

COMPLAINT:

Charging by writ or other related systems of court procedures used to bring physical beings to the decision by either juries or judges, guilty or not, of a complaint to a code, law or statute, of American Indians, where Juris Prudence has not been agreed upon between Indian Nations, tribes, or reservations, and the Government of the United States, and which is in direct conflict of Indian land, resources, and rights

BRIEFING:

Citizens or members of Indian Nations, Tribes, and Reservations cannot assume to have obligations to, or under the protection of a Nation other than their own, because United States citizenship and Indian Exclusive Jurisdiction control are in direct conflict due to Indian Sovereign Land Base Rights. Courts have no Right(s) to assume this Jurisdiction when it cannot prove that any existing tribal relations or affiliations have terminated or dissolved because the Indian having left Indian Sovereign Territories (practicing his right of occupancy). This question of jurisdiction, or the lack of it, is the exclusive right of Congress, President, and the Secretary, of the Indian which cannot be set aside, changed, or altered as long as the Indian has not asked that Guardianship, Alienation, and Severalty be relieved. (U.S.-Halbert v. U.S., Wash., 51 S.Ct.615, 283 U.S.753, 75 L.Ed. 1339, reversing, C.C.A., U.S. v. Halbert, 38 F.2d. 795, U.S. v. Provoe, 33 F.2d. 799, U.S. v. Walkowsky, 33 F.2d. 805, U.S. v. Wolfson, 38 F.2d.806, certiorari granted Halbert v. U.S., 51 S.Ct.23, 282 U.S. 318, 75 L.Ed.731,-U.S. v. Dewey County, S.D., 14 F.2d.784, affirmed, C.C.A., Dewey v. U.S., 26 F.2d.434, certiorari denied 49 S.Ct.94, 278 U.S. 649, 73 L.Ed.561, -U.S. v. City of Salamanca, D.C.N.Y., 27 F.Supp.541, D.C.-Work v. U.S., ex rel. Gouin, 18 F.2d.820, 57 App. D.C.170, 31 C.J. Pg.482 note 49(a)(3)).

Now, the question of charges or crimes that conflict with Indian law agreed upon between the United States and Indian Nation, Tribes, and reservations and this jurisdiction is questionable because (the courts of this country has never been opened to the Indian and civil liberties of United States citizens given to Indians. (Jaeger v. U.S., 27 Ct. Cl.278).

STATEMENT OF AMERICAN CITIZENSHIP OF INDIANS LOCATED IN THE TERRITORY LIMITS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

ACTION: PART FOUR OF SIX PARTS TO: "ex parte DAKOTA QUINN PAPERS".

been agreed upon between Indian Nations, tribes, or reservations, and the Government of the United States, and which is in direct conflict of Indian land, resources, and rights

BRIEFING: Citizens or members of Indian Nations, Tribes, and Reservations cannot assume to have obligations to, or under the protection of a Nation other than their own, because United States citizenship and Indian Exclusive Jurisdiction control are in direct conflict due to Indian Sovereign Land Base Rights. Courts have no Right(s) to assume this Jurisdiction when it cannot prove that any existing tribal rela-

tions or affiliations have terminated or dissolved because

the Indian having left Indian Sovereign Territories

jurisdiction, or the lack of it, is the exclusive right of Congress, President, and the Secretary, of the Indian which can

the question of crimes that conflict with

Indian law agreed upon the United States and Indian Nation, Tribes, and Reservations and this is the question of the courts of this country has never been opened to the Indian and civil liberties of United States citizens given to Indians. (Jaeger v. U.S., 27 Ct. Cl 278),'

STATEMENT OF AMERICAN CITIZENSHIP OF INDIANS LOCATED IN THE TERRITORY LIMITS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA ii

ACTION! PART FOUR OF SIX PARTS TO: "in part DAKOTA QUINN PAPERS".