

=====

**littlehammer's**  
**Weekly Tax Exempt Newsletter**  
**with**  
**Questions and Answers**  
**and**  
**Conference Call Reminder**

Copyright (except quotations) © 2000, 2001, 2002 by Paul Leinthall

=====

Tuesday, February 26, 2002

- [1] Welcome & Editorial:           How About Some Questions and Answers?
- [2] Questions and Answers:       Individual Tax Exemption and Corporation Sole.
- [3] News Briefs & Comments:     Watch out! Clients of Bank of America!
- [4] Conference Call Reminders:   **“Question & Answer “Call - for New Folks**  
**Wednesday NIGHTS - 9 pm EASTERN**  
**1-620-584-8202, Pin 2974#**  
**“\*6” (Star 6) MUTES and UN-MUTES your line**  
**ALSO**  
**Corporation Sole (specific) Conference Call**  
**Friday MORNINGS - 10:00 AM EASTERN**  
**Same Number and Pin as Above**  
**PLUS**  
**A CLIENT’S ONLY CALL**  
**Call Your Representative for Number and Time**
- [5] Contact Information, Legal Notice & Notice of Copyright explanation.

In this section (below), I explain why I use the bracketed phrases [THE COMPANY] and [THE FOUNDER] to refer to the founder and his company, who achieve the 100% effective results of having the IRS change their internal records to reflect the fact that each client is exempt from income taxes on any income, regardless of amount or source, unless the source of the income is the federal government itself or a trade or business under the sovereign jurisdiction of the government. [THE COMPANY] accomplishes this fully (and only) in accord with the Internal Revenue Code, and thus, none of their clients ever experience adverse IRS confrontation or court proceedings.

-----NOTICE-----

In compliance with Title 17 U.S.C. section 107, this material is distributed freely, without profit or payment, for educational purposes only.

=====

To **SUBSCRIBE/UNSUBSCRIBE**: If you have received information DIRECTLY from the author (Paul Leinthall), you are already and automatically subscribed. If you are not already subscribed, you may send an email to "TaxExempt@primemail.com," with the word "subscribe" in the subject heading AND your name in the body of the email. I do NOT provide your private information to ANYONE else. To unsubscribe, simply put the word "unsubscribe" in the subject heading.

=====
[1] Welcome & Editorial
=====

Hi Folks,

Ever since [THE COMPANY's] Friday MORNING conference calls began last month on the subject of Corporation Sole, we've been seeing an increased interest in this subject.

When I started this newsletter in it's present form a year ago, I wasn't addressing questions about Corporation Sole. Now, however, it's a different story.

Also, for the last couple of newsletters, I haven't been addressing questions at all. So, this week, we'll again pick up some questions. The questions will be a mixture, covering both the aspects of the "revocation of election process," for the purpose of being free from income tax liability individually, AND the aspect of Corporation Sole.

Enjoy your read.

Paul Leinthall
661-822-7889, 9am-8pm, Mon-Fri., PACIFIC time
email: littlehammer@primemail.com

=====
[2] Questions and Answers
=====

Before we begin, let me cover something for the benefit of my new readers. In this section, most of my "material" comes directly from the stimulation of folks asking me questions. What you generally find in this section, are edited versions of my communication and dialog with people about their own concerns and the questions that come to their minds.

I do, in fact, prior to including them in my newsletter, edit these dialogues, and often re-write my answers, as I have here, sometimes adding a lot more than what I originally included in my initial response. So, if you find yourself reading and recognizing your own questions, you might want to NOT skip the answers you'll see here, because I may have expanded on it, and you'll be getting more "bang for your buck," as they say.

Also, I no longer ask for permission from folks to include their correspondence to me. I do, however, as you'll notice, remove all personal references, so the only one who might recognize the person with whom I'm dialoguing would be the person him/herself.

Hello Paul.

Regarding [a] recent newsletter:

I know you have said many times in the past that we became taxpayers when we signed our 1040. If that is true, then without a signature, we are not taxpayers, correct? From my experience, if you send them a 1040 without a signature, they will assess your taxes for you. I also realize that only contracts, licenses and permits are required by law and thus require a signature. Everyone knows that if you don't sign a permit, contract or license, even if you send the paperwork

and money to the licensing regulators, if you don't sign it, you don't get the permit/license - the signature is required by law. The 1040 does not fall the same category of licenses, permits and contracts because there is no law that says I have to have a 1040 to work.

So, if I never signed a 1040 in my entire life and decide to become a client of [THE COMPANY], because the IRS is assessing my taxes, what contract would the Declaration and Notice [THE COMPANY] sends to IRS, be claiming to revoke?

Thanks, XXXX

Hi XXXX,

In the past, the IRS has used LOTS of "evidence" to suggest you are a taxpayer. One of the primary forms of such evidence, is the W-2's or 1099 that have been sent to them, with your social security number attached. Since that represents a "witness" against you, saying that you have been paid "taxable income", the IRS considers you a "taxpayer" just from that. So, regardless of whether, or not, you've actually ever signed a 1040 Form, they're going to consider that you owe them money on that "taxable income". This is one of the reasons [THE COMPANY] continues to file each year for every client, to keep positioning each client as NOT in the taxpayer category, and denying that any W-2 and 1099 income falls in their list of "taxable sources" from Section 861 of the Code (unless, of course, a client's income does fall into a taxable category). This is also why [THE COMPANY] needs copies of ALL W-2's, 1099's, 1098's, K-1's or an income statement, each year, for each client.

An adhesion contract is NOT a plain, simple, straightforward contract; it's actually, in most cases, a "joining together" with certain other terms and conditions not explicitly spelled out on the piece of paper you're signing, which is why it is so subtle. You're correct in that it is not a typical contract, with all the terms and conditions spelled out on the contract, or which contains a statement that the "law requires a signature" along with the stated penalty for failure to comply. Even most of the "contracts" you think are required by law (e.g., licenses and permits, including marriage licenses) are not actually "required" - they just make it so difficult for you to operate without them, that's it's simply easier, in most cases, to pay the license or permit fees and be done with it.

Each person has to pick and choose which issues he wants to confront in this regard. The arena of the so-called "income tax" is an arena where the money saved makes confronting this issue worthwhile for lots of people, whereas taking a stand at law regarding drivers licenses or hunting licenses would be both a waste of time and money, from my perspective, although the principle is the same.

Sincerely,  
Paul Leinthall

.....

Paul, where, in the information you sent, is the issue of what is filed each year? Then do I understand you correctly, the "Company" files on our behalf?

Also, are any dollar amounts stated in the filing?

And are we filing under penalty of perjury?

Most of all, I want to read "where" and "what" is filed each year. 50 pages of information is more than I have time to read and search through at this point.

Thank you,  
XXXXXX

Hi XXXXX,

[THE COMPANY] files a "statement and declaration of material facts" and a "Request for Determination of Status" each year for each client. No figures are provided, unless the person has federally sourced income, in which event, that specific income might create an income tax liability (on that income only). In that case, the figures must be provided.

You receive a copy of EVERYTHING filed on your behalf, and many times, it has to come to you first for your signature.

Most documents are signed with the following "penalty of perjury clause" (There are two kinds of "penalty of perjury" clause: one for the federal United States, the "corporate" United States; and one for the Constitutionally recognized entity, the united States of America; [THE COMPANY] only uses the latter, not the one that is under the corporate, or "federal," United States.

The penalty of perjury clause [THE COMPANY] uses reads as follows:

I declare under penalty of perjury, pursuant to the common law of the State of (your State) and the Unites States of America, that the foregoing is true, accurate, and complete to the best of my knowledge and belief.

(Signature)

If those are your only questions, I've just saved you from reading all the information.

There is no rush on our part. You can take as much time as you need to make your own best informed decision. [THE COMPANY] is not planning on going anywhere, and they've never yet failed in what they do.

Sincerely,  
Paul Leinthall

.....

Paul,

I have a question that must be answered before I proceed. Could you tell me where in the information you have provided, do they discuss filing a 1040 every year. Also the reasoning why we are required to sign a 1040 every year.

My research indicates that a 1040 is for reporting another form of income which we do not have as average wage earners, and signing a 1040, under Penalty Of Perjury, is taking away our Constitutional Rights.

Another issue, how does one afford the cost of a 2 hour conference call?

Your reply would be very helpful,.....  
XXXXXXXXXX

Hi XXXXXXXXX,

We do NOT file 1040's each year. Being required by the Code to file "a return or Statement" does NOT necessarily mean a Form 1040. Besides, that was never the "correct" form to begin with. [THE COMPANY] files a STATEMENT, along with a "Declaration of Material Facts" each year for each client, which is in harmony with the requirements of the law for filing purposes.

Signing the penalty of perjury clause under the federal government, in distinction to the Constitutionally "common law" form of penalty of perjury clause, probably doesn't "take away" you Constitutional Rights; but it may well be a way in which you voluntarily elect to surrender some of your Constitutional rights, under "CONTRACT" law. Your Constitutional RIGHT to engage in any contract you wish, no matter how stupid it may be, and no matter how one-sided it may be (as are most "adhesion" contracts), is your absolute RIGHT - guaranteed and protected under the Constitution. If you choose to get yourself into a contract that is not in your own best interest, that's entirely up to you, of course. The thing that fools most people these days, when people say you "have to sign", is that you're entering some form of contract, and it behooves you to know what your signature is getting yourself into. When it looks as if you have no choice, you may want to write above your signature, something like "All rights reserved under Common Law". If you have a choice, however, better to not sign at all, or sign using a Common Law "penalty of perjury" clause.

Regarding being able to afford a conference call: Most Wednesday night conference calls are less than an hour and a half. The others, are just about an hour. But let me use your two-hour example.

If you dial 1010636 prior to dialing the regular conference call number (1-620-584-8202), you will pay just 5¢ a minute, billed directly to your regular phone bill. With 120 of those minutes in two hours, that's \$6.00. Most adults can't eat at McDonalds for much less than that (not that I'm advocating a diet of McDonalds; I'm using it simply for illustration purposes).

(By-the-way, you can also call Clear Choice Communications and get that 5¢ a minute rate, 24 hours a day, seven days a week, with no monthly fee. You're charged a minimum call amount of 15¢ for any call, so if you talk for less than three minutes, those first one or two minutes are the only ones that cost more than 5¢. Boy, at this rate, I ought to arrange a commission from Clear Choice Communications. Actually, I use a flat-rate long distance company (not Clear Choice), where I get 5000 minutes for \$69.95, which, of course, comes out to be less than 1.5¢ a minute; but if you're regular long distance calling is not more than \$70 or \$80 a month, that doesn't make sense).

An hour on a conference call, of course, at the 5¢ a minute rate, is \$3.00.

How much money in taxes do you pay each year? Is it worth it? Only you can answer that.

Sincerely, Paul Leinthall

Dear Paul,

I am with [another group in the "tax honesty" movement]. I have spoken with you before and I still have itchy feet. I am also waiting on a big paycheck that may come soon. But I was wondering what would happen if I went through your company and started this process of Tax-exemption, and then you suddenly cease to exist as a company, or, God forbid, you die suddenly. What happens then? Where do I stand because I have no clue what you are doing. I cannot just sent 1040's to the IRS and assume they will tax-exempt me. That is a real concern and probably the main reason I haven't jumped into your program. I look forward to your reply.

Thank you,  
XXXX XXXX

Hi XXXX,

I'll answer your questions on three fronts. Obviously, there are no "guarantee's" in life... For example, while there can be no guarantee about the length of anyone's physical lifetime, there are also no guarantees that a year or two, or five, from now, the laws would even be as they are today; in fact, pertaining to taxing laws, there's every likelihood they will have been tweek'd and twiddled as they have been in the past; and it is incumbent upon all of us, as Citizens, to be aware of the law. However, in the last 90 years, none of the law "tampering" has changed the basis of what [THE COMPANY] does, although [THE FOUNDER] occasionally finds more powerful ways to accomplish what [THE COMPANY] does; and the changes are always incorporated on the behalf of every client, no matter when a person became a client.

Now, to address your question more directly:

First, [THE COMPANY] consists of more than one person, and even [THE FOUNDER] is bringing others on board who can do, in essence, what he and his staff now do. He's already working with a CPA, who is coming on board; he's anticipating being able to work with an "enrolled Agent"; and eventually, he will have an attorney on staff.

Second, every client has a pretty good (in fact. an exact) idea of what is done in HIS particular case (since no two clients have the exact same set of circumstances), because he gets copies of everything that is filed or communicated on his behalf. While it is not intended that something should happen to [THE COMPANY] to cause it to no longer exist or be effective, should something drastic happen [because there are no guarantees in life], each client will have had all the documents and filings in his case, and in the normal course of future annual filings, all a client would have to do would be to prepare the same thing each year, while keeping abreast of any changes in law that might negatively impact on what had been done in the past. Admittedly, keeping abreast of all the changes in law is not the easiest thing to do, perhaps, and is one of the key benefits that clients enjoy, since they don't have to do it themselves, it is not impossible to do. As I say, however, the law has not changed in 90 years to make ineffective what we do; and while there is no guarantee that it could not be changed in the future, one would think it would already have been done. Then, again, it would not be an easy thing to do without changing the Statutes at Large, going back to having to change the Constitution (and not simply by an amendment).

Third, there is the availability for a person to structure his affairs utilizing a corporation sole, which, when established properly, is the only "entity" that has never been penetrated in our nations history. When I say "established properly" I mean a corporation sole, which, from it's creation, is not under the jurisdiction of the IRS in any way (unless the folks setting it up were "suckered" into believing it has to be formulated around any of the IRS Code Section 501 requirements, like a "501(C)(3) Non-profit Corporation"). A properly created Corporation Sole not only has no income tax paying requirements, but no filing or reporting requirements, either. So, if an individual had himself structured via corporation sole, and all income and property were held in and run through the accounts of the corporation sole, and since the government has no jurisdiction in that regard, it wouldn't matter what changes in law occurred regarding the individual income tax; unless, of course, Congress decided to take on the issue of changing the laws regarding corporation sole, wherein they would encounter a tremendous battle with the likes of the worldwide Roman Catholic Church, the Mormon Church and even the Queen of England (who's office is a corporation sole, and obviously not a church).

Also, from what I understand from [THE FOUNDER], some of our government agencies operate under corporation sole, which gives them greater latitude in what they do.

I'm going to send you two emails following this which will address the distinctions between the individual tax exempt process and the corporation sole.

Sincerely,  
Paul Leinthall

.....

Hi XXXXX,

Let me intersperse my replies:

Hi Paul, Thanks for your previous answers. My husband and I are interested in either getting a Tax Exempt status or a Corporation Sole, or both if it is needed.

1. Do we need to have a Tax Exempt status if we are not expecting to receive any W-2's or 1099's?

Because the tax exempt status covers you both forward AND BACKWARDS in time (although you may not be needing individual tax exempt status going forward, due to not receiving W-2's or 1099's), you may be wanting to avoid any trouble from taxing agencies going backwards for past tax years. More of this question will be cleared up in the further questions and answers

2. Do each of us, myself and my husband, need a separate Corporation Sole, if we both receive money in each of our names from an investment, or can it be put under one Corporation Sole umbrella?

It's possible to put everything under one umbrella Corporation Sole; but individual circumstances differ, and you may ultimately decide differently.

The key to Corporation Sole is that for the money to be protected, it must either BE IN or come INTO the corporation sole or "in the corporation sole name". If it comes first to you, and then you put it in the corporation sole, the IRS considers that it came to YOU.

Regarding OFF shore income, it can ONLY be protected when the money comes from offshore INTO a corporation sole account. Even that kind of income creates a "taxable event" when it goes into an individual account, regardless of individual "tax exemption".

There's even greater protection if the Corporation Sole has an offshore account FROM which the money is transferred. Remember, the Corporation Sole can do virtually anything YOU can do, but government agencies have no jurisdiction over it, and the laws which govern it are the laws in the State in which it was created. None of the laws of any State, to date, give any income taxation jurisdiction over the Corporation Sole, either to the federal government or to any State.

Since the events of "9/11", it's pretty obvious that the United States government is interested in increasing its ability to "track" money movements. Although the new laws are being passed in the name of terrorism and patriotic duty to stop terrorism, to my knowledge, none of the new laws would have caught or stopped the "9/11" events, which causes one to wonder what is the true purpose of the new laws. I suspect (and notice, I said "suspect") that they're really wanting a way to track the movement of money for other purposes, springing from the belief to which all big governments seem to inevitably fall prone, which is that at least some of everyone's money "belongs" to them. While income taxation is definitely not the thrust or intent of our own country's Constitution, it appears that government's often pull their shenanigans to get the money under the cover of "war," just as they began the withholding tax during WWII. This time, of course, we're not really at war, except we're being asked to believe we are. So, today, it's politically correct to believe we're at war.

Therefore, realizing that money-tracking is ONE issue, and the governments right to actually HAVE the money is another issue, perhaps some extra steps need to be taken, all of which can be taken utilizing the simple, power protection of the entity called "Corporation Sole".

Let me present another scenario: Some of [THE COMPANY's] clients, for example, are expecting some large offshore pay outs from particular programs in the near future; and some of these folks are concerned about having enough time to get themselves setup properly before their pay out. A question poses itself? How can I keep my money from falling into the jurisdiction of the tax laws in that event?

Notice, I did NOT ask: "How can I avoid or evade paying taxes which I'm actually obligated to pay by law?", but "how can I be sure I don't fall into the situation where I am obligated to pay in the first place?". We're not advocating the non-payment of taxes legitimately owed or for which one is truly liable for paying under the laws of any State or country.

Let's, for an example here, use the scenario where an offshore pay out is due, and I'm not properly set up or structured at the time of the pay out. How can it be handled so my money does not come within the jurisdiction of our government and the IRS? Since the corporation sole is recognized in most countries around the world, these principles would apply in most any country.

[I do have readers of this newsletter in other countries].

A simple solution would be to first open an offshore account in your name (which a person can do now, just as easily as opening a bank account in your own home town) before the pay out occurs. If the actual pay out occurs before you're properly set up, you can have the money wired or sent to that offshore account. In other words, it would be going from one offshore account to another offshore account (where our government already does NOT have jurisdiction for income tax purposes); and the money could sit in your offshore account until you're properly set up and structured. Now, admittedly, you still would not be able to bring any of it INTO the country without creating a "taxable event"; but, if you've waited as long as I know some folks have waited, what's another couple weeks, or even a couple of months?

One little tidbit I might throw in here regarding transferring money between offshore banks: A lot of folks don't realize that money transfers IN U.S.DOLLARS are ALWAYS tracked by American Federal Reserve Banks, even if the money is being transferred from one offshore bank to another offshore bank. There are two ways to avoid even the tracking: one way would be to have an account at the same bank as the bank from whence the money is coming, so there would be no "wire" transfer created; the other would be to exchange U.S. Dollars for some foreign currency, and then to wire transfer the money from one account to the other in that foreign currency. [Foreign to whatever currency is used in YOUR country, which, in America, of course, is U.S. dollars].

When everything Stateside is set up, then you can transfer what you need/want into a corporation sole account in the States. For added protection, you could set up a Corporation Sole account in the same bank where your account with the money is. In other words, transfer it, within the offshore bank, from your personal account to the corporation sole account, and then wire transfer from the offshore corporation sole account to the onshore corporation sole account.

In the case where the program, from which you're expecting a pay out, would send a "check" to you in the States, that's okay, as long as it's not deposited in the your name. You could simply SEND the physical check for deposit to the offshore account, following the scenario I've already outlined.

Currently, we are only receiving SS checks. However, we are expecting some returns on investments made about a year ago. Also we each have an IRA savings account. If you need more specifics in order to answer these questions, we would be glad to provide whatever you need. We have also been looking into opening an offshore bank account.

Certainly, opening an offshore account might be a good way to "store" money offshore, but the event of bringing it INTO the country is what makes it "taxable" from the IRS laws. They would have you BELIEVE, however, that simply having the money, or making the money, offshore creates the necessity for income taxation; but that is not the fact of law. It is a fact, however, that many asset protection attorneys BELIEVE that is the law as the IRS prescribes, so even OFFshore, you run into the same ignorance of the law as ONshore.

Thanks & Best Wishes,XXXXXX

Sincerely,  
Paul Leinthall

Paul,

If most of my future income was offshore and I had myself set up as a Corporation Sole, would there be much need to obtain Legal Tax Exemption [through the revocation of election process]? Also, what taxes would I need to pay if I set myself up as a Corporation Sole?

Will plan to listen to the conference call Friday morning.

God bless,  
XXXX XXXX

Hi XXXX,

Corporation sole protects forward into time from the point of creation and only regarding what is IN it, or what comes INTO it (like income from offshore, or anywhere, into it's accounts). It only offers tax protection to you as an individual if "your" income is not really your's, meaning it comes TO the corporation sole, and any reporting from your income providers to the IRS and State taxing agency (via W-2's, 1099's, etc). is in the NAME of the corporation sole.

If you have any kind of INDIVIDUAL (in your name) income, even after creating a corporation sole, that income can still be subject to income tax liability. Also, if you're concerned about any taxing agency chasing you backwards in time (which they can do for up to 10 years PRIOR to the current 2001 tax-reporting year), then you must understand that ONLY the individual tax exemption process can protect you in that regard.

Sincerely,  
Paul Leinthall

.....

Dear Paul,

...I drug out the 73 page Corporation Sole manuscript that you sent me and started reading it again...where the Ashurst case begins and ends... As I understand it, if I turn my assets over to Corporation Sole, I am exempt from the IRS. Is it possible then that I would not have to change over my investments to Corporation Sole? Just turn over the profits?

Hi XXXX

Only what's IN the corporation sole is tax exempt. You, as an individual, simply on the basis of maintaining a corporation sole, are not tax exempt. The corporation sole and the individual revocation of election process are two different issues, and each is handled according to the law in different ways.

However, if you, as an individual, have no income FROM the corporation sole, meaning that the Corporation Sole does not give money directly to you (although it could have a mortgage on the home in which you live, and it could be paying all the bills, and "own" everything you have), and as long as you are not receiving sufficient individual income

from other directions, you could very well not have any income taxes to pay. However, that's not the same as having completed the revocation of election process and being, in essence, income "tax exempt".

The Ashurst case to which you refer was not about income taxes; it was about the county of San Luis Obispo, California, trying to regain \$40,000 of medical expenses that it had paid out to the couple they were pursuing for reimbursement of the monies that were spent on their behalf. When the Ashurst family put their property into a corporation sole, the county could not seize the property, even though it had a prior lien on it before they transferred ownership to the corporation sole. They tried to get the couple for "fraudulent conversion" and using the corporation sole as an alter-ego. After losing in two successive courts, having spent in excess of \$300,000 pursuing the \$40,000, they decided it was a fruitless cause, and the county ended up eating the \$340,000. While it was obviously a "win" for the Ashurst's, that is not the same as saying that the folks, as individuals, were "tax exempt" or, as you phrased it, "exempt from the IRS".

If the investments are offshore, then the pay out can be directly to offshore accounts. [For purposes of this newsletter, I've already painted a scenario, above, for what I think is an effective way to handle both this AND the new money-tracking laws coming out of the "war" on terrorism].

Sincerely,  
Paul Leinthall

=====  
[\[3\] News Briefs & Comments](#)  
=====

Several weeks ago, I reported on Irwin Schiff's lawsuit in Las Vegas, Nevada, against Bank of America, for taking \$8000 out of one of his accounts and turning it over to the IRS on a "Notice of Levy". Since the IRS has no real authority to demand anyone's money without a prior court order, and since they are not making any headway in Mr. Schiff's case against them, they're apparently using other means to cover their ass-etts. I think you'll find this interesting. I emphasized in bold print that of which I think every present Bank of America Customer might want to be aware.

I guess, in light of this, one would really want to be quite careful in selecting Bank of America as their bank of choice into which to transfer huge amounts of money - onshore OR offshore! My guess is, that folks with really large amounts of money, might be able to "stike a deal" so the bank would eliminate the clause about which you'll be reading here. Banks hate to turn down money, maybe even more than the government.

[\(Next Page\)](#)

## Bank Of America Can Now Give Your Bank Account Away With No Liability

By Claudia Sinclair  
Special To Las Vegas Tribune  
2-19-2

Irwin Schiff's recent Clark County lawsuit against the Bank of America has caused that Bank to change its "Depositor's Agreement." It now reads that if that Bank mistakenly gives your money to someone else, you won't hold the Bank liable. No, we are not making this up. You will find this new provision on page 2, paragraph 5 of its new "Depositor's Agreement." "Unlike most other banks," said Schiff, "the Bank of America's 'Depositor's Agreement' allows it to turn over your money to "another person or entity (who) makes a claim against the funds in your account." even without a court order.

Most people are unaware of these agreements, including myself, when I opened several accounts in that bank a while ago. The Bank subsequently turned over \$8,000 of my money to the IRS, even though they were under no legal obligation to do so. So I sued the Bank for breach of contract and am now seeking \$83,000 in damages.

Despite this provision in its Agreement, I was still able to claim an abuse of desecration and breach of contract. The Bank had no legal obligation to honor a Notice of Levy sent to it by IRS Revenue Officer James F. Gritis. A month after I filled my lawsuit," said Schiff, "the bank substantially rewrote its agreement which now includes an outrageous provision that depositors won't hold the Bank liable even if it wrongfully turns over their money to someone else. How many people with money in that Bank know that they have agreed to such a ridiculous proposition? And the Bank even added a provision that by leaving your money in that bank you have agreed to these new provisions even if you are unaware of them."

Trying to insulate itself against a rash of law suits which would result from Schiff's successful lawsuit against the Bank, the Bank's new agreement also contains provisions that if you do sue the bank, you waive your right to a jury trial and also agree not to join any class action or other lawsuit against the bank. Schiff claimed that he doesn't believe that these new provisions will hold up, and anyone who has had funds turned over to the IRS by that Bank in the last two years could join his lawsuit against the bank.

"In addition," said Schiff, who has written numerous books exposing the federal government's illegal enforcement of the income tax, "anybody can sue any third party who has turned over your funds to the IRS within the last two years, on the same basis as I have sued the bank of America." For more information on how to sue banks and other third parties who have turned over your money to the IRS, call Schiff, who maintains offices at 444 E. Sahara, at 385-6920

=====  
[4] Call Reminder  
=====

The **TAX EXEMPT Conference Call**, for “new” folks, takes place **EVERY Wednesday NIGHT at 9 PM EASTERN** time. The number is: **620-584-8202, pin 2974#**.

The **CORPORATION SOLE (specific) Conference Call**, is on **Friday MORNINGS**, at **10 AM EASTERN** time. The number is the same as above

Also, there is a **CLIENT’S ONLY Conference Call** available (obviously) for Clients Only. If you're already a client, and you would like to be on that call, **CALL YOUR REPRESENTATIVE for the phone number and time**, ]

I want to mention something to new readers and to folks who have never been on the [THE COMPANY] Conference Calls. The calls are NOT what you may be expecting from a typical “conference call” these days. A lot of people are used to big sales-hype conference calls, with a lot of “Rah-Rah-Rah”. The conference calls are NOT “sales” calls. No one is trying to get you to enroll in something, or asking or suggesting that you try to get your friends to enroll. These are ALL TEACHING calls. They consist almost entirely of questions and answers, after a brief introduction. They’re a great place to hear other folks ask all sorts of questions and get any questions of your own answered, and they provide you the opportunity to get a pretty well-rounded understanding of what this is all about in 60 to 90 minutes. I think you’ll find they’re one of the best \$3 to \$5 values you can find today. (The telephone long distance charges for most people).

Pressing “\*6” (Star 6) on your phone will mute your end of the line, so everyone can hear better; then, when you want to ask a question, you can press “\*6” again to go off mute. If you’re having a hard time hearing, with various noises in the background from other folk’s lines, such as: conversations, kids-playing, dishes clanging, and phones & faxes ringing, then be assured, everyone else can hear the ambient sounds from your environment. It simply makes it much more difficult to hear whoever is speaking at the moment. Thanks for your consideration in this regard.

May I suggest, if possible, that when you call, you use a regular “connected-to-the-wall telephone”, rather than a cellular phone (particularly when driving), or even a cordless phone. Also, please, not a speaker phone, either, unless it has a “mute” button, because speaker phones amplify the ambient sounds in your environment. And PARTICULARLY NOT an Internet phone, a true “killer” of conference call Quality.

If you like what you hear on the call, and you want to talk further to someone (including the call presenter) or ask more “personal” questions, remember how you heard about the call. No contact numbers are given out on the call, not because anyone is trying to hide anything, but because various representatives of [THE COMPANY] bring folks to the call. The call itself is not a “sales” forum and doesn’t get involved in the sales “hierarchy”.

See you on the call. Tell your friends about it, too.

=====  
[5] Contact Information  
=====

Paul Leinthall

Phone: 661-822-7889, Mon. - Fri. 9 AM to 5, PM (Pacific)

Email: [littlehammer@primemail.com](mailto:littlehammer@primemail.com)

You may notice that I refer to [THE COMPANY] or to the founder of the company [THE FOUNDER] in various places throughout the Newsletter. I choose those expressions, instead of providing the actual names of the company or it's founder, for a couple of reasons...reasons which you'll also find reflected in my explanation of the copyright notice (below). I want to insulate [THE COMPANY] and [THE FOUNDER] from undue and unwarranted attention (especially negative attention or reaction), whether from a casual reader or from any taxing agency or authority, their attorneys, or representatives. Therefore, it is my desire that the reader be absolutely clear who is responsible for what appears in this newsletter. This newsletter is NOT sponsored directly by [THE COMPANY] or [THE FOUNDER], and while I believe I am being representative of [THE COMPANY's] and [THE FOUNDER's] philosophy, goals, ideals and the truth in law and in fact on which [THE COMPANY] stands to perform its valuable service for its clients (of which I am one), and while I may quote [THE FOUNDER], or someone else, I always seek to maintain each person's privacy, unless their words are already in the public (published) domain; thus I will take the heat for any negative attention, response or reaction.

Also, this allows anyone, including other representatives of [THE COMPANY], who find this information valuable, and who want to share it with others, to substitute their name and contact information for mine, and not have to worry about potential clients of the company going over their heads and bypassing them. Since [THE COMPANY] sponsored conference call follows this same philosophy of client protection for their representatives, the information in this newsletter can, then, be more widely disseminated for the value and education of others.

About the copyright notice: The copyright notice covers all the contents herein, except quotations, if any. I value my (and the reader's) freedom, integrity and responsibility, and I desire to maintain an environment where I (and the reader) can utilize and distribute this written material. From the point of view of copyright law, if I don't first copyright this material, someone else could; and then, by law, they could disallow me (and the reader) from using or distributing it. Given that fact, copyright is the best avenue I know to continue allowing freedom for all of us regarding this matter.

Therefore, the reader is free to copy, print, use and distribute this material by personal email, fax, or handout (including substituting her own contact information), as long as BOTH the copyright notice AND this explanation of the copyright notice remain in the material. **However, I do NOT, nor does [THE COMPANY], in its own philosophy and ideals, authorize or condone ANY mass media distribution of COMPANY writing or materials, including (and especially) posting to any web sit. However, material written solely by the herein named copyright owner MAY be posted to a web site or some other media - but ONLY with the copyright owner's express, written, prior permission, in each instance.** The responsibility for the words contained herein resides with the copyright owner. The copyright notice makes absolutely clear who is responsible for what appears here; that way, the buck stops with me, should anyone question or challenge what is written herein.

This material is not intended to be interpreted as legal or financial advice. The copyright owner is neither an attorney nor CPA and has no license to offer legal and financial advise. I encourage the reader to study and think for herself and to make her own informed decisions, based on her own desires and beliefs, in harmony with her own inner sense and self-interested, positive and comfortable, good-gut feeling. For THAT, each reader is, himself/herself, entirely responsible.