

## 2 IRS CODES!

SUBJECT: HERE IS WHERE ALL OF YOU ARE MISSING THE BOAT REGARDING WHERE AND WHEN THE PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT APPLIES & DOESN'T APPLY!!!!

In all the cases cited by Lindsey Springer and Richard Cornforth, I want ALL of you to specifically look at see WHICH of the TWO (2) SEPARATE IRS LAWS is in dispute in each particular case!!!!

Yes, Richard Cornforth did NOT cite the DAWES, COLLINS & DOLE CASE, but SO WHAT!!!!

Richard Cornforth is CORRECT when he shows that the PRA Defense is a REALLY LIMITED and VERY WEAK DEFENSE and cannot be used in THE BLANKET MANNER that it has been by Lindsey Springer as the latest BS SILVER BULLET!!!!

The PRA Defense will NOT work in MOST IRS prosecutions and here is why:

There are TWO (2) SEPARATE IRS LAWS!!!!

Actually THE TRUTH is that ONE is a STATUTE which is an ACT OF CONGRESS.

The other is a CODE that is NOT an ACT OF CONGRESS.

Go look at Title 1, Section 204 in the FOOTNOTES:

Department of International Chapter

1 USCS § 204N 2

Chapt. 3 Codes & Supplements 1 USCS 204 note 3

The Internal Revenue Code of 1954 was enacted in the form of a separate code by Act Aug. 16, 1954 c 736, 68A Stat. 1, The sections of Title 26 are identical to the Chapters and sub chapters of the Internal Revenue Code. and;

Title 1, Section 204, Chapter 3 at note 3 clearly states in part: "The sections of Title 26 are identical to the Chapters and subchapters of the Internal Revenue Code."

NOTE: Please notice how the last statement in footnote No. 3 of Title 1, Section 204, Chapter 3 is NO LONGER IN A FOOTNOTE in the 2006 version of this CODE SECTION:

". . . TITLE 26, INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

The Internal Revenue Code of 1954 was enacted in the form of a separate code by act Aug. 16, 1954, ch. 736, 68A Stat. 1. Pub. L. 99-514, Sec. 2(a), Oct. 22, 1986, 100 Stat. 2095, provided that the Internal Revenue Title enacted Aug. 16, 1954, as heretofore, hereby, or hereafter amended, may be cited as the "Internal Revenue Code of 1986". The sections of Title 26, United

States Code, are identical to the sections of the Internal Revenue Code."

Title 1, Section 204 clearly states in part: "The sections of Title 26, United States Code, are identical to the sections of the Internal Revenue Code."

DID YOU NOTICE THE CHANGE IN 2006????

The 2005 and early version says: "The sections of Title 26 are identical to the Chapters and subchapters of the Internal Revenue Code."

The 2006 version says: "The sections of Title 26, United States Code, are identical to the sections of the Internal Revenue Code."

DID YOU SEE THE SWITCH????

From 2005 and before the Internal Revenue Code had "Chapters and subchapters."

From 2006 and forward, the Internal Revenue Code now has "sections."

I can't reveal everything in this little dissertation!!!!

But if you hire me, I can beat any IRS CRIMINAL PROSECUTION and get your case DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE and do it PRE-TRIAL!!!!

Here is some more interesting stuff you should look up:

Please look up the definition of "SAME" and "LIKE" and you will find that IDENTICAL does NOT mean the "same" or "like."

Look up the definition of "IDENTICAL."

There are clearly TWO (2) completely different and separate IRS LAWS with "identical" wording and punctuation for TWO (2) separate purposes:

- 1.) The first is Title 26 - It is an implementing regulation for the National Prohibition Act.
- 2.) The second is the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 - For implementing and enforcing the Internal Revenue Laws of the United States.

\* \* \*

Title 26 is a CODE SECTION!!!!

The Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is a STATUTE and is an ACT OF CONGRESS

\* \* \*

ONE IS A CODE SECTION UN-ENACTED OR NOT ENACTED INTO LAW BY CONGRESS MAKING IT NO MORE THAN AN ADMINISTRATIVE RULE.

THE OTHER IS A STATUTE BECAUSE IT IS A STATUTE AT LARGE OR DISJUNCTIVELY AN ACT OF CONGRESS.

\* \* \*

The Paperwork Reduction Act only applies to Title 26.

The Paperwork Reduction Act only applies to the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 because the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is an ACT OF CONGRESS!!!!

The Paperwork Reduction Act does NOT apply to ACTS OF CONGRESS!!!!

OMB's do NOT apply to ACTS OF CONGRESS!!!!

The Paperwork Reduction Act does is NOT REQUIRED to be fulfilled by agencies promulgating rules and forms required to be filled out by the people as long as there is an ACT OF CONGRESS or LAW supporting it that says that they have to create or formulate a form.

The main mistake that Lindsey Springer and all other PRA Advocates are making is claiming that the PRA Defense can be applied in a BLANKET manner to all IRS prosecutions.

The Paperwork Reduction Act only applies to Title 26.

This does NOT mean that everyone who raises the PRA defense is going to WIN!!!!

In FACT, quite the opposite!!!!

Most will LOSE in court with the PRA defense because you are civilly dead and your rights are "subrogated" to their rights.

Go look up the term: SUBROGATION!!!!

YOU DON'T HAVE ANY RIGHTS!!!!

You are SUBROGATED to their RIGHTS!!!!

We need to "hold the mirror" up to them and REVERSE this and show them that THEY are SUBROGATED to our RIGHTS because they took an OATH to uphold both Federal and State Constitutions and the laws of the United States and the laws of the State, regardless of the fact that their oath is valid or defective, because they still took an oath regardless of it's defect.

However, for those who want to argue the OATH ISSUE, go see Title 4, Section 101 & 102 for the proper method of taking and filing OATH!!!!

Title 4, Section's 101 & 102 makes it clear that a Public Official has to take TWO (2) SEPARATE OATH(S).

The first one to the Federal Constitution.

The second one to the State Constitution.

Title 4, Section 101 & 102 makes it clear that the person who gave the oath to the public official taking the oath is responsible for FILING that public officials oath in the same manner as was done under State law.

**NO PUBLIC OFFICIAL HAS EVER FILED THE PROPER FORM(S) PROVING THAT THE PERSON WHO GAVE THEM THEIR OATH ACTUALLY FILED THE PUBLIC OFFICIALS OATH FOR THEM!!!!**

Hope this is helpful to all of you!

Sincerely

Luis Ewing at (253) 226-3741 or <rcwcodebus...@comcast.net> or <rcwcodebus...@yahoo.com>