**“Right to Travel” my testimony via AFFIDAVIT by (enter your name here)**

I, IF I CHOOSE, HAVE THE PRIVATE RIGHT TO ENGAGE IN COMMERCE TO EITHER MAKE A LIVING AND OR AS A COMMON PRIVATE RIGHT, HOWEVER, AT THIS TIME, AND AT THIS VERY MOMENT I AM NOT ENGAGED IN SUCH ACTIVITIES. I HAVE A PRIVATE RIGHT TO TRAVEL IN PURSUIT OF MY GOALS, AND PURSUIT OF HAPPINESS AND TO DO SO NOT-FOR-PROFIT AND OR GAIN, AND MY PRIVATE PROPERTY TO ALWAYS BE CONSTRUED AS PRIVATE PROPERTY, “CONSUMER HOUSEHOLD GOODS” exempt FROM CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT AND OR REGULATION, AS DEFINED UNDER THE UNIFORM COMMERCIAL CODE ARTICLE 9 – 102 AND 109, IN LAW AND THE COURTS HAVE AGREED AND RULED THAT PRIVATE CITIZENS HAVE A RIGHT TO PRIVATE TRAVEL WITHOUT STATE PERMITS and or LICENSE!

**\*\*\*\*\*IF You are an agent, a deputy, an officer, an official, an administrator, a member of the Department of Defense, and/or otherwise the highlighted section in red below is for your special attention. If you disagree with any of the following, you are to provide proof of claim supporting your position back by facts and conclusions of law and not presumption! If you disagree with any of the conditions stated herein, then I accept your offer under the following conditions, providing that you supply proof within two calendar days of receipt of this presentment as stated under the terms and conditions in contained herein. \*\*\*\*\***

Passenger for hire means “a passenger for whom consideration is contributed as a condition of carriage on the vessel, whether directly or indirectly flowing to the owner, charterer, operator, agent, or any other person having an interest in the vessel.” (46 USCS § 2101), I am neither an Uber driver or a Lyft driver, nor am I currently in the employment of a commercial business owner whereby the commercial driver’s regulations should apply to my private person and/or my private property and/or the Private Rights associated thereto.

**Statement of Purpose. The general courts have found that the authority of the department of safety/DMV is limited to only the commercial users of the public ways and that the corporate state employees have, by their silence, failed to fully inform the sovereign people of the state that an automobile has been confirmed to be "private property" defined by current Article 9-109, as "household goods" and "consumer goods" not for commercial use or for profit or gain.  Further, the courts of the United States have found that corporate public servants who ignore their accountability as mandated in The Bill of Rights have by their silence and failure to fully inform the sovereign people of the consequences arising from the corporate "offer to contract," is deemed silent deception and inducement by fraud.**

There can be no sanction or penalty imposed upon one because of this exercise of constitutional rights." *Sherer v. Cullen, 481 F 946*

"The use of the highway for the purpose of travel and transportation is not a mere privilege, but a common fundamental right of which the public and individuals cannot rightfully be deprived." *Chicago Motor Coach v. Chicago, 169 NE 221.*

"The right of the citizen to travel upon the public highways and to transport his property thereon, either by carriage or by automobile, is not a mere privilege which a city may prohibit or permit at will, but a common law right which he has under the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." *Thompson v. Smith, 154 SE 579.*

"The right to travel is a part of the liberty of which the citizen cannot be deprived without due process of law under the Fifth Amendment." *Kent v. Dulles, 357 US 116, 125.*

"The right to travel is a well-established common right that does not owe its existence to the federal government. It is recognized by the courts as a natural right." *Schactman v. Dulles 96 App DC 287, 225 F2d 938, at 941.*

The U.S Supreme Court held:

"The state cannot diminish rights of the people… "Statutes that violate the plain and obvious principles of common right and common reason are null and void." *Hertado v. California, 110 US 516; Bennett v. Boggs, 1 Baldw 60,*

"The assertion of federal rights, when plainly and reasonably made, is not to be defeated under the name of local practice.", "Where rights secured by the Constitution are involved, there can be no rule making or legislation which would abrogate them.", "The claim and exercise of a constitutional right cannot be converted into a crime." *Davis v. Wechsler, 263 US 22, at 24; Miranda v. Arizona, 384 US 436, 491; Miller v. US, 230 F 486, at 489.*

Article Six of the U.S. Constitution:

"This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof; ...shall be the supreme Law of the Land; and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby, any Thing in the Constitution or laws of any State to the Contrary notwithstanding."

"The Senators and Representatives before mentioned, and the Members of the several State Legislatures, and all executive and judicial Officers, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by Oath or Affirmation, to support this Constitution..."

"...For while a citizen has the right to travel upon the public highways and to transport his property thereon, that right does not extend to the use of the highways...as a place for private gain. For the latter purpose, no person has a vested right to use the highways of this state, but it is a privilege...which the (state) may grant or withhold at its discretion..." State v. Johnson, 245 P 1073.

in [*Corfield v. Coryell*](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Corfield_v._Coryell)*,* [6 Fed. Cas. 546](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Case_citation) (1823), [freedom of movement](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Freedom_of_movement) has been judicially recognized as a fundamental Constitutional right. In [*Paul v. Virginia*](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Paul_v._Virginia)*,* 75 U.S. 168 (1869), the Court defined freedom of movement as "right of free ingress into other States, and egress from them." The [Supreme Court](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Supreme_Court_of_the_United_States) recognized under the "privileges and immunities" clause this fundamental right: [*Ward v. Maryland*](https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Ward_v._Maryland&action=edit&redlink=1)*,* 79 U.S. 418 (1871), the [*Slaughter-House Cases*](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Slaughter-House_Cases)*,* 83 U.S. 36 (1873) and [*United States v. Harris*](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_States_v._Harris)*,* 106 U.S. 629 (1883),

The U.S. Supreme Court on the right to travel in the case of [*Saenz v. Roe*](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Saenz_v._Roe), 526 U.S. 489 (1999). Justice [John Paul Stevens](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/John_Paul_Stevens), writing for the majority, held that the [United States Constitution](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_States_Constitution) protected aspects of the right to travel among the states: the right to enter one state and leave another, the right to be treated as a welcome visitor rather than a hostile stranger (protected by the "immunities" clause in [Article IV](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Article_Four_of_the_United_States_Constitution), § 2), and equal protection and Property principle under the 5th Amendment Due Process Clause.

\*\*\*\*\*You will be inclined to tell me to take it up “The judge” or other administrative officer, I am admonished to inform you that it has been taken up with several judges as mentioned above, and **the supreme law** of the land, so, if you wish to proceed in violating my rights, I conditionally accept your offer under the following terms and conditions! \*\*\*\*\*

Should there be a disagreement as to my private right to travel, then all related parties (whether directly and/or indirectly related, third party, interested party and/or otherwise) agree to settle any and all disputes by arbitration, via the A1SALES ARBITRATION ASSOCIATION and if not available or otherwise be deemed incapable of conducting the proceedings either personally or through a subcontractor, the parties elect that the default arbitration shall be had through THE EEON FOUNDATION, and the parties agree that arbitrations shall be the sole and exclusive remedy for settling any and all disputes arising out of this agreement and/or associated in any way with this agreement. As the Affiant conditionally accepts your offer, but immediately upon rejection of this offer you agree to walk away and leave me to pursue my travel goals unmolested. Should you interfere with my private rights in any contradiction of the aforegoing judicial determinations which you are bound to adhere to, you will be held personally liable, as you waive any and all rights, immunities, defenses and forever agreed to be estopped concerning any matter and or issues arising here-out-of and or related hereto. Should you be found guilty and/or in breach of this agreement and you agree to be liable respecting the fines and/or penalties associated hereto at no less than $10,000 USD per breach, plus a penalty of $5,000.00 USD for each Day of nonpayment for each consecutive half-day of either breach or noncompliance. All parties agree that on any matter involving a default, that the arbitration may be solely through electronic communications held via De Novo hearing. A party shall be granted 2 calendar days to opt-out of the agreement to arbitrate, however, failure to provide evidence supported by facts and conclusions of law contrary to the aforementioned stated facts shall be construed as assent/consent/conduct/performance which equates to tacit acquiescence with respects this agreement as a whole and the party shall be bound herein and hereby thenceforth. Any challenge to this agreement as a whole shall be presented only to the arbitrator who shall have the exclusive jurisdiction of making a determination on the issue, and this includes a severability challenge to the arbitration clause.

I also attest that I am a private citizen exercising my private rights, as cognizable by the Uniform Commercial Code article 9 § 102, 109. All of my properties are private possessions, which include my rights my physical and or intellectual properties, my name as it is associated with my person. These rights are classified as “consumer, household goods” and are exempt if you’re operating off of a presumption, I must object, as presumption is not law, is not based on fact or conclusions of law. However, the aforementioned adjudicated rights based on fundamental facts and truths, and I rest, stand, and rely on such, and do not choose to have my words spoken at any moment to be used against me as I am not under oath, but I believe you are!

Verification statement of attestation:

I (**enter** **your name here**) having attained the age of the majority, and not a minor nor incompetent person as defined in statute, do hereby declare as well as attest and affirm that the aforementioned is wholly accurate, is based on actual firsthand knowledge and actual firsthand facts and conclusions of law and presented on this day (**enter date here**), under penalty of divine retribution if otherwise so help me God who has witness this event in His Notarial Capacity.

**name**-

as, Affiant