

EXHIBIT O

JUDICIAL NOTICE FINDINGS LIMITED TO FACTS AND CONCLUSIONS OF ENACTED LAW ONLY

SECTION 1 — INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Evidence 201, Plaintiff hereby gives formal notice that, in this action, judicial findings must be confined strictly to

- (a) *verifiable facts and law in the record, Statutes at Large* and
- (b) *conclusions drawn solely from congressional enacted session laws.*

No presumptions, no inferences, no conflations, or judicial bench interpretations unsupported by the black-letter text of Acts of Congress are permissible and shall be adhered to as written with no deviation.

SECTION 2 — FACTUAL FOUNDATION

- A. Preamble, U.S. Constitution — “**We the People** ... do ordain and establish this Constitution,” reserving to the People the ultimate sovereign authority.
 - B. Judiciary Act of 1789, § 34, 1 Stat. 92 — Federal courts must apply statutory law where provided; only in the absence of statutory guidance may the common law fill gaps.
 - C. Congressional Record, 80th Cong., 1st Sess., July 30 1947, p. A4301 — Statutes at Large are the “legal evidence of laws,” foreclosing reliance on editorial codifications or judicial gloss.
-

SECTION 3 — CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. Act of Congress — Rules Enabling Act, Act of June 19, 1934, ch. 651, 48 Stat. 1064, (28 U.S.C. § 2072) limits rule-making and judicial procedure to that “which shall not abridge, enlarge or modify any substantive right.”
2. Act of Congress — Civil Rights Act of 1866, 14 Stat. 27 § 1, and Ku-Klux Act of 1871, 17 Stat. 13 § 1, impose liability on “any person” acting under color of state law; the text contains no immunity qualifiers and admits of no judicial exceptions.
3. Supreme Court precedent — *Stephan v. United States*, 319 U.S. 423 (1943): where Statutes at Large conflict with any other source, the Statutes at Large control, and courts may not supply “interpretive alterations.”

4. Supreme Court precedent — *United States Nat'l Bank v. Independent Insurance Agents*, 508 U.S. 439 (1993): judicial construction cannot override statutory text or U.S. codification omissions by rewriting the law.
5. Supreme Court precedent — *Sibbach v. Wilson & Co.*, 312 U.S. 1 (1941): Confirms that rules issued under the Act are valid only if they regulate procedure and do not affect substantive rights.
6. Supreme Court precedent — *Hanna v. Plumer*, 380 U.S. 460 (1965): Reaffirms that the Rules Enabling Act prohibits procedural rules from altering substantive rights.

SECTION 4 — REQUESTED JUDICIAL ACTION

- (a) Take judicial notice that this Court's findings of fact must rest exclusively on evidence admitted to the record, without presumption.
 - (b) Take judicial notice that conclusions of law must derive directly and solely from enacted session laws governing this action, without judicial supplementation or interpretation.
 - (c) Direct that any argument, instruction, or order relying on presumption, inference, or non-statutory judicial gloss be stricken as ultra vires.
-

Respectfully Tendered,

Lane Lee Bowers | Plaintiff, Pro Se,

2511 26th Street,
Snyder, Texas 79549

RecordsForLane@gmail.com