

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA

In the Interest of C.D.C., a minor child

B.C. }
 Plaintiff and Appellant, }
 }
 vs. }
 }
 S.P. n/k/a S.H. }
 Defendant and Appellee. }

**BRIEF IN RESPONSE TO
APPEAL**

Supreme Court File # 20180371

Cass County File # 09-2018-DM-00828

In this Case there are several reasons for appeal to be dealt with including Jurisdiction, Statute of Limitations, Res Judicata, Constitutional Rights and most importantly the Law of God according to the Scriptures. I, B.C as Plaintiff and a Party in this matter; of legal age; and acting Pro-se without council; do hereby set my pen to this brief in support of my appeal as an affidavit to be true and correct to my best knowledge.

Table of Contents:

- Heading and Tables. Page 1-2
- Jurisdiction. Page 3-4
- Res Judicata Page 4-5
- Statute of Limitations Page 5-6
- Hospital Procedures Page 7
- Conclusion of Legalistic Matters Page 7-8
- US Constitutional Rights Page 8-11
- Conclusion Page 11-12
- For Reference
 - Supreme Court File Number 20180371
 - Cass County Support File Number 09-05-C-00713
 - Cass County Paternity File Number 09-2018-DM-00828
 - Clay County Support File Number 14-FA-10-3471
 - Clay County Paternity File Number 14-FA-18-2933

Table of Authorities:

- NDCC 14-20-11. (301)
- NDCC 14-20-12. (302)
- NDCC 14-20-18 (308)
- NDCC 14-20-12
- NDCC 14-20-52. (631)
- NDCC 14-19-06.
- Downes v. Bidwell 182 US 244
- US Constitution 13th Amendment
- US Constitution 1st Amendment
- United States Supreme Court Seger v. United States
- Public Law 97-280 October 4, 1982.
- 1-15.100 – Religious Liberty Act Background
- 1-15.300 - Principles of Religious Liberty
- Downes v. Bidwell 182 US 244
- Admitted Evidence
 - Transcript Cass County Paternity File Number 09-2018-DM-00828
 - DNA Test Results
 - Copies of Rescinding Contracts
 - IRS Form 966
 - Letter to IRS to Rescind CDC SS Contract
 - Letter to North Dakota Vital Records Rescinding Birth Certificate and AoP.
 -
- Appendix of Additional Evidence
 - Acknowledgement of Paternity
 - Military Orders
 - Transcript Clay County Paternity File Number 14-FA-18-2933
 - Letter from State of North Dakota Vital Records confirming Receiving Letter of Rescinding CDC Birth Certificate/AoP.

1) Jurisdiction:

In appealing Answer in 09-2018-DM-00828 for lack of Jurisdiction, Judicial Referee Susan Solheim was unwilling to hear the Complaint based on her interest in a Minnesota case file for Contempt against Plaintiff B.C, (Transcript Page 5-7) stating that if Minnesota had jurisdiction to file contempt against Plaintiff then it may be that Minnesota holds jurisdiction for paternity. Judicial Referee Susan Solheim argued according to “Uniform Interstate Family Support Act” From APPEAL on North Dakota Paternity File Number 09-2018-DM-00828 Transcript Page 7 Lines 1-4 and Page 10 Lines 8-12 Jurisdiction may have transferred to Minnesota based on both party residency. I agree with Judicial Referee Susan Solheim in this matter and have questioned Minnesota in their Jurisdiction to file contempt against the Plaintiff where Minnesota is not even a Plaintiff in that matter but the State of North Dakota is the Plaintiff in that Support File enforced in Minnesota as well. Judicial Referee Susan Solheim did not deny Jurisdiction, however stated that She was not familiar with the Minnesota File and wasn’t sure who had jurisdiction Page 15 lines 21-25 and Page 16 lines 1-6.

Judicial Referee Susan Solheim argued by what grounds does North Dakota have to proceed and that is by Minnesota’s denial of jurisdiction and stating the Support file was not sent to Minnesota for Modification therefore Uniform Interstate Family Support Act does not apply in this matter but rather the Interstate Distribution Act applies for Collection.

Judicial Referee Susan Solheim also stated a possibility of Jurisdiction based on Documents signed in North Dakota as well as Parentage Adjudication in North Dakota if Minnesota did not have a Modification Order. Page 9 Lines 16-25 and Page 10 Lines 1-5. As well as a possibility of Jurisdiction based on Rescinding Documents Page 12 Lines 23-25.

- The Support File was not closed in North Dakota, and the Support file was not sent over to Minnesota for “Modification” but rather for “Collection” and garnishment under the “Interstate Distribution Act” according to records and testimony by the State and Courts of Minnesota.
- However, Plaintiff filed a similar Complaint in the State of Minnesota based on Minnesota’s claim for jurisdiction for Support and in MN paternity file number 14-FA-18-2933 Judge Amber B. Gustafson denied Jurisdiction stating the State of Minnesota is only enforcing a support order and jurisdiction for Paternity was held in North Dakota.
- Minnesota Paternity File Number 14FA-18-2933 Transcript Page 4 line 8-10; and Page 5 lines 18-19 and Page 5 line 25/Page 6 line 1.
- This Transcript was entered into evidence verbally as witness From APPEAL on North Dakota Paternity File Number 09-2018-DM-00828 Transcript Page 6 Lines 17-23. Also Page 7 Lines 20-23. But more specifically Page 15 lines 1-8.
- Because of Testimony of the Plaintiff B.C. in ND concerning the Minnesota hearing related to this matter being appealed and being

recorded, the transcript of the Minnesota hearing is also included as corroborating evidence verbally submitted as testimony and witness.

- I had stated this fact as testimony and as a witness to that hearing being a party in that matter. I had a failed attempt to get that transcript to submit it as evidence in due time for this hearing, therefore the Plaintiff testified to it's facts.
- A copy of the Transcript for the Minnesota Civil Suit for Paternity Fraud File Number 14-FA-18-2933 is enclosed as well for Corroborating Evidence as entered verbally as evidence first.
- Jurisdiction and/or/Venue for Paternity has been denied in every court in North Dakota and Minnesota since 2005 (for the Plaintiff), it is my belief that jurisdiction is held in the State in which the documents were signed and filed and statutes concerning the signing of these documents and their time relevance. As well as Minnesota's current denial of jurisdiction in previous court hearings stating Minnesota does not have a Modification file but only for collection. Also the fact that the Minnesota Support file still shows that it is an Open file under North Dakota. Therefore Jurisdiction cannot be held in any other State.

2) Res Judicata:

Separate Issues: The Hearing was opened with the suggestion to consolidate Cass County Paternity Fraud File Number 09-2018-DM-00828 with Cass County Support File Number 09-05-C-00713 based on the collateral effect one file could have on the other Transcript Page 3 Lines 23-25 and Page 4 Lines 1-16.

These two files certainly must be consolidated for this reason as a Judgment in favor of the Plaintiff in this matter would certainly terminate the support file. However these matters although consolidated for this reason certainly as the State of North Dakota and the State of Minnesota have continually stated are complete and separate issues that must be dealt with separately. I will touch more specifically on that in my reply to Res Judicata.

One point to mention first on this matter is Judicial Referee Susan Solheim answer on Page 8 Lines 16-17 stating the North Dakota Court adjudicated the Plaintiff as the Father of said child. This was an attempt to combine these issues now after several hearings of being separate issues to now being one in the same issue as if I could have argued this in prior hearings. However, the Court did not adjudicate the Plaintiff as the father of said child. The court has continually stated that the Plaintiff has a signed Acknowledgement of Paternity, a voluntary Contract Adjudicating thyself as the Father and the court was simply upholding the Plaintiff's contract.

Another attempt by Judicial Referee Susan Solheim to combine these issues as one in the same was in Transcript Page 9 Lines 7-9, where the statement was made the Plaintiff attempted to Vacate the judgment of Paternity in the State of Minnesota when speaking about the Minnesota Support File and Charge of Contempt. This again is incorrect as the Plaintiff did not make such an attempt but rather attempted to file a motion to Dismiss for Lack of Jurisdiction which was not heard to this point.

It is important to give a historical account considering the Res Judicata claim in this matter in order to give the Supreme Court a full insight on this appeal.

- In June 7th 2005 Judge Steven L. Marquart overheard and issued a Judgment for support where the plaintiff in this appeal stated on record that there was a concern with Paternity. The State of North Dakota stated paternity was a separate matter and would have to be dealt with in a separate hearing. Again, Paternity is a Separate issue that must be filed as a separate hearing. A copy of that transcript was entered into evidence as well.
- In 2007 the Plaintiff hired an attorney who argued the Default Judgment must be set aside according to the Soldiers and Sailors Relief Act as the Plaintiff was on Military Orders at the time of said child's birth, scheduled for deployment at that very time which was denied as the Plaintiff's attorney did not argue those points but argued only military service.
- Also later in 2007 the Plaintiff (in this appeal) filed a Motion (as pro se defendant) to Challenge the Acknowledgement of Paternity (Under the Support File Number) and the State responded stating that it was indeed a "separate issue" and could not be heard until B.C. "Challenged the Acknowledgement of Paternity". Court agreed and denied for better terms lack of Venue or Jurisdiction under the Support File Number as a Court Procedure issue. Again, Paternity is a Separate Issue that must be filed as a separate hearing.
- In 2009; Still unaware of what was fully needed to seek remedy, the Plaintiff attempted a second time to file a Motion (as defendant) slightly different; to Challenge the Acknowledgement of Paternity under the Same support file number in which the State responded with "Res Judicata" and the court upheld the States response. Failed attempts to find what statutes were used, I found a similar circumstance under criminal matters where Res Judicata can be applied where a party attempts to file a motion or complaint where it cannot be heard. Barring the party from filing under that particular File Number. Although I understand this is not a Criminal matter and the statutes concerning the "Criminal" res judicata would not be relevant, again it is the only response that I have found concerning it and would assume it would be similar; therefore since it was a Support File number B.C did not file an Appeal on that particular use of "Res Judicata".
- In late 2017 B.C. became aware that the Plaintiff must "file suit" against the other party for Paternity Fraud, in which initiated new proceedings. NOW; in times past the Plaintiff has had a few attorneys "Suggest" filing a Law Suit against the Defendant for Fraud, not that it was Plaintiff's only avenue but was a suitable avenue for remedy according to those attorneys. The Plaintiff denied such actions in times past believing it was legally unnecessary, BUT more so based on Scripture as it is technically against the Law of God to sue someone in

court. So this action was subdued for a time until I found it was the only option to terminate this matter that was offered to be upheld. It is also stated according to “Jesus” in *“Matthew 5:40 And if any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also”*. So it is a difficult decision to make such Complaints. However, being the only avenue for remedy the Law of God also states, *“Leviticus 6:2-5 If a soul sin, and commit a trespass against the LORD, and lie unto his neighbour in that which was delivered him to keep, or in fellowship, or in a thing taken away by violence, or hath deceived his neighbour; extortion, Or have found that which was lost, and lieth concerning it, and sweareth falsely; in any of all these that a man doeth, sinning therein: Then it shall be, because he hath sinned, and is guilty, that he shall restore that which he took violently away, or the thing which he hath deceitfully gotten, extortion or that which was delivered him to keep, or the lost thing which he found, Or all that about which he hath sworn falsely; he shall even restore it in the principal, and shall add the fifth part more thereto, and give it unto him to whom it appertaineth, in the day of his trespass offering.”*. Therefore I leave it up to the Court what shall be Ordered above and beyond the termination of such contracts and support obligations.

- In 2018 (concerning this appeal) Plaintiff filed a Summons and Complaint against the Defendant for Paternity Fraud which was denied but at least in this Case the Plaintiff was allowed to admit into evidence documents which has been subdued previously, as the courts have been unwilling to accept. Note in this hearing that Judicial Referee Susan Solheim who first issued the answer for Res Judicata in 2009 was also presiding for this hearing in 2018. Judicial Referee Susan Solheim stated there was an order of Res Judicata standing. How can this be considering this is “A Separate issue filed as a Separate Hearing” as I stated several times even in this hearing Transcript Page 6 line 12-16 Page 7 Line 25 and Page 8 Lines 4-5 and Lines 13-14. Indeed the two File Numbers are only Combined for the possibility that the Court rules in favor of the Plaintiff it would affect and terminate the Support File.
- As for Res Judicata in its full definition, The doctrine of *res judicata* bars **claims** that have either been litigated or that could have been litigated from being litigated again. The doctrine of *collateral estoppel* bars **issues** that have been litigated from being litigated again. The US Supreme Court has upheld that there is “No Affirmative Defense of Res Judicata that can bar a party from filing a Motion or Complaint that has not been fully examined by the Court, including but not limited to Evidence, Testimony and Witnesses”. For the continual response of Lack of Jurisdiction and failure to receive Evidence or Testimony concerning Paternity in this matter, Res Judicata cannot apply to this Complaint against the Defendant for Paternity Fraud filed properly. It can only be applied to filing similar motions under the Support File

Number and as the Court has responded many times; this is “a separate matter” in which Res Judicata does not apply. The Plaintiff has done an extensive research for Res Judicata and has failed to find a single case that was not fully examined where the Affirmative Defense was used. If the State is going to continually respond with these two issues being separate, they cannot come now in new proceedings stating they are the same, as one was a Motion to Challenge the AoP under the Support file number, and the new is a Complaint for Paternity Fraud filed under a separate matter. For denial of Jurisdiction and failure to receive evidence and testimony concerning paternity, these matters have not been litigated nor has the Plaintiff had opportunity to litigate these issues. It is my Continual Objection of the Courts use for Res Judicata in this matter. Crimes are being committed against the Plaintiff and there is a Cause for Relief. Page 19 lines 1-9.

3) Statute of Limitations

- According to State Terms and Definitions in the State of North Dakota per time relevance of signing such documents.
 - a. Acknowledgement of Paternity can only be signed by the Biological Father and Biological mother of said child.
 - i. **NDCC 14-20-11. (301) Acknowledgment of paternity. The mother of a child and a man claiming to be the genetic father of the child may sign an acknowledgment of paternity with intent to establish the man's paternity.**
 - ii. **NDCC 14-20-12. (302) Execution of acknowledgment of paternity.**
 - a. **An acknowledgment of paternity must:**
 - b. **Be in a record;**
 - c. **Be signed, or otherwise authenticated, under penalty of perjury by the mother and by the man seeking to establish his paternity;**
 - b. This same statement is also written on the Acknowledgement of Paternity Document itself, stating that under fraud or perjury the “Mothers Statement” stating it can ONLY be signed by the Biological Father and there is NO OTHER biological father possible.
 - c. Acknowledgement of Paternity is not a Waiver of Responsibility, but rather a Statement by the Mother of said child that the Biological Father is available and present that the Child may take the Fathers Last Name, the Mother rescinding her right to the Childs Legal Last Name on the Birth Certificate.
 - There is NO statute of limitations on an Aop when dealing with a Non-Paternal/Non-Biological Parent, all Statutes are under the assumption that the Acknowledged Father is the Biological Father of said child.
 - Defendant Mrs. P/H is married; herself and her husband have stated the desire for her new husband to adopt said child, in which the AoP would have to be Rescinded during this process as well.

- Although the AoP in defendants opinion and definitions based on NDCC does not pertain to Non-biological parents; in the event that it did pertain and was designed for such use; defendant can file a motion to challenge beyond the Statute of Limitations for several reasons, including but not limited to Fraud and Duress.

d. NDCC 14-20-18 (308) Challenge after expiration of period of rescission. (2) A party challenging the acknowledgement of paternity or denial of paternity has the burden of proof.

- Burden of Proof of what I ask, does it pertain to the Defendants first verbal statement that the plaintiff was not the biological father, genetic testing confirming that; perhaps the burden of proof concerning the legalities behind having to file suit; or does it go beyond such things such as the burden of proof when Scripture is revealed and seeks to rescind such as in 2017 where the Plaintiff rescinded such contracts based on Scriptural Knowledge.
- *Fraud.* Where Defendant Mrs. P/H informed Plaintiff verbally for the first several months of the child’s life; that C.D.C. was in fact biologically Plaintiff’s child. DNA test results shows this is a fraudulent statement.
- *Fraud and Perjury.* Defendant Mrs. P/H signed the AoP stating the Plaintiff was the “Only Possible Father” of said child as per “Mothers Statement”. DNA test results shows this was a fraudulent statement and the AoP is null and void.
- **NDCC 14-20-12 Execution of Acknowledgement of Paternity.**
 - **Acknowledgement of Paternity must: (b) be signed, or otherwise authenticated, under penalty of perjury, by the mother.**
- *Duress.* Plaintiff was active in the US Army Military service and was scheduled to deploy on Active Duty Orders the very morning in 2003, the same time of said child’s birth. The Plaintiff was unable to contact any chain of command for their deployment and was considered AWOL (absent without leave) punishable under UCMJ (Uniform Code of Military Justice). The Plaintiff would not have taken such measures without the assumption of being a biological parent and obligated to attend the birth of said child. Plaintiff was excused based on the circumstances when later explained only because of high standing in military service record. Fact is the Plaintiff was under great amount of stress in the moment signing several documents without explanation under the assumption of paternity.
 - *A Copy of Military Orders which have not been allowed into Evidence up to this point are included as Possible Evidence if the Supreme Court would consider.*

4) DNA Test results show Plaintiff is not the Paternal/Biological Father of said child therefore Acknowledgement of Paternity is Void.

- **NDCC 14-20-52. (631) Rules for adjudication of paternity.**

- **The court shall apply the following rules to adjudicate the paternity of a child:**
 - **The paternity of a child having a presumed, acknowledged, or adjudicated father may be disproved only by admissible results of genetic testing excluding that man as the father of the child or identifying another man as the father of the child.**
- NDCC 14-20-52 (631) deals primarily with NON-biological parents unlike other statutes dealing with Biological parents; shows no statute of limitations.
- A copy of the Genetic Testing was entered into evidence in this case after many failed attempts to get it admitted under separate file numbers.
- I notice here in NDCC 14-20-52 it is not listed up with 14-20-18 ect. And do not agree with Judicial Referee Susan Solheim's interpretation of being intermingled as they become conflicting with one another.
- Page 20 Lines 12-25, Page 21 Lines 1-25.

5) Hospital Procedures:

Another point that should be addressed to the court is ND Rules of the Court and Proper Procedure. This point has failed to be brought up although attempted, and is only mentioned here to give the Court knowledge of failed procedures that could have prevented such hearings. The Plaintiff was unaware of the signing of the AoP prior to Support Initiation. The Plaintiff was knowledgeable of signing the Birth Certificate which was based on the assumption of paternity. According to the Rules of the Court and procedure, the Hospital Administration has a procedure that must be followed when directed to administer an AoP, where the document in question must be Identified, Explained and notice given for possible desire and time limitations for rescinding such documents. This procedure was not followed and the hospital was negligent.

- **NDCC 14-19-06. Hospital-based program for acknowledgment of paternity - Effect of noncompliance.**
 - **During the period immediately preceding or following the birth of a child to an unmarried woman in a birthing hospital, the hospital, at a minimum, shall:**
 - **Provide to the mother and the alleged father, if the alleged father is present in the hospital:**
 - **Written materials about paternity establishment;**
 - **The forms necessary to voluntarily acknowledge paternity;**
 - **A written and oral description of the rights, responsibilities, and legal consequences of acknowledging paternity; and**
 - **The opportunity to speak, either by telephone or in person, with staff who are trained to clarify information and answer questions about paternity establishment;**
 - **Provide the mother and the alleged father, if the alleged father is present, the opportunity to voluntarily acknowledge paternity in the hospital;**
 - **Afford due process safeguards by informing, in writing, the mother and the alleged father, if the alleged father is present, of the manner in which a relationship of father and child established under this chapter may be vacated or rescinded.**

Conclusion on Legalistic Matters: It is my understanding according to NDCC and its rules of the Court that interpretations of the Law have to be in accordance with each other and interpretations based on few Statutes lead to false interpretations just as it is within the religious sects.

- A) Jurisdiction:
 - a. Original Jurisdiction is held in North Dakota for time relevance for signing such documents.
 - b. North Dakota Support file has not been fully or properly closed, nor has full authority been transferred to Minnesota.
 - c. State of Minnesota denies jurisdiction for paternity stating they are only enforcing and collecting on a North Dakota order,
- B) Statute of Limitations: That there is no statute of Limitations concerning this ongoing/continual Paternity Fraud.
 - a. Concerning Biological Parents there is a 60 day rescinding limit for challenging the AoP.
 - b. There is a two year limitation concerning discrepancies on those Biological Parents when challenging the AoP. As well as the Burden of Proof which can be extended to begin with New evidence, from Genetic Testing to a Life Style Change based on Scripture.
 - c. And there is NO statute of limitation when Genetic Testing reveals that the “Biological Parent” is NOT the Biological Parent and Fraud is present; except in the event that the Support File is closed which in this case is not.
 - d. State Law cannot give a Statute of Limitation on Rescinding a Birth Certificate if the one rescinding is Exercising the 1st and the 13th Amendments of the US Constitution. It would be conflicting; especially if these actions are based on new information leading to exercising the use of those Amendments.
- C) Res Judicata
 - a. Res Judicata is applied to the ND Support file which bars the Plaintiff from filing a “Motion to Challenge the Acknowledgement of Paternity” under the Support file number.
 - b. Res Judicata cannot be applied to a Civil Suit for Paternity Fraud when such suit has not been filed nor has there been opportunity to enter for consideration, Evidence, Witness and Testimony, nor has the case been fully examined. These things can only be entered where they are allowed which was not acceptable until this current Complaint was filed nor could these things previously been brought; especially when the States response has continually been, “This is a separate matter that must be brought in a separate hearing”.
- D) I don’t believe the Law can bar the Plaintiff from seeking relief from past, present and even Current; acts of Fraud and Concealment, and even Extortion that are still present today. It is my belief that the Interpretations of the Law are

incorrect. Paternity Fraud is unique as it is not like other acts of fraud that are temporary or a one-time event but it is continual. If the Support File was terminated and the file closed then there can be a statute of limitation concerning seeking relief of damages from past events, however the reasons for so many exceptions within the statutes is that it is a continual event.

Weightier Matters of the Law

6) Plaintiff entered into Evidence documents showing that the Plaintiff rescinded his signature on the Aop, Birth Certificate and Social Security contracts. It is these contracts which give the state the Authority and Jurisdiction to file proceedings and collect support. Entering into Evidence a Copy of Letter to the State of North Dakota rescinding Birth Certificate Signature including AoP, letter to the IRS rescinding signature on Social Security Contract a copy of IRS Document 966 and a letter received from the State of North Dakota confirming the State of North Dakota received my Letter to Rescind.

a. *Downes v. Bidwell 182 US 244*

“Two national governments exist; one to be maintained under the Constitution with all its restrictions; the other to be maintained by Congress outside and independently of that instrument.” A ruling made showing the distinguishing differences between registering a possession from a Car, house or children or anything that may be bought or acquired as property and that of those who do not register and/or rescind which are governed under the US Constitution; while those items registered are governed under Congress.

b. CDC is not the only child subject to the Law of God concerning our lifestyle. Plaintiff has a wife and four (4) biological children in my household in which are free and sovereign citizens governed under the US Constitution. In the Plaintiffs household the Plaintiff himself is the only person who has a Social Security Contract (temporarily) as the Plaintiff works for a company who is obligated under the Social Security Act to pay Social Security Tax. The Movement to sovereign living and understanding the scriptures takes time and many changes as well as a self sufficient lifestyle. The Plaintiff is also subject to terminate such employment by the Law of God; but is forced into Labor by threats of incarceration to pay support in US Currency which is also deemed unlawful not to allow for barter and trade. This is a terrible burden on the Plaintiff to not be able to follow and obey the Law of God when the knowledge of these scriptures has been revealed.

7) US. Constitutional Rights

- 13th Amendment of the US Constitution: Page 13 Line 12
 - ***Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their***

jurisdiction.

- The 13th Amendment gives all US citizens the right to rescind any signature on a voluntary contract including but not limited to Birth Certificate Contracts, Acknowledgment of Paternity Contracts as well as Social Security Contracts and to be denied this right is a clear violation of the 13th amendment.
- Judicial Referee Susan Solheim stated Page 20 Lines 2-3 the Court can't rescind however the Plaintiff did in fact rescind such things personally accordingly in 2017 with the State of North Dakota and the IRS.
- 1st Amendment of the US Constitution:
 - ***Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.***
 - ***United States Supreme Court *Seeger v. United States****
“There is a higher loyalty than the loyalty to country; and that is loyalty to God.”
 - ***Public Law 97-280 October 4, 1982.***
Congress declares the Bible the Word of God and encourages the people of America to teach the principles of the Bible to American families.
 - ***1-15.100 – Religious Liberty Act Background To the greatest extent practicable and permitted by law, Department components and United States Attorneys’ Offices must reasonably accommodate religious observance and practice in all activities, including litigation. See 82 Fed Reg. 49668. As set forth below, the Office of the Associate Attorney General has supervisory responsibility for overseeing the Department’s respect for religious liberty in litigation. [updated April 2018]***
1-15.300 - Principles of Religious Liberty The freedom of religion is a fundamental right of paramount importance, expressly protected by federal law.
Religious liberty is enshrined in the text of our Constitution and in numerous federal statutes. It encompasses the right of all Americans to exercise their religion freely, without being coerced to join an established church or to satisfy a religious test as a qualification for public office. It also encompasses the right of all Americans to express their religious beliefs, subject to the same narrow limits that apply to all forms of speech. In the United States, the free exercise of religion is not a mere policy preference to be traded against other policy preferences. It is a fundamental right.

The free exercise of religion includes the right to act or abstain from action in accordance with one's religious beliefs.

The Free Exercise Clause protects not just the right to believe or the right to worship; it protects the right to perform or abstain from performing certain physical acts in accordance with one's beliefs. Federal statutes, including the Religious Freedom Restoration Act of 1993 ("RFRA"), support that protection, broadly defining the exercise of religion to encompass all aspects of observance and practice, whether or not central to, or required by, a particular religious faith.

- 8) As within the Scriptures (Bible) concerning God who spoke to Abraham first and then unto Moses concerning the "Law", it is written come out of the nation in which you were born and follow My Laws and My Statutes and My Commandments. As Moses wrote concerning the Law of God stating "You shall not be numbered among any other nation nor shall you enter into contracts with those nations less it be a snare unto you". It is also written, as spoken to Abraham Yahovah Yirah (The Lord My Provider) that whichever nation you are numbered among shall be your provider (Welfare). One cannot walk two paths as it is written as "Jesus" spoke, You cannot serve two masters, nor can one serve God and Mammon.
- The Law of God demands rescinding such documents, the Federal Law in the United States allows me the option to rescind such documents. The US Supreme Court has upheld several times there is "two ways" to be governed and its citizens are free to move among those governs. To be governed under Congress or to be free and sovereign governed under the US Constitution.
 - *Downes v. Bidwell 182 US 244*
"Two national governments exist; one to be maintained under the Constitution with all its restrictions; the other to be maintained by Congress outside and independently of that instrument."
 - The Plaintiff's Signature on the Birth Certificate for CDC, child in question for Support Order was properly rescinded August 1, 2016; which also rescinds the signature authority of the Defendant on the Acknowledgment of Paternity. The Birth Certificate is a legal and binding contract that Defendant entered into under fraud and concealment, withholding the legalities behind such documents and the relinquishing of rights of parent over to the United States for said child. Jurisdiction and census being held in the State of Birth. In which had also come to knowledge afterwards of entering into such documents was against the Law of God written within the Scriptures (Bible); and according to state statutes can be only rescinded under the basis of Fraud and Religious objection.
 - Plaintiff B.C being adjudicated father of Defendant S.H. Child C.D.C therefore giving me the right to rescind such contracts for said child as well. Defendant continues to use the child's Birth Certificate and Social Security number, voiding out a full rescission, such as filing taxes and claiming as dependent. Rescinding of said Childs Birth Certificate

October, 2017 as a second attempt for lack of response from the State. Although the State is not obligated to respond, Plaintiff made a second attempt to show Intentions were clear. By this action, I may only rescind "My Own Signature". The Contract itself is not rescinded. According to the Internal Revenue Service, Social Security Contract may be rescinded by Letter of Intention, the Social Security Card is destroyed, however the Contract itself is only destroyed and rescinded after a certain period of time of "Non-Use", using this Social Security Number in or on any document or contract will fully reinstate the contract.

- Plaintiff's signature on said child's Social Security Contract was rescinded in August of 2017 reaffirmed in October 2017. Again, by this I only rescind "My Own Signature" not the contract itself.
- Plaintiff Filed IRS 966 on behalf of said child, for Corporate Dissolution of Corporation also in Oct. 2017 as the Childs Person and Social Security Number are considered two separate identifications.
- This is evidence of rescinding the Rights of the State for jurisdiction over this matter. The Court indeed has jurisdiction over the Child and Division of Child Support in Minnesota (where support is enforced currently) is free to file for a support order as there is no longer a "Father" claimed. As the Court Order confirming an Adjudicated Father was prior to Plaintiff's actively applying his Constitutional Rights to operate freely between the First (1st) and the Thirteenth (13th) Amendments. Meaning the Court Order for Adjudicated Father and Support in 2005 does not relinquish the Plaintiff's Constitutional Rights to: Live according to Scripture, rescinding all contracts exercising the US Constitutional Right of the 13th Amendment, with other nations exercising the US Constitutional Right of the First Amendment.

9) Conclusion on Weightier Matters of the Law: Plaintiff is protected under the 1st and 13th amendments of the US Constitution as well as the Religious Liberty Act to rescind such documents and forced obligations. Not to be Forcibly Obligated by threat of Incarceration, Peonage and Involuntary Servitude and free to Follow the Torah (Law) of God as long as it is peaceably and not a threat to society or its citizens. To be forcibly obligated to these contracts would greatly hinder any ability to follow the Scripture accordingly.

If State Laws and Statutes are conflicting with the observation of US Federal and Constitutional Laws as well as the Law of God in which this Country was established on, then those interpretations must be reverted to its original intent. And each case must be considered with the obligation to Justice, Moral and Merit.

Plaintiff has entered into evidence a copy of the AoP showing this document itself can only be signed by the Biological Parents under Perjury/Fraud. Has entered into evidence Genetic Testing showing the Plaintiff was a victim of Fraud, and has entered into evidence proof of the Plaintiff's intentions of rescinding binding documents of Plaintiff B.C 's connection of parentage to Minor

Child C.D.C. I had not previously asked the Court for an Order to Rescind such contracts and documents, for the Plaintiff has already accomplished this task according to Federal Law and the Law of God, I was simply asking the Court to witness my actions and testimony. For it is my Signature on these Voluntary Contracts, and it is myself who rescinds that signature.

Plaintiff asks for the North Dakota Supreme Court to overturn the Judgement and Answer of Judicial Referee Susan Solheim.

Dated this 13th Day of December, 2018.

B. B. C
Pro-se for Plaintiff