

**Constitution.** In American law. The written instrument agreed upon by the people of the Union or of a particular state as the absolute rule of action and decision for all departments and officers of the government in respect to all the points covered by it, which must control until it shall be changed by the authority which established it, and in opposition to which any act or ordinance of any such department or officer is null and void. **Cooley, Const. Lim. 2**

## Supporting Supreme Court Case Laws:

“We are bound to interpret the Constitution in the light of the law as it existed at the time it was adopted.” **Mattox v. U.S., 156 US 237, 243.**

“The Constitution is a written instrument. As such, its meaning does not alter. That which it meant when it was adopted, it means now.” **S. Carolina v. U.S., 199 U.S. 437, 448 (1905).**

“The Constitution of these United States is the supreme law of the land. Any law that is repugnant to the Constitution is null and void of law.” **Marbury v. Madison, 5 US 137.**

“The claim and exercise of a Constitutional right cannot be converted into a crime.”  
**Miller v. U.S., 230 F.2d. 486, 489.**

“Waivers of Constitutional Rights, not only must they be voluntary, they must be knowingly intelligent acts done with sufficient awareness.”  
**Brady v. U.S., 397 U.S. 742, 748.**

**Note:** Therefore if and when they try to treat you as if you have ‘Waived your Rights’, know if you did waive them it must be a willing and knowing act, thus there need be some **valid record** where you **sufficiently** said “I waive my Rights, do what you want with me, violate me, sanction me even though there is no crime committed, even though there must be an injured party in order for a crime to be committed in the first place, hey, sanction me anyway. **Did you waive your Rights? Did you commit a Crime?**

For a crime to exist, there must be an injured party (Corpus Delicti) There can be no sanction or penalty imposed on one because of this Constitutional right. **Sherer v. Cullen 481 F. 945:**

US v. Tallmadge 829 F2d 767: “... *One who relies on a legal interpretation by a government official assumes the risk that it is in error... it has also been held or said that ‘the government could scarcely function if it were bound by its employees unauthorized representations’*” Goldberg v. Weinberger, 546 F2d 477.

### **US Supreme Court in US vs. Minker, 350 US 179 at page 187:**

“Because of what appears to be a lawful command on the surface, many citizens, because of their respect for what only appears to be a law, are cunningly coerced into waiving their rights, due to ignorance.”

**Compliments of R.V. Bey Publications “Sistars Standing On Law” page for Blog Talk.**