

Kenneth A. Gomez
4 CR 5095
Bloomfield, New Mexico 87413

January 8, 2015

Office of the Clerk
Mr. Scott S. Harris, Clerk
Supreme Court of the United States
1 First Street
Washington, D.C. 20543-0001

RE: Letter dated December 29, 2015 is evidence of practicing law in violation of
28 United States Code Section 955

Dear Mr. Harris:

Ms. Cynthia Rapp - assumed to be in your employ - engaged in the practice of law prohibited by referenced Section 955 on several counts; as follows:

1. Ms. Rapp statement: "Your claim that you are the Governor of New Mexico is false and therefore does not give the Court Original Jurisdiction over your case." about my status as Governor of New Mexico being false cannot be supported either by her or any person currently occupying a position as a State public officer in Santa Fe, New Mexico; however my status as the legitimate Governor of New Mexico was constitutionally and lawfully established and supported in the Original Complaint - a copy is attached hereto and made an integral part of this letter. Ms. Rapp decision was a prohibited practice of law and her decision effectively gave credibility to the criminal insurgency currently active within the State of New Mexico in overt defiance to the powers of Sections 3 and 4, Fourteenth Amendment. Please know that the huge expense of researching, preparing, and mailing the suit in four boxes to the Court is recoverable without recourse under provisions of Section 4 of the Fourteenth Amendment, this Court's decision by and through Ms. Rapp, your agent, to the contrary; notwithstanding *under* provisions of Sections 1 and 2, Article III of the Constitution for the United States of America - the Nation, not the government.

A. I am aware that private citizens are considered repugnant when attempting to appear in the People's supreme courts throughout the Nation which overtly subordinates them by court rule methodology including Rule 37.1 of this Court to those authorized unlawfully to practice law using publicly appropriated funds.

B. Said Complaint represented our last resort to seek remedial action for crimes against our humanity within the State and Federal governments. I have prepared a Human Rights Complaint for the United Nations Human Rights Commission showing we have exhausted all remedial avenues within the State and Federal Government as the Complaint's appendix revealed.

2. Ms. Rapp also engaged in the prohibited practice of law by court clerks in the following statement: "The original jurisdiction of this Court does not extend to a suit by an individual against a state."

A. She returned my original filing involving the *Governments of California, Colorado, and New Mexico*; a suit that did not name the States of California, Colorado, and New Mexico. Moreover, Alice Burns, Marzella Porath, Ronald Porath, and Laurence Goodman are not members of any of the governments mentioned that are harming them, although they are members and residents of at least one of those States. Accordingly, they did not file their suit against any of the States mentioned, and no decision of this Court or any other court of law has judicial power or authority to combine a State and its government as a single entity without deference to the citizens of the State contrary to their retained powers of the Ninth and Tenth Amendments.


B. Furthermore, prior decisions of this Court interpreting or deciding what the constitution means which efficaciously amends the Constitution for the United States of America contrary to Article V is obviously unconstitutional; *Hans v. Louisiana*, 1344 U.S. 1 (1890) to the contrary, notwithstanding. Ms. Rapp's statement and evidence *applying* that erroneous conclusion harming the non-government persons filing the suit constituted the practice of law as your agent.

3. The Eleventh Amendment mentioned in Ms. Rapp's letter was not accepted by the applicable States with a referendum vote of the electorate as required by the Ninth and Tenth Amendments. Accordingly, the Eleventh Amendment was and continues to be an unconstitutional Amendment by ignoring the word "or" in the Tenth Amendment. Furthermore, the Eleventh Amendment cannot apply to the citizens under provisions of the Thirteenth Amendment being an amendment binding upon the American People without their consent; thereby, it is null, void, and without legal effect as a surrender result of the American Civil War otherwise ineffective from the date the Thirteenth Amendment took effect. Ms. Rapp's citing of the Eleventh Amendment was therefore erroneous authority and also constituted the practice of law.

In conclusion, the suit returned in the four boxes by Ms. Rapp made this Court, the justices, and all political and judicial entities receiving copies of the suit to become accessory after-the-fact in the criminal insurgency currently active within the *Governments of California, Colorado, and New Mexico*. Accordingly it shall be the

Court's obligation under law - if the Court, its rules, and its decisions are subject to the rule of law - to obtain sufficient copies of the suit at its expense in the format acceptable to it within 30 days to escape the wrath of 18 U.S.C. §§ 2, 3, and 4; since, the situation and circumstances created was its own exclusive work product. The United States House of Representatives and the United States Senate are provided copies of this letter because they are responsible and accountable for the rules governing the Courts operations under Title 28.

Please be so informed.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Kenneth A. Gomez", written over a horizontal line.

Kenneth A. Gomez
Governor of New Mexico