembly meets every year now, to debate and enact "laws". When they finish with their process, the thing that everyone can see is called an "enrolled bill", which is signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Senate Pres., the Senate Clerk, the Secretary of State, and sometimes the Governor.

After it is so signed, it is a "law". The law is then encoded into something called the Oregon Revised Statutes by a group under the supervision of Legislative Council (Dexter Johnson). The gal who does "transportation law" is Heidi Elliot. Sometimes this may take awhile, so I was not sure whether you receive the "law" or the "Oregon Revised Statutes". It probably doesn't matter what form it is in, it should read, verbatim, the same. The statutes are "evidence that
laws have been enacted".

I do not want anything written on the piece of paper that is a law or an Oregon Revised Statute, just the doc as it was initially printed. When and if I had asked, "What does this doc mean?", that would be something that most people would call "an interpretation".

Perhaps my limited experience with the English language is standing between my intellect and "knowledge". Will I be allowed to ask from whence cometh E. Shannon Johnson's word "interpretation"?

The only reason I ask this silly question is that I have followed up on E. Shannon Johnson's referrals. I tried "Legal Aid". In a rather protracted conversation I eventually asked, "Are you saying that E. Shannon Johnson is incompetent, or is (he, she or it) engaging in willful misrepresentation of material fact?" I was told that there might be something else, so I asked what that might be... but rather than than hazard a guess, she referred me to the Law Library.

I read him the opening lines of my request and he was
able to see that what I was asking for is a piece of paper, a work product of the Legislative Assembly. I don't know why it is so, but I find that librarians are remarkably open minded. He asked me what the piece of paper I was requesting said, and that led to a long conversation, about an hour and a quarter. I told him that I was not able to find the law that you promised me, but I gave him the laws that were mentioned in my request.

The Librarian eventually asked if I was going to seek a solution "legally or politically". I explained that my next event was something a little different, it is called "mediation". Last session's public record law created a process by which one may "mediate" the release of public pieces of paper, that is to say docs created by public officials who were doing public business when the docs were drafted. Oh, and the other thing he said was that incompetence or willful misrepresentation of material fact seemed to be the only legitimate choices I could entertain about E. Shannon Johnson.

The trouble with "incompetence" is that public servants are presumed to know the law, like the public record law, and the laws that are enforced against
"persons" (ORS 174.100(6); 183.310(8)(10); 153.039, "to the extent provided"). I have no idea how long E. Shannon Johnson has been offering "legal advice" to City of Keizer, but if he, she or it continues with the cover story that the problem is "incompetence", maybe someone will get around to hiring a new attorney.

As for the Attorney Referral Service... I have been calling them so often that they are reluctant to give me any more referrals, but... I just got an appointment with an attorney, who will help me understand what "interpretation" means! I must say that when I read what E. Shannon Johnson wrote to me, to the Bar Referral gal, she said she didn't understand what the "legal problem" is. I told her that I just got this email from you and you had attached a letter from E. Shannon Johnson and I read her what was written, meaning, "How would I know what E. Shannon Johnson means when I say I want a piece of paper and I get an attachment that says I should get an "interpretation from a Bar Referral?".

So here is my question to you. If I find, as a result of a public record law request, that there is no such record, the laws that allow the City of Keizer Police to
write tickets to the general public, what will the City of Keizer do with that information? To whom will I make this information available? Is there a process of conveying information such as this that is subject to the Public Record Law?

Please bear in mind that I am not asking you for a "legal interpretation" nor for "legal advice". What will City of Keizer do with that information, means what have the principals of the municipal government mandated the City of Keizer to do, or what have the courts said is to be done with this information?

Perhaps I may make a public record law request for the piece of paper, with no writing on it other than the initial writing that describes what the City of Keizer shall do with with "laws", "statutes" or "enrolled bills" that conflict with the standard operating procedure, "sop" of City of Keizer".

Please make this record available to me at my email address as appears hereon, in a timely manner. You may, but I do not think it would be appropriate, request an extension of time in which to comply with this
request by briefly stating the cause for your request and a date certain by which I may expect it in my inbox.

If you wish to say that no such record exists, you must ask your attorney for an extemporaneous assertion of what City of Keizer is mandated to do when it receives information to the effect that the City's SOP is not in accordance with current law.

Thank you for assisting me in this learning experience. I'll let you know what the attorney says about "interpretation".

Richard L. Koenig

for
Why are you asking?
On Thu, Oct 12, 2017 at 3:55 PM, Davis, Tracy <DavisT@keizer.org> wrote:
Good Afternoon, Mr. Koenig. Please find attached a response from Keizer City Attorney Shannon Johnson on your request for a public record. Thank you.

Tracy L. Davis, MMC
City Recorder – City of Keizer

From: Richard Koenig [mailto:richardl.koenig@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 11, 2017 5:22 PM
To: Davis, Tracy <DavisT@keizer.org>
Subject: Request for a Public Record under ORS 192.420

Dear Traci,

Please consider this, my second attempt, to be the one most complete.

I am so glad to have met you! My day brightened when you said you could send me a public record.
To adequately describe the public record, let me begin by saying that it is an Oregon Law, but it may also be encoded in the Oregon Revised Statutes. I could even be persuaded to accept the "enrolled bill". I suspect that when the legislature sends the City of Keizer what it needs to know, that it is in the form of a law. Please Correct me if I am wrong in this regard. A "law" is cited by the year of its enactment, such as "Laws of Oregon, 2017", and includes the "chapter" number, which is assigned chronologically by time of enactment.

As I said, it could be encoded, and if this is the case, it will be labeled as a section of the Oregon Revised Statutes, aka ORS. The numbers represent the chapter number and to the right of the decimal is the "section" number.

This law is "common knowledge" in our culture, everybody knows that it is a "privilege to drive". I am not very good at "common knowledge". I know that the following "persons" are,

801.050 Privilege of motorist to use highways. Subject to compliance with the motor vehicle law of this state, owners and operators of motor vehicles are granted the privilege of using the highways of this state. [1983 c.338 §10; 1985 c.16 §8]
I also know that,

801.305 “Highway.” (1) “Highway” means every public way, road, street, thoroughfare and place, including bridges, viaducts and other structures within the boundaries of this state, open, used or intended for use of the general public for vehicles or vehicular traffic as a matter of right.

I am aware of similar language in,

806.010 Driving uninsured prohibited; penalty. (1) A person commits the offense of driving uninsured if the person operates a motor vehicle in this state on any highway or premises open to the public in this state without either:

and

807.010 Operating vehicle without driving privileges or in violation of license restrictions; penalty. (1) A person commits the offense of operating a vehicle without driving privileges if the person operates a motor vehicle upon a highway or premises open to the public in this state and the person does not have an appropriate grant of driving privileges...
I wondered about the different terms, "person" and "the general public" so I looked up Statutory Construction at the definition section,

174.100 Definitions. As used in the statute laws of this state, unless the context or a specially applicable definition requires otherwise:

(1) “Any other state” includes any state and the District of Columbia.

(2) “City” includes any incorporated village or town.

(3) “County court” includes board of county commissioners.

(4) “Husband and wife,” “husband or wife,” “husband” or “wife” means spouses or a spouse in a marriage.

(5) “May not” and “shall not” are equivalent expressions of an absolute prohibition.

(6) “Person” includes individuals, corporations, associations, firms, partnerships, limited liability companies and joint stock companies.
(7) “Sexual orientation” means an individual’s actual or perceived heterosexuality, homosexuality, bisexuality or gender identity, regardless of whether the individual’s gender identity, appearance, expression or behavior differs from that traditionally associated with the individual’s sex at birth.

(8) “State Treasury” includes those financial assets the lawful custody of which are vested in the State Treasurer and the office of the State Treasurer relating to the custody of those financial assets.

(9) “To” means “to and including” when used in a reference to a series of statute sections, subsections or paragraphs.

(10) “United States” includes territories, outlying possessions and the District of Columbia.

(11) “Violate” includes failure to comply.

[Amended by 1953 c.145 §2; 1957 c.360 §1; 1963 c.213 §1; 1965 c.518 §1; 1967 c.409 §1; 1983 c.327 §1; 1993 c.73 §1; 1995 c.93 §30; 2001 c.671 §1; 2007 c. 100 §1; 2015 c.629 §33]
Pursuant to the language in subsection 1, I went to the definition section of the vehicle code (again) and found that there is no particular "person" described between 801.385 and 801.387, nor is there an alternate definition in any other chapter of the Vehicle Code, so "person" has to be one of those listed at 174.100.

At that point I realized that perhaps I could find the "public" in a different document, so I looked to the Oregon Constitution, and there at Article I

Section 1. Natural rights inherent in people. We declare that all men, when they form a social compact are equal in right: that all power is inherent in the people, and all free governments are founded on their authority, and instituted for their peace, safety, and happiness; and they have at all times a right to alter, reform, or abolish the government in such manner as they may think proper.—

so I thought about who might have sufficient power to "grant a privilege" to these "people" and aren't "the people" actually the same as the "public"? Then I found these words in Article I,

Section 18. Private property or services taken for public use. Private property shall not be taken for public use, nor the particular services of any man be demanded, without just compensation; nor except in the case of the state, without such compensation first assessed and tendered; provided, that the use of all roads, ways and waterways necessary to promote the transportation of the raw products of mine or farm or forest or water for beneficial use or drainage is necessary to the development and welfare of the
The Oregon Legislative Assembly is a piece of government that the people established, they are actually "authorized" by the all powerful people to make laws for "the people's" own peace, safety and happiness. And since we are guaranteed a "republican form of government" and we're all equal in right, no single human being, or even a group of them, such as Legislators, may deprive the others of their "equal rights".

These realizations/concepts seem to be in conflict with the law that I am requesting, so I was relieved to hear you offer assurances that you will provide it for my inspection.

Please provide for my inspection the law, statute or bill which has the effect of authorizing law enforcement officers to stop and write trafficking tickets to anyone other than the

153.039 Stop and detention for violation. (1) An enforcement officer may not arrest, stop or detain a person for the commission of a violation except to the extent provided in this section and ORS 810.410.

(2) An enforcement officer may stop and detain any person if the officer has reasonable grounds to believe that the person has committed a violation. An enforcement officer may stop and detain any employee, agent or representative of a firm, corporation or other
organization if the officer has reasonable grounds to believe that the firm, corporation or other organization has committed a violation.

(3) Except as provided in subsection (4) of this section, the period of detention may be only as long as is necessary to:

(a) Establish the identity of the person, firm, corporation or organization believed to have committed the violation;

(b) Conduct any investigation reasonably related to the violation; and

(c) Issue a citation for the violation.

(4) The authority of an enforcement officer to stop and detain a person for a traffic violation as defined by ORS 801.557 is governed by ORS 810.410. [1999 c.1051 §10]

I understand that there are other references to "person(s)" in the foregoing paragraph, but Article IV of Oregon's Constitution helps make what's going on there clear,

Section 20. Subject and title of Act. Every Act shall embrace but one subject, and matters properly connected therewith, which subject shall be
expressed in the title. But if any subject shall be embraced in an Act which shall not be expressed in the title, such Act shall be void only as to so much thereof as shall not be expressed in the title.

An "Act" includes all language between one "legislative history" and the next "legislative history" such as you see in the small print after "ORS 810.410" in the section about authorizing enforcement officers to stop and detain, so you have to understand that the single subject of this section is the "employees" etc "of a firm, corporation or other organization".

The law I am requesting authorizes enforcement officers to stop and detain for the purpose of writing a ticket to members of the general public. One might assume that it is in the same chapter as persons in ORS 153.039. However, this being a particularly short chapter, it is easy to quickly highlight it and search using any of your usual search terms. I can say that I have done so and it is not there.

And why would the general public be ticketed? Provide the law that says they must be licensed; the law that says they must title and register their "solely for personal use" vehicles; the law that says they must obtain and carry proof of insurance; the law that says they must pay parking fees or fines; the law that says they must pay the "motor vehicle" fuel tax.

The previous paragraph came out pretty quickly, and may have been confusing. So in order to assist you in coming up with the desired law(s), I have attached a document that details former DMV Director David P. Moomaw's best guess at how to make these laws most effective.
You shall timely provide these records to my address as appears hereon (digitally). You may request an extension of time in which to provide these records by briefly stating the cause of your request and a date certain by which I may expect to see them in my inbox (for some reason I normally request hard copy, so I would like to reserve the right to obtain them in this way, but we'll see).

In the event that you fail to email the requested records, I will enjoy the option to either Presume that they do not exist, or you would have done your lawful duty prescribed by ORS 192.420, or "Evidence willfully suppressed is adverse to the party suppressing".

If you wish to tell me that these laws have never been written, please use the following succinct language: "No such law exists".

Thanks for brightening my day.

--

Richard L. Koenig

--

Richard L. Koenig
Why are you asking?

--

Richard L. Koenig
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