

Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document

4. Is it true that Shawn Boyd, by failing to register his law firm properly, for Case Nos. 21RI-CR00579 and 21RI-CR00579-01 has engaged in unauthorized legal practice, thus voiding any alleged attorney-client contract with Sara Rice McFall? See Exhibit 2
5. Is it true that Judge Michael Martin Pritchett failed to verify whether Shawn Boyd was compliant with the STATE OF MISSOURI's Fictitious Names Act for BOYD LAW OFFICE, L.L.C. for Case Nos. 21RI-CR00579 and 21RI-CR00579-01, as required under RSMo 417.200? See Exhibit 2, Page 7
6. Can you confirm that by failing to comply with RSMo 417.200, Shawn Boyd is operating illegally, and his representation of Sara Rice McFall in Case Nos. 21RI-CR00579 and 21RI-CR00579-01 is void?
7. Is it true that Shawn Boyd's lack of proper registration (Exhibit 2) disqualifies him from legally representing Sara Rice McFall, requiring the dismissal of Case Nos. 21RI-CR00579 and 21RI-CR00579-01?
8. Can you confirm that under RSMo 417.200, failure to file a fictitious name registration invalidates any and all contracts, including legal representation in Case Nos. 21RI-CR00579 and 21RI-CR00579-01?
9. Is it true that Shawn Boyd's failure to register his law firm violates Sara McFall's rights to effective counsel, as protected by the Sixth Amendment in Case Nos. 21RI-CR00579 and 21RI-CR00579-01?
10. Can you confirm that Shawn Boyd's failure to comply (Exhibit 2) with the STATE OF MISSOURI's Fictitious Name Act constitutes a breach of the STATE OF MISSOURI state law and voids his representation in Case Nos. 21RI-CR00579 and 21RI-CR00579-01?
11. Is it true that Shawn Boyd's fictitious entity BOYD LAW OFFICE, L.L.C. has no legal standing to represent Sara McFall in Case Nos. 21RI-CR00579 and 21RI-CR00579-01 due to his non-compliance with RSMo 417.200?
12. Is it true, Shawn Boyd's failure to register BOYD LAW OFFICE, L.L.C., fictitious name is a misdemeanor under Missouri law and businesses failing to register are subject to charges by the statutory duty of the local prosecuting attorney per RSMo 351.574(4)

"Every foreign corporation now doing business in or which may hereafter do business in this state without a certificate of authority shall be subject to a fine of not less than one thousand dollars...; in addition to which penalty, no foreign corporation, failing to comply with this chapter, can maintain any suit or action, either legal or equitable, in any of the courts of this state..." RSMo § 351.574

13. Is it true that as outlined in Section 351.574(4) RSMo., it is the responsibility of the Secretary of State to notify the prosecuting attorney of any city or county where these foreign corporations are conducting business without a certificate of authority?
14. Is it not true and correct that, "Any person who shall engage in or transact any business in this state under a fictitious name, as in sections 417.200 to 417.230 defined, without registering such name as herein required, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor."?
15. Furthermore, is it true that under Section 351.574(4) RSMo., every foreign corporation doing business in Missouri without a certificate of authority is subject to fines and is a

misdeemeanor and cannot maintain any suit or action such as Case Nos. **21RI-CR00579** and **21RI-CR00579-01** in Missouri courts.

16. Is it within the statutory duty of the Secretary of State upon a formal complaint to notify the prosecuting attorney of any city or county in which the foreign corporation is operating without a certificate of authority, initiating the process of penalizing such entities?
17. **Registration Compliance:** Can the STATE OF MISSOURI, as Plaintiff, confirm why Shawn Boyd, under BOYD LAW OFFICE, L.L.C., is permitted to practice without the necessary registration, given Missouri's requirements for business entities to be formally registered and compliant? Exhibit 2
18. **Representation Legitimacy:** How has the State validated Shawn Boyd's legal standing and authority to represent Sara Rice McFall, given that BOYD LAW OFFICE, L.L.C. lacks official registration and that this voids the legitimacy of his representation? See Exhibit 2, pages 1-7
19. **Conflict of Interest and Dual Representation:** Has the State reviewed and justified how Public Defender Jordan Cantony's switch from representing Megan McFall (Case Nos. 21RI-CR00578 and 21RI-CR00578-01) to Sara McFall (Case Nos. 21RI-CR00579, 21RI-CR00579-01, 24RI-CR00308, and 24RI-CR00308-1) does not constitute a serious conflict of interest, given the close relationship and overlapping interests of these cases?
20. **Conflict of Interest Protocols:** What specific protocols or safeguards did the STATE OF MISSOURI, as Plaintiff, enforce to ensure that Public Defender Jordan Cantony's shift in representation from one twin Megan Christian McFall to the other Sara Rice McFall would not lead to compromised confidentiality, especially considering the exact similarities in case details?
21. **Public Defender Assignment Standards:** On what basis did the STATE OF MISSOURI, as Plaintiff, allow Public Defender Jordan Cantony to represent both twins Megan and Sara McFall in separate but same situation cases, and were any independent oversight or waivers obtained from either Megan Christian McFall or Sara Rice McFall to ensure that ethical standards were not violated? See Exhibit 3
22. **Review of Ethical Standards Compliance:** Has the STATE OF MISSOURI, as Plaintiff, conducted an independent review to assess whether Cantony's representation of Sara Rice McFall (21RI-CR00579-01, 24RI-CR00308, 24RI-CR00308-01, following his prior representation of Megan Christian McFall (21RI-CR00578 and 21RI-CR00578-01), aligns with STATE OF MISSOURI, as Plaintiff, Rules of Professional Conduct on conflicts of interest (particularly Rule 4-1.7, concerning conflicts of interest)? See Exhibit 3
23. **Failure to Register the Law Office:** Does the STATE OF MISSOURI, as Plaintiff, acknowledge the apparent contradiction between allowing BOYD LAW OFFICE, L.L.C. to function without registration and Missouri's legal requirements for entity registration, especially when representing civil plaintiffs or respondent's and criminal defendants in every case since he allegedly opened his law firm after he was admitted to the BAR in 1995 and by RSMo. § 351.574 cannot maintain any suit or action FOR ANYONE since because he has not registered his law firm since he started his law business in past and ongoing cases under Section 351.574(4) RSMo., every foreign corporation doing

Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document

business in Missouri without a certificate of authority is subject to fines and cannot maintain any suit or action (Missouri Revised Statutes § 351.574) such as Case Nos. 21RI-CR00579 and 21RI-CR00579-01 in Missouri courts?

24. Does the STATE OF MISSOURI, as Plaintiff, still believe that as per Exhibit 1, page 1, and page 7 states that there was and is, “No Probable Cause to believe that the defendant has received ineffective assistance of counsel.”? See Exhibit 1, and Exhibit 2

25. **Ethical Training and Oversight:** What training, if any, does the STATE OF MISSOURI, as Plaintiff, provide or require for public defenders in managing and identifying conflicts of interest in cases involving close relatives or interconnected case details, as seen here?

26. **Implications for Client Trust and Fairness:** How does the STATE OF MISSOURI, as Plaintiff, justify maintaining Sara Rice McFall’s representation under conditions where her attorney also previously represented her twin sister Megan Christian McFall in identical case Nos. 21RI-CR00578 and 21RI-CR00578-01 circumstances, impacting the defendant Sara Rice McFall’s right to unbiased and fair representation? See Exhibit 3, and in Megan McFall 21RI-CR00578 and 21RI-CR00578-01 to Sara McFall 21RI-CR00579 and 21RI-CR00579-01.

27. **Accountability for Unregistered Practices:** What actions does the STATE OF MISSOURI, as Plaintiff, plan to take regarding BOYD LAW OFFICE, L.L.C.’s unregistered status to uphold Missouri’s regulatory standards, and how will the STATE OF MISSOURI, as Plaintiff, address disciplinary or corrective measures for any parties involved in facilitating or overlooking this non-compliance?

28. **Breach of Fundamental Legal Protections**
The actions described, including procedural obstruction and misrepresentation of consent, amount to a fundamental breach of Defendant’s constitutional protections under the organic United States Constitution included herein in its entirety by reference. Further prosecution would only exacerbate these violations and continue to undermine the fairness of the judicial process. Therefore, dismissal is the only appropriate remedy to rectify these violations and prevent further harm.

29. Is it true that Federal Reserve Notes (slave script/“CASH”/private credit) are classified as debt obligations under 18 U.S.C. § 8 and cannot legally be used to settle debts? See attached Exhibit 4

30. Is it true that the STATE OF MISSOURI has no legal authority to collect court fees, fines, or bonds from SARA RICE MCFALL, SARA RICE MCLEOD, SARA R MCFALL, MCFALL SARA R, MCFALL, SARA R, SARA MCFALL in a currency that is legally classified as a debt instrument (private credit)? See attached Exhibit 4

31. Has the STATE OF MISSOURI considered the ethical implications of charging (penal sums/monetary value) Sara Rice McFall in a system based on unbacked unconstitutional currency “Federal Reserve Notes” aka “CASH”? See Exhibit 4, Pages 1 to 10

32. If federal reserve notes are “private credit,” can the STATE OF MISSOURI claim to operate in the interest of all citizens, especially in Case Nos. 21RI-CR00578 and 21RI-CR00578-01, 21RI-CR00579, 21RI-CR00579-01, 24RI-CR00308, 24RI-CR00308-1?

33. If the STATE OF MISSOURI, as Plaintiff, courts use capitalized names to alter legal identity, are they acting in full transparency? See Exhibit 1, pages 1-11

Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document

34. Does the STATE OF MISSOURI, as Plaintiff, agree that the unbacked and unconstitutional (U.S.C. Article 1, Section 10) Federal Reserve Note aka "CASH", slave script, private credit, system's alleged enslavement of citizens undermines its own justice system especially for Sara Rice McFall in Case Nos. 21RI-CR00579, 21RI-CR00579-01, 24RI-CR00308, 24RI-CR00308-1?
35. Why should Sara Rice McFall be penalized under a system with ties to unconstitutional private banking corporations collateralizing the sweat equity of "We the People" since with unbacked Federal Reserve Notes, aka "CASH" (Exhibit 4) the 1933 bankruptcy?
36. Does the STATE OF MISSOURI, as Plaintiff, have clear guidelines on how fiat currency (Federal Reserve Notes aka "CASH") impacts its legal and judicial processes?
37. Is it true and correct STATE OF MISSOURI, as Plaintiff, that, "A debt is not paid by the giving of a note." Noland Co. v. Maryland Casualty Co.?
38. Is it true and correct STATE OF MISSOURI, as Plaintiff, that, "A [Federal Reserve] note is only a promise to pay and not payment," Fidelity Savings State Bank v. Grimes, 131 P.2nd 894?
39. Is it true and correct STATE OF MISSOURI, as Plaintiff, that, "The "giving of a [Federal Reserve] note DOES NOT constitute payment." See Echart v Commissioners C.C.A., 42 Fd2d 158?
40. Is it true and correct STATE OF MISSOURI, as Plaintiff, that, "Legal Tender [Federal Reserve] Notes ARE NOT good and lawful money of the United States." See Rains v State, 226 S.W. 189?
41. Is it true and correct STATE OF MISSOURI, as Plaintiff, that, "Federal reserve notes ARE valueless." See IRS Codes Section 1.1001-1 (5657) C.C.H.?
42. Is it true and correct STATE OF MISSOURI, as Plaintiff, that, the individual cannot be compelled to use 'federal money,' nor federal negotiable instruments, Federal Notes (Swanson v. Fuline, 248 F. Supp. 364) the federal reserve being a private corporation (Lewis v. U.S., 680 F.2d 1238 at 1241) which is engaged in commercial activity by law of merchants (UCC 721-1-103) USE OF FEDERAL RESERVE NOTES IS "USE OF PRIVATE CREDIT" PURSUANT TO LEWIS v. UNITED STATES, SUPRA?
43. Is it true and correct STATE OF MISSOURI, as Plaintiff, that, 18 U.S. Code § 1583 - Enticement into slavery resonates with demands for "CASH" aka Federal Reserve Notes aka "private credit"? Exhibit 4
44. Can the STATE OF MISSOURI, as Plaintiff, guarantee the impartiality of its court if it relies on federal reserve notes "CASH", private credit? See Exhibit 4
45. Does the STATE recognize any ethical conflicts in prosecuting under a system established by private financial entities (Federal Reserve Bank)?
46. Can the STATE OF MISSOURI prove that Sara Rice McFall's charges with full penal sums for Case Nos. 24RI-CR00308-1 & 21RI-CR00579-01 were pursued without financial motivations?
47. If the STATE OF MISSOURI, as Plaintiff, relies on "federal slave script," aka "CASH" aka "Federal Reserve Notes", does it not then support a flawed system?
48. Can the STATE OF MISSOURI deny the existence of interests between banks and the judicial system?
49. Does the STATE OF MISSOURI fully disclose and ensure that its citizens fully understand the Federal Reserve's BANKS influence over their lawful rights in Case Nos.

Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document

- 24RI-CR00308-1 & 21RI-CR00579-01 regarding "CASH", aka Federal Reserve Notes/slave script/private credit/checks/? See Exhibit 4
50. Is it not true and correct that (FRN) 18 U.S.C. § 8 FEDERAL RESERVE NOTES are not money or legal tender per Public Law 73-10, Chapter 48, 48 Stat 48 112, 12 U. S. C. 411; Securities Act § 2(1), 3(a)(3), AND settlement in terms of Congressional Statutes At Large, Title 62.?
 51. Is it not true and correct STATE OF MISSOURI, as Plaintiff, that contracts requiring Corporate Legal BANK money that is not true money like: bank checks, money orders, attorney checks, FEDERAL RESERVE PROMISSORY NOTE DOLLARS, cashier checks, and certified checks from a bank or escrow company are illegal pursuant to Title 31 U.S.C. §5118(d)(2), 31 U.S.C.A., § 463, and Public Law 97-258 (September 13, 1982) contracts REQUIRING only types of BANK money to pay debts are illegal?
 52. Is it not true and correct STATE OF MISSOURI, as Plaintiff, that "...Every taxpayer is a cestui que trust having a sufficient interest in preventing abuse of the trust to be recognized in the field of this court's prerogative jurisdiction as a relator in the proceeding to set a sovereign authority in motion by action..." *In re Bolens 135 N.W. Rep. 164 (1912) Supreme Court Wisconsin?*
 53. If federal reserve notes are "debt," STATE OF MISSOURI, as Plaintiff, how does this impact the justice Sara Rice McFall receives?
 54. Should the STATE OF MISSOURI, as Plaintiff, court Case Nos. 24RI-CR00308-1 & 21RI-CR00579-01 have provided full disclosure and full discovery of the implications and be educated on the 1933 removal of gold and silver backing for any and all Ripley County 36th Judicial Circuit court cases?
 55. Is the social security number assigned to Sara Rice McFall being used in a way that alters her status in court without her consent? See Exhibit 4, Page 4, 6, of 10
 56. If social security numbers serve as a hidden contract, should the STATE OF MISSOURI, as Plaintiff, disclose this to all defendants, including Sara Rice McFall?
 57. Can the STATE OF MISSOURI, as Plaintiff, explain why Sara Rice McFall charges are valid if they're linked to a bankrupt since 1933 federal system?
 58. Can the STATE OF MISSOURI, as Plaintiff, explain why Sara Rice McFall charges are valid if they're linked to a bankrupt federal system? See Exhibit 1 and Exhibit 4
 59. Does the state believe Sara Rice McFall has full disclosure of her rights within the Federal Reserve Note aka "CASH" debt-based system?
 60. Can the STATE OF MISSOURI, as Plaintiff, guarantee the impartiality of its court if it relies on federal reserve notes aka "CASH"? See Exhibit 4
 61. Does the STATE OF MISSOURI, as Plaintiff, recognize any ethical conflicts in prosecuting under a system established by private financial entities such as the Federal Reserve Bank using their unbacked unconstitutional (USC Article 1, Section 10) private credit known as Federal Reserve Notes aka "CASH"? See Exhibit 4
 62. Is it not true and correct that the U.S. Constitution, Article I, Section 10: "**No State shall enter into any Treaty, Alliance, or Confederation; grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal; coin Money; emit Bills of Credit; make any Thing but gold and silver Coin a Tender in Payment of Debts; pass any Bill of Attainder, ex post facto Law, or Law impairing the Obligation of Contracts, or grant any Title of Nobility.**"?

63. Does Missouri acknowledge that enforcing charges with penal sums, fines, fees, "CASH" bail bonds in federal reserve notes aka "CASH" indirectly binds Sara Rice McFall to debt servitude, given the 1933 federal bankruptcy? See Exhibit 1, Exhibit 4
64. Can Missouri confirm whether the charges in these cases reflect lawful monetary values, or are they mere representations of "slave script" aka "CASH" created by the private Federal Reserve corporation?
65. Is Missouri able to fully disclose if penal sums associated with Sara Rice McFall's charges are calculated in a manner that does not impose debt servitude through fiat currency?
66. Has Missouri validated that the penal sums behind each charge in Sara Rice McFall's cases reflect tangible value, or are they sustained purely by private Federal Reserve interests?
67. Without disclosure of the penal sums' backing, can Missouri ensure that Sara Rice McFall's charges are free from debt-based peonage?
68. It is true and correct STATE OF MISSOURI, as Plaintiff, I require full disclosure and challenge the Jordan Michael Cantoni and Shawn Edward Boyd for failing to raise these and debt peonage due to the bankruptcy in 1933 and the STATE OF MISSOURI's usage of slave script/Federal Reserve Notes/private credit, critical defenses in his and Shawn Edward Boyd's representation of Sara Rice McFall and Megan Christian McFall?
69. Does the STATE OF MISSOURI, as Plaintiff, disclose to defendants like Sara Rice McFall the implications of their social security numbers in court?
70. Can the STATE OF MISSOURI explain how SARA RICE MCFALL's penal sums in cases 24RI-CR00308-1 & 21RI-CR00579-01, 24RI-CV00226, 21RI-CR00579, and 14BT-CR00765 do not constitute a form of debt peonage, especially given the state's reliance on fiat currency established during the 1933 bankruptcy?
71. Has the STATE OF MISSOURI provided full disclosure on whether the penal sums in Sara Rice McFall's cases are directly or indirectly funded by Federal Reserve bank credit?
72. How does the STATE OF MISSOURI justify prosecuting Sara Rice McFall if the penal sums attached to her case effectively link her to a system based on private Federal Reserve credit rather than lawful money as stated in Article I, Section 10 of the Constitution?
73. If Ecclesiastes 7:12 states, "For wisdom is a defense, and money is a defense," does the STATE OF MISSOURI acknowledge the debt-based currency it enforces deprives citizens like Sara Rice McFall of true monetary defense?
74. Given that Social Security ties citizens' identities to financial obligations, does the STATE OF MISSOURI recognize how this might implicate Sara Rice McFall's case in a system of financial peonage?
75. Can the STATE OF MISSOURI show that it has no hidden financial interest in the penal sums attached to Sara Rice McFall's cases, considering the Federal Reserve's involvement in the monetary system?

76. Is the STATE OF MISSOURI able to fully disclose whether penal sums tied to Sara Rice McFall's cases are funded by private credit interests?
77. How can the STATE OF MISSOURI prove that Sara Rice McFall's penal sums are not tied to debt-based currency, potentially placing her in involuntary servitude?
78. Is the STATE OF MISSOURI prepared to prove that the penal sums in Sara Rice McFall's cases have real, lawful value outside the debt-based system instituted by the 1933 bankruptcy?
79. Can the STATE OF MISSOURI affirm it is not enforcing slavery by relying on debt peonage through penal sums calculated in federal reserve notes in Sara Rice McFall's cases?
80. How can the STATE OF MISSOURI guarantee that Sara Rice McFall is not subjected to financial servitude, considering the penal sums' attachment to debt-based currency?
81. Does the STATE OF MISSOURI acknowledge that by prosecuting Sara Rice McFall, it may be perpetuating a system of debt slavery under fiat currency?
82. Has the STATE OF MISSOURI fully disclosed the origin and valuation of each penal sum related to Sara Rice McFall, especially in light of Ecclesiastes 7:12 on monetary wisdom?
83. Without disclosure of monetary values in lawful terms, can the STATE OF MISSOURI justify the penal sums in Sara Rice McFall's cases as constitutionally sound?
84. Does the STATE OF MISSOURI admit that, by enforcing penal sums, it may be indirectly enforcing financial enslavement on Sara Rice McFall?
85. How does the STATE OF MISSOURI justify penal sums in federal reserve notes when lawful currency is constitutionally required to be in gold or silver?
86. Can the STATE OF MISSOURI prove that penal sums in Sara Rice McFall's cases are untainted by interests from the private banking sector?
87. Has the STATE OF MISSOURI ensured that penal sums related to Sara Rice McFall do not perpetuate debt-based peonage?
88. By not providing full discovery, is the STATE OF MISSOURI confident it isn't hiding connections to private banking interests tied to Sara Rice McFall's penal sums?
89. If the STATE OF MISSOURI is operating under a fiat currency system, can it ensure that Sara Rice McFall's penal sums are free from debt-peonage implications?
90. Has the STATE OF MISSOURI disclosed how it calculates penal sums to avoid placing citizens in financial bondage?
91. Can the STATE OF MISSOURI prove Sara Rice McFall's penal sums do not carry debt peonage characteristics, given the reliance on federal reserve notes?
92. Has the STATE OF MISSOURI fully disclosed the relationship between Social Security and the financial liabilities tied to Sara Rice McFall's identity?
93. Does the STATE OF MISSOURI acknowledge that penal sums may link citizens to a system of financial enslavement via federal reserve notes?
94. How can the STATE OF MISSOURI justify penal sums without addressing the private interests involved in the fiat currency system?
95. By prosecuting Sara Rice McFall, does the STATE OF MISSOURI admit to enforcing financial obligations based on debt-peonage practices?
96. Has the STATE OF MISSOURI disclosed the full implications of the penal sums attached to each of Sara Rice McFall's case numbers?

Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document

97. Can the STATE OF MISSOURI provide full transparency about federal reserve notes' impact on penal sums in Sara Rice McFall's cases?
98. Does the STATE OF MISSOURI recognize that enforcing penal sums without disclosure risks imposing financial servitude on Sara Rice McFall?
99. How can the STATE OF MISSOURI ensure Sara Rice McFall's penal sums aren't part of an ongoing financial enslavement tied to debt currency?
100. If penal sums rely on federal reserve notes, is the STATE OF MISSOURI certain they don't indirectly enslave Sara Rice McFall financially?
101. How does the STATE OF MISSOURI justify penal sums that may be backed by private banking interests?
102. By attaching financial obligations in federal reserve notes, does the STATE OF MISSOURI avoid placing Sara Rice McFall under financial duress?
103. Has the STATE OF MISSOURI considered the moral implications of debt-based penal sums?
104. Without full transparency, can the STATE OF MISSOURI prove penal sums are not debt peonage mechanisms for Case Nos. 24RI-CR00308-1 & 21RI-CR00579-01?
105. Has the STATE OF MISSOURI disclosed its financial interests in prosecuting citizens under penal sums such as Sara Rice McFall in Case Nos. 24RI-CR00308-1 & 21RI-CR00579-01?
106. How do you justify the multiple infringements in Case Nos. 24RI-CR00308, 24RI-CR00308-1 & 21RI-CR00579, 21RI-CR00579-01 and other cases on the copyrighted name *Sara Rice McFall* since 1986, including the failure to follow the proper public fee schedule as published worldwide at SaraRiceMcFall.com?
107. Can you explain how you intend to address the ongoing financial liability incurred from repeated copyright infringements published worldwide public fee schedule at SaraRiceMcFall.com?
108. Are you aware that each unauthorized use of the name incurs a fee, and why has the court not addressed these infringements?
109. Why was the fee schedule at SaraRiceMcFall.com for the use of *Sara Rice McFall* not invoked before issuing subpoenas and court orders under these names?
110. What steps will you take to rectify the erroneous filings and infringements found at SaraRiceMcFall.com on *Sara Rice McFall's* copyrighted name within your jurisdiction?
111. How does the STATE OF MISSOURI, as Plaintiff, plan to handle the financial consequences of the copyright violations public fee schedule posted at SaraRiceMcFall.com caused by issuing legal documents under her copyrighted names?
112. Does the STATE OF MISSOURI admit that the charges and penal sums (monetary value) associated with Sara Rice McFall's cases are calculated based on Federal Reserve Notes aka "CASH" (Exhibit 4), which violates constitutional provisions requiring "gold and silver" (USC Article 1, Section 10) as legal tender for debts?
113. How does the STATE OF MISSOURI justify using charges with penal sums, monetary values for Case Nos. 24RI-CR00308, 24RI-CR00308-1 & 21RI-CR00579, 21RI-CR00579-01 that could place Sara Rice McFall in financial servitude under a fiat currency system, given that Federal Reserve Notes (Fiat) do not constitute lawful money?

Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document

114. Can the STATE OF MISSOURI demonstrate that it has disclosed all financial implications of the penal sums tied to Sara Rice McFall's cases, ensuring she is not subjected to involuntary debt-based servitude?
115. Is the STATE OF MISSOURI prepared to confirm that it has no private banking interests tied to the penal sums in Sara Rice McFall's cases, ensuring these sums do not exploit her through debt peonage?
116. Has the STATE OF MISSOURI disclosed that it may be operating as a corporate entity under federal bankruptcy administration since 1933, and if so, how does this impact the validity of judgments and penal sums associated with Sara Rice McFall's cases?
117. Given that Federal Reserve Notes do not meet the lawful money standard, is the STATE OF MISSOURI confident that its penal sums against Sara Rice McFall are constitutionally sound?
118. How does the STATE OF MISSOURI justify demanding payment in Federal Reserve Notes without offering the option of payment in gold or silver, as required by the U.S. Constitution?
119. Can the STATE OF MISSOURI demonstrate that Sara Rice McFall's penal sums are not calculated in a manner that indirectly enslaves her through debt-based currency?
120. How does the STATE OF MISSOURI ensure that Sara Rice McFall's charges and penal sums for all cases regarding her in the STATE OF MISSOURI, as Plaintiff, are free from the influence of private financial interests tied to the Federal Reserve private banks Fiat non-backed Federal Reserve Notes aka "CASH"?
121. Yes or No: Is it not true and correct that the STATE OF MISSOURI, as Plaintiff, requires defendants to pay bond in Federal Reserve Notes ("CASH") (Exhibit 4), which, per 18 U.S.C. § 8, Public Law 73-10, and 12 U.S.C. 411, are not considered lawful money or legal tender? And is it not true that such a demand (Exhibit 1 and Exhibit 4) contradicts Title 31 U.S.C. § 5118(d)(2) and Public Law 97-258, making the use of such "CASH" illegal?
122. Yes or No: Is it not true and correct that the STATE OF MISSOURI, as Plaintiff, allows private bail bond agents to charge non-refundable fees in Federal Reserve Notes ("CASH") (Exhibit 4), despite FRNs not being recognized as lawful money under 18 U.S.C. § 8 and Public Law 73-10 and U.S.C. Article 1, Section 10? Is it also correct that such fees exploit individuals who may be found innocent, thereby contradicting the purpose of fair bail practices?
123. Yes or No: Is it not true and correct that the STATE OF MISSOURI, as Plaintiff, imposes high court and filing fees, payable in Federal Reserve Notes ("CASH") (Exhibit 4), which under 18 U.S.C. § 8 and Public Law 73-10 are not considered true money, thus creating an illegal obligation under Title 31 U.S.C. § 5118(d)(2) and Public Law 97-258?
124. Yes or No: Is it not true and correct that the STATE OF MISSOURI, as Plaintiff, requires defendants who cannot afford private counsel to pay for public defender services in Federal Reserve Notes ("CASH"), slave script, private credit, even though FRNs are not deemed lawful money by 18 U.S.C. § 8 and Public Law 73-10 and U.S.C. Article 1, Section 10? How does the STATE OF MISSOURI, as Plaintiff, justify enforcing this payment when contracts requiring only corporate bank money are illegal?
125. Yes or No: Is it not true and correct that the STATE OF MISSOURI, as Plaintiff, permits exorbitant charges for inmate phone calls, paid in Federal Reserve Notes

Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document

("CASH"), slave script, private bank credit, which 18 U.S.C. § 8 and Public Law 73-10 do not recognize as lawful money, imposing unnecessary financial hardship on families?

126. Yes or No: Is it not true and correct that the STATE OF MISSOURI, as Plaintiff, permits excessive commissary markups requiring payment in Federal Reserve Notes ("CASH"), slave script, which under 18 U.S.C. § 8 and Public Law 73-10 are not lawful tender, thereby profiting at the expense of incarcerated individuals?
127. Yes or No: Is it not true and correct that the STATE OF MISSOURI, as Plaintiff, charges inmates for medical care in Federal Reserve Notes ("CASH"), even though FRNs are not true money per 18 U.S.C. § 8 and Public Law 73-10, thus creating an obligation in a currency of not backed by gold or silver, non-redeemable Federal Reserve Notes?
128. Yes or No: Is it not true and correct that the STATE OF MISSOURI, as Plaintiff, imposes electronic monitoring fees in Federal Reserve Notes ("CASH"), despite FRNs not being considered lawful money per 18 U.S.C. § 8 and Public Law 73-10, burdening defendants with payment obligations in illegal currency (not gold or silver per USC Art.1, Sec. 10)?
129. Yes or No: Is it not true and correct that the STATE OF MISSOURI, as Plaintiff, demands monthly probation and parole fees in Federal Reserve Notes ("CASH"), which are not lawful money per 18 U.S.C. § 8 and Public Law 73-10, turning post-conviction monitoring into an illegal profit scheme?
130. Yes or No: Is it not true and correct that the STATE OF MISSOURI, as Plaintiff, imposes administrative fees for community service payable in Federal Reserve Notes ("CASH"), a currency that 18 U.S.C. § 8 and Public Law 73-10 do not recognize as lawful, thereby imposing undue financial burdens in contravention of federal law?
131. Yes or No: Is it not true and correct that the STATE OF MISSOURI, as Plaintiff, imposes diversion program fees in Federal Reserve Notes ("CASH") aka slave script, which are not recognized as legal tender per 18 U.S.C. § 8 and Public Law 73-10, preventing low-income defendants from completing diversion?
132. Yes or No: Is it not true and correct that the STATE OF MISSOURI, as Plaintiff, collects fees for managing restitution payments, requiring payment in Federal Reserve Notes ("CASH") aka slave script, private banker credit, even though 18 U.S.C. § 8 and Public Law 73-10 do not recognize FRNs (Federal Reserve Notes aka "CASH") as lawful money?
133. Yes or No: Is it not true and correct that the STATE OF MISSOURI, as Plaintiff, charges inmates transportation fees payable in Federal Reserve Notes ("CASH"), despite FRNs not being legal tender under 18 U.S.C. § 8 and Public Law 73-10, making these fees illegal?
134. Yes or No: Is it not true and correct that the STATE OF MISSOURI, as Plaintiff, imposes punitive late fees payable in Federal Reserve Notes ("CASH"), which 18 U.S.C. § 8 and Public Law 73-10 do not recognize as lawful money, creating ongoing financial exploitation?
135. Yes or No: Is it not true and correct that the STATE OF MISSOURI, as Plaintiff, requires fees for court supervision payable in Federal Reserve Notes ("CASH") aka slave script, a currency that lacks legal tender status per 18 U.S.C. § 8 and Public Law 73-10, essentially the STATE OF MISSOURI profiting from monitoring requirements?

Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document

136. Yes or No: Is it not true and correct that the STATE OF MISSOURI, as Plaintiff, imposes daily jail fees in Federal Reserve Notes ("CASH") on pretrial detainees, despite FRNs not being recognized as lawful tender per 18 U.S.C. § 8 and Public Law 73-10?
137. Yes or No: Is it not true and correct that the STATE OF MISSOURI, as Plaintiff, permits high charges for digital stamps and emails in Federal Reserve Notes ("CASH"), which 18 U.S.C. § 8 and Public Law 73-10 do not recognize as lawful, adding unnecessary hardship?
138. Yes or No: Is it not true and correct that the STATE OF MISSOURI, as Plaintiff, charges visitation fees in Federal Reserve Notes ("CASH"), even though FRNs are not lawful money under 18 U.S.C. § 8 and Public Law 73-10, further exploiting families of inmates?
139. Yes or No: Is it not true and correct that the STATE OF MISSOURI, as Plaintiff, charges high fees for court transcripts, payable in Federal Reserve Notes ("CASH"), a currency not considered lawful money under 18 U.S.C. § 8 and Public Law 73-10?
140. Yes or No: Is it not true and correct that the STATE OF MISSOURI, as Plaintiff, requires appeal filing fees in Federal Reserve Notes ("CASH"), slave script, despite the fact that FRNs unbacked and private bankers' credit are not lawful tender per 18 U.S.C. § 8 and Public Law 73-10?
141. Yes or No: Is it not true and correct that the STATE OF MISSOURI, as Plaintiff, imposes residency fees in halfway houses payable in Federal Reserve Notes ("CASH"), a currency not considered lawful by 18 U.S.C. § 8 and Public Law 73-10?
142. Yes or No: Is it not true and correct that the STATE OF MISSOURI, as Plaintiff, requires reentry program fees payable in Federal Reserve Notes ("CASH"), a currency not considered lawful money under 18 U.S.C. § 8 and Public Law 73-10?
143. Yes or No: Is it not true and correct that the STATE OF MISSOURI, as Plaintiff, adds processing fees on fine payments in Federal Reserve Notes ("CASH"), even though 18 U.S.C. § 8 and Public Law 73-10 do not recognize FRNs as lawful tender?
144. Yes or No: Is it not true and correct that the STATE OF MISSOURI, as Plaintiff, permits interest accrual on unpaid fines in Federal Reserve Notes ("CASH"), despite FRNs not being lawful money per 18 U.S.C. § 8 and Public Law 73-10?
145. Yes or No: Is it not true and correct that the STATE OF MISSOURI, as Plaintiff, relies on civil penalties and fines as revenue, requiring payment in Federal Reserve Notes ("CASH"), even though FRNs are not lawful money per 18 U.S.C. § 8 and Public Law 73-10?

II. Legal Basis for Immediate Dismissal

1. **Statutory and Contractual Principles Supporting Rescission**
The STATE OF MISSOURI, as Plaintiff, rescission is justified when consent is obtained by mistake or misrepresentation (Exhibit 1). The Defendant's express rescission of any contractual obligation related to these cases, as declared in the attached affidavit, extinguishes any legal basis for continued prosecution including, but not limited to these Case Nos. 24RI-CR00308, 24RI-CR00308-1 & 21RI-CR00579, 21RI-CR00579-01. See Exhibit 1.
2. **Violation of Defendant's Right to Due Process**
By obstructing the acceptance of Defendant's filings on October 30, 2024, the Plaintiff

has engaged in conduct that not only infringes on statutory protections but also deprives Defendant of her right to participate fully in her defense. This deprivation underscores the necessity for dismissal on procedural and equitable grounds. Exhibit 1, Page 12-15

III. Demand for Immediate Dismissal and Release

In light of these clear statutory and contractual grounds for rescission (Exhibit 1, Page 1-11), as well as the Plaintiff's procedural misconduct (Exhibit 1, Page 12-15), Defendant respectfully requests that the Court dismiss all charges immediately and order her unconditional release.


WHEREFORE, Sara Rice McFall moves this Court dismiss all charges in Cases 24RI-CR00308, 24RI-CR00308-1 and 21RI-CR00579, 21RI-CR00579-01, order her immediate release from detention, and grant such other relief as the Court deems just and equitable.

Dated this 4th day of November, 2024.

Respectfully Submitted,

Sara McFall

Sara Rice McFall©
Ripley County Detention Center
301 Lafayette Street
Doniphan, union-Missouri



CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE


I hereby certify that this document is being personally filed into Case Nos. 24RI-CR00308, 24RI-CR00308-1 & 21RI-CR00579, 21RI-CR00579-01 on November 4, 2024 with the Ripley County Circuit Clerk's Office. Opposing counsel is served through electronic filing system as provided in Rule 103.8.

By: *Sara McFall*, Beneficiary
Sara Rice McFall©

STATE OF MISSOURI
COUNTY OF RIPLEY

Sworn to (or affirmed) and subscribed before me
this 4th day of NOV, 2024
by *Sara McFall*

Lisa Kay Ball Lisa Ball
Notary Public's Signature Notary Name
My Commission Expires 07-24-2026



Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document
Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document

PROPOSED ORDER

IN THE 36th JUDICIAL CIRCUIT COURT OF RIPLEY COUNTY, STATE OF MISSOURI

STATE OF MISSOURI,
Plaintiff,

v.

SARA RICE MCFALL,
Defendant.

) Cause Nos.: 24RI-CR00308-1 &
) 21RI-CR00579-01

) Division II (Criminal Division)

**ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO DISMISS AND ORDERING
IMMEDIATE RELEASE**

Upon review of Defendant's Motion to Dismiss and the attached affidavits in Exhibit 1, Pages 1-15, declaring the rescission of any implied or apparent consent, as well as the documented procedural obstructions against her, and for good cause shown, it is hereby:

ORDERED that the charges in Case Nos. 24RI-CR00308, 24RI-CR00308-1 & 21RI-CR00579, 21RI-CR00579-01 against Defendant Sara Rice McFall are hereby **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE.**

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendant Sara Rice McFall shall be immediately **RELEASED FROM DETENTION** at Ripley County Detention Center, Doniphan, MO.

SO ORDERED on this ___ day of November, 2024.

JUDGE OF THE CIRCUIT COURT