**Nul tiel corporation**

**NOTICE OF ASSERTION IN ABATEMENT IS GIVEN  
 THAT NO SUCH CORPORATION EXISTS**

**(Your Name Normal)** **a Sovereign Man of Standing denies there is no such Corporation bearing the name “YOUR NAME ALL CAPS**“**nor is such presumed corporation assignable to said Sovereign Man by legislative fiat**

**Whereas, (Your Name Normal) declares; Nul tiel corporation.No such corporation exists, bearing the name (YOUR NAME IN ALL CAPS) The form of a plea denying the existence of an alleged corporation. Under the common law practice, a plea of “nul tiel corporation” was a simple negation or a denial of capacity in which the plaintiff sued, and was not an averment of an affirmative fact {New York Bond & Mortgage Co. v. McWilliams, 253 Ill.App. 404}. A plea that plaintiff corporation is not a corporation either de jure or de facto, and consequently not entitled to sue, is not a plea of ultra vires, which assumes an incorporation either de jure or de facto and a misuse of or departure from a franchise, but is a plea of “nul tiel corporation.” {Rialto Co. v. Miner, 166 S.W. 629, 632, 183 Mo.App. 119}. That a Special Plea of Nul Tiel Corporation is necessary to question the Corporate Capacity of the plaintiff, see: 10 Cyc. 1355;Inhabitants of Orono v. Wedgewood, 44 Me. 49, 69 Am.Dec. 81 (1857).Keokuk & Hamilton Bridge Co. v. Wetzel, 228 Ill. 253, 81 N.E. 864 (1907) (which held that a Plea denying that the plaintiff is a corporation is a Plea in Bar, but a Plea denying that the defendant is a corporation is a Plea in Abatement.); Koffler/Reppy, Common Law Pleading, 423 n. 67 (West, 1969).**

**BACKGROUND**

**Whereas, there are two (2) classes of citizens under American law never repealed.  Federal citizens were not even contemplated when Article III was being drafted.  Pannill v. Roanoke, 252 F. 910, 914 is definitive and dispositive on this important point. Federal citizenship is a municipal franchise domiciled in the District of Columbia.**[**Murphy v. Ramsey ,**](http://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/114/15/)**114 U.S. 15 (1885) (the political rights of federal citizens are franchises which they hold as privileges in the legislative discretion of Congress).**

**The standing of State Citizens to invoke anyTitle 42 [Municipal]remedies, in part because these remedies originate in the 1866 Civil Rights Act — a federal municipalstatute.   State Citizens are not subject to federal municipal law. (Emphasis added)**

**At all times, “this state” acting in the name of the State of \_\_\_\_\_\_ having legislative jurisdiction gives cause for (Your name normal )to reserve His right to move to a common law cause of action for the appropriation of His birth name to be bastardized for commercial purposes and may be pleaded by alleging (1) “this state’s” misuse of(Your name normal) identity;　 (2) the manipulation of (Your name normal) proper name to “this state’s” exclusive advantage, both commercially and otherwise;　 (3) lack of consent to craft a likeness of my birth name for commercial and other purposes and to the extreme prejudice of (Your name normal) to wit:(YOUR NAME ALL CAPS);　 and (4) the resulting and ongoing injury, both commercial and otherwise. Also, consideration is likewise reserved to move for a RICOinvestigation regarding the issue of bastardizing the birth name onSTATE OF \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ commercial instruments as a for profit enterprise and thereby, a taxable event.**

**“this state’s” decision to use a name upon commercial instruments other than my birth name, whether such decision rests on religious, marital, commercial or other personal considerations, does not imply intent to set aside my birth name, or identity associated with that name.**

**Unlike a registered trademark, My proper name cannot be deemed abandoned by Me throughout this possessor’s life, despite any failure to use it, and continue to use it, privately and or commercially.　Montana v. San Jose Mercury News, Inc. 40 Cal.Rptr.2d 639, 34 Cal.Appl.4th 790**

**I (Your name spelled normal), declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct.**

**Executed on February \_\_\_\_\_\_, 2010**

**With reservation of all rights, remedies and Treaties UCC 1-308  
I am:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**ACKNOWLEDGMENT**

**That a Special Plea of Nul Tiel Corporation is necessary to question the corporate of the plaintiff, see: Inhabitants of Orono v. Wedgewood, 44 Me. 49, 69 Am.Dec. 81 (1857).**

**Inhabitants of Orono v. Wedgewood, 44 Me, 49 (1857) Keokuk & Hamilton Bridge Co. v. Wetzel, 228 Ill. 253, 81 N.E. 864, (1907), which held that a Plea denying that the plaintiff is a corporation is a Plea in Bar, but that a Plea denying that the defendant is a corporation is a Plea in Abatement.**