

No. 18-

---

---

In the  
Supreme Court of the United States



In Re CATHERINE ROSE DREYER,  
*Petitioner.*

---

On Petition for Writ of Certiorari to the  
Supreme Court of Texas

---

---

**PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI**

---

---

CATHERINE ROSE DREYER  
*PETITIONER PRO SE*  
1991 CR 334  
GOULDBUSK, TX 76845  
(325) 370-9871  
LLTK480422@GMAIL.COM

JULY 26, 2018

---

---

SUPREME COURT PRESS ♦ (888) 958-5705 ♦ BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS

## QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the issuance of a court order from an *ex-parte* probate hearing, granting the petitioning party the power to enter someone else's private home and remove their private property and valuables without prior notice to or consent from the resident of that home, violates the due process clause of the Fifth or Fourteenth Amendment to the United States (U.S.) Constitution.

2. Whether the issuance of a court order from an *ex-parte* probate hearing, granting the petitioning party the power to enter someone else's home and remove their private property and valuables without prior notice to or consent from the resident of that home, violates the unreasonable search and seizure clause of the Fourth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

3. Whether the removal of someone else's private property and valuables, without probable cause, prior notice to, or consent from the resident of that home, violates the freedom of religion clause found in the First Amendment of the U.S. Constitution.

4. Whether any state statute, code, rule, policy, procedure, practice, legislation, "law", judgment or court order, etc., which violates an Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, is void, *ab initio*, pursuant to the Supremacy Clause found in Article 6, Clause 2 of the U.S. Constitution.

## **PARTIES TO THE PETITION**

### **Petitioner**

---

- Catherine Rose Dreyer

### **Respondents – Real Parties in Interest**

---

- Christie L. Wislicenus
- Billy D. Bledsoe, Judge, Constitutional County Court, Coleman County, Texas

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
QUESTIONS PRESENTED.....	i
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....	v
OPINIONS BELOW .....	1
STATEMENT OF JURISDICTION.....	1
CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS, STATUTES AND POLICIES AT ISSUE .....	3
STATEMENT OF CASE.....	6
A. The Facts Giving Rise to This Case .....	6
B. District Court Proceedings .....	7
C. Appellate Court Proceedings .....	8
REASONS WHY CERTIORARI SHOULD BE GRANTED .....	8
I. REVIEW IS WARRANTED BECAUSE THE 27 MARCH 2017 COURT ORDER VIOLATES THE 5TH AND 14TH AMENDMENT RIGHT TO DUE PROCESS .....	8
II. REVIEW IS WARRANTED BECAUSE THE 27 MARCH 2017 COURT ORDER VIOLATED THE 4TH AMENDMENT RIGHT TO BE SECURE IN ONE’S HOME AGAINST UNREASONABLE SEARCHES AND SEIZURES .....	12
III. REVIEW IS WARRANTED BECAUSE THE 27 MARCH 2017 COURT ORDER PROHIBITED THE FREE EXERCISE OF RELIGIOUS BELIEFS IN VIOLATION OF THE 1ST AMENDMENT .....	16
CONCLUSION.....	21

**TABLE OF CONTENTS – Continued**

Page

**APPENDIX TABLE OF CONTENTS**

Order of the Supreme Court of Texas Denying Petition for Writ of Mandamus (May 4, 2018) ..	1a
Judgment of the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals (March 15, 2018).....	3a
Order Appointing Temporary Administrator (March 27, 2017).....	4a
Constitutional Provisions, Statutes, and Other Authorities.....	7a
Biblical Authorities.....	15a
Dreyer Petition for Writ of Mandamus, Relevant Excerpts (April 4, 2018).....	37a
Purchase Contract on Petitioner’s Home (February 6, 2014).....	40a

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page
<b>CASES</b>	
<i>Cohens v. Virginia</i> , 19 U.S. 264 (1821) .....	12
<i>Cooper v. Aaron</i> , 358 U.S. 1, 78 S.Ct. 1401 (1958) .....	11
<i>Earle v. McVeigh</i> , 91 U.S. 503, 23 L.Ed. 398 (1875) .....	9, 11
<i>Evans v. Corporate Services</i> , 207 Ill.App.3d 297, 565 N.E.2d 724 (2nd Dist. 1990).....	8
<i>Hanson v. Denckla</i> , 357 U.S. 235, 2 L.Ed.2d 1283, 78 S.Ct 1228 (1958) .....	10
<i>Jordon v. Gilligan</i> , 500 F.2d 701 (6th Cir. 1974) .....	12
<i>Kalb v. Feuerstein</i> , 308 U.S. 433, 60 S.Ct 343, 84 L.Ed. 370 (1940) .....	11
<i>Lubben v. Selective Service System Local Bd.</i> <i>No. 27</i> , 453 F.2d 645 (1st Cir. 1972) .....	12
<i>Mapp v. Ohio</i> , 367 U.S. 643 (1961) .....	15
<i>Moore v. Sievers</i> , 336 Ill. 316, 168 N.E. 259 (1929) .....	8, 15
<i>Oak Park Nat. Bank v. Peoples Gas Light &amp;</i> <i>Coke Col</i> , 46 Ill.App.2d 385, 197 N.E.2d 73 (1st Dist. 1964) .....	8

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued

	Page
<i>Old Wayne Mut. L. Assoc. v. McDonough</i> , 204 U.S. 8, 27 S.Ct. 236 (1907) .....	9
<i>People v. Wade</i> , 116 Ill.2d 1, 506 N.E.2d 954 (1987).....	8
<i>Renaud v. Abbott</i> , 116 U.S. 277, 29 L.Ed. 629, 6 S.Ct 1194 (1886) .....	10
<i>Rose v. Himely</i> , 4 Cranch 241, 2 L.Ed. 608 (1808) .....	9
<i>Sabariego v. Maverick</i> , 124 U.S. 261, 31 L.Ed. 430, 8 S.Ct 461 (1888) .....	12
<i>United States v. Throckmorton</i> , 98 U.S. 61 (1878) .....	8, 15
<i>United States v. Will</i> , 449 U.S. 200 (1980) .....	12
<i>Weeks v. United States</i> , 232 U.S. 383 (1914) .....	13, 14
<i>Williamson v. Berry</i> , 8 How. 495, 12 L.Ed. 1170 (1850) .....	9

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued**

	Page
<b>CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS</b>	
U.S. Const. Amend. I .....	i, 1, 16
U.S. Const. Amend. IV.....	i, 1, 12, 15
U.S. Const. Amend. V.....	i, 1, 8, 9
U.S. Const. Amend. XIV.....	i, 1, 8, 9, 12
U.S. Const. Art. 6, Cl. 2 .....	i, 1, 10
 <b>STATUTES AND CODES</b>	
18 U.S.C. § 241.....	12
18 U.S.C. § 242.....	12
18 U.S.C. § 2381.....	12
28 U.S.C. § 1257(a) .....	2
28 U.S.C. § 1651(a) .....	2
28 U.S.C. § 2101(c).....	2
30A Am. Jur. Judgment § 44.....	13
30A Am. Jur. Judgment § 45.....	13
Texas Code of Crim. P. § 18.01(b) .....	14
Texas Estates Code § 32 .....	11
 <b>JUDICIAL RULES</b>	
Francis Lieber	
Civil Liberty and Self-Government, 62 .....	14
West's Encyclopedia of American Law,	
Edition 2 .....	11

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued**

	Page
<b>FROM THE ULTIMATE AUTHORITY</b>	
<b>Our Creator's Perfect Law</b>	
Exodus 20:15-17.....	16
Exodus 22:22-24.....	18
Deuteronomy 4:1-9.....	18
Deuteronomy 4:2.....	17
Deuteronomy 4:40.....	18
Deuteronomy 5:29.....	18
Deuteronomy 12:8.....	19
Deuteronomy 12:28.....	18
Deuteronomy 12:32.....	17
Deuteronomy 16:18-20.....	19
Deuteronomy 24:17.....	18
Deuteronomy 26:16-19.....	17
Deuteronomy 27:18-19.....	19
Deuteronomy 28.....	18
Deuteronomy 29:9-15.....	18
Deuteronomy 30:15-20.....	18
<b>CHRIST ON THE LAW</b>	
Matthew 5:17-20.....	18
Matthew 7:1-2.....	19
Mark 12:29-31.....	20
SPECIAL NOTE: Psalm 2.....	18



## OPINIONS BELOW

There were no opinions offered by the Texas Supreme Court in Austin, Texas or the 11th Court of Appeals in Eastland, Texas. A verbatim copy of the Texas Supreme Court denial is attached.



## STATEMENT OF JURISDICTION

As the Result of an *Ex-Parte* Hearing Held on 27 March 2017, Letters of Temporary Administration Were Granted by the County Court of Coleman County, Texas, Which Included Powers to “Withdraw and Remove Any Gold or Silver or Other Valuables . . .” from the Home of the Petitioner Without Notice. This Order Violated Rights Expressed in the 1st, 4th, 5th and 14th Amendments of the U.S. Constitution, and Thus Is Void Pursuant To the Supremacy Clause (Clause 2) Found in Article 6 of the U.S. Constitution.

On 11 April 2017, this probate matter was transferred to the 42nd District court after the Petitioner contested the unlawful 27 March 2017 County court order appointing a temporary administrator who was not entitled to that position, and then empowering that individual to commit criminal, unconstitutional acts.

On 3 May 2017, the 42nd District court refused to set aside the County court’s 27 March 2017 court order or to consider the criminality of the actions sanctioned by the County court, effectively validating

the 27 March 2017 court order. This probate case is, at the time of this filing, ongoing in the 42nd District court, where the unconstitutionality of these proceedings has been challenged for over a year.

On 11 January 2018, formal, criminal charges were filed with the Coleman County Sheriff's Office against the temporary administrator and her accomplices for the burglary of Petitioner's home and for the theft of a covered utility trailer full of tools and equipment. The formal, criminal charges also cited violations of U.S. Constitutional Amendments. These charges have yet to be presented to a grand jury for their consideration.

On 15 March 2018, a petition for a writ of mandamus was filed in the 11th District Court of Appeals, in Eastland, Texas, to recognize that the unconstitutional County court order issued on 27 March 2017 was, as a matter of law, VOID, *ab initio*. The petition was denied that same day, 15 March 2018, without opinion.

On 4 April 2018, the appellate court's 15 March 2018 decision was appealed to the Texas Supreme Court. The Texas Supreme Court denied the appeal on 4 May 2018, also without opinion.

The jurisdiction of this Court to review the judgment of the Texas Supreme Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. § 1257(a), 28 U.S.C. § 1651(a), and 28 U.S.C. § 2101(c).



## CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS, STATUTES AND POLICIES AT ISSUE

- **U.S. Const. Amend. I**

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.
- **U.S. Const. Amend. IV**

The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.
- **U.S. Const. Amend. V**

No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a grand jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the militia, when in actual service in time of war or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offense to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due

process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.

- **U.S. Const. Amend. XIV**

Section 1.

All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the state wherein they reside. No state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

Section 2.

Representatives shall be apportioned among the several states according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each state, excluding Indians not taxed. But when the right to vote at any election for the choice of electors for President and Vice President of the United States, Representatives in Congress, the executive and judicial officers of a state, or the members of the legislature thereof, is denied to any of the male inhabitants of such state, being twenty-one years of age, and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridged, except for participation in rebellion, or other crime, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens twenty-one years of age in such state.

### Section 3.

No person shall be a Senator or Representative in Congress, or elector of President and Vice President, or hold any office, civil or military, under the United States, or under any state, who, having previously taken an oath, as a member of Congress, or as an officer of the United States, or as a member of any state legislature, or as an executive or judicial officer of any state, to support the Constitution of the United States, shall have engaged in insurrection or rebellion against the same, or given aid or comfort to the enemies thereof. But Congress may by a vote of two-thirds of each House, remove such disability.

### Section 4.

The validity of the public debt of the United States, authorized by law, including debts incurred for payment of pensions and bounties for services in suppressing insurrection or rebellion, shall not be questioned. But neither the United States nor any state shall assume or pay any debt or obligation incurred in aid of insurrection or rebellion against the United States, or any claim for the loss or emancipation of any slave; but all such debts, obligations and claims shall be held illegal and void.

### Section 5.

The Congress shall have power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article.

- **U.S. Const. Art. 6, Cl. 2**

This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every state shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.



## **STATEMENT OF CASE**

### **A. The Facts Giving Rise to This Case**

On 4 March 2017, the Petitioner's husband passed away. 23 days later, on 27 March 2017, Christie L. Wislicenus, the newly appointed temporary administrator, her mother Rogenna G. Hanson, and their attorney S. Clinton Nix, broke into the Petitioner's home, and forcibly pried open the Petitioner's safe, criminally damaging it in the process. The contents of that safe, including gold, silver, jewelry and important paperwork, all of which belongs to the Petitioner, was stolen.

The Petitioner's covered utility trailer, registered in her name only, which was filled with equipment and tools, was likewise stolen. Petitioner was not home at the time of the burglary and theft, which was witnessed by two deputies from the Coleman County Sheriff's Office, who were conducting a "civil standby"; however both deputies did enter the home without a warrant to do so.

These criminal actions were taken without prior notice and within minutes of the issuance of the unconstitutional 27 March 2017 court order appointing temporary administrator in Cause No. PR06234, by the County court of Coleman County, Texas (herein and hereafter referred to as “the 27 March 2017 court order”), which appointed Christie L. Wislicenus as the temporary administrator of the “estate” of the Petitioner’s late-husband. The 27 March 2017 court order was the direct result of an ex-parte hearing held that same day, which supposedly granted the temporary administrator the powers to “withdraw and remove any gold or silver or other valuables . . .” from the home of the Petitioner and to “take possession of any tools of the Decedent . . .”

There was no evidence presented to the County court of Coleman County, Texas that day that ANY of the items that were stolen actually belonged to the Decedent, or that exigent circumstances existed that would have perhaps merited the actions that were taken. The stolen items, valued at over \$100,000, have still not been returned to the Petitioner.

#### **B. District Court Proceedings**

The constitutionality of the 27 March 2017 court order, and the court’s jurisdiction to issue it, has been challenged in the 42nd District court on multiple occasions through multiple filings for months, and has consistently and repeatedly been ignored. Left with no other remedy or relief through the 42nd District court, a petition was filed for a writ of mandamus in the 11th District Court of Appeals in Eastland, Texas, to review the irrefutable evidence that the 27 March 2017 court order was in fact unconstitutional, was

based upon information known to be fraudulent, and was therefore null and void for multiple reasons, as a matter of law (see *Moore v. Sievers*, 336 Ill. 316, 168 N.E. 259 (1929); *United States v. Throckmorton*, 98 U.S. 61 (1878); see also *Res Adjudicata*, sec. 499).

“If the order is void, it may be attacked at any time in any proceeding,” *Evans v. Corporate Services*, 207 Ill.App.3d 297, 565 N.E.2d 724 (2nd Dist. 1990); see also *People v. Wade*, 116 Ill.2d 1, 506 N.E.2d 954 (1987), *Oak Park Nat. Bank v. Peoples Gas Light & Coke Col*, 46 Ill.App.2d 385, 197 N.E.2d 73, 77 (1st Dist. 1964)

### C. Appellate Court Proceedings

Both the 11th District Court of Appeals and the Texas Supreme Court denied a petition for a writ of mandamus to vacate the void, unconstitutional 27 March 2017 court order, without opinion.



## REASONS WHY CERTIORARI SHOULD BE GRANTED

### I. REVIEW IS WARRANTED BECAUSE THE 27 MARCH 2017 COURT ORDER VIOLATES THE 5TH AND 14TH AMENDMENT RIGHT TO DUE PROCESS

The genesis of this entire matter being referred to as a probate case stems from an *ex parte* hearing held on 27 March 2017, in the County court of Coleman, County, Texas, without jurisdiction, which resulted

in the issuance of an unlawful and unconstitutional court order that was, by law, null and void, *ab initio*.

“Courts are constituted by authority and they cannot go beyond that power delegated to them. If they act beyond that authority, and certainly in contravention of it, their judgments and orders are regarded as nullities. They are not voidable, but simply void, and this even prior to reversal.” *Old Wayne Mut. L. Assoc. v. McDonough*, 204 U.S. 8, 27 S.Ct. 236 (1907); *Williamson v. Berry*, 8 How. 495, 540, 12 L.Ed. 1170, 1189 (1850); *Rose v. Himely*, 4 Cranch 241, 269, 2 L.Ed. 608, 617 (1808).

Both the 5th and the 14th Amendments to the U.S. Constitution contain due process clauses. From Section 1 of the 14th Amendment:

“No state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.”

The reason the due process clause is found twice, in two separate amendments, is to emphasize its importance. At a bare minimum, procedural due process has been interpreted by this Court to require notice, an opportunity to be heard, and a decision made by a neutral decision-maker, before someone may legally be deprived of life, liberty or property (*see Earle v. McVeigh*, 91 U.S. 503, 23 L.Ed. 398).

The limitations inherent in the requirements of due process and equal protection of the law extend to judicial as well as political branches of government, so that a judgment may not be rendered in violation of those constitutional limitations and guarantees. *Hanson v. Denckla*, 357 U.S. 235, 2 L.Ed.2d 1283, 78 S.Ct 1228.

The term "*ex-parte*" literally means "with respect to or in the interests of one party only." A one-sided, *ex-parte* hearing in a civil matter, to decide whether there is a lawful reason to deprive the life, liberty or property of another—who is not at the hearing nor received notice of it—is, by its very nature, unconstitutional. It is a fundamental doctrine of law that a party to be affected by a personal judgment MUST have his day in court, and an opportunity to be heard. *Renaud v. Abbott*, 116 U.S. 277, 29 L.Ed. 629, 6 S.Ct 1194.

If there are any Texas statutes, codes, policies, procedures, or legislation, etc., which allow *ex-parte* hearings in matters where the life, liberty or property of another may be deprived, *i.e.* without procedural due process, then they are decidedly unconstitutional and thus are null and void pursuant to Article 6, Clause 2 of the U.S. Constitution.

If the Texas courts have misinterpreted their own statutes, codes, policies, procedures, or legislation, etc., as to grant them the authority to hold *ex-parte* hearings where the life, liberty or property of another may be deprived without due process, then any decision from such a hearing is unconstitutional, beyond the court's jurisdiction, and is likewise null and void, *ab initio*.

Every person is entitled to an opportunity to be heard in a court of law upon every question involving his rights or interests, BEFORE he is affected by any judicial decision on the question. *Earle v. McVeigh*, 91 U.S. 503, 23 L.Ed. 398.

“A void judgment does not create any binding obligation.” Federal decisions addressing void state court judgments include *Kalb v. Feuerstein* (1940) 308 U.S. 433, 60 S.Ct 343, 84 L.Ed. 370

If probate proceedings in Texas are considered to be in rem, as the Texas Estates Code § 32 claims, then the *in rem* jurisdiction of a court may be exercised only “AFTER parties who are known to have an interest in the property are notified of the proceeding AND have been given the opportunity to present their claims to the court”, by legal definition (West’s Encyclopedia of American Law, Edition 2).

The Coleman County court therefore did NOT have jurisdiction over the probate matter BEFORE all interested parties had been notified of the proceeding and given the opportunity to present their claims.

The refusal of the Coleman Constitutional County court and the 42nd District court to reconsider their unconstitutional decisions, and the refusal of the 11th District Court of Appeals and the Texas Supreme Court to grant a writ of mandamus to vacate the unconstitutional 27 March 2017 court order which, as a matter of law, IS VOID, are themselves violations of due process. *See Cooper v. Aaron*, 358 U.S. 1, 78 S.Ct. 1401 (1958).

These actions should also constitute sufficient grounds to invoke the self-executing clauses of Sections 3 & 4 of the 14th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution for ALL of the respondents. *See United States v. Will*, 449 U.S. 200 (1980); *Cohens v. Virginia*, 19 U.S. 264 (1821); and 18 U.S. Code § 241, 242, 2381.

Further, and for the reasons stated above, these actions represent such a profound departure from the accepted and usual course of judicial proceedings as to merit the exercise of this Court's supervisory power.

A judgment of a court without hearing the party or giving him an opportunity to be heard is not a judicial determination of his rights. *Sabariego v. Maverick*, 124 U.S. 261, 31 L.Ed. 430, 8 S.Ct 461, and is not entitled to respect in any other tribunal.

"A void judgment is no judgment at all and is without legal effect." *Jordon v. Gilligan*, 500 F.2d 701, 710 (6th Cir. 1974) "a court MUST vacate any judgment entered in excess of its jurisdiction." *Lubben v. Selective Service System Local Bd. No. 27*, 453 F.2d 645 (1st Cir. 1972)

## II. REVIEW IS WARRANTED BECAUSE THE 27 MARCH 2017 COURT ORDER VIOLATED THE 4TH AMENDMENT RIGHT TO BE SECURE IN ONE'S HOME AGAINST UNREASONABLE SEARCHES AND SEIZURES

The 4th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution specifies that "the right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, SHALL NOT BE VIOLATED".

How could there be a more unreasonable search and seizure, than to have a court—without jurisdiction, without probable cause of a crime, without contractual agreement, and without ANY evidence whatsoever—appoint an uninterested party to be a temporary administrator and then authorize that temporary administrator to “withdraw and remove any gold or silver or other valuables . . .” from someone else’s home without notice, without an opportunity to be heard, and without a decision made by a neutral decision-maker? What part of “shall NOT be violated” is not understood?

“The MAXIM that ‘every man’s house is his castle’ is made a part of our constitutional law in the clauses prohibiting unreasonable searches and seizures, and has always been looked upon as of high value to the citizen.” Judge Cooley, in his *Constitutional Limitations*, pp. 425, 426, as quoted in *Weeks v. United States*, 232 U.S. 383 (1914).

The void, unconstitutional 27 March 2017 court order, issued *ex-parte* and without jurisdictional authority (*see* 30A Am. Jur. Judgments § 44, 45 on void judgments) was assumed to have the power of a search warrant. It allegedly and unlawfully empowered a newly appointed and bonded officer of the state court, acting in the capacity of temporary administrator, to break into someone else’s private, locked home to “withdraw and remove”, *i.e.* STEAL, whatever “valuables” they wanted based solely on allegations, without any corroborating evidence of ownership or even a cursory background check of the applicant’s own criminal record.

There is no such thing as a “civil search warrant” for this very reason; a search warrant is issued ONLY in criminal matters, and only after sufficient evidence has been presented to a court that probable cause of a CRIME does in fact exist [see Texas Code of Criminal Procedure § 18.01(b)].

Francis Lieber, in his work on Civil Liberty and Self-Government, 62, stated, “no man’s house can be forcibly opened, or he or his goods be carried away after it has thus been forced, except in cases of felony” [see *Weeks v. United States*, 232 U.S. 383 (1914)].

It seems noteworthy to mention that Coleman County Judge Billy D. Bledsoe, who issued the void, unconstitutional 27 March 2017 court order, is NOT an attorney licensed by the State of Texas and thus lacks the authority to issue an actual, criminal search warrant.

It likewise seems noteworthy that the issuance of the void, unconstitutional 27 March 2017 court order was based upon information known to be fraudulent, including false and misleading statements in the application about the ownership of the home, the private property contained within the home and within the Petitioner’s covered utility trailer, as well as a fabricated sense of urgency and non-existent expenses.

Fraud which could have been exposed had there been an opportunity to be heard BEFORE the unreasonable search and seizure was conducted.

“The maxim that fraud vitiates every transaction into which it enters applies to judg-

ments as well as to contracts and other transactions.”, *Moore v. Sievers*, 336 Ill. 316, 168 N.E. 259 (1929); *United States v. Throckmorton*, 98 U.S. 61 (1878); see also *Res Adjudicata*, sec. 499.

To further illustrate just how unreasonable and unlawful this home invasion, search and seizure really was, did any of the Texas courts ever consider the possibility that the Decedent’s last will and testament may have been among the important papers in the locked safe that the temporary administrator and her accomplices broke into and destroyed?

“The RIGHT of the people to be secure in their persons, HOUSES, PAPERS, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, SHALL NOT BE VIOLATED”.

In *Mapp v. Ohio*, 367 U.S. 643 (1961), this Court extended 4th Amendment protections to the states in criminal cases, determining that evidence obtained in violation of the 4th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution is inadmissible in state courts.

Although it should be self-evident, the application of the 4th Amendment to civil cases appears to be lacking. The instant case therefore presents this Court with a unique opportunity to stipulate the same protections apply in state civil proceedings, to hopefully put an end to this unconstitutional practice.

**III. REVIEW IS WARRANTED BECAUSE THE 27 MARCH 2017 COURT ORDER PROHIBITED THE FREE EXERCISE OF RELIGIOUS BELIEFS IN VIOLATION OF THE 1ST AMENDMENT**

The First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution unequivocally states that “Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof”.

The first five books of the Bible, namely Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy, contain The Perfect Law of Liberty (The Law), which was given to us by our Creator to protect us from evil and keep us free.

Within The Law, it specifically states the following in Exodus 20:15-17, which is part of what is commonly referred to as “the Ten Commandments”:

Exodus 20:15-17

20:15 Thou shalt not steal [nor make up thine own laws to enable thee to do so by fraud (deceiving people)].

20:16 Thou shalt not tell lies [not even to thy “Self”, neither to, nor] against thy neighbour.

20:17 Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour’s house, thou shalt not covet thy neighbour’s wife, nor his manservant, nor his maidservant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor any thing that [is] thy neighbour’s.

Please note well The Law does NOT say “thou shalt not steal, except in this circumstance or that circumstance” because there are NO CIRCUMSTANCES whereby it is LAWFUL to steal ANYTHING from

another. It is intentionally simple and unambiguous so that everyone can understand, keep and enforce the very basic and fundamental principle that THEFT IS A CRIME.

The rest of The Law is written in the same, straightforward way, and includes its very own Supremacy Clause, found in Deuteronomy 4:2 and 12:32, to keep extremely evil people from making up their own unjust and oppressive rules through the use of deceitful legalese and corporate fictions. Even thinking about stealing from someone else (coveting) is wrong, much less actually doing it.

It should therefore be self-evident that breaking into someone's locked home to get to their locked safe and then criminally destroying that safe, to steal someone's life savings, is UNLAWFUL under ANY circumstances. The same goes for stealing a covered utility trailer that was fitted with a trailer tongue lock which likewise was locked. Only thieves do such things.

Using nice-sounding words like "withdraw and remove" or "take possession of" should be readily recognized as nothing more than deceitful attempts to legitimize theft. And any court attempting to legitimize criminal acts has in fact committed a criminal act itself and thus is clearly acting beyond its jurisdictional authority, which renders its orders null and void, from the beginning (Deut. 26:16-19).

The Commandments, Statutes and Judgments found in The Law together form the perfect system of justice, whereby the punishment doesn't just "fit" the crime; it PREVENTS crime. Lessening the penalty, or worse yet legalizing criminal activity, actually rewards

and encourages crime, while further punishing the victims, precisely as it has done in this probate case. It also creates unnecessary confusion over what is right and wrong. How else would one explain the complete absence of understanding, at every level of the Texas legal system, over the very simple and IMMUTABLE truth that theft IS a crime (*see* Psalm 2)?

There are common misbeliefs that The Law is “antiquated” (it isn’t—Deut. 4:40, 5:29, 12:28) or that it doesn’t apply to everyone (it does—Deut. 29:9-15), or that it doesn’t deal with every modern-day situation with specificity (see Deut. 28, Matt. 5:17-20), as if right and wrong are transient, dynamic concepts, that change with the times (they aren’t—Deut. 4:1-9, Deut. 30:15-20).

On the contrary, The Law actually covers every conceivable circumstance concisely and with maximum clarity, and has since the beginning, including probate matters involving a widow and/or a fatherless child.

Exodus 22:22-24

22:22 Ye shall not afflict any widow, or fatherless child.

22:23 If thou afflict them in any wise, and they cry at all unto Me, I will surely hear their cry;

22:24 And My wrath shall wax hot, and I will kill you with the sword; and your wives shall be widows, and your children fatherless.

Deuteronomy 24:17 Thou shalt not pervert the Judgment of the stranger, [nor] of the fatherless; nor take a widow’s clothing for security:

## Deuteronomy 27:18-19

27:18 Cursed [be] he that maketh the blind to wander out of The Way. And all the people shall say, Amen.

27:19 Cursed [be] he that perverteth the Judgment of the stranger, fatherless, and widow. And all the people shall say, Amen.

Holding a secret meeting to obtain permission to go out and steal from a widow, precisely as occurred on 27 March 2017 in the instant case, would unquestionably qualify as perverting Judgment and afflicting the widow, both of which are criminal in the eyes of our Creator. Shouldn't we trust in His Perfect Judgment instead of our own faulty and unjust judgments (*see* Deut. 12:8, Deut. 16:18-20, Matt. 7:1-2)?

One doesn't need to respect the establishment of any organized religion to understand and appreciate that we are in fact created human+Beings, who have been endowed by our Creator with certain unalienable rights, as the U.S. Declaration of Independence correctly states. Those unalienable rights, and the responsibilities that go along with those rights, are unsurprisingly enumerated in great detail in The Law that God gave us for our benefit, found in the first five books of the Bible.

No court, under ANY circumstances, has the jurisdictional authority to take those unalienable rights away, and any attempt to do so is a clear violation of the First Amendment as well as the First COMMANDMENT and the "golden rule" (*i.e.* the Second Great Commandment).

Mark 12:29-31

12:29 And Jesus answered him, The First of all the Commandments [is], Hear, O Israel; The Lord our God is one Lord:

12:30 And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength and serve Him ONLY: this [is] the first COMMANDment.

12:31 And the second [is] like, [namely] this, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. There is none other COMMANDment greater than these.

As renowned English jurist and judge William Blackstone stated "No enactment of man can be considered law unless it conforms to The Law of God."



**CONCLUSION**

Based on the foregoing, the Petitioner respectfully suggests that this Petition for Writ of Certiorari should be granted, and that this Court should exercise its supervisory authority to reverse this injustice by granting the requested extraordinary writ of mandamus and vacating the void, unconstitutional 27 March 2017 court order in Cause PR06234.

Respectfully submitted,

CATHERINE ROSE DREYER

*PETITIONER PRO SE*

1991 CR 334

GOULDBUSK, TX 76845

(325) 370-9871

LLTK480422@GMAIL.COM

JULY 26, 2018

**BLANK PAGE**