

August 10th, 2024

Notice of 'Regulation Z' and Failure to Provide Remedy!

From: Lora Danielle Kelsey, American State National, Nevadan, sole living owner, executor, and beneficiary. All Rights Reserved Without Prejudice.

c/o 153 Honors Course Drive
Las Vegas, Nevada, [89148]

Nevada Secretary Of State
Francisco V. Aguilar
101 North Carson Street, Suite 3
Carson City, NV 89701

Priority mail, signature upon receipt requested #

With Completion of Service and designation of Witness To:

Nevada Attorney General
Aaron D. Ford
555 E. Washington Avenue, Suite 3900
Las Vegas, NV, 89101

Priority mail, signature upon receipt requested #

Dear NEVADA Secretary of State Francisco V. Aguilar,

I am writing to you to help bring awareness to a situation you might not be aware of, but is vitally important that you at least look into it. Because more and more people are realizing the unjustness and going after the officers personally.

It has come to my attention that the Nevada DMV/Department of Motor Vehicles, is supposed to issue private individuals, Regulation Z number plates. For you information, Regulation Z requires the vendors (DMV or Depart of Transport) to give you private license plates (or tags) under the Federal Highway Safety Act of 1956, so that your car can be properly identified as a private American car, not actually a Motor Vehicle.

You may be asking your self what the definition of a 'Motor Vehicle' is... Let me share the legal definition of it, as per **18 U.S. Code § 31 (6)** -means every description of carriage or other contrivance propelled or drawn by mechanical power and used for commercial purposes on the highways in the transportation of passengers, passengers and property, or property or cargo.

This essentially clarifies that my private and not for higher automobile and the vast majority of everyone else's automobiles, in Nevada, are legally NOT classified as 'motor vehicles'.

So I ask you why are the authorities forcing us to lie, and to register our cars as something they are clearly not?

The only code that comes close to a reason is the "Motor Vehicle Theft Protection Program" of **34 USC § 12611**-'a national voluntary motor vehicle theft prevention program'. For clarification for your benefit, this code means that your employees have essentially been forcing people to register their private automobiles, under color of law, when it was voluntary and never needed.

Unfortunately, we have all been strong-armed into "registering" our automobiles as "motor vehicles" and as "public property" when they really aren't. THIS TYPE OF FORCED REGISTRATION IS EXTORTION.

In the realm of corporate law, to make something 'legal', that would normally be 'illegal', technically all you have to do is offer some type of remedy. Well, in this instance, in order to pull off your otherwise illegal registration demands, you had to offer remedy to private non-commercial drivers, and that remedy is 'Regulation Z' of the Securities Laws adopted by the Federal Reserve Board of Governors. Meaning that myself and my car(s) and the vast majority of Nevadans are actually exempt from registration requirements and we can claim that exemption, as long as we are Americans who are not employed by the Federal Government corporations... I assure you I am an American speaking on behalf of all the other Americans here in Nevada and who are NOT federal employees.

Which leads me to my next point, 'Drivers Licenses'. No, you don't need a license to travel from Point A to Point B for your own private reasons and you never did need a license to travel. The entire idea behind licensing is rooted in the fact that some people drive as a profession and make their living off of the use of public roads, and some people drive very large and potentially dangerous loads on the public roads -- the origin of Commercial Driver's Licenses (CDLs) -- as a business. The courts make a distinction between private use --- Grandma going to the grocery store --- and ABC Trucking, Inc. doing a double-decker long haul via semi-trailer truck from Nevada to Georgia. And I think that is reasonable.

What's not reasonable is forced registration of our private trucks and cars and obstruction when we claim our Regulation Z remedy. What's not reasonable is when we have to defend ourselves against Highway Patrolmen threatening us with bodily harm over broken tail lights. What's not reasonable is when we are being "mistaken" accidentally-on-purpose as foreigners in our own country. And what's really not reasonable is when our ability to travel freely is being impeded or prevented by rules, codes, regulations, ordinances, mandates, and statutes that don't apply to us, because someone thinks that they have the right to redefine "interstate commerce".

I realize this is a little 'left field' but the law clearly rules in favor of us to travel freely without licensing and registration. Read on for a nice fat list of court citations that absolutely and definitively deal with the issue of whether or not we need a driver's license when we travel for private purposes --- and the answer is "No!" just as it has been since the 1890's. But be aware that the bigger issue is the imposition of forced and largely false registration of private cars as "motor vehicles" and obstruction of our access to our Regulation Z exemptions. So please consider this your notice and any trespass on my rights as an American will be met with substantial commercial liens both to the corporation and the individual officers at fault.

I am also including a very detailed notice from the American States Assemblies. Please thoroughly read through everything.

Notice to Principals is notice to Agents. Notice to Agents is notice to Principals.

Thompson v. Smith, 154 SE 579, 11 American Jurisprudence, Constitutional Law, section 329, page 1135 *"The right of the Citizen to travel upon the public highways and to transport his property thereon, in the ordinary course of life and business, is a common right which he has under the right to enjoy life and liberty, to acquire and possess property, and to pursue happiness and safety. It includes the right, in so doing, to use the ordinary and usual conveyances of the day, and under the existing modes of travel, includes the right to drive a horse drawn carriage or wagon thereon or to operate an automobile thereon, for the usual and ordinary purpose of life and business."*

– **Thompson vs. Smith, supra.; Teche Lines vs. Danforth, Miss., 12 S.2d 784** *"... the right of the citizen to drive on a public street with freedom from police interference... is a fundamental constitutional right"*

-**Caneisha Mills v. D.C. 2009** *"The use of the automobile as a necessary adjunct to the earning of a livelihood in modern life requires us in the interest of realism to conclude that the RIGHT to use an automobile on the public highways partakes of the nature of a liberty within the meaning of the Constitutional guarantees. . ."*

-**Berberian v. Lussier (1958) 139 A2d 869, 872, See also: Schecter v. Killingsworth, 380 P.2d 136, 140; 93 Ariz. 273 (1963).** *"The right to operate a motor vehicle [an automobile] upon the public streets and highways is not a mere privilege. It is a right of liberty, the enjoyment of which is protected by the guarantees of the federal and state constitutions."*

-**Adams v. City of Pocatello, 416 P.2d 46, 48; 91 Idaho 99 (1966).** *"A traveler has an equal right to employ an automobile as a means of transportation and to occupy the public highways with other vehicles in common use."*

-**Campbell v. Walker, 78 Atl. 601, 603, 2 Boyce (Del.) 41.** *"The owner of an automobile has the same right as the owner of other vehicles to use the highway, * * * A traveler on foot has the same right to the use of the public highways as an automobile or any other vehicle."*

-**Simeone v. Lindsay, 65 Atl. 778, 779; Hannigan v. Wright, 63 Atl. 234, 236.** *"The RIGHT of the citizen to DRIVE on the public street with freedom from police interference, unless he is engaged in suspicious conduct associated in some manner with criminality is a FUNDAMENTAL CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT which must be protected by the courts."*

-**People v. Horton 14 Cal. App. 3rd 667 (1971)** *"The right to make use of an automobile as a vehicle of travel along the highways of the state, is no longer an open question. The owners thereof have the same rights in the roads and streets as the drivers of horses or those riding a bicycle or traveling in some other vehicle."*

-**House v. Cramer, 112 N.W. 3; 134 Iowa 374; Farnsworth v. Tampa Electric Co. 57 So. 233, 237, 62 Fla. 166.** *"The automobile may be used with safety to others users of the highway, and in its proper use upon the highways there is an equal right with the*

users of other vehicles properly upon the highways. The law recognizes such right of use upon general principles.

-Indiana Springs Co. v. Brown, 165 Ind. 465, 468. U.S. Supreme Court says No License Necessary To Drive Automobile On Public Highways/Streets No License Is Necessary Copy and Share Freely YHVH.name 2 2 *"A highway is a public way open and free to any one who has occasion to pass along it on foot or with any kind of vehicle."*

-Schlesinger v. City of Atlanta, 129 S.E. 861, 867, 161 Ga. 148, 159; Holland v. Shackelford, 137 S.E. 2d 298, 304, 220 Ga. 104; Stavola v. Palmer, 73 A.2d 831, 838, 136 Conn. 670 *"There can be no question of the right of automobile owners to occupy and use the public streets of cities, or highways in the rural districts."*

-Liebrecht v. Crandall, 126 N.W. 69, 110 Minn. 454, 456 *"The word 'automobile' connotes a pleasure vehicle designed for the transportation of persons on highways."*

-International Motor Transit Co. vs. Seattle, 251 P. 120 The term 'motor vehicle' is different and broader than the word 'automobile.'"

-City of Dayton vs. DeBrosse, 23 NE.2d 647, 650; 62 Ohio App. 232 *"Thus self-driven vehicles are classified according to the use to which they are put rather than according to the means by which they are propelled"*

– Ex Parte Hoffert, 148 NW 20 *"The Supreme Court, in Arthur v. Morgan, 112 U.S. 495, 5 S.Ct. 241, 28 L.Ed. 825, held that carriages were properly classified as household effects, and we see no reason that automobiles should not be similarly disposed of."*

-Hillhouse v United States, 152 F. 163, 164 (2nd Cir. 1907). *"...a citizen has the right to travel upon the public highways and to transport his property thereon..."*

-State vs. Johnson, 243 P. 1073; Cummins vs. Homes, 155 P. 171; Packard vs. Banton, 44 S.Ct. 256; Hadfield vs. Lundin, 98 Wash 516, Willis vs. Buck, 263 P. 1 982; Barney vs. Board of Railroad Commissioners, 17 P.2d 82 *"The use of the highways for the purpose of travel and transportation is not a mere privilege, but a common and fundamental Right of which the public and the individual cannot be rightfully deprived."*

-Chicago Motor Coach vs. Chicago, 169 NE 22; Ligare vs. Chicago, 28 NE 934; Boon vs. Clark, 214 SSW 607; 25 Am.Jur. (1st) Highways Sect.163 *"the right of the Citizen to travel upon the highway and to transport his property thereon in the ordinary course of life and business... is the usual and ordinary right of the Citizen, a right common to all."*

– Ex Parte Dickey, (Dickey vs. Davis), 85 SE 781 *"Every Citizen has an unalienable RIGHT to make use of the public highways of the state; every Citizen has full freedom to travel from place to place in the enjoyment of life and liberty."*

-People v. Nothaus, 147 Colo. 210. *"No State government entity has the power to allow or deny passage on the highways, byways, nor waterways... transporting his vehicles and personal property for either recreation or business, but by being subject only to local regulation i.e., safety, caution, traffic lights, speed limits, etc. Travel is not a privilege requiring licensing, vehicle registration, or forced insurances."*

Chicago Coach Co. v. City of Chicago, 337 Ill. 200, 169 N.E. 22. *"Traffic infractions are not a crime."*

-People v. Battle *"Persons faced with an unconstitutional licensing law which purports to require a license as a prerequisite to exercise of right... may ignore the law and engage with impunity in exercise of such right."*

Shuttlesworth v. Birmingham 394 U.S. 147 (1969). U.S. Supreme Court says No License Necessary To Drive Automobile On Public Highways/Streets No License Is Necessary Copy and Share Freely YHVH.name 3 *"The word 'operator' shall not include any person who solely transports his own property and who transports no persons or property for hire or compensation."*

Statutes at Large California Chapter 412 p.83 *"Highways are for the use of the traveling public, and all have the right to use them in a reasonable and proper manner; the use thereof is an inalienable right of every citizen."*

Escobedo v. State 35 C2d 870 in 8 Cal Jur 3d p.27 **"RIGHT** — *A legal RIGHT, a constitutional RIGHT means a RIGHT protected by the law, by the constitution, but government does not create the idea of RIGHT or original RIGHTS; it acknowledges them. . . "*

Bouvier's Law Dictionary, 1914, p. 2961. *"Those who have the right to do something cannot be licensed for what they already have right to do as such license would be meaningless."*

City of Chicago v Collins 51 NE 907, 910. *"A license means leave to do a thing which the licensor could prevent."*

Blatz Brewing Co. v. Collins, 160 P.2d 37, 39; 69 Cal. A. 2d 639. *"The object of a license is to confer a right or power, which does not exist without it."*

Payne v. Massey (19__) 196 SW 2nd 493, 145 Tex 273. *"The court makes it clear that a license relates to qualifications to engage in profession, business, trade or calling; thus, when merely traveling without compensation or profit, outside of business enterprise or adventure with the corporate state, no license is required of the natural individual traveling for personal business, pleasure and transportation."*

Wingfield v. Fielder 2d Ca. 3d 213 (1972). *"If [state] officials construe a vague statute unconstitutionally, the citizen may take them at their word, and act on the assumption that the statute is void."*

Shuttlesworth v. Birmingham 394 U.S. 147 (1969). *"With regard particularly to the U.S. Constitution, it is elementary that a Right secured or protected by that document cannot be overthrown or impaired by any state police authority."*

Donnolly vs. Union Sewer Pipe Co., 184 US 540; Lafarier vs. Grand Trunk R.R. Co., 24 A. 848; O'Neil vs. Providence Amusement Co., 108 A. 887. *"The right to travel (called the right of free ingress to other states, and egress from them) is so fundamental that it appears in the Articles of Confederation, which governed our society before the Constitution."*

(Paul v. Virginia). *"[T]he right to travel freely from State to State ... is a right broadly assertable against private interference as well as governmental action. Like the right of association, it is a virtually unconditional personal right, guaranteed by the Constitution to us all."*

(U.S. Supreme Court, Shapiro v. Thompson). EDGERTON, Chief Judge: *"Iron curtains have no place in a free world. ...'Undoubtedly the right of locomotion, the right to remove from one place to another according to inclination, is an attribute of personal*

liberty, and the right, ordinarily, of free transit from or through the territory of any State is a right secured by the Constitution.'

Williams v. Fears, 179 U.S. 270, 274, 21 S.Ct. 128, 45 L.Ed. 186. "Our nation has thrived on the principle that, outside areas of plainly harmful conduct, every American is left to shape his own life as he thinks best, do what he pleases, go where he pleases."

Id., at 197. Kent vs. Dulles see Vestal, Freedom of Movement, 41 Iowa L.Rev. 6, 13—14. "The validity of restrictions on the freedom of movement of particular individuals, both substantively and procedurally, is precisely the sort of matter that is the peculiar domain of the courts."

Comment, 61 Yale L.J. at page 187. "a person detained for an investigatory stop can be questioned but is "not obliged to answer, answers may not be compelled, and refusal to answer furnishes no basis for an arrest."

Justice White, Hiibel "Automobiles have the right to use the highways of the State on an equal footing with other vehicles."

Cumberland Telephone & Telegraph Co. v Yeiser 141 Kentucky 15. "Each citizen has the absolute right to choose for himself the mode of conveyance he desires, whether it be by wagon or carriage, by horse, motor or electric car, or by bicycle, or astride of a horse, subject to the sole condition that he will observe all those requirements that are known as the law of the road."

Swift v City of Topeka, 43 U.S. Supreme Court says No License Necessary To Drive Automobile On Public Highways/Streets No License Is Necessary Copy and Share Freely

YHVH.name 4 Kansas 671, 674. The Supreme Court said in U.S. v Mersky (1960) 361 U.S. 431: An administrative regulation, of course, is not a "statute." A traveler on foot has the same right to use of the public highway as an automobile or any other vehicle.

Cecchi v. Lindsay, 75 Atl. 376, 377, 1 Boyce (Del.) 185. Automotive vehicles are lawful means of conveyance and have equal rights upon the streets with horses and carriages.

Chicago Coach Co. v. City of Chicago, 337 Ill. 200, 205; See also: Christy v. Elliot, 216 Ill. 31; Ward v. Meredith, 202 Ill. 66; Shinkle v. McCullough, 116 Ky. 960; Butler v. Cabe, 116 Ark. 26, 28-29. ...automobiles are lawful vehicles and have equal rights on the highways with horses and carriages.

Daily v. Maxwell, 133 S.W. 351, 354. Matson v. Dawson, 178 N.W. 2d 588, 591. A farmer has the same right to the use of the highways of the state, whether on foot or in a motor vehicle, as any other citizen.

Draffin v. Massey, 92 S.E.2d 38, 42. Persons may lawfully ride in automobiles, as they may lawfully ride on bicycles.

Doherty v. Ayer, 83 N.E. 677, 197 Mass. 241, 246; Molway v. City of Chicago, 88 N.E. 485, 486, 239 Ill. 486; Smiley v. East St. Louis Ry. Co., 100 N.E. 157, 158. "A soldier's personal automobile is part of his 'household goods[.]'"

U.S. v Bomar, C.A.5(Tex.), 8 F.3d 226, 235" 19A Words and Phrases – Permanent Edition (West) pocket part 94. "[I]t is a jury question whether ... an automobile ... is a motor vehicle[.]"

United States v Johnson, 718 F.2d 1317, 1324 (5th Cir. 1983). Other right to use an automobile cases: – EDWARDS VS. CALIFORNIA, 314 U.S. 160 – TWINING VS NEW

JERSEY, 211 U.S. 78 – WILLIAMS VS. FEARS, 179 U.S. 270, AT 274 – CRANDALL VS. NEVADA, 6 WALL. 35, AT 43-44 – THE PASSENGER CASES, 7 HOWARD 287, AT 492 – U.S. VS. GUEST, 383 U.S. 745, AT 757-758 (1966) – GRIFFIN VS. BRECKENRIDGE, 403 U.S. 88, AT 105-106 (1971) – CALIFANO VS. TORRES, 435 U.S. 1, AT 4, note 6 – SHAPIRO VS. THOMPSON, 394 U.S. 618 (1969) – CALIFANO VS. AZNAVORIAN, 439 U.S. 170, AT 176 (1978) Look the above citations up in American Jurisprudence. Some citations may be paraphrased.

By: *Lora Danielle Kelsey*
Lora Danielle Kelsey © Nevada, State National
All Rights Reserved. Without Prejudice

Recording Secretary and International Notarial Witness

Nevada
Clark County

I, Aaron Michael Lucey, a Nevada Assembly Recording Secretary and International Notarial Witness, do hereby affirm that the Declarant has been positively identified and I have witnessed their signing of this Notice of 'Regulation Z' and Failure to Provide Remedy:

Nevada Assembly Recording Secretary By: *Aaron Michael Lucey*
All Rights Reserved Without Prejudice

Nevada Assembly Recording Secretary
Land Recording Office
The United States of America
Date: 08-10-2024
Recording #: NV-231017-003-00000177

