THE REVISED CODE OF WASHINGTON AT RCW 69.50.302(c)(3) ALLOWS ME TO LAWFULLY "POSSESS" MARIJUANA BECAUSE I AM THE RCW 69.50.101(b)(b) “ULTIMATE USER.”

RCW 69.50.302(c)(3) Registration requirements clearly reads:

“(c) The following persons need NOT register and MAY LAWFULLY POSSESS controlled substances under this chapter:
. . . (3) AN ULTIMATE USER or a person in possession of any controlled substance pursuant to a lawful order of a practitioner or in lawful possession of a substance included in Schedule V.”

It is a CR 8(d) undisputed fact that Washington Law at RCW 69.50.302(c)(3) & 21 U.S.C. 822(2)(C)(3) clearly states that an “ULTIMATE USER” as defined by RCW 69.50.101(bb) & 21 U.S.C. 802(27) need NOT register AND MAY LAWFULLY POSSESS MARIJUANA. See RCW 69.50.101 (bb) & 21 U.S.C. 802(27) defining ultimate user:

“RCW 69.50.101 (bb) "Ultimate user" means an individual who lawfully possesses a controlled substance for the individual's own use or for the use of a member of the individual's household or for administering to an animal owned by the individual or by a member of the individual's household.” (Washington law allows me to get my dogs & cats HIGH if I want to!)

Furthermore, it is NOT illegal to “possess” or “use” “drug paraphernalia” under RCW 69.50.412 if you are the “ULTIMATE USER” and nor is it illegal to “USE” “drug paraphernalia” unless you are using it with intent to deliver or manufacture with intent to deliver as stated in RCW 69.50.412(2):

“RCW 69.50.412Prohibited acts: E--Penalties.
(1) It is unlawful for any person to “USE” drug paraphernalia to plant, propagate, cultivate, grow, harvest, manufacture, compound, convert, produce, process, prepare, test, analyze, pack, repack, store, contain, conceal, inject, ingest, inhale, or otherwise introduce into the human body a controlled substance. Any person who violates this subsection is guilty of a misdemeanor.
(2) It is unlawful for any person to deliver, possess with intent to deliver, or manufacture with intent to deliver drug paraphernalia, knowing, or under circumstances where one reasonably should know, that it will be used to plant, propagate, cultivate, grow, harvest, manufacture, compound, convert, produce, process, prepare, test, analyze, pack, repack, store, contain, conceal, inject, ingest, inhale, or otherwise introduce into the human body a controlled substance. . .” (Hey Officer Friendly: Did you “SEE” me “USING” my pipe???)

RCW 69.50.412(1) and (2) clearly reads: “(1) IT IS UNLAWFUL FOR ANY PERSON TO USE DRUG PARAPHERNALIA . . . WITH INTENT TO DELIVER, POSSESS WITH INTENT TO DELIVER, OR MANUFACTURE WITH INTENT TO DELIVER DRUG PARAPHERNALIA.” Therefore, possession of the “drug paraphernalia” by itself is not illegal!

“THE STATUTE IS VIOLATED ONLY IF POSSESSION IS ACCOMPANIED BOTH BY KNOWLEDGE of the nature of the act AND ALSO BY THE INTENT “TO MANUFACTURE, DISTRIBUTE, OR DISPENSE.” United States v. Clark, 475 F.2d 240, 248-49 (2d Cir. 1973).” UNITED STATES v. JEWELL, 532 F.2d 697 (9th Cir. February 27,
It is crystal clear that 21 U.S.C. 841(a)(1) is worded in the conjunctive “and.”

United States v. Jewell, supra, makes it clear that you cannot be charged with the “lesser but included offense” of “possession” unless they also charge you with “manufacturing with intent to distribute.” – POSSSESSION BY ITSELF IS NOT ILLEGAL!!!

Furthermore, you cannot be charged with any violation of RCW 69, et seq. the PHARMACEUTICAL CODE unless you have or possess a RCW 69 PHARMACEUTICAL LICENSE on the following authority:

"privilege" . . . is synonymous with license . . . . The possession of a . . . license is a prerequisite to violation of this statute . . . . On appeal the Superior court dismissed the charges against Cole on the ground that since he had no . . . license, he had no privilege . . . [2] the statute refers to those whose "privilege" . . . is suspended. Cole never had any type of privilege . . . License is synonymous with privilege, since Cole did not have a license, and that state did not grant Cole a license, THE STATE CANNOT SUSPEND WHAT HE DOES NOT HAVE. Aberdeen v. Cole, 13 Wn. App. 617, 537 P.2d 1073 (June 10, 1975). (See also United States v. Jin Fuey Moy, 241 U.S. 394 (June 5, 1916.).

MARIJUANA IS NOT ILLEGAL AND NEVER HAS BEEN! THE REVISED CODE OF WASHINGTON IS NOT THE LAW!

“But the legislature specifically disclaimed any intention to change the meaning of any statute. The compilers of the code were not empowered by congress to amend existing law, and doubtless had no thought of doing so . . . .” ...the act before us does not purport to amend a section of an act, but only a section of a compilation entitled “REVISED CODE OF WASHINGTON,” WHICH IS NOT THE LAW. Such an act purporting to amend only a section of the prima facie compilation leaves the law unchanged. En Banc.” PAROSA v. TACOMA, 57 Wn.(2d) 409 (Dec.22, 1960).

Contact Luis Anthony Ewing at (253) 226-3741 or <rcwcodebuster@comcast.net> for help with Drug Possession, D.U.I.'S, Driving While License Suspended Violations and all traffic tickets. See also: <www.ultimaterusers.com> or <www.lawfullypossess.com>

WE DRIVE WITH NO DRIVER’S LICENSE’S & SMOKE POT AND SO CAN YOU! 