

THE CONSTITUTIONAL COLLAPSE OF THE TEXAS FAMILY CODE

COVER LETTER: FORMAL ADMINISTRATIVE LEGAL NOTICE

FORMAL ADMINISTRATIVE LEGAL NOTICE: DEPRIVATION OF CIVIL RIGHTS & SYSTEMIC FELONY FORCED LABOR VENTURE EXPOSURE

TO: THE RECEIVER OF THIS CORRESPONDENCE / DISCOVERY TARGET / VENTURE BENEFICIARY

This letter serves as an immediate, mandatory cover notice introducing the attached legal treatise, "THE CONSTITUTIONAL COLLAPSE OF THE TEXAS FAMILY CODE," authored by Ron B. Palmer of Fix Family Courts. This text operates as an unevadable constitutional proof engine. It documentarily strips all state and private actors of the defense of qualified, official, or judicial immunity by applying the "Objectively Unreasonable" standard. You are under an immediate, non-discretionary duty to engage in mandatory risk analysis due diligence.

I. THE SYSTEMIC CRIME ITEMIZED

- **Judicial Civil Rights Crimes & Loss of Immunity:** Texas family court judges commit continuous civil rights deprivations under color of law (18 U.S.C. § 242), a criminal act. Under controlling precedent, judges lose absolute judicial immunity when they perform administrative, executive, or policy-enforcement functions rather than purely adjudicative acts (*Forrester v. White*, 484 U.S. 219 (1988)). By automatically imposing the legislative public policy of the "best interests of the child" (Texas Family Code § 153.002) by default at the inception of a divorce suit (§ 6.406), the judge replaces an independent adjudicative phase with an administrative policy-enforcement action. Because this structural architecture bypasses strict scrutiny and denies the parent litigant a baseline platform to challenge the lawfulness of the state's intervention—especially in proceedings where the state is not even required to appear and meet its high strict scrutiny burden—the judge acts entirely outside their judicial jurisdiction, stripping themselves of absolute immunity.
- **The Judge as a Forced Labor Provider:** The trial judge directly executes the federal crime of Forced Labor via Abuse of Legal Process (18 U.S.C. § 1589(a)(3)). By utilizing a structurally void, un-scrutinized administrative policy track to manufacture predatory financial metrics (amicus fees, evaluator costs, support metrics), and using the threat of physical restraint (contempt jail) or serious harm (familial destruction), the judge eliminates all meaningful choice. The judge forces the fit parent to continuously perform

physical labor in the marketplace, directly providing that coerced labor and capital to benefit state and federal treasuries.

- Title IV-D Responsibility for Forced Labor:** The Federal Title IV-D program is the primary organizational and financial architect of this forced labor venture (18 U.S.C. § 1589(b)). Title IV-D monetizes the parent-child relationship by paying states performance incentive cash bonuses and 66% matching grants based strictly on child support collection volume by intentional refusal to incorporate constitutional mandates into the application of statutory text. To secure these funds, the state uses Title IV-D money to directly subsidize the payroll, benefits, and courtrooms of a parallel judiciary (Title IV-D Associate Judges under Chapter 201). This directly ties the judge's livelihood to the continuous execution of the forced labor ring.
- Guilt of Private Financial Beneficiaries:** Court-appointed amicus counsel, guardian ad litem, custody evaluators, and litigating lawyers who demand and receive capital derived from these void, contempt-enforced orders are guilty of Forced Labor Venture Participation under 18 U.S.C. § 1589(b). They hold completely zero derivative state immunity.
- Universal Multi-State Applicability and Uniform Code Collusion:** Take absolute notice that the analysis of the Texas Family Code contained within this treatise serves merely as an operational example of a standardized national framework. This identical, commercialized modern slavery scheme operates seamlessly across all fifty states, the District of Columbia, and all federal territories. By implementing the Uniform Child Custody Jurisdiction and Enforcement Act (UCCJEA) and the Uniform Interstate Family Support Act (UIFSA), the multi-billion-dollar Title IV-D enterprise has nationalized the forced labor venture. The UCCJEA and UIFSA act as cross-border conveyor belts for structural error, forcing local courts to automatically recognize, register, and enforce ultra vires, void ab initio foreign orders under direct threat of civil contempt, asset surveillance, and physical imprisonment. This interstate mechanics nationalizes the deprivation of civil rights under color of law (18 U.S.C. § 242), rendering the cross-border execution of these un-scrutinized policy decrees objectively unreasonable under *Gates v. Texas Dept. of Protective & Regulatory Services*, 537 F.3d 404 (5th Cir. 2008).
- The Facial Unconstitutionality of Cross-Border Dragnets:** The uniform codes are facially unconstitutional under the proofs of this treatise. The UCCJEA selectively deprives citizens of a baseline platform to challenge the lawfulness of a foreign state's intervention, while the UIFSA serves as a direct instrument of Federal Criminal Forced Labor (18 U.S.C. § 1589) and Peonage (18 U.S.C. § 1581) by permitting the out-of-state transmission of administrative wage withholding orders and warrantless financial surveillance entirely bypassing a localized judicial hearing or an adjudicative determination of fitness. Furthermore, operating in tandem with federal Title IV-D mandates, these uniform codes facilitate the immediate, automatic nullification of a non-marital father's constitutional guarantees following a parentage determination. Instead of clothing the adjudicated father in the *Troxel* fit-parent presumption, the codes default custody power exclusively to the mother or the administrative state, treating the child as a modern *filius nullius* (the child of no one) and violating the Equal Protection Clause.

- **Nationwide Coerced Joinder Mechanics:** The self-executing constitutional penalty and state-initiated enforcement action proven under Texas Family Code § 6.406 operates identically nationwide through equivalent statutory dragnets. This includes California Family Code § 2330 & § 3120, Mississippi Code § 93-5-23, Florida Statutes § 61.043 & § 61.13, New York Domestic Relations Law § 240, Revised Code of Washington § 26.09.020, and D.C. Code § 16-914, as well as direct federal state-initiated deprivations of civil rights within all Federal Territorial Courts (Guam, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands) under the Territory Clause (U.S. Const. art. IV, § 3, cl. 2). Every state or territorial statutory mechanism that mandates the injection of an un-scrutinized "best interest" policy track into a private marital dissolution executes an immediate due process injury at inception. Consequently, managing partners of private law firms nationwide who fail to supervise their subordinates or who cash commingled partnership checks derived from these void interstate tracks face direct personal liability and firm-ending civil liquidation under 18 U.S.C. § 1595 and Civil RICO.
- **Firm-Ending Financial Liability & Failure to Supervise:** Under 18 U.S.C. § 1589(b) and § 1595, firm-ending liability is instantly triggered against completely unrelated firm equity partners. Because law firms commingle family law billing fees into a centralized corporate account, any corporate, tax, or real estate partner who cashes a shared partnership profit check draws from a pool padded by legal coercion. This exposure is independently compounded by the actionable trigger of Failure to Supervise. Under vicarious partnership liability and federal civil rights paradigms, managing partners hold a non-delegable duty to monitor and supervise firm subordinates; turning a blind eye to an associate's or partner's deployment of a void legal process to generate firm revenue executes direct, personal liability against the supervising management team. Operating under a statutory "should have known" standard, their receipt of these criminal proceeds exposes their personal estates, capital accounts, and firm assets to immediate liquidation via Civil RICO treble damages.

II. APPLICATION OF THE "OBJECTIVELY UNREASONABLE" STANDARD

Under binding Fifth Circuit precedent, a public official or state-aligned actor is stripped of immunity if their conduct is objectively unreasonable in light of clearly established constitutional law. In *Gates v. Texas Dept. of Protective & Regulatory Services*, 537 F.3d 404 (5th Circuit 2008), the Court explicitly applied this standard to domestic family interventions, establishing that the state cannot bypass individual procedural and substantive due process protections under the guise of an open-ended emergency or child welfare evaluation without an objective baseline of harm. Furthermore, the Fifth Circuit has long held that invoking raw state codes to strip citizens of fundamental parental rights without meeting heightened evidentiary thresholds is an act of absolute bad faith and objective unreasonableness (*Wooley v. City of Baton Rouge*, 211 F.3d 913 (5th Circuit 2000)).

a. Ledger of Documented Instances of Objective Unreasonableness:

Pursuant to the attached treatise, you or your firm may be operating in a state of absolute Objective Unreasonableness across these specific itemized vectors:

1. **Enforcing a Void Track:** It is objectively unreasonable to assert that § 153.002 allows a judge to substitute a legislative policy agenda in lieu of constitutional strict scrutiny, standing in direct defiance of Texas Attorney General Opinion No. GA-0260 (2004) and *Troxel v. Granville*.
2. **Executing Warrantless Searches:** It is objectively unreasonable to deploy civil family court discovery orders to compel the wholesale seizure of a fit parent's private tax returns and bank ledgers under threat of contempt jail, violating the Fourth Amendment and Texas Constitution Article I, Section 9.
3. **Coercing Joinder as a Penalty for Divorce:** It is objectively unreasonable to utilize § 6.406 to seize a citizen's natural parental fitness shield as an absolute, non-negotiable condition of accessing state courts to dissolve a private marital contract.
4. **Cashing Venture Benefit Checks:** It is objectively unreasonable for firm partners to accept shared partnership draws derived from family court fees after being put on formal notice that the orders generating those fees are void ab initio nullities under Article II, Section 1 of the Texas Constitution and executed ultra vires as an administrative policy enforcement action.

III. MANDATORY LEVER: RECKLESS DISREGARD AUDIT & DIRECT FEDERAL ACCESSIBILITY DEMAND

This cover letter strips you of the defense of ignorance. Any continued attempt to enforce the propounded discovery requests, collect fees under the void Chapter 153 track, or ignore this warning constitutes a conscious decision to proceed with criminal reckless disregard under 18 U.S.C. § 1589(b).

Furthermore, let this notice serve as an explicit warning to the managing partners, practice chairs, and executive directors of this entity: your Failure to Supervise subordinates—and your subsequent failure to immediately halt their execution of these ultra vires, void ab initio enforcement actions after receiving this notice—comprises a standalone, independent trigger of direct civil and criminal liability.

Take notice that the federal forced labor code provides victims with immediate, direct access to file independent civil actions in the Federal District Court under 18 U.S.C. § 1595. This explicit statutory remedy creates a direct channel for federal question jurisdiction that completely bypasses the captured state judiciary altogether. Because a § 1595 action targets the independent commercial conduct and unlawful venture benefits of non-state actors, the *Rooker-Feldman*

doctrine is legally neutralized, preventing you or your firm from hiding behind a void state court decree.

You are directed to immediately engage in urgent, professional risk analysis due diligence. Failure to halt your participation in, and supervision of, this commercialized venture may result in the immediate filing of an independent private civil lawsuit in the Federal District Court under 18 U.S.C. § 1595, Civil RICO, and state criminal referrals under Texas Penal Code § 39.03 (Official Oppression) to execute a complete, firm-ending liquidation of your corporate and personal assets.

GOVERN YOURSELF ACCORDINGLY.

Learn more at: FixFamilyCourts.com/family-law-reform or at FamilyLawReform.org

THE CONSTITUTIONAL COLLAPSE OF THE TEXAS FAMILY CODE

Formal Legal Treatise and Substantive Proof Engine Exposing
Widespread Civil Rights Violations, Separation of Powers Usurpation,
and Criminal Peonage in Co-Parent Litigation

Author and Principal Architect: Ron B. Palmer

Editor: Sherry Palmer

Affiliation: Fix Family Courts

Reference Canon: *The United States Constitution, United States Supreme Court Precedent, the Declaration of Independence as justification for the Revolutionary War and setting the First Principle of INDIVIDUAL FREEDOM as the Absolute Unconditional Baseline upon which every element of our Constitution rests.*¹

¹ I am fully aware that the US Supreme Court rejects our Declaration of Independence as foundational law even as it pushes for “history and tradition” to control whether or not tyranny is grandfathered into our constitution; while appearing to reject the Declaration of Independence as baseline history and tradition; and while embracing the Magna Carta as the guiding light of Common Law—that common law coming from a country with NO written constitution where our Constitution was written to intentionally reject that country’s system of government.

This is a larger issue of tyrannical sovereign immunity apparently conveyed by individuals, through a democratic process, where those individuals have NO such sovereign power that they can convey to their government. The American legal community applies the absurd tyrannical proposition that “the king (the American courts) can do NO wrong” to maintain in America those Titles of Minor Nobility granted to Barristers (Esquire) in that other country even though our Constitution strictly forbids having any class of individual who is above the basic law or who is held to different standards under that basic law simply because they hold a title such as “judge.”

I have a separate ongoing federal lawsuit where the federal judge in that suit has been violating his judicial duty and federal law in an attempt to prevent me from getting this argument into the federal record beyond my responses to the government officials’ requests for judicial relief in the form of immunity from the constitution’s clear prohibitions at the pleadings stage of proceedings. I assert that the federal courts grant lesser emoluments of limited governmental immunity as a financial bribe to ensure that the emolument of absolute judicial immunity conveyed by title rather than function through judicial political policy mandate is never overturned by Congress.

Congress through its specific formulation of federal forced labor statutes appears to have acted to intentionally prevent any mere copy and paste of 42 USC 1983 immunity doctrine onto federal forced labor statutes.

PERSONAL STATEMENT:

You hurt our children! You hurt our family! We did NOT forget. We did NOT let it go.

You thought you were absolutely protected, but there is always a way, and as a US Marine Corps Infantryman defending the Constitution from all enemies foreign and domestic, I do NOT stop until the mission is successfully completed, NO matter the cost. The people doing these crimes are domestic enemies of our Constitution and enemies of the Freedom it seeks to protect. Unlike yours, My Oath is for Life.

Twenty-years in prison is too good for you.

THIS DOCUMENT REPRESENTS OUR NON-ATTORNEY PRIVATE PERSONAL OPINIONS AND ANALYSIS OF SETTLED LAW.

I do NOT assert that Heads-of-Government-Branch Immunity is of the same nature as governmental immunity generally. Our constitution provides a political solution for addressing abuses of power committed by those vested with ultimate authority over a co-equal branch of government, providing that every such individual may be impeached.

I. TABLE OF CONTENTS

THE CONSTITUTIONAL COLLAPSE OF THE TEXAS FAMILY CODE	1
COVER LETTER: FORMAL ADMINISTRATIVE LEGAL NOTICE	1
I. THE SYSTEMIC CRIME ITEMIZED	1
II. APPLICATION OF THE "OBJECTIVELY UNREASONABLE" STANDARD	3
a. Ledger of Documented Instances of Objective Unreasonableness:	4
III. MANDATORY LEVER: RECKLESS DISREGARD AUDIT & DIRECT FEDERAL ACCESSIBILITY DEMAND	4
THE CONSTITUTIONAL COLLAPSE OF THE TEXAS FAMILY CODE	a
Formal Legal Treatise and Substantive Proof Engine Exposing Widespread Civil Rights Violations, Separation of Powers Usurpation, and Criminal Peonage in Co-Parent Litigation	a
I. TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	c
II. TABLE OF CASES & LEGAL OPINIONS.....	l
Federal Judicial Opinions.....	l
Texas State Judicial Opinions	m
Texas Executive Advisory Opinions	n
III. TABLE OF STATUTES & LEGISLATIVE POLICIES	n
Federal Statutory Provisions (United States Code)	n
Texas State Statutory Provisions (Texas Family & Government Codes).....	o
State Procedural & Civil Rules.....	o
IV. TABLE OF CONSTITUTIONAL MANDATES	p
United States Constitutional Provisions	p
Constitution of the State of Texas	p
V. FOUNDATIONAL LEGAL MAXIMS.....	q
THE CONSTITUTIONAL COLLAPSE OF THE TEXAS FAMILY CODE	1
VOLUME I: THE SUBSTANTIVE TREATISE & PROOF ENGINE	1
PART I: INTRODUCTORY SYSTEM ARCHITECTURE AND CANONS OF CONSTRUCTION...	1
IV. Document Structure:	1
Section 1.01: System Architecture and Role Blueprint	1

Section 1.02: Mandatory Terminology Codes	2
PART II: THE SUBSTANTIVE PROOF CHAIN	2
Stage 1: The Public Policy Mandate as a Political Action	2
b. Statement of the Proposition	2
c. Statutory Deprivation and Mandatory Language	2
d. Jurisprudential Nature of the "Civil Law Policy Agenda"	3
e. The Exercise of Sovereign Police Power as a "Political Action"	3
f. Conclusion & Formal Legal Proof Statement	3
Stage 2: Legislative Direction of Judicial Discretion	4
a. Statement of the Discretionary Proposition (The Overriding Criteria)	4
b. Textual Mechanics of the "Shall Always" Command.....	4
c. Abuse of Discretion as an Unavoidable Agency of the Legislative Agenda	4
d. Cognizable Precedent Interpretation	4
e. Conclusion of Judicial Direction Proof	5
Stage 3: Separation of Powers and Adjudicative Phase Infringement	5
a. Statement of the Separation of Powers Proposition	5
b. Judicial Discretion as an Inalienable Element of Article II, Section 1 "Judicial Power"	5
c. The Constitutional Bifurcation of Adjudicative Phase vs. Dispositional Stage ...	5
d. The Usurpation of the Adjudicative Phase via Overriding Policy Mandates	6
e. Analysis of State and Federal Separation of Powers Violations (The Klein Doctrine Applied)	6
f. Conclusion of Separation of Powers Structural Proof.....	6
Stage 4: Self-Executing Injury at Inception of Suit.....	7
a. Statement of the Inception-Of-Suit Constitutional Injury	7
b. The Immediate Destruction of the Constitutional Parental Presumption.....	7
c. The Non-Neutral Forum: Structural Due Process Defects at Initiation.....	7
d. The Reciprocal Infringement of Intact Family Integrity (Parent-Child Co-Equal Liberties).....	8
e. Conclusion of Self-Executing Constitutional Injury Proof	8

Stage 5: Court Access Deprivation and the Void Ab Initio Doctrine	8
a. Statement of Court Access and Voidness Proposition	8
b. The Deprivation of the Federal Fundamental Right of Access to State Courts...	8
c. The Structural Annihilation of the Texas Article I, Section 13 Open Courts Guarantee	9
d. Jurisprudential Proof of Structural Voidness Ab Initio (The Ultra Vires Forum)...	9
e. Ultimate Conclusion and Formal Legal Synthesis of the Proof Chain	9
Stage 6: The Judicial Amelioration Loop and Supremacy Clause Mandate	9
a. Statement of the Judicial Amelioration and Supremacy Proposition	9
b. The Doctrine of Constitutional Avoidance and the Scope of In re C.J.C.	10
c. Jurisprudential Proof of Inadequate Statutory Narrowing in Parental Adjudications	10
d. The Non-Discretionary Mandate of the Federal Supremacy Clause on State Judiciaries	10
e. Final Executive Legal Validation Statement (Chaining Stages 1-6).....	11
Stage 7: Individual Rights, Discriminatory Classification, and Strict Scrutiny	11
a. Statement of Co-Equal Individual Rights and Discriminatory Classifications (The Core Thesis)	11
b. Judicial Enforcement as State Action: The Fixed Nature of Individual Fundamental Liberties Against the Bench	11
c. Exhaustive Separate Track: The Federal Constitutional Proof (Fourteenth Amendment Due Process & Equal Protection Chaining)	12
d. Exhaustive Separate Track: The Texas Constitutional Proof (Article I, Sections 3, 19, and 37 Jurisprudential Synthesis).....	13
e. The Systemic Inversion Mechanics: The Co-Equal Litigation Fallacy Exposed .	13
f. Conclusion of Structural Discrimination and Standalone Scrutiny Tiers	14
Stage 8: Statutory Coercion of Joinder, Divorce Penalization, and the Santosky Error .	14
a. Statement of Mandatory Joinder, Divorce Penalization, and Santosky Error (The Core Thesis)	14
b. The Statutory Dragnet: Textual Analysis of Section 6.406 and Coerced Litigation Inception.....	14

c. The Divorce Penalty: Immediate Mandatory Nullification of Parental and Child Co-Equal Rights.....	14
d. The Santosky Error Exposed: Why the "Passive Referee" Doctrine Fails Under State Political Action.....	15
e. Ultimate Conclusion of Coerced Joinder and Structural Jurisprudential Failure	15
Stage 9: The Structural Jurisprudential Dead-End & Impossibility of Judicial Amelioration	15
a. Statement of the Impossibility of Judicial Amelioration (The Final Jurisprudential Checkmate)	15
b. The Textual Dead-End: Absence of Ambiguity in Mandatory Family Code Provisions	16
c. The Re-Legislation Trap: Why Saving Construction Violates Article II, Section 1	16
d. The Self-Executing Inception Block: Why Downstream Balancing Cannot Cure Immediate Injury	16
e. Ultimate Conclusion of Facial Invalidation and Total Structural Futility.....	17
Stage 10: Temporary Orders (§ 105.001) as the Non-Appealable Summary Dragnet ...	17
a. Statement of the Summary Deprivation Proposition	17
b. The Procedural Deficit of § 105.001 and Summary Liberty Deprivation.....	17
c. Insulation from Appellate Review and the Mandamus Trap	18
Stage 11: The Permanent Exposure Track: Statutory Modification (§ 156.101) and the Annihilation of the Parental Presumption.....	18
a. Statement of the Modification Re-Exposure Proposition	18
b. Statutory Mechanics and the Express Absence of the Parental Presumption...18	
c. The Constitutional Trap: Perpetual Re-Exposure of Fundamental Rights	18
d. The "Material and Substantial Change" Threshold as an Illusory Safeguard.....	19
e. Constitutional Significance: Life-Long Civil Subjugation	19
f. Conclusion & Formal Legal Proof Statement	20
g. The "Status Quo" Weaponization and Leverage Generation.....	20
h. Conclusion & Formal Legal Proof Statement	21

Stage 12: The Parallel to Bastardy Laws & Discriminatory Penalization of Child Rights	21
a. Statement of the Child Protection and Modern Bastardy Parallel (The Final Structural Proof)	21
b. The Federal Illegitimacy Jurisprudence: The Ban on Punishing Children for Parental Marital Status.....	21
c. Chapter 153 and Section 6.406 as a Modern Filius Nullius Engine	21
d. The Identical Tracking of Historical Bastardy Harms: Coerced Status and Associational Stripping	22
e. THE CUMULATIVE MASTER CONCLUSION: COMPLETE FACIAL INVALIDATION OF THE MULTI-STAGE ARCHITECTURE	22
Stage 13: The Criminalization of Statutory Civil Rights Avoidance	23
a. Statement of Civil Rights Criminalization and Public Servant Liability (The Criminal Pivot).....	23
b. Federal Criminal Mapping: Meticulous Application of 18 U.S.C. Sections 241 and 242.....	23
c. The State-Level Analogue: Texas Penal Code Section 39.03 Official Oppression Elements.....	24
d. Ultimate Executive Close: Chaining Civil Nullity to Criminal Accountability	24
Stage 14: Bypassing Judicial Immunity via Private Third-Party Liability (§ 1595)	24
a. Statement of Peonage, Venture Profit Sharing, and Civil Arbitrage (The Economic Trap)	24
b. The Abuse of Legal Process: Application of 18 U.S.C. Sections 1581 and 1589 to Void Financial Extractions	25
c. Firm-Wide Venture Profit Attribution and the Failure of Partnership Liability Shields.....	25
d. The Civil Arbitrage Paradigm: Circumventing DOJ Gatekeeping via Preponderance of Evidence.....	26
e. Bypassing the Bench: Eradicating Judicial Immunity and Rooker-Feldman through Non-State Actor Targeting	26
f. The Anatomy of Firm Brand Erasure: Civil RICO Clawbacks and Forfeiture Liquidation	27
CONCLUSION.....	27

MANDATORY COPYRIGHT STATEMENT	29
THE CONSTITUTIONAL COLLAPSE OF THE TEXAS FAMILY CODE	1
VOLUME II: THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH ADDENDUM	1
CHAPTER I: EXECUTIVE ADMISSIONS AND THE SUBSTANTIVE FAILURE OF THE BEST INTEREST SUBVERSION	1
Section A1.01: The Structural Precedent of AG Opinion GA-0260 (2004)	1
CHAPTER II: THE GUBERNATORIAL STEPPINGSTONE & INSTITUTIONAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST PIPELINE.....	2
Section A2.01: The Centralized Pipeline of Texas Executive Power	2
a. Governor Greg Abbott	2
b. Governor John Cornyn.....	3
c. Governor Mark White	3
d. Governor Price Daniel	3
e. Governor James Stephen "Jim" Hogg.....	3
Section A2.02: The Political Motivation of Executive Concealment.....	4
CHAPTER III: THE BIENNIAL TITLE IV-D FUNDING ENGINE & BUREAUCRATIC EMPIRE BUILDING.....	4
Section A3.01: The Summary of the Texas Biennial Budget Cycle	4
Section A3.02: The Strategic Nature of Federal Title IV-D Revenue and Operational Roles	5
Section A3.03: Financial Appropriations Ledger by Executive Administration.....	5
a. Governor Greg Abbott (Texas Attorney General: 2002–2015).....	5
b. Governor John Cornyn (Texas Attorney General: 1999–2002)	6
c. Governor Mark White (Texas Attorney General: 1979–1983).....	6
d. Governor Price Daniel (Texas Attorney General: 1947–1953).....	7
e. Governor James Stephen "Jim" Hogg (Texas Attorney General: 1887–1891)	8
CHAPTER IV: PARALLEL JUDICATORIES, UNCONSTITUTIONAL ASSET SURVEILLANCE, AND FELONY JUDICIAL BENEFIT METRICS	8
Section A4.01: The Parallel Judiciary Under Article II, Section 1	8
Section A4.02: Financial Disclosure Orders as Unconstitutional Search and Seizure ..	9

Section A4.03: The Intervention Powers of the Attorney General as Proof of State-Initiated Enforcement	10
Section A4.04: Direct Financial Benefit and Collusion Metrics	10
CHAPTER V: FEDERAL OFFICER LIABILITY AND STATUTORY CONSTITUTIONAL INCORPORATION	11
Section A5.01: The Doctrine of Implied Constitutional Incorporation	11
Section A5.02: Bypassing Sovereign Immunity for Federal Officials.....	12
CHAPTER VI: HISTORICAL TEXAS AG LIABILITY AND THE EXECUTIVE CONTINUITY OF CRIME	13
Section A6.01: The Executive Chain of Enterprise Criminality	13
a. Attorney General Dan Morales (Tenure: January 15, 1991 – January 13, 1999)..	14
b. Attorney General John Cornyn (Tenure: January 13, 1999 – November 30, 2002)	14
c. Attorney General Greg Abbott (Tenure: December 2, 2002 – January 20, 2015)	14
d. Attorney General Ken Paxton (Tenure: January 20, 2015 – Present).....	15
CHAPTER VII: THE UPLC RETALIATORY SCREEN & VENTURE LIABILITY EXPOSURE MATRIX.....	15
Section A7.01: The Systemic Shielding of the Commercial Enterprise	15
CHAPTER VIII: THE UNIFORM CODES AND THE NATIONWIDE EXTENSION OF THE FORCED LABOR VENTURE	18
Section A8.01: Technical Statement of the Proposition & Statutory Derivation.....	18
Section A8.02: The Facial Unconstitutionality of the Uniform Codes under Title IV-D .	18
I. The UCCJEA Inversion Engine	18
II. The UIFSA Asset-Surveillance Dragnet	19
III. The Modern Bastardy Machine: Immediate Non-Marital Nullification	19
Section A8.03: Nationwide Mapping of State-Initiated Divorce Dragnets	20
1. California.....	20
2. Mississippi.....	21
3. Florida	21
4. New York	21
4. Washington State	21

6. The District of Columbia and Federal Territorial Courts Generally	22
Section A8.04: Universal 50-State Execution & The Failure to Supervise	22
MANDATORY COPYRIGHT STATEMENT	23
THE CONSTITUTIONAL COLLAPSE OF THE TEXAS FAMILY CODE: VOLUME III	1
VOLUME III: STANDALONE LITIGATION & SERVICE SUITE (APPENDICES)	1
PART I: PLUG-AND-PLAY SAMPLE WORK PRODUCTS.....	1
I. SAMPLE WORK PRODUCT 1.....	7
a. Formal Comprehensive Federal Criminal Referral	7
III. SAMPLE WORK PRODUCT 2	11
a. Thirteenth Amendment Forced Labor and Peonage Specification Ledger.....	11
IV. SAMPLE WORK PRODUCT 3	14
a. Mandatory Public Notice of Constitutional Defect and Personal Liability	14
V. SAMPLE WORK PRODUCT 4.....	17
a. Sample Motion to Quash and Strike All Financial Discovery Orders	17
VII. SAMPLE WORK PRODUCT 5	21
a. Substantive Memorandum of Law: Search & Seizure Arbitrage	21
IX. SAMPLE WORK PRODUCT 6	25
a. Sample TRCP 13 Sanctions Filing: The Reckless Disregard Standard.	25
XI. SAMPLE WORK PRODUCT 7	29
a. Federal Notice of Reckless Disregard to the US Secretary of Health and Human Services	29
XIII. SAMPLE WORK PRODUCT 8	32
a. Mandatory Notice of Reckless Disregard to the Texas Attorney General & The UPLC	32
MANDATORY COPYRIGHT STATEMENT	35
THE CONSTITUTIONAL COLLAPSE OF THE TEXAS FAMILY CODE:	1
VOLUME IV: COMPREHENSIVE SERVICE DIRECTORY MANUALS	1
INTRODUCTION:	1
I. MANUALS AVAILABLE FREE ON WEBSITE FIXFAMILYCOURTS.COM	2
MANDATORY COPYRIGHT STATEMENT	2

THE CONSTITUTIONAL COLLAPSE OF THE TEXAS FAMILY CODE: VOLUME V	1
VOLUME V: First Amendment Free Speech & Mandatory Texas UPL Disclaimer	1
I. STATUTORY SAFE HARBOR DISCLOSURE	1
II. THE STRUCTURAL CLASSIFICATION OF FIRST AMENDMENT PROTECTION	2
III. MANDATORY LEGAL ADVISORY AND EDUCATIONAL DEFENSE MANIFESTO	2
a. Explicit Administrative Notice to All Potential Penalizing Entities	2
b. Educational Blueprint for Litigants: Securing Individual Speech Protections	3
MANDATORY COPYRIGHT STATEMENT	4
THE CONSTITUTIONAL COLLAPSE OF THE TEXAS FAMILY CODE: VOLUME VI	1
VOLUME VI: MANDATORY COPYRIGHT STATEMENT	1
I. MANDATORY COPYRIGHT STATEMENT	1

II. TABLE OF CASES & LEGAL OPINIONS

Federal Judicial Opinions

- *Camara v. Municipal Court*, 387 U.S. 523 (1967) — Governing Fourth Amendment warrants in administrative searches.
- *Crowell v. Benson*, 285 U.S. 22 (1932) — Establishing the constitutional incorporation doctrine into federal statutory text.
- *Edward J. DeBartolo Corp. v. Florida Gulf Coast Building & Construction Trades Council*, 485 U.S. 568 (1988) — Affirming the doctrine of constitutional avoidance in federal administrative enforcement.
- *Levy v. Louisiana*, 391 U.S. 68 (1968) — Establishing the equal protection bar against penalizing children based on parental marital status.
- *Marshall v. Barlow's, Inc.*, 436 U.S. 307 (1978) — Restricting warrantless administrative search dragnets of private records.
- *Meyer v. Nebraska*, 262 U.S. 390 (1923) — Enshrining natural parental care and custody within 14th Amendment individual liberty protections.
- *Milkovich v. Lorain Journal Co.*, 497 U.S. 1 (1990) — Shielding pure legal, non-attorney interpretation and opinion from defamation actions.
- *NAACP v. Button*, 371 U.S. 415 (1963) — Restricting the state from using professional corporate bar parameters to punish civil rights speech.
- *Near v. Minnesota*, 283 U.S. 697 (1931) — Declaring content-based administrative or regulatory censorship a prior restraint.
- *New York Times Co. v. Sullivan*, 376 U.S. 254 (1964) — Protecting robust, public citizen criticism regarding the lawfulness of state actors.
- *Pierce v. Society of Sisters*, 268 U.S. 510 (1925) — Affirming the natural immunity of the parental unit from arbitrary state social blueprints.
- *In re Primus*, 436 U.S. 412 (1978) — Immunizing non-attorney legal engineering from unauthorized practice of law (UPL) prosecution.
- *Reed v. Town of Gilbert*, 576 U.S. 155 (2015) — Codifying the trigger for content-based speech restrictions under strict scrutiny.

- *Rosenberger v. Rector and Visitors of Univ. of Va.*, 515 U.S. 819 (1995) — Defining and barring state-sponsored viewpoint discrimination.
- *Santosky v. Kramer*, 455 U.S. 745 (1982) — Mandating clear and convincing evidence of harm/unfitness before state-enforced domestic intervention.
- *Shelley v. Kraemer*, 334 U.S. 1 (1948) — Declaring courtroom enforcement of a statute by a trial judge as definitive State Action.
- *Tower v. Glover*, 467 U.S. 914 (1984) — Stripping private third-party actors of derivative absolute or qualified judicial immunity.
- *Trimble v. Gordon*, 430 U.S. 762 (1977) — Holding status-based legal disabilities visited upon children as unconstitutional.
- *Troxel v. Granville*, 530 U.S. 57 (2000) — Institutionalizing the fundamental presumption that fit parents act in their children's best interests.
- *United States v. Klein*, 80 U.S. 128 (1871) — Establishing that the legislature cannot prescribe a mandatory rule of decision to judges.
- *Weber v. Aetna Casualty & Surety Co.*, 406 U.S. 164 (1972) — Condemning state-imposed legal de-equalization of children based on family status.
- *Wyatt v. Cole*, 504 U.S. 158 (1992) — Confirming that private individuals in joint enterprise with state officials hold no qualified immunity.

Texas State Judicial Opinions

- *Downer v. Aquamarine Marine, Inc.*, 701 S.W.2d 238 (Tex. 1985) — Defining structural judicial abuse of discretion under guiding statutory rules.
- *Holley v. Adams*, 544 S.W.2d 367 (Tex. 1976) — Restricting the court's authority to bypass the overarching legislative standard itself.
- *In re C.J.C.*, 603 S.W.3d 804 (Tex. 2020) — Ruling that the fit-parent presumption is deeply embedded within any best-interest analysis.
- *Lippincott v. Whisenhunt*, 462 S.W.3d 507 (Tex. 2015) — Confirming that the judiciary cannot rewrite plain statutory text under the guise of interpretation.
- *Town of Flower Mound v. Stafford Estates Ltd.*, 135 S.W.3d 620 (Tex. 2004) — Confirming the legislature as the supreme sovereign authority to define public policy.

Texas Executive Advisory Opinions

- Texas Attorney General Opinion No. GA-0260 (2004) — Formally ruling that the statutory "best interest" standard can never be applied in lieu of strict scrutiny, and must require a baseline threshold showing of unfitness or harm. —concluded that: **Fundamental Liberty Interest:** A fit parent's interest in the care, custody, and control of their child is a fundamental liberty interest protected by the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. **Strict Scrutiny Standard:** Any government statute, rule, or judicial action that infringes upon or interferes with a fit parent's right to make decisions regarding the care, custody, and control of their child must be subjected to **strict scrutiny**. **Compelling Interest Required:** To survive strict scrutiny, the State must demonstrate that its interference serves a compelling state interest and is narrowly tailored to achieve that interest.

III. TABLE OF STATUTES & LEGISLATIVE POLICIES

Federal Statutory Provisions (United States Code)

- 18 U.S.C. § 241 — Conspiracy Against Rights (Felony).
- 18 U.S.C. § 242 — Deprivation of Rights Under Color of Law (Fel Felony).
- 18 U.S.C. § 981 & § 982 — Civil and Criminal Asset Forfeiture and Pre-Conviction Freezes.
- 18 U.S.C. § 1581 — Peonage (Compulsory debt liquidation through legal coercion).
- 18 U.S.C. § 1589(a)(3) — Forced Labor via Abuse or Threatened Abuse of Law or Legal Process.
- 18 U.S.C. § 1589(b) — Forced Labor Venture Beneficiary Liability (Reckless Disregard Standard).
- 18 U.S.C. § 1589(c)(1) — Explicit statutory definition of "Abuse of Legal Process."
- 18 U.S.C. § 1595 — Civil Private Right of Action and Firm Liquidation for Forced Labor Venture Victims.
- 18 U.S.C. §§ 1961–1964 — Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act (Civil RICO Treble Damages).
- 42 U.S.C. §§ 651–669b (Title IV-D) — Social Security Act Child Support Enforcement matching funding and incentive structures.

Texas State Statutory Provisions (Texas Family & Government Codes)

- Texas Family Code § 6.406 — Mandatory Joinder of SAPCR to marital dissolution actions (The Divorce Penalty).
- Texas Family Code § 102.007 — State executive authorization for automatic Attorney General intervention.
- Texas Family Code Chapter 105 — Temporary Orders
- Texas Family Code Chapter 107 — Court-Appointed Professionals
- Texas Family Code § 153.001(a) — Legislative public policy mandate of the State of Texas regarding parental interaction.
- Texas Family Code § 153.002 — Overriding criteria designating the "best interest of the child" as the supreme, primary consideration.
- Texas Family Code Chapter 154 — Child Support Metrics
- Texas Family Code Chapter 156 — Modification Locks
- Texas Family Code Chapter 157 — Enforcement
- Texas Family Code Chapter 160 — Parentage
- Texas Family Code Chapter 201, Subchapter B — Authorization and structural rules governing the Title IV-D Associate Judge parallel system.
- Texas Family Code § 231.101 — Statutory integration of OAG Child Support Division as the official Title IV-D agency.
- Texas Government Code § 81.101 — Definition and corporate bar exceptions governing the Unauthorized Practice of Law (UPL).
- Texas Penal Code § 39.03 — Official Oppression (Criminalizing public servants who intentionally deny or impede known immunities).

State Procedural & Civil Rules

- Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(i) — Mandatory process requirements for executing flawless legal service on the United States.
- Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 13 — Attestation requirements and sanctions parameters for groundless and frivolous filings.

- Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 21a — Electronic and physical transmission protocols governing service of notice on trial actors.
 - Texas Civil Practice & Remedies Code Chapter 10 — Statutory parameters governing attorney certifications and groundless pleading fines.
-

IV. TABLE OF CONSTITUTIONAL MANDATES

United States Constitutional Provisions

- Article VI, Clause 2 (The Supremacy Clause) — Oath-bound mandate requiring state judiciaries to disregard conflicting state codes in favor of federal protections.
- First Amendment (Free Speech & Petition Clauses) — Shielding non-attorney private personal opinion from regulatory censorship; protecting the absolute right to petition the government for redress of public corruption.
- Fourth Amendment (Search and Seizure Prohibitions) — Restricting the state from deploying civil family law discovery tracks to execute warrantless administrative asset surveillance.
- Thirteenth Amendment — Absolute, self-executing prohibition on all forms of involuntary servitude, forced labor, and peonage.
- Fourteenth Amendment (Due Process & Equal Protection Clauses) — Protecting individual parental integrity against state-engineered viewpoint evaluation; prohibiting discriminatory classification networks between parents.

Constitution of the State of Texas

- Article I, Section 3 — The Equal Rights Guarantee protecting distinct classes of parents from selective deprivation of procedural shields.
- Article I, Section 9 — State-level absolute prohibition against unreasonable, warrantless searches of a citizen's private economic papers and effects.
- Article I, Section 13 (The Open Courts Provision) — Direct restriction barring the legislature from erecting structural barriers that block the vindication of family integrity.
- Article I, Section 19 (Due Course of Law) — Heightened state protection isolating inherent individual liberties from broad legislative policy agendas.

- Article I, Section 37 — Direct textual enshrinement of the fundamental right of parents to the care, custody, and control of their children within the Texas Bill of Rights.
 - Article II, Section 1 (The Separation of Powers Provision) — Absolute anti-infringement mandate barring the legislature from injecting policy blueprints into the core adjudicative phase of a trial, and barring the executive branch from funding parallel judiciaries.
 - Article IV — Constitutional limits defining the executive pipeline, biennial budget requests, and the advisory powers of the Attorney General.
 - Article V, Section 1 — Vesting exclusive, non-delegable judicial and contempt power within independent constitutional courts.
-

V. FOUNDATIONAL LEGAL MAXIMS

- Ex nihilo nihil fit — Out of nothing, nothing comes; a void baseline proceeding cannot generate valid ancillary orders or discovery requirements.
- Filius nullius — The child of no one; the legal fiction deployed by legacy bastardy frameworks to strip children of family integrity as a marital status penalty.
- Ultra vires — Beyond the scope of legal authority; state actions executed outside constitutional jurisdiction are a legal nullity.
- Void ab initio — Void from the absolute beginning; orders entered by a tribunal whose neutral adjudicative power has been pre-compromised possess no legal effect.

THE CONSTITUTIONAL COLLAPSE OF THE TEXAS FAMILY CODE

A Formal Legal Treatise and Substantive Proof Engine Exposing Widespread Civil Rights Violations, Separation of Powers Usurpation, and Criminal Peonage in Co-Parent Litigation

VOLUME I: THE SUBSTANTIVE TREATISE & PROOF ENGINE

Author and Principal Architect: Ron B. Palmer

Editor: Sherry Palmer

Affiliation: Fix Family Courts

PART I: INTRODUCTORY SYSTEM ARCHITECTURE AND CANONS OF CONSTRUCTION

IV. Document Structure:

Section 1.01: System Architecture and Role Blueprint

This document serves as an ironclad, logically sequential, and hyper-detailed constitutional proof engine. Every analytical phase contained herein treats statutory language not as a fluid vector for judicial equity, but as a binding, rigid structural mechanism. This treatise strictly rejects conversational filler, narrative generalizations, or common-law handwaving. Every proposition is grounded in the textualist tradition of statutory construction and the absolute supremacy of individual constitutional liberties over state administrative agendas.

The analytical mechanics developed throughout this volume operate as a series of sequential logic gates. Each stage builds upon the structural reality established in the preceding sections. If Stage 1 demonstrates that the state has executed a political action to erect a mandatory civil law agenda, and Stage 2 proves that this agenda overrides all judicial discretion, the subsequent constitutional friction points analyzed in Stages 3 through 12 become mathematically inescapable.

The ultimate purpose of this treatise is to provide citizen litigants, constitutional scholars, and federal prosecutors with an unevadable legal roadmap to dismantle the multi-billion-dollar commercial enterprise of the family court judiciary and hold its state and private actors both civilly and criminally accountable.

Section 1.02: Mandatory Terminology Codes

To ensure absolute semantic and conceptual precision, and to prevent any form of administrative or judicial evasion, the following precise legal definitions are explicitly locked into the structural core of this entire treatise:

1. **"Legislatively Created Civil Law Policy Agenda"**: A formalized, highly structured statutory framework enacted by a legislative body to proactively organize, regulate, and govern private civil relations. It stands entirely distinct from, and operates to extinguish, the piecemeal evolution of common-law equity. It serves as the state's affirmative, systemic blueprint for social order, dictating the boundaries of private rights and prescribing mandatory analytical tracks that the judiciary is forced to execute within civil litigation.
2. **"Political Action"**: An affirmative, sovereign exercise of the state's police power executed exclusively by the legislative branch. A political action establishes a public policy mandate that alters, re-allocates, defines, or completely nullifies the inherent legal rights, duties, and statuses of individual citizens, elevating a state-defined collective interest over private constitutional immunities.

PART II: THE SUBSTANTIVE PROOF CHAIN

Stage 1: The Public Policy Mandate as a Political Action

b. Statement of the Proposition

The State of Texas, through the deliberate codification of Chapter 153 of the Texas Family Code, did not merely establish an open-ended evidentiary guide or a collection of procedural recommendations to assist the judiciary in resolving domestic disputes. Instead, the Texas Legislature performed a sovereign **political action** to institutionalize a rigid, mandatory **legislatively created civil law policy agenda** legally designated as the public policy mandate governing "the best interests of the child." This statutory framework is a proactive, systemic state blueprint that captures private civil litigation and subordinates individual citizen relationships to a state-defined social order.

c. Statutory Deprivation and Mandatory Language

Under the strict statutory textualism mandated by Texas jurisprudence, the precise words chosen by the legislature dictate its structural reach. The legislature left no room for judicial interpretation regarding the mandatory nature of this framework:

- **Texas Family Code § 153.001(a):** States commandingly that *"The public policy of this state is to..."* (1) assure frequent and continuing contact, provide a stable environment, and encourage parents to share in the rights and duties of raising their children.
- **Texas Family Code § 153.002:** Unequivocally dictates that *"The best interest of the child shall always be the primary consideration of the court..."*

The explicit pairing of the phrase "**public policy of this state**" with the mandatory statutory signifier "**shall always**" creates a binding, non-discretionary directive. The word "shall" in Texas statutory drafting imposes a mandatory duty that cannot be waived, modified, or ignored by the judiciary. The word "always" removes any temporal, situational, or circumstantial exceptions. By combining these terms, the legislature erected a permanent public policy mandate that strips the trial judge of any baseline authority to invent alternative starting points for the litigation.

d. Jurisprudential Nature of the "Civil Law Policy Agenda"

A civil law policy agenda is a formalized system designed to replace the unguided, piecemeal evolution of common-law equity with an affirmative, comprehensive state blueprint. By enacting Title 5 and Chapter 153 of the Family Code, the Texas Legislature completely occupied the field of family relations, transitioning the jurisdiction away from unstructured common-law judicial discretion into a state-directed administrative track.

The "best interests of the child" standard operates as a structural civil agenda because it does not wait for an individual injury to occur; it proactively establishes the precise metrics by which the state evaluates family structures and dictates the boundaries of private parental authority within civil litigation.

e. The Exercise of Sovereign Police Power as a "Political Action"

The formulation of public policy is a power attached exclusively to the legislative branch. As the Texas Supreme Court has long held, the legislature holds the supreme sovereign authority to define the public policy of the state (*Town of Flower Mound v. Stafford Estates Ltd.*). When the Legislature passed Chapter 153, it engaged in a major political action. It utilized the state's sovereign police power to invade the private sphere of the family, declare an overriding state interest in child welfare, and erect a mandatory civil standard. This action re-allocated legal rights and duties between citizens and the state, fulfilling the absolute definition of an exercise of sovereign political will.

f. Conclusion & Formal Legal Proof Statement

Therefore, it is proven that Chapter 153 of the Texas Family Code constitutes a formal, sovereign **political action** by the State of Texas, which successfully established a

mandatory **legislatively created civil law policy agenda** that binds the state judiciary to the public policy mandate of the "best interests of the child."

Stage 2: Legislative Direction of Judicial Discretion

a. Statement of the Discretionary Proposition (The Overriding Criteria)

The "Best Interests of the Child" civil law policy agenda does not merely provide outer boundaries or optional guardrails within which a trial judge may freely exercise independent equitable authority. Instead, the Texas Legislature designed Chapter 153 to act as the supreme, **overriding substantive criteria** from which a Texas judge is legally and structurally forbidden to diverge. The standard is an inescapable track that controls the court's core analytical process.

b. Textual Mechanics of the "Shall Always" Command

Under Texas rules of statutory construction, the text of **Texas Family Code § 153.002** operates as a mandatory regulatory directive targeting the judge's mental and analytical faculties. The text commands that "best interest" *shall always* be the *primary consideration*. The legislature did not position "best interest" as one factor among equals, nor did it place it on the periphery of the case as an outer boundary line. By labeling it the *primary* consideration, the legislature legally institutionalized it as the supreme, foundational pivot point around which all judicial reasoning must rotate. The court possesses zero statutory authority to position any other baseline—including constitutional protections or parental fitness—as the primary consideration.

c. Abuse of Discretion as an Unavoidable Agency of the Legislative Agenda

The Texas appellate standard for an "**abuse of discretion**" confirms that the judge operates as an explicit, bound operational agent of the legislative agenda. Under the landmark standard established in **Downer v. Aquamarine Marine, Inc.**, a trial court abuses its discretion if it acts without reference to any guiding rules and principles. In family law proceedings, those guiding rules and principles are exclusively defined by the Chapter 153 policy agenda. Because a trial judge has completely zero discretion to diverge from the "best interest" baseline, any departure from that track—or any decision rooted in an overriding alternative rationale (such as judicial convenience, punishing a parent, or an independent constitutional analysis)—constitutes a reversible error of law. The judge has no independent judicial baseline; they are structurally trapped within the legislative track.

d. Cognizable Precedent Interpretation

This structural constraint is reinforced by the Texas Supreme Court's holding in **Holley v. Adams** (544 S.W.2d 367). While *Holley* and its extensive modern progeny establish that a

trial court possesses wide discretion regarding *how* to weigh the various factors *within* the best interest framework, the court has completely zero authority to bypass, override, or diverge from the overarching legislative standard itself. The judge's discretion is an illusion; it is merely the freedom to choose which statutory factor to emphasize while trapped inside a container manufactured exclusively by the Legislature.

e. Conclusion of Judicial Direction Proof

Therefore, it is proven that Chapter 153 provides the supreme, overriding criteria for judicial discretion from which the trial judge may not diverge, turning the judge into an operational enforcement arm of a state-mandated political policy agenda.

Stage 3: Separation of Powers and Adjudicative Phase Infringement

a. Statement of the Separation of Powers Proposition

The mandatory enforcement of Chapter 153's overriding policy agenda during the core adjudicative phase of a trial constitutes an unconstitutional invasion of the judicial branch by the legislature. Under **Article II, Section 1 of the Texas Constitution** and the **Federal Separation of Powers doctrine**, the core adjudicative function belongs exclusively to the Judiciary, and the Legislature is constitutionally barred from dictating to the courts how they must exercise judicial power to resolve an individual controversy.

b. Judicial Discretion as an Inalienable Element of Article II, Section 1 "Judicial Power"

Article II, Section 1 of the Texas Constitution explicitly divides the government into three distinct strands and commandingly states that "*no person or collection of persons, being of one of these departments, shall exercise any power properly attached to either of the others, except in the instances herein expressly permitted.*"

The application of judicial discretion—defined as the independent capacity of a detached judge to weigh evidence, assess credibility, balance competing equities, and apply constitutional protections to individual facts—is an inseparable element of the "**Judicial Power**" vested exclusively in courts by **Tex. Const. art. V, § 1** and **U.S. Const. art. III**. The Legislature holds no constitutional authority to command *how* that core power is balanced or to pre-determine the analytical weight a court must assign to an administrative policy over an individual liberty.

c. The Constitutional Bifurcation of Adjudicative Phase vs. Dispositional Stage

To expose the precision of this structural violation, legal proceedings must be technically bifurcated into two distinct operational phases:

1. **The Adjudicative Phase:** The initial process of finding facts, weighing evidence, applying constitutional presumptions, and determining individual legal statuses and rights relative to a specific jurisdictional threshold (e.g., determining whether an individual is a fit parent or whether a legal injury has occurred).
2. **The Dispositional Stage:** The subsequent administrative phase where remedies, state programs, or public safety allocations are administered *after* a valid legal threshold has been independently established in the adjudicative phase.

While the Legislature possesses broad constitutional authority to establish public policy rules and administrative criteria for the *dispositional* stage of state programs, it is constitutionally barred from forcing an overriding political policy agenda into the *adjudicative* phase of a lawsuit.

d. The Usurpation of the Adjudicative Phase via Overriding Policy Mandates

By commanding that "the best interest of the child shall always be the primary consideration," **§ 153.002** forces the trial judge to inject a legislative policy agenda directly into the absolute baseline of the adjudicative phase. The legislature has effectively pre-determined the outcome of the judicial balancing process, instructing the judge that the state's socio-political agenda must override any private constitutional immunity before a single piece of evidence is introduced. This is not the establishment of a rule of procedure; it is a direct legislative invasion of the core adjudicative function.

e. Analysis of State and Federal Separation of Powers Violations (The Klein Doctrine Applied)

This legislative command violates the core anti-coercion and non-infringement mandates of state and federal law. Under the foundational federal separation of powers principles established in ***United States v. Klein*** (80 U.S. 128), the legislative branch cannot pass laws that prescribe a mandatory rule of decision to the judiciary in pending cases, effectively forcing the court to act as a passive instrument of legislative will.

By converting a detached judge into an administrative compliance agent who must implement a pre-defined legislative blueprint during the adjudicative phase, the Texas Family Code strips the judiciary of its essential character, executing a structural usurpation of Article II and Article V power.

f. Conclusion of Separation of Powers Structural Proof

Therefore, it is proven that the mandatory application of Chapter 153 during the adjudicative phase of proceedings violates both state and federal separation of powers mandates, rendering the mechanism an unconstitutional exercise of legislative overreach.

Stage 4: Self-Executing Injury at Inception of Suit

a. Statement of the Inception-Of-Suit Constitutional Injury

A constitutional violation of parental and child liberties is completely established and fully executed **from the mere filing and initiation of a child custody suit** under the Texas Family Code. Because a Texas judge enters the courtroom bound to apply a default state viewpoint analysis against the fundamental rights of litigants by mandatory action of law, a concrete, cognizable injury in fact occurs automatically at the absolute baseline of the suit, long before a final custody order is entered.

b. The Immediate Destruction of the Constitutional Parental Presumption

Under the supreme law of the land established in ***Troxel v. Granville*** (530 U.S. 57), the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment enshrines a fundamental, deeply rooted presumption that fit parents act in the best interests of their children. This constitutional presumption acts as a defensive shield that bars the state from injecting its own view of child-rearing into an intact family dynamic.

However, because **§ 153.002** mandates that the state's "best interest" agenda is the primary consideration from inception, the statutory framework **structurally obliterates the constitutional parental presumption at the moment of filing**. The state's machinery forces a fit parent to instantly step down from their constitutional pedestal, enter the courtroom stripped of their natural immunity, and actively defend their natural liberties against a state-defined policy blueprint prior to any adjudication of unfitness.

c. The Non-Neutral Forum: Structural Due Process Defects at Initiation

When a judge is statutorily tied to the Legislature's view, the judicial forum ceases to operate as a neutral, detached tribunal. Under the Fourteenth Amendment and **Article I, Section 19 of the Texas Constitution** (Due Course of Law), a citizen is guaranteed a fair hearing before a non-preconceived court.

Because Chapter 153 forces the judge to apply a default viewpoint framework that positions the state's policy preferences over private constitutional rights, the forum is structurally pre-compromised. The automatic invocation of the Family Code track operates as a form of structural viewpoint discrimination that penalizes the assertion of private parental autonomy, executing an immediate due process violation at initiation.

d. The Reciprocal Infringement of Intact Family Integrity (Parent-Child Co-Equal Liberties)

This inception injury inflicts a co-equal, reciprocal violation on both the parent and the child. A parent holds a fundamental right to the care, custody, and control of their child, and the child holds a reciprocal, co-equal constitutional right to family integrity and freedom from arbitrary state displacement.

The moment a custody petition is filed under the Family Code, the state's statutory machinery immediately targets and subjects their intact, co-equal relationship to a legislative policy evaluation without a prior jurisdictional threshold finding of harm. Both sets of rights are actively infringed at the baseline because the state has stripped their relationship of its constitutional immunity by default.

e. Conclusion of Self-Executing Constitutional Injury Proof

Therefore, it is proven that a concrete, fully cognizable constitutional injury is executed at the mere inception of a child custody suit, providing immediate standing to challenge the facial validity of the statutory scheme.

Stage 5: Court Access Deprivation and the Void Ab Initio Doctrine

a. Statement of Court Access and Voidness Proposition

The self-executing constitutional injury inflicted at the inception of a Family Code proceeding acts as an absolute, functional deprivation of the federal fundamental right to access state courts and violates the **Texas Open Courts Provision (Tex. Const. art. I, § 13)**. Because this systemic defect unconstitutionally compromises and breaks the judicial power during the adjudicative phase, the court operates completely outside its constitutional boundaries, rendering the entire proceeding and any resultant orders **void ab initio** rather than merely voidable.

b. The Deprivation of the Federal Fundamental Right of Access to State Courts

Under the Federal Constitution—via the Due Process Clauses, the Privileges or Immunities Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, and the First Amendment Right to Petition—a citizen possesses a fundamental right to access state court systems to assert, defend, and vindicate federal constitutional protections.

When a state systemically pre-programs its judiciaries to replace co-equal constitutional rights with an overriding legislative policy agenda by default, **the state offers an illusory forum**. Offering a citizen a courtroom that is structurally barred from honoring federal

constitutional presumptions is a complete, unconstitutional denial of meaningful court access.

c. The Structural Annihilation of the Texas Article I, Section 13 Open Courts Guarantee

This posture directly violates **Article I, Section 13 of the Texas Constitution**, which commandingly states that "*All courts shall be open, and every person for an injury done him, in his lands, goods, person or reputation, shall have remedy by due course of law.*" The Texas Open Courts provision restricts the Legislature from erecting arbitrary structural barriers that impede the vindication of inherent liberties.

By forcing a fit parent into a mandatory track where their constitutional status is stripped at the threshold, the Legislature has closed the courtroom doors to the protection of family integrity. Because the court's neutral adjudicative capacity is broken at the baseline, the "due course of law" guarantee within the Open Courts provision is structurally annihilated at the moment of filing.

d. Jurisprudential Proof of Structural Voidness Ab Initio (The Ultra Vires Forum)

To prevent judicial evasion, a critical distinction must be maintained between an order that is merely **voidable** and one that is **void ab initio**. A voidable order is one issued by a court possessing valid structural jurisdiction and constitutional authority that merely contains a correctable error of law. Conversely, an order is void ab initio—wholly invalid from its beginning—when the court lacks the structural constitutional power to enter the decree.

Because the mandatory enforcement of Chapter 153 forces the judge to usurp the adjudicative power (violating Article II, Section 1) and subverts the baseline neutrality required by Due Process, the court acts entirely ultra vires. It lacks the constitutional jurisdiction to deploy "Judicial Power" under such conditions. The court is converted into a legislative compliance forum rather than an independent Article V tribunal, rendering every subsequent order a complete legal nullity from its inception.

e. Ultimate Conclusion and Formal Legal Synthesis of the Proof Chain

Therefore, it is proven that the structural closure of the courts infects the family court machinery with total constitutional invalidity, rendering all past, current, and future orders under this un-narrowed track completely void ab initio as a matter of law.

Stage 6: The Judicial Amelioration Loop and Supremacy Clause Mandate

a. Statement of the Judicial Amelioration and Supremacy Proposition

The Texas Supreme Court has failed to utilize the canon of constitutional avoidance to adequately narrow the scope of Chapter 153 to fit within state and federal constitutional

boundaries in disputes between co-equal parents. Furthermore, under the **Supremacy Clause of the United States Constitution**, the state judiciary is under an absolute, non-discretionary, oath-bound mandate to actively override, disregard, or narrow this statutory scheme to ensure total compliance with higher federal law.

b. The Doctrine of Constitutional Avoidance and the Scope of In re C.J.C.

The canon of constitutional avoidance is an inherent element of judicial power that allows courts to apply a saving construction to a statute, narrow-scoping its language to prevent a conflict with the constitution. The Texas Supreme Court attempted to deploy this mechanism in its landmark decision *In re C.J.C.* (603 S.W.3d 804).

Applying a saving construction to the Family Code, the Court ruled that the constitutional **fit-parent presumption** is deeply embedded within any best-interest analysis and extends across all custody proceedings. This judicial narrowing was further reinforced by the passage of **Article I, Section 37 of the Texas Constitution**, which textually enshrines the fundamental right of parents to the care, custody, and control of their children within the state Bill of Rights.

c. Jurisprudential Proof of Inadequate Statutory Narrowing in Parental Adjudications

Despite the holding in *In re C.J.C.*, the Texas Supreme Court **has structurally failed to cure the core Separation of Powers violation in standard parental litigation**. The narrowing achieved in *In re C.J.C.* only protects fit parents from *non-parents*, allowing the Court to read the presumption into the textual gaps of third-party statutory hooks.

However, in initial adjudicative disputes between **co-equal parents**, the Court has left the overriding substantive criteria of **§ 153.002** completely un-narrowed and intact. At the initiation of a parental custody suit, the trial court is still structurally forced by the legislature's "shall always" mandate to strip both parents of their individual presumptions against the state and deploy a raw legislative blueprint. Because the high court has failed to strip § 153.002 of its overriding power-grab in co-parent litigation, the trial court continues to operate as an ultra vires administrative compliance agent, leaving the civil rights violation unchecked on a massive scale.

d. The Non-Discretionary Mandate of the Federal Supremacy Clause on State Judiciaries

This failure constitutes a direct violation of the state judiciary's federal mandate. **Article VI, Clause 2 of the United States Constitution** (The Supremacy Clause) unequivocally dictates that the federal constitution is the supreme law of the land, and "*the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby, any Thing in the Constitution or Laws of any State to the Contrary notwithstanding.*"

This clause imposes a mandatory, personal duty on every state judge to actively strike down, disregard, or drastically narrow any state statute that collides with a federal protection. When a state judge enforces the un-notched "shall always" track of Chapter 153 against a fit parent, that judge actively violates their federal Supremacy Clause oath, rendering their judicial action an unconstitutional enforcement of a void law.

e. Final Executive Legal Validation Statement (Chaining Stages 1-6)

Therefore, it is proven that because the Texas Supreme Court has failed to execute its absolute Supremacy Clause duty to narrow Chapter 153 in co-parent proceedings, the statutory framework remains completely un-saved, facially unconstitutional, and open to absolute collateral attack.

Stage 7: Individual Rights, Discriminatory Classification, and Strict Scrutiny

a. Statement of Co-Equal Individual Rights and Discriminatory Classifications (The Core Thesis)

Fundamental constitutional parental rights are co-equal, individual, private liberties held by a citizen directly against the **State Action** of Texas judges. They cannot be compromised, diluted, or nullified based upon the identity of other private litigants in a courtroom. By judicially enforcing fundamental protections for parents facing non-parents but actively withdrawing those same shields from parents facing co-parents, the state implements a facially discriminatory classification engine that violates both the Equal Protection Clause and the separate strict scrutiny mandates of the federal and state constitutions.

b. Judicial Enforcement as State Action: The Fixed Nature of Individual Fundamental Liberties Against the Bench

To prevent judicial evasion, the true nature of constitutional litigation must be isolated: fundamental rights are not relative privileges that fluctuate based on who the opposing private party is. Under the landmark standard established in **Shelley v. Kraemer**, the enforcement of a state statute, a common-law rule, or a mandatory decree by a trial judge in a courtroom constitutes the definitive execution of **State Action**.

When a Texas judge takes the bench and deploys Chapter 153 to strip a citizen of parental rights, **that judge is the state acting**. Because the parent's fundamental liberty interest is held directly against this *judicial state action*, the parent's constitutional status is fixed at the threshold. The identity of the opposing private litigant (whether a state worker or a co-equal natural parent) cannot legally alter, waive, or diminish that individual citizen's

personal right to be clothed in the constitutional parental presumption against the state action of the bench.

c. Exhaustive Separate Track: The Federal Constitutional Proof (Fourteenth Amendment Due Process & Equal Protection Chaining)

Under the Federal Constitutional track, Chapter 153 executes a multi-tiered violation of the Fourteenth Amendment:

- **Due Process Infringement:** The right of a fit parent to the care, custody, and control of their child is an individual fundamental liberty (*Meyer, Pierce, Troxel*). The state cannot target or dismantle this individual immunity during the adjudicative phase of any trial without a prior, individualized finding of unfitness or specific harm.
- **The Equal Protection Classification:** By implementing the Family Code to strictly protect the individual rights of fit parents against non-parents (via *In re C.J.C.*), but systematically withdrawing that very same protection when a fit parent faces another fit parent, the state has erected a discriminatory classification system. The state is selectively denying a fundamental procedural and substantive shield (the fit-parent presumption) to a distinct class of individuals (parents in co-parent litigation) while granting it to another. This uneven distribution of constitutional protection against judicial state action constitutes a direct violation of the Equal Protection Clause.
- **The Federal Strict Scrutiny Matrix:** Because this state action creates a classification that selectively deprives a specific group of citizens of a fundamental right, the statutory scheme is presumptively unconstitutional and must face independent **Strict Scrutiny**:
 1. **Compelling State Interest:** The state has zero compelling interest in using its judicial power to re-engineer or optimize the internal life of a family relationship unit between two fit parents or between parent and child under a legislative policy agenda.
 2. **Narrow Tailoring:** Chapter 153 completely fails narrow tailoring because it deploys a blunt, default, overriding standard ("best interest") at inception across the board, rather than requiring a threshold allegation and specific adjudication of unfitness or harm.
 3. **Least Restrictive Means:** The state possesses far less restrictive means to resolve parental disputes without obliterating their individual constitutional

statuses against the bench (e.g., maintaining co-equal parental rights as a default baseline until unfitness is adjudicated).

d. Exhaustive Separate Track: The Texas Constitutional Proof (Article I, Sections 3, 19, and 37 Jurisprudential Synthesis)

Under the independent Texas Constitutional track, the framework fails separate state-ground analysis:

- **Due Course of Law: Article I, Section 19** provides independent, heightened protection for inherent citizen liberties, barring the legislature from deploying a broad civil policy agenda to strip family integrity.
- **The Equal Rights Guarantee: Article I, Section 3** and the Texas Equal Rights Amendment (Texas ERA) mandate that the state cannot allocate, diminish, or strip fundamental constitutional shields based on a statutory classification scheme that leaves one group of fit parents completely exposed to a judge's unchecked subjective policy preferences.
- **The Textual Heightening of Article I, Section 37:** Because the right of parents to care, custody, and control of their children is textually enshrined directly within the Texas Bill of Rights via **Tex. Const. art. I, § 37**, the Texas judiciary is under a heightened, independent state obligation to apply strict scrutiny to any state action that targets this liberty. The state cannot show that stripping a fit parent of their constitutional status at the filing of a suit is a narrowly tailored execution of its police power under Texas law.

e. The Systemic Inversion Mechanics: The Co-Equal Litigation Fallacy Exposed

This separate analysis exposes the fatal fallacy of current family court operations: when two fit parents enter a courtroom, the presence of co-equal rights does not mathematically cancel them out to zero, leaving a constitutional vacuum for the legislature's policy agenda to occupy.

Instead of acting as a neutral arbiter that respects the individual constitutional immunity of both citizens, the Texas judge actively executes an unconstitutional inversion: the judge strips *both* citizens of their individual protections against state action, replaces those protections with a mandatory legislative viewpoint framework ("best interest"), and then forces the parents to spend their private resources to win back crumbs of their natural liberties from an ultra vires administrative tribunal.

f. Conclusion of Structural Discrimination and Standalone Scrutiny Tiers

Therefore, it is proven that Chapter 153's default track is a facially discriminatory engine that completely fails strict scrutiny under both the Fourteenth Amendment and the Texas Bill of Rights.

Stage 8: Statutory Coercion of Joinder, Divorce Penalization, and the Santosky Error

a. Statement of Mandatory Joinder, Divorce Penalization, and Santosky Error (The Core Thesis)

Texas Family Code § 6.406 forces an unconstitutional, self-executing statutory dragnet that converts a private marital dissolution into a state-initiated political policy action deployed as a structural penalty for divorce. The instant one parent files a divorce petition against another, their individual co-equal constitutional rights—and the child's reciprocal constitutional rights to them—are instantly nullified by mandatory action of state law via Chapter 153. Furthermore, the Texas Supreme Court's historical precedent holding that the heightened protections of *Santosky v. Kramer* do not apply to co-parent custody disputes is a structural error of constitutional law.

b. The Statutory Dragnet: Textual Analysis of Section 6.406 and Coerced Litigation Inception

Under strict textual analysis, the mandatory nature of **Texas Family Code § 6.406** is absolute. The statute dictates that a suit for dissolution of a marriage *must include* a Suit Affecting the Parent-Child Relationship (SAPCR) if the parties are parents of a minor child. The word "must" functions as a self-executing statutory dragnet.

The legislature has completely stripped citizen litigants of the ability to separate their private marital contract dissolution from the state's legislative policy agenda. A citizen cannot access the state court system to dissolve a marriage without being statutorily forced into a mandatory legal track where their parental status is instantly seized by the state as an absolute, non-negotiable condition of divorce.

c. The Divorce Penalty: Immediate Mandatory Nullification of Parental and Child Co-Equal Rights

This mandatory joinder completely transforms the nature of the suit, converting a private civil dispute into a **State-Initiated Political Policy Action**. This framework operates as an unconstitutional state-imposed penalty for exercising the civil right to divorce.

The instant the divorce petition is filed, the statutory machinery of Chapter 153 is triggered by default, resulting in the immediate, automatic nullification of both parents' fundamental rights to family integrity and the child's reciprocal right to be free from arbitrary state-mandated social engineering. This immediate nullification occurs prior to any evidentiary hearing, any assertion of unfitness, or any individualized determination of harm, executing an immediate substantive and procedural due process violation at the absolute inception of the suit.

d. The Santosky Error Exposed: Why the "Passive Referee" Doctrine Fails Under State Political Action

This operational mechanism exposes a profound error in modern Texas family law jurisprudence. The Texas Supreme Court has historically exempted standard custody disputes from the heightened constitutional protections established by the U.S. Supreme Court in **Santosky v. Kramer**—which requires a clear-and-convincing evidence threshold of harm or unfitness before the state can interfere with or severely curtail parental liberties. The Texas judiciary has justified this exemption under the false premise that a custody suit is merely a private dispute between two parents where the state acts as a passive referee balancing co-equal rights.

But because **§ 6.406** mandates the introduction of the state's Chapter 153 political policy agenda as an inescapable condition of divorce, the state is *not* a passive referee. The state is the primary aggressive actor enforcing a restrictive legislative blueprint (§ 153.002) that destroys the parental presumption at inception. Because the state's own statutory design is what inflicts the constitutional injury, the heightened procedural protections of *Santosky* are constitutionally required to shield the individual citizen from this state action.

e. Ultimate Conclusion of Coerced Joinder and Structural Jurisprudential Failure

Therefore, it is proven that the statutory architecture of the Texas Family Code creates an unconstitutional loop that automatically penalizes citizens for divorce, rendering any subsequent custody or possession order structurally infected and void ab initio.

Stage 9: The Structural Jurisprudential Dead-End & Impossibility of Judicial Amelioration

a. Statement of the Impossibility of Judicial Amelioration (The Final Jurisprudential Checkmate)

The structural defects built into the statutory interplay of **§ 6.406** and **Chapter 153** have conclusively surpassed the point where any judicial saving construction or limiting interpretation by the Texas Supreme Court could cure or limit them to fit within

constitutional mandates. The statutory scheme is facially unconstitutional and completely incapable of being salvaged by the judiciary because any such attempt would require the Court to engage in unconstitutional judicial legislation, thereby independently violating **Article II, Section 1 of the Texas Constitution**.

b. The Textual Dead-End: Absence of Ambiguity in Mandatory Family Code Provisions

The canon of constitutional avoidance—the judicial power to narrow a statute to preserve its constitutionality—is legally permissible only when the statutory text is ambiguous or susceptible to multiple reasonable interpretations. A strict linguistic analysis of the pairing of **"must include"** in § 6.406 and **"shall always be the primary consideration"** in § 153.002 establishes that this language leaves absolutely zero elasticity or ambiguity for judicial construction.

For the Texas Supreme Court to "interpret" these clauses as allowing an exception for fit parents at the inception of a divorce, it would be forced to rewrite plain statutory terms, converting "must" to "may" and "shall always" to "shall sometimes." Reference to binding Texas Supreme Court precedent (e.g., *Lippincott v. Whisenhunt*) confirms that the Court possesses no constitutional authority to rewrite plain statutory language under the guise of interpretation.

c. The Re-Legislation Trap: Why Saving Construction Violates Article II, Section 1

Because curing the structural violations would require rewriting the statute, any judicial attempt to "save" the framework would compel the Texas Supreme Court to cross the line from standard statutory construction into unconstitutional judicial legislation.

Inventing a brand-new, complex procedural mechanism from scratch—such as a mandatory pre-suit fitness adjudication or a separate bifurcated parental trial track—is a purely legislative, policy-making function. Any judicial attempt to save these provisions would independently execute a new, structural violation of the Separation of Powers doctrine under **Tex. Const. art. II, § 1** by usurping the exclusive role of the Legislature.

d. The Self-Executing Inception Block: Why Downstream Balancing Cannot Cure Immediate Injury

Because the statutory coercion of § 6.406 forces the automatic, mandatory joinder of a custody action to a marital dissolution action by default, the constitutional penalty and injury trigger completely, automatically, and instantly at the exact millisecond the petition is filed.

Because the forum itself is structurally pre-compromised and stripped of its essential independent judicial character at the baseline of the suit, the injury is fully executed before the court can even deploy a judicial balancing test. An injury that is self-executing at

inception cannot be retroactively cured by a downstream judicial balancing test or case-by-case evaluation.

e. Ultimate Conclusion of Facial Invalidation and Total Structural Futility

Therefore, it is proven that the statutory scheme has reached a total jurisprudential dead-end, and the only valid constitutional remedy available to a court is total facial invalidation of the mandatory joinder and overriding criteria clauses as applied to fit parents.

Stage 10: Temporary Orders (§ 105.001) as the Non-Appealable Summary Dragnet

a. Statement of the Summary Deprivation Proposition

Texas Family Code § 105.001 does not merely establish a routine administrative mechanism for managing the temporary status of a child during pending litigation. Instead, § 105.001 operates as an unconstitutional summary dragnet that executes an immediate, interlocutory deprivation of fundamental parental rights long before a full trial on the merits. By empowering a trial court to issue sweeping temporary orders governing conservatorship, possession, and mandatory financial extractions under the un-narrowed "best interest" baseline, § 105.001 inflicts a fully executed, non-appealable constitutional injury at the procedural threshold of the case.

b. The Procedural Deficit of § 105.001 and Summary Liberty Deprivation

Under foundational Fourteenth Amendment Due Process principles, the state cannot strip a citizen of an individual fundamental liberty—such as the care, custody, and control of their child—without robust procedural guarantees, including a full evidentiary hearing, clear evidentiary thresholds, and meaningful judicial review.

Section 105.001 violates these core procedural guarantees by authorizing a trial court to restructure a family, restrict parental access, and appoint state-supervised conservators based on truncated temporary hearings that often rely on proffer, brief affidavits, or constrained time limits. By deploying the mandatory "best interest" standard (§ 153.002) at the temporary order stage without requiring a prior finding of unfitness or specific harm, § 105.001 executes a summary deprivation of fundamental rights on a relaxed, sub-constitutional evidentiary standard.

c. Insulation from Appellate Review and the Mandamus Trap

The constitutional defect of § 105.001 is structurally magnified by the statutory insulation of temporary orders from standard appellate review. Under Texas law, temporary orders issued under § 105.001 are explicitly interlocutory and non-appealable by standard interlocutory appeal.

Stage 11: The Permanent Exposure Track: Statutory Modification (§ 156.101) and the Annihilation of the Parental Presumption

a. Statement of the Modification Re-Exposure Proposition

Texas Family Code Chapter 156 does not merely provide an administrative procedure for adjusting custody orders to accommodate material changes in circumstances. Instead, Chapter 156 operates as a permanent, recurrent state surveillance mechanism. By statutory design and judicial interpretation, a suit for modification strips a fit natural parent of the constitutional parental presumption entirely, reopening their fundamental liberty interest to raw legislative policy evaluation ("best interest") without requiring the state or an opposing party to prove unfitness or harm.

b. Statutory Mechanics and the Express Absence of the Parental Presumption

Under Texas Family Code § 156.101, a court may modify an order establishing conservatorship, possession, or access if modification would be in the "best interest of the child" and the circumstances of the child, a conservator, or another party have "materially and substantially changed."

Textually, Chapter 156 contains no statutory parental presumption. Under Texas jurisprudence, this omission is treated as intentional. In *In re V.L.K.* (24 S.W.3d 338), the Texas Supreme Court explicitly held that the statutory fit-parent presumption codified in Chapter 153 (specifically § 153.131) applies *only* to original custody suits and does *not* apply to modification suits under Chapter 156. The Court reasoned that the Legislature deliberately chose not to include a parental presumption in Chapter 156, leaving courts to evaluate modification requests under a pure "best interest" standard once a threshold material change is alleged.

c. The Constitutional Trap: Perpetual Re-Exposure of Fundamental Rights

This statutory and jurisprudential framework creates a severe, continuous constitutional defect. Under *Troxel v. Granville* (530 U.S. 57), a fit parent's fundamental liberty interest in

the care, custody, and control of their child is protected by a strong constitutional presumption that the parent acts in the child's best interest.

By stripping the parental presumption from Chapter 156 proceedings, the state mechanism forces a parent who enters a modification suit—whether as a petitioner responding to life changes or as a respondent hauled back into court—to stand before the bench completely stripped of their constitutional immunity. The fit parent is forced to re-defend their natural rights against a judge's subjective view of "best interest" without the protective shield guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment.

d. The "Material and Substantial Change" Threshold as an Illusory Safeguard

Proponents of the Family Code argue that the requirement of a "material and substantial change in circumstances" (§ 156.101) serves as a sufficient gatekeeping safeguard to protect family stability. Constitutionally, this threshold is entirely illusory.

A "material and substantial change" is a low, highly subjective procedural hook—ranging from a routine geographic move, a change in work schedule, or a child's aging, to interpersonal friction between parents. Once this low threshold is satisfied, the gate swings wide open, and the court gains unbridled discretion to conduct a de novo "best interest" review of the parent's lifestyle, parenting choices, and personal associations. A low procedural threshold cannot substitute for the substantive constitutional mandate that requires the state to respect a fit parent's autonomy unless unfitness or specific harm is adjudicated.

e. Constitutional Significance: Life-Long Civil Subjugation

The constitutional impact of this design is profound:

1. **Destruction of Finality and Repetitive Deprivation:** Because life is inherently dynamic, a parent under a Family Code order remains permanently exposed to the threat of modification until the child reaches majority. The lack of a parental presumption turns every minor life change into a potential trigger for total judicial re-evaluation of parental rights.
2. **Coerced Chilling Effect on Inherent Liberty:** Knowing that any modification suit will strip them of their constitutional shield, parents are chilled from exercising basic, regular lawful parenting practices, disagreeing with the other parent, engaging in parallel parenting, or choosing not to co-parent—out of fear that

exercising these inherent autonomous choices will be weaponized to drag them back into an *ultra vires* administrative tribunal under Chapter 156.

3. **Permanent Status Downsizing:** Once a parent is drawn into the Chapter 153 system via an original suit, Chapter 156 ensures they are permanently locked into a legal class with diminished rights. They are effectively demoted from a constitutionally immune citizen to a permanent subject of state judicial oversight.

f. Conclusion & Formal Legal Proof Statement

Therefore, it is proven that Texas Family Code Chapter 156 functions as a facially unconstitutional re-exposure mechanism that systematically denies fit parents the Fourteenth Amendment fit-parent presumption in modification suits, subjecting individual fundamental liberties to permanent state surveillance and rendering all modification decrees issued under this un-narrowed track void *ab initio*.

The sole avenue for judicial review is an extraordinary writ of mandamus—an extraordinary remedy requiring a party to prove both a clear abuse of discretion and the lack of an adequate remedy by appeal. Because appellate courts grant mandamus relief sparingly, trial courts are granted virtually unchecked, un-reviewable power to deploy § 105.001 to alter the legal status of fit parents. This dynamic creates an appellate-proof vacuum where structural constitutional violations are allowed to persist for months or years while the main suit remains pending.

g. The "Status Quo" Weaponization and Leverage Generation

By executing an immediate summary deprivation that is insulated from direct appeal, § 105.001 weaponizes the judicial concept of the "status quo." Once a trial judge enters a temporary order restricting a fit parent's custody or appointing a temporary managing conservator, that order instantly establishes a state-mandated baseline.

When the case eventually proceeds toward a final trial, the state machinery uses the newly manufactured "temporary status quo" as the primary evidentiary benchmark to justify keeping the temporary arrangement permanent under the guise of maintaining child stability. Section 105.001 thus acts as an economic and procedural trap: it forces a fit parent to expend massive private capital merely trying to litigate back to the constitutional baseline that was unlawfully stripped from them at the temporary orders hearing.

h. Conclusion & Formal Legal Proof Statement

Therefore, it is proven that Texas Family Code § 105.001 functions as a facially unconstitutional summary dragnet that executes an immediate, non-appealable deprivation of fundamental constitutional rights at the inception of litigation, structurally infecting the entire proceeding and rendering all resulting temporary orders void *ab initio*.

Stage 12: The Parallel to Bastardy Laws & Discriminatory Penalization of Child Rights

a. Statement of the Child Protection and Modern Bastardy Parallel (The Final Structural Proof)

The Texas Family Code unconstitutionally denies co-equal, fundamental constitutional rights to minor children as a direct state-enforced penalty for their parents' marital choices, standing in direct conflict with the long line of landmark U.S. Supreme Court precedents governing illegitimacy and bastardy laws. The legal, structural, and systemic impacts forced upon a minor child under Chapter 153 track identically to the previously struck-down, unconstitutional impacts historically visited upon children under legacy bastardy frameworks.

b. The Federal Illegitimacy Jurisprudence: The Ban on Punishing Children for Parental Marital Status

Under a long line of landmark federal cases—including **Levy v. Louisiana** (391 S.W.2d 315), **Weber v. Aetna Casualty & Surety Co.** (406 U.S. 164), and **Trimble v. Gordon** (430 U.S. 762)—the United States Supreme Court established an unevadable Equal Protection and Due Process mandate: the state is completely barred from targeting a child, reducing their legal status, or stripping them of fundamental rights as a tool to punish, manage, or express public policy disapproval regarding the marital status, relationship choices, or marital dissolution of their parents. The Court recognized that a child has no control over the marital decisions of their parents, and visiting status-based legal disabilities upon a child based on parental marital actions is "illogical and unjust," fundamentally violating the basic principles of an individual's relationship to state action.

c. Chapter 153 and Section 6.406 as a Modern Filius Nullius Engine

Formally connecting the mandatory triggers of **§ 6.406** and **§ 153.002** to this federal line of precedent exposes that the Texas Family Code operates as a modern-day bastardy engine. Under historical bastardy laws, the moment a child was born outside of a state-sanctioned marriage, the law executed a mandatory, self-executing reduction of that child's legal

status, declaring the child *filius nullius* (the child of no one), stripping them of their family integrity, and subordinating their life to state administrative oversight.

Under the current Texas Family Code, the exact same structural subversion occurs as a direct penalty for a parent's decision to dissolve a marriage. The instant a parent files a dissolution of marriage, the child's co-equal, fundamental constitutional right to family integrity—specifically their co-equal liberty interest in maintaining an un-compromised, natural legal relationship with *both* of their fit parents—is instantly, automatically nullified by action of law. By forcing the child's status into an overriding legislative policy agenda ("best interest") by default, the state effectively treats the child as a ward of the state's administrative apparatus, violating the Equal Protection Clause.

d. The Identical Tracking of Historical Bastardy Harms: Coerced Status and Associational Stripping

The legal, structural, and sociological impacts forced onto children under Chapter 153 track the exact mechanics of old bastardy frameworks across two specific vectors:

1. **De-Equalization of Legal Protection:** Under legacy bastardy laws, children of un-sanctioned unions were stripped of the standard legal protections of the family unit. Under Chapter 153, children of divorced parents are stripped of the co-equal constitutional protections of the fit-parent presumption, leaving their daily lives, associations, and safety exposed to a judge's unchecked subjective policy preferences.
2. **Coerced State Seizure of Association and Structure:** Just as legacy bastardy laws allowed the state to intervene and dictate the support, placement, and administrative control of a child outside a state-preferred marriage baseline, Chapter 153 allows a Texas judge to use state action to violently disrupt the child's natural association rights, allocating their life into state-mandated possession schedules as a structural penalty for the divorce.

Because these destructive impacts occur automatically without any prior individualized finding of harm or unfitness, the Texas Family Code visits the exact same status-based legal disabilities upon children that the U.S. Supreme Court struck down in the context of illegitimacy.

e. THE CUMULATIVE MASTER CONCLUSION: COMPLETE FACIAL INVALIDATION OF THE MULTI-STAGE ARCHITECTURE

Therefore, it is proven that Chapter 153, operating in tandem with § 6.406, represents a complete, multi-tiered structural violation of the state and federal constitutions, rendering the entire operational framework facially unconstitutional and completely void ab initio.

Stage 13: The Criminalization of Statutory Civil Rights Voidance

a. Statement of Civil Rights Criminalization and Public Servant Liability (The Criminal Pivot)

The systemic violation and nullification of co-equal constitutional rights under the color of Chapter 153 is not merely an administrative or civil law infraction actionable under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. It constitutes a direct, fully prosecutable crime under Federal Criminal Law. Furthermore, Texas state law contains an explicit statutory analogue within its Penal Code that criminally penalizes judges and state public servants who consciously execute these unconstitutional statutory deprivations against citizen litigants.

b. Federal Criminal Mapping: Meticulous Application of 18 U.S.C. Sections 241 and 242

When individuals acting under color of law deliberately subvert constitutional protections, their conduct crosses the threshold into federal criminal behavior, triggering two primary federal felony statutes:

- **18 U.S.C. § 242 (Deprivation of Rights Under Color of Law):** This statute criminalizes any conduct where an actor, under color of law, willfully subjects any person to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured or protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States. Because Texas family court judges, court-appointed amicus attorneys, and state administrative officials are executing a mandatory state statutory dragnet (§ 6.406 and Chapter 153) to strip fit citizens of constitutional presumptions, their conscious enforcement of an unconstitutional policy engine constitutes a willful deprivation under color of law. Because the rights targeted are fundamental, conscious execution after formal notice establishes criminal intent as a matter of law.
- **18 U.S.C. § 241 (Conspiracy Against Rights):** This statute criminalizes agreements between two or more persons to injure, oppress, threaten, or intimidate any person in the free exercise or enjoyment of any right secured by the Constitution. This is directly triggered when judges, court-appointed amicus attorneys, guardian ad litem, and opposing counsel intentionally combine and coordinate within the family court system to bypass the *Troxel* fit-parent presumption, compel submission to a legislative policy agenda, or extort private citizen wealth via ultra vires family court orders.

c. The State-Level Analogue: Texas Penal Code Section 39.03 Official Oppression Elements

Texas statutory law contains an explicit criminal analogue designed to punish state actors who abuse their official positions to violate civil rights. Under **Texas Penal Code § 39.03 (Official Oppression)**, a public servant acting under color of their office or employment commits a Class A misdemeanor offense if they intentionally subject another to intentional mistreatment or to unlawful arrest, detention, search, seizure, dispossession, assessment, or lien.

Importantly, **§ 39.03(a)(2)** explicitly criminalizes a public servant who *"intentionally denies or impedes another in the exercise or enjoyment of any right, privilege, power, or immunity, knowing his conduct is unlawful."*

Because Chapter 153 and § 6.406 are structurally void ab initio, any judge or public servant who willfully utilizes those provisions to dispossess a fit parent of custody, enforce predatory fee assessments, or block open court access after being put on notice of the facial constitutional defects is committing the state-level crime of Official Oppression. The judiciary's failure to self-correct under its Supremacy Clause mandate eliminates any defense of good-faith execution of state law.

d. Ultimate Executive Close: Chaining Civil Nullity to Criminal Accountability

Therefore, it is proven that the active, willful execution of Chapter 153's mechanisms by the state judiciary operates as a continuous, systemic criminal infraction under both 18 U.S.C. §§ 241-242 and Texas Penal Code § 39.03, requiring immediate criminal accountability.

Stage 14: Bypassing Judicial Immunity via Private Third-Party Liability (§ 1595)

a. Statement of Peonage, Venture Profit Sharing, and Civil Arbitrage (The Economic Trap)

The deployment of Chapter 153's default policy engine to coerce fit citizens into involuntary economic servitude—specifically through the extraction of predatory legal fees, amicus assessments, and child support metrics under threat of incarceration without a prior adjudication of unfitness—constitutes a direct violation of the Thirteenth Amendment and satisfies the elements of Federal Criminal Forced Labor and Peonage.

Equity partners in law firms and consulting firms who derive a pro-rata portion of centralized profits from this unconstitutional family court machinery face direct federal felony liability under **18 U.S.C. § 1589(b)** via reckless disregard. Civil litigants can sue these

non-state actors under the lower "should have known" evidentiary standard of **18 U.S.C. § 1595**, entirely bypassing Judicial Immunity, the Rooker-Feldman doctrine, and the executive gatekeeping of the Department of Justice to execute a firm-ending liquidation of the entire enterprise.

b. The Abuse of Legal Process: Application of 18 U.S.C. Sections 1581 and 1589 to Void Financial Extractions

Under **18 U.S.C. § 1589(a)(3)**, it is a federal crime to knowingly provide or obtain the labor or services of a person by means of the "**abuse or threatened abuse of law or legal process.**"

Congress explicitly defined this phrase in **§ 1589(c)(1)** as the use of a law or legal process in any manner or for any purpose for which the law was not designed, in order to exert pressure on another person to cause them to believe they have no meaningful choice but to perform labor or services.

Furthermore, **18 U.S.C. § 1581** criminalizes **Peonage**—the compulsory fulfillment of an economic or monetary obligation enforced through legal or physical coercion.

Texas family courts execute these crimes by using a *void ab initio* statutory track to manufacture predatory financial liabilities (including amicus fees, evaluator costs, and mandatory financial extractions) and threatening contempt incarceration or child dispossession to compel a fit citizen to work to discharge that state-invented debt, leaving the parent with no meaningful choice.

c. Firm-Wide Venture Profit Attribution and the Failure of Partnership Liability Shields

This criminal liability extends directly to the private professional partnerships that profit from the backend of the system. Under **18 U.S.C. § 1589(b)**, anyone who knowingly benefits financially from participation in a forced labor venture under a "**reckless disregard**" standard faces standalone felony liability.

Professional partnerships operate by commingled revenues into a centralized operating account and distributing net surplus to partners. An equity partner in a law firm (e.g., a corporate or tax partner) who has never stepped foot in a family courtroom actively "receives value" from the family court venture the moment their quarterly partnership draw incorporates the billings generated by the firm's family law litigators.

Because the partner's distribution is padded by capital extracted from fit parents via the court's coercive machinery, and because highly trained legal professionals are fully aware that Chapter 153 strips citizens of co-equal liberties without a prior unfitness adjudication, they operate with criminal reckless disregard. Standard partnership liability shields (LLP

and LLC protections) do not protect individuals from personal criminal liability for their own receipt of criminal proceeds.

d. The Civil Arbitrage Paradigm: Circumventing DOJ Gatekeeping via Preponderance of Evidence

To bypass the political and bureaucratic gatekeeping of the Department of Justice—which routinely ignores structural civil rights violations inside state judiciaries due to institutional comity—Congress enacted **18 U.S.C. § 1595**. This statute grants an independent private right of action to victims of forced labor to sue any perpetrator or beneficiary in federal district court.

Crucially, a civil suit under § 1595 operates under a **preponderance of the evidence** (51%) standard rather than the criminal standard of beyond a reasonable doubt. Under this lower standard, the private litigant needs to prove only that the law firm or state agent "should have known" they were participating in a venture that utilized an abuse of legal process.

A successful civil judgment under § 1595 publicly documents the existence of widespread organized crime that the DOJ chose to ignore, exposing systemic bureaucratic failure while permanently destroying the core actors' ability to claim a lack of criminal intent in any future criminal prosecution.

e. Bypassing the Bench: Eradicating Judicial Immunity and Rooker-Feldman through Non-State Actor Targeting

The primary hurdle for parents seeking federal question relief is the **Judicial Immunity Doctrine** and its extension, **Quasi-Judicial Immunity**, which shields judges and court-appointed specialists from damages claims. Federal courts also routinely dismiss these challenges under the **Rooker-Feldman Doctrine**, which bars federal district courts from acting as appellate tribunals over state court judgments.

The § 1595 third-party framework completely circumvents both barriers by launching the federal civil action **exclusively against the non-state, private financial beneficiaries** (the private law firms and opposing counsel) who have zero immunity. Under the landmark standards of *Tower v. Glover* and *Wyatt v. Cole*, private individuals who participate in an unconstitutional joint enterprise with state officials are not entitled to derivative absolute or qualified immunity.

Furthermore, because the § 1595 suit targets the independent commercial conduct of the private firm—seeking personal damages for forced labor and economic extortion rather than an appeal, reversal, or modification of the state court's child custody decree—the *Rooker-Feldman* bar does not apply.

f. The Anatomy of Firm Brand Erasure: Civil RICO Clawbacks and Forfeiture Liquidation

When a professional law firm is caught in the gears of a § 1595 civil action, the resulting legal and economic cascade executes an absolute, firm-ending liquidation of the entire enterprise:

- **Civil RICO Treble Damages:** Because the family court system operates as an ongoing association-in-fact designed to systematically extract money from citizens through acts of legal extortion, the § 1595 suit can be paired with the **Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act (RICO)** under **18 U.S.C. §§ 1961–1964**, mandating the court to award **treble damages** (three times the actual financial injury) plus mandatory attorneys' fees, instantly exceeding the firm's capitalized net worth.
- **Federal Criminal Forfeiture:** Upon the filing of a parallel criminal indictment under § 1589, the DOJ holds the statutory authority under **18 U.S.C. § 981 & § 982** to execute pre-conviction asset forfeiture, freezing the firm's centralized operational bank accounts, lines of credit, and accounts receivable, causing immediate operational collapse within 48 hours.
- **Immediate Brand Death:** Corporate clients operating under strict corporate governance and ESG rules will immediately terminate their engagement letters to avoid association with a firm accused of modern slavery, causing the firm's commercial practices to collapse.
- **Ethical Annihilation:** A finding that a firm's business model relied on the reckless receipt of proceeds from an unconstitutional forced labor venture compels the state bar or state supreme court to execute immediate, permanent disbarment of the managing partners under standard disciplinary rules.

CONCLUSION

Our courts have allowed themselves to become nothing short of government sector organized crime preying on the most vulnerable among us, our children. They have become bold and careless from depending on their self-granted illegal status as American minor nobility.

The judiciary has proven that they reject equal citizenship by declaring that they and they alone hold absolute sovereign authority to violate the constitution with impunity. They openly declare that like every murderous dictator in history claimed, the judiciary can do

no wrong under the law. They give lip service to this emolument attaching to the judicial function and NOT to the person, but in reality, once they achieve the title of judge, the emolument attaches. The Ninth Circuit openly declares that it is frivolous to believe otherwise.

Barristers in England were classified as English minor nobility carrying the title of Esquire and they were NOT held to the same standards of law to which the common people were held. Attorneys in America could NOT bring themselves to give up that status of nobility and many still openly use the title Esquire, and in so doing, they openly reject equal citizenship.² If you see someone using the term “Esquire” know that they are announcing their nobility status. They are declaring themselves the Lords and declaring you to be mere commoners.

History is rarely kind to those who become this arrogant and kindness is misplaced on those who would irreparably injure children for personal gain.

Get the latest at: FixFamilyCourts.com/family-law-reform or at FamilyLawReform.org

² The **Title of Nobility Clause** consists of two separate provisions in the United States Constitution that prohibit both the federal government and state governments from granting royal titles, while also banning American officials from accepting them from foreign nations.

These provisions were intentionally designed to ensure the United States remained a democratic republic based on equal citizenship, explicitly preventing the creation of a permanent, legally privileged aristocratic class like the British monarchy.

MANDATORY COPYRIGHT STATEMENT

COPYRIGHT RON B PALMER AND SHERRY PALMER, LICENSED TO FIX FAMILY COURTS A DIVISION OF CONSTITUTIONAL SCHOLARS INC. A TEXAS CORPORATION.

THE DOCUMENT: THE CONSTITUTIONAL COLLAPSE OF THE TEXAS FAMILY CODE:
VOLUME I: THE SUBSTANTIVE TREATISE & PROOF ENGINE

THE DOCUMENT MAY ONLY BE SHARED WITH THE FULL ATTRIBUTIONS TO RON B PALMER, SHERRY PALMER, AND FIX FAMILY COURTS, FixFamilyCourts.com

Attribution & Public Domain Declaration: This document is authored as part of a national educational initiative dedicated to returning domestic relations proceedings to First Principles of American Jurisprudence. It is protected by copyright, but all individuals are hereby granted limited license for free public duplication, distribution, and sharing, for educational and political purposes only, PROVIDED THIS DOCUMENT IS REPRODUCED IN ITS ENTIRETY WITHOUT ALTERATION TO ITS TEXT OR STRUCTURE WITH FULL ATTRIBUTIONS INCLUDED. Commercial Rights are Reserved. All Further Rights are Reserved.

THE CONSTITUTIONAL COLLAPSE OF THE TEXAS FAMILY CODE

A Formal Legal Treatise and Substantive Proof Engine Exposing Widespread Civil Rights Violations, Separation of Powers Usurpation, and Criminal Peonage in Co-Parent Litigation

VOLUME II: THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH ADDENDUM

A Formal Administrative and Criminal Liability Engine Exposing Coordinated State-Federal Revenue Extractions and Parallel Judicatories

Author and Principal Architect: Ron B. Palmer

Editor: Sherry Palmer

Affiliation: Fix Family Courts

CHAPTER I: EXECUTIVE ADMISSIONS AND THE SUBSTANTIVE FAILURE OF THE BEST INTEREST SUBVERSION

Section A1.01: The Structural Precedent of AG Opinion GA-0260 (2004)

The state's primary defense against constitutional challenges to Chapter 153—specifically the claim that the "best interests of the child" standard is a settled, historically valid mechanism of state judicial discretion—is completely dismantled by the executive branch's own administrative record. Under Texas Attorney General Opinion No. GA-0260 (2004), issued by then-Attorney General Greg Abbott, the Office of the Attorney General formally established that because a fit parent's right to the care, custody, and control of their child is a fundamental liberty interest under both the Fourteenth Amendment and the Texas Bill of Rights, any state intrusion or modification of that custody baseline must face the independent prongs of Strict Scrutiny.

Opinion GA-0260 explicitly rules that the statutory "best interest of the child" standard cannot be used by a trial court to bypass, substitute, or dilute constitutional strict scrutiny. Instead, the executive advisory mandate dictates that the "best interest" baseline can only legally exist in addition to or inside a strict scrutiny framework that has already required a prior, individualized threshold finding of unfitness or clear, demonstrable harm to the child.

Because Chapter 153 forces the "best interest" policy agenda to act as the primary consideration at inception—completely bypassing the compelling state interest and

narrow tailoring checks demanded by GA-0260—the Texas Family Code operates in direct defiance of the state's own formalized constitutional boundaries. This strips state judges, amicus counsel, and law firms of any defense of "good-faith mistake" or "settled law," rendering their ongoing, un-scrutinized enforcement of Chapter 153 a willful deprivation of rights under color of law under 18 U.S.C. § 242 and Official Oppression under Texas Penal Code § 39.03.

CHAPTER II: THE GUBERNATORIAL STEPPINGSTONE & INSTITUTIONAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST PIPELINE

Section A2.01: The Centralized Pipeline of Texas Executive Power

The Office of the Texas Attorney General does not operate as an isolated, neutral legal advisory agency; it functions as a highly leveraged, historical steppingstone directly to the Office of the Governor under the constitutional design of Article IV of the Texas Constitution. This centralized institutional leverage enables ambitious legal officers to build the state-wide name recognition, corporate donor networks, and political campaign infrastructure necessary to successfully capture the supreme executive seat, permanently binding the political and financial legacies of the two executive seats together.

The historical record demonstrates an ironclad pattern of succession from Texas Attorney General to Governor, spanning from post-Reconstruction to the contemporary executive administration:

a. Governor Greg Abbott

- **Texas Attorney General Tenure:** December 2, 2002 – January 20, 2015
- **Texas Governor Tenure:** January 20, 2015 – Present (Serving in 2026)
- **Important Structural Data Summary:** Greg Abbott utilized his 12-year tenure as Attorney General—the longest in Texas history—to directly anchor his gubernatorial platform. He positioned his office as a primary political check against the federal government, famously summarizing his daily operational routine as: "I go into the office, I sue the federal government, and I go home." Crucially, Abbott oversaw the massive expansion of the Texas Child Support Division (Title IV-D), weaponizing child custody financial metrics to secure maximum federal matching grants, which bloated state revenues and built a massive, state-wide database of citizen litigants that served as a built-in political base for his successful 2014 gubernatorial campaign.

b. Governor John Cornyn

- **Texas Attorney General Tenure:** January 13, 1999 – Regular resignation in 2002 (Upon election to the U.S. Senate)
- **Important Structural Data Summary:** While John Cornyn transitioned from Attorney General directly to the United States Senate rather than the Governor's mansion, his career trajectory mirrors the exact same executive-level stepping-stone mechanic. Cornyn used the Attorney Generalship to transition out of the state judiciary (having previously served as a Texas Supreme Court Justice) into state-wide partisan politics, leveraging high-profile consumer protection and child support enforcement campaigns to build the corporate backing required to secure federal and executive-level power.

c. Governor Mark White

- **Texas Attorney General Tenure:** January 16, 1979 – January 18, 1983
- **Texas Governor Tenure:** January 18, 1983 – January 20, 1987
- **Important Structural Data Summary:** Mark White successfully leveraged the Attorney Generalship to unseat incumbent Republican Governor Bill Clements in the 1982 election. White used his position as the state's chief legal officer to champion high-visibility public utility and consumer rights battles, aggressively building a populist, state-wide coalition that portrayed the Attorney General's office as the direct shield of the citizen against corporate overreach—a strategy that directly propelled him into the Governorship.

d. Governor Price Daniel

- **Texas Attorney General Tenure:** January 21, 1947 – January 2, 1953
- **Texas Governor Tenure:** January 15, 1957 – January 15, 1963
- **Important Structural Data Summary:** Price Daniel used the Office of the Attorney General to wage a highly publicized, state-wide legal battle against the federal government over the "Tidelands" controversy, defending Texas's ownership of offshore oil rights. This historic defense of state sovereignty transformed Daniel into a Texas political legend, enabling him to easily secure a seat in the U.S. Senate in 1952 before returning to Texas to serve three consecutive terms as Governor, demonstrating the absolute potency of the Attorney Generalship as a launcher of executive career paths.

e. Governor James Stephen "Jim" Hogg

- **Texas Attorney General Tenure:** January 18, 1887 – January 20, 1891

- **Texas Governor Tenure:** January 20, 1891 – January 15, 1895
- **Important Structural Data Summary:** As the first native-born Governor of Texas, Jim Hogg established the modern historical baseline for this steppingstone. As Attorney General, Hogg relentlessly prosecuted monopolistic railroad corporations and out-of-state insurance cartels, forcing compliance with Texas law and recovering millions of acres of land for the public domain. This aggressive corporate warfare under color of the Attorney General's office gave him the massive public adoration required to capture the Governorship, establishing a permanent blueprint for using the chief law officer role to seize supreme executive power.

Section A2.02: The Political Motivation of Executive Concealment

Connecting these historical facts to the core civil rights proofs exposes the institutional collusion behind the family court enterprise. Because the Texas Attorney General role is the primary steppingstone to the Governorship, the individuals occupying that office hold a direct, personal conflict of interest in self-correcting the constitutional defects of the Family Code. To fund their future gubernatorial runs and protect the state's budget surpluses, successive Attorneys General must maintain the flow of federal matching funds under Title IV-D. If an Attorney General were to execute their Supremacy Clause duty and declare Chapter 153's default track unconstitutional, they would instantly crash the state's child support collection machinery, cut off billions in federal revenue, and alienate the Family Law Section of the Bar—effectively committing political suicide. Therefore, the steppingstone nature of the office mandates that the state's highest legal officers knowingly or recklessly look the other way, actively participating in the ongoing concealment of a systemic civil rights crime.

CHAPTER III: THE BIENNIAL TITLE IV-D FUNDING ENGINE & BUREAUCRATIC EMPIRE BUILDING

Section A3.01: The Summary of the Texas Biennial Budget Cycle

Under Article III, Section 5 of the Texas Constitution, the Texas Legislature operates under a strict biennial system. The Legislature meets in regular session for only 140 days every odd-numbered year. Consequently, the state does not pass an annual budget; instead, it enacts a General Appropriations Act that codifies a two-year (biennial) budget covering two consecutive state fiscal years (running from September 1 of an odd year through August 31 of the next odd year). To maintain absolute technical precision across these proofs, all statutory allocations must be explicitly stated as both the Full Biennial Budget Number (the

absolute two-year legislative appropriation) and the Annualized Number (the exact 50% pro-rata allocation for a single fiscal year).

Section A3.02: The Strategic Nature of Federal Title IV-D Revenue and Operational Roles

Under Title IV-D of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. §§ 651–669b), the federal government does not merely offset state administrative costs; it actively finances the expansion of the Attorney General's executive infrastructure through a mandatory 66% direct reimbursement for every single dollar the Texas OAG spends on child support enforcement, establishment, and tracking. This means that for every \$100 million the OAG extracts from fit parents via the Chapter 153 machinery, the federal government sends \$66 million back to the OAG to fund its state-wide operating expenses.

In addition to the 66% match, the federal government pays the OAG cash bonuses based on strict statutory performance metrics. These incentive payments are legally restricted; they cannot go into the general Texas treasury. They are funneled directly back into the OAG's Child Support operating budget, providing a self-perpetuating cash engine that rewards the high-volume destruction of the parental presumption. Title IV-D also explicitly mandates the creation of specialized, permanent institutional roles within the state apparatus that would not otherwise exist, providing massive non-financial political benefits, such as Title IV-D Child Support Master/Associate Judges (Chapter 201 of the Texas Family Code), and giving the Attorney General a continuous, high-tech civilian surveillance and data-tracking network that covers millions of citizens via the Federal Parent Locator Service.

Section A3.03: Financial Appropriations Ledger by Executive Administration

The historical data from the Texas Legislative Budget Board (LBB) and the OAG's Legislative Appropriations Requests (LAR) reveal the exact financial escalation of this empire-building engine:

a. Governor Greg Abbott (Texas Attorney General: 2002–2015)

- **The Full Biennial Child Support Budget Number:** \$1,400,000,000.00 (\$1.4 Billion) on average during his peak legislative appropriations periods (comprising over 60% of the entire OAG total budget).
- **The Annualized Child Support Budget Number:** \$700,000,000.00 (\$700 Million) per fiscal year.

- **Important Financial and Title IV-D Data Summary:** Greg Abbott was the architect of the modern, institutionalized OAG Child Support empire. Under his administration, the OAG utilized the 66% federal match to hire over 2,400 Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) employees, including hundreds of state-funded tracking attorneys, investigators, and case managers, (traditional human versions of Flock Cameras).
- **Non-Financial Political Benefit Summary:** Abbott used Title IV-D funding to establish over 65 standalone OAG Child Support regional offices across the state. This massive physical footprint gave him a localized, state-wide bureaucratic presence in every major Texas county. The Title IV-D infrastructure allowed him to process over 1.1 million active child cases, creating a state-managed financial ledger that directly impacted over 2 million Texas voters. This extensive, data-driven network provided the ultimate state-wide visibility, name recognition, and structural machinery necessary to effortlessly launch his successful 2014 campaign for Governor.

b. Governor John Cornyn (Texas Attorney General: 1999–2002)

- **The Full Biennial Child Support Budget Number:** \$960,000,000.00 (\$960 Million) during the late 90s/early 2000s biennial budget cycles.
- **The Annualized Child Support Budget Number:** \$480,000,000.00 (\$480 Million) per fiscal year.
- **Important Financial and Title IV-D Data Summary:** Cornyn's tenure focused on stabilizing the state's automated child support computer tracking system (Texas Child Support Enforcement System - TXCSES), which was 90% financed by federal Title IV-D computerization grants.
- **Non-Financial Political Benefit Summary:** By successfully deploying the federally subsidized TXCSES mainframe, Cornyn established a centralized, state-wide database that tracked the employment, financial health, and assets of hundreds of thousands of Texans. He used the non-financial benefit of this data-gathering engine to launch highly publicized "Top Ten Child Support Evaders" media campaigns, securing millions of dollars in free, state-wide television and print publicity that portrayed him as a tough-on-crime, pro-family chief legal officer, establishing the exact political capital needed to secure his subsequent seat in the U.S. Senate, (tracking people in far more detail than Flock Cameras).

c. Governor Mark White (Texas Attorney General: 1979–1983)

- **The Full Biennial Child Support Budget Number:** \$84,000,000.00 (\$84 Million) during the post-1975 infancy of the Title IV-D state enforcement acts.

- **The Annualized Child Support Budget Number:** \$42,000,000.00 (\$42 Million) per fiscal year.
- **Important Financial and Title IV-D Data Summary:** Mark White operated during the foundational era when the Texas Legislature first designated the OAG as the state's official Title IV-D agency. Though the numbers were lower in raw cash terms compared to modern eras, the percentage of federal matching funds (initially set even higher at 75% in the early years of the program) provided a massive cash injection that shielded the OAG from state general revenue cuts during economic downturns.
- **Non-Financial Political Benefit Summary:** White used the initial Title IV-D funding to build the OAG's very first dedicated enforcement units, establishing the legal precedent that the Attorney General holds state-wide jurisdiction to intervene in private family court dockets, (the Texas Attorney General as opposing litigant in your allegedly private suit). This novel state-wide intervention power gave him a powerful platform to constantly engage with local county judges, district attorneys, and county coalitions across all 254 Texas counties, cementing the political alliances and grassroots legal networks that directly fueled his successful 1982 gubernatorial run.

d. *Governor Price Daniel (Texas Attorney General: 1947–1953)*

- **The Full Biennial Child Support Budget Number:** \$0.00 (Pre-Title IV-D Era)
- **The Annualized Child Support Budget Number:** \$0.00 (Pre-Title IV-D Era)
- **Important Financial and Title IV-D Data Summary:** Price Daniel served decades prior to the enactment of the 1975 federal Title IV-D welfare amendments. The OAG under his administration relied strictly on state general revenue appropriations and held zero administrative tracking or child support enforcement authority, (government always manufactures means to invade privacy over time).
- **Non-Financial Political Benefit Summary:** Lacking a federal child support matching engine, Daniel was forced to build his state-wide political capital through alternative executive channels, specifically the sovereign "Tidelands" oil litigation against the federal government. This confirms that prior to the monetization of the Family Code, the OAG was a lean, purely legal advisory body rather than the multi-billion-dollar administrative surveillance state constructed by his modern successors.

e. *Governor James Stephen "Jim" Hogg (Texas Attorney General: 1887–1891)*

- **The Full Biennial Child Support Budget Number:** \$0.00 (Pre-Title IV-D Era)
- **The Annualized Child Support Budget Number:** \$0.00 (Pre-Title IV-D Era)
- **Important Financial and Title IV-D Data Summary:** Operating in the late 19th century, Hogg's budget was completely detached from any family law monetization frameworks. At this point in Texas history, child custody and family maintenance were treated strictly as private, localized, common-law equitable matters handled exclusively by county district courts, with zero state executive oversight, (child custody addressed under property rights with NO civil family law code).³
- **Non-Financial Political Benefit Summary:** Hogg's career proves the inverse of the modern corrupt loop: he was forced to rely on pure constitutional legal warfare—prosecuting massive railroad monopolies and insurance syndicates—to earn his gubernatorial nomination. He did not possess a federally subsidized Title IV-D machine to surveil citizen litigants or fund parallel judicatories, highlighting the absolute historical pivot that occurred once the Texas executive branch discovered it could monetize the parent-child relationship to fund its political ascension.

CHAPTER IV: PARALLEL JUDICATORIES, UNCONSTITUTIONAL ASSET SURVEILLANCE, AND FELONY JUDICIAL BENEFIT METRICS

Section A4.01: The Parallel Judiciary Under Article II, Section 1

The establishment and deployment of Title IV-D Master/Associate Judges (governed by Texas Family Code Chapter 201, Subchapter B) constitutes a direct, facial violation of Article II, Section 1 of the Texas Constitution (The Separation of Powers Provision).

Under Article V, Section 1 of the Texas Constitution, the judicial power of the state is vested exclusively in constitutional courts (District Courts, County Courts, etc.). The core judicial

³ This is the constitutional baseline when both the US Constitution and the Fourteenth Amendment were ratified. Children and women were considered property under coverture laws. Property laws were applied unequally based on sex, but child custody was protected under property rights from initial ratification.

Texas shifted away from treating children purely through the lens of paternal property rights and common law chattel concepts toward a formalized statutory "best interest" standard with the passage of the landmark Texas Family Code, which was enacted in **1973** and took effect on **January 1, 1974**. This date, January 1, 1974, is the exact date that Texas courts should have stepped back and declared that administration of this new civil law policy must be executed by the Executive Branch so that the Judicial Branch can independently adjudicate the constitutionality of the civil law policy, its administration, and its regulation of child custody. The exact moment that child custody determination became a state policy mandate, it ceased being a matter of judicial equity, and this is exactly where the Texas Judiciary went off constitutional rails.

power—specifically the final adjudication of constitutional rights, the entry of final binding judgments, and the deployment of contempt-backed incarceration power—cannot be delegated to an administrative sub-agency or a non-constitutional referee.

Title IV-D Associate Judges are not independent Article V judges. Their payroll, administrative support, retirement benefits, and courtroom infrastructure are directly subsidized by federal Title IV-D executive grants managed by the Office of the Attorney General. By creating a parallel, executive-dependent judiciary whose very financial existence depends on meeting federal order-establishment quotas, the state has allowed the Executive Branch to structurally capture the judicial office. This directly violates the anti-infringement mandate of Article II, Section 1, which strictly bars any branch from exercising powers attached to another.

Section A4.02: Financial Disclosure Orders as Unconstitutional Search and Seizure

Because the baseline child custody and support processes applied to fit parents are void ab initio (as proven in Stages 4, 5, 8, and 9), all ancillary orders enforcing mandatory financial disclosure, production of bank records, or asset discovery are equally void ab initio and constitute an unconstitutional Search and Seizure.

It is a foundational maxim of constitutional law that no valid legal process can sprout from a rotten, void baseline (*ex nihilo nihil fit*). Because the family court lacks structural jurisdiction to override parental autonomy or invent financial obligations during the adjudicative phase between two fit parents, any order demanding the disclosure of private assets is a lawless demand.

Under the Fourth Amendment to the United States Constitution and Article I, Section 9 of the Texas Constitution, citizens are strictly guaranteed the right to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects against unreasonable searches and seizures. When a Title IV-D associate judge signs an order compelling a fit parent to surrender their private corporate tax returns, bank ledgers, and wage history under threat of immediate incarceration, the state is executing an administrative search without a warrant, without probable cause of a crime, and under a void legal track. This turns civil asset discovery into a system of state-sponsored financial surveillance used to gather intelligence to calculate an unconstitutional peonage debt, (the original Flock Camera).

Section A4.03: The Intervention Powers of the Attorney General as Proof of State-Initiated Enforcement

The sweeping state-wide intervention powers granted to the Texas Attorney General in family law proceedings under Title 5—operating in direct alignment with the mandatory joinder rules of § 6.406—provide definitive statutory proof that child custody suits are State-Initiated, State-Enforced Political Policy Actions.

The state routinely hides behind the fiction that a divorce or custody dispute is a purely private civil matter between two citizens where the state merely acts as a passive referee. However, Texas Family Code § 102.007 and § 231.101 explicitly authorize the Attorney General to automatically intervene, file pleadings, and become a necessary party to any suit where Title IV-D services are requested or triggered by default through state assistance programs.

When combined with § 6.406, which mandates that parental status must be injected into every divorce proceeding, the state has built a structural dragnet. The state creates the legal requirement to litigate, dictates the supreme policy standard of review (§ 153.002), inserts its chief executive law officer (the AG) into the docket, and deploys its own executive-funded judges to enforce the output. This satisfies every element of a State-Initiated Enforcement Action, rendering the "private litigation" defense a total legal fiction, (and a conspiracy to conceal federal crimes).

Section A4.04: Direct Financial Benefit and Collusion Metrics

The operational scheme where the Texas Attorney General and Texas family court judges actively cooperate to administer and enforce the Title IV-D program creates an unconstitutional conflict of interest and an ongoing Separation of Powers violation. The OAG and the state judiciary operate under an explicit financial cooperative contract. The OAG receives federal matching funds based on child support collection volume, and a portion of those federal funds is directly funneled back to local counties to subsidize the budgets of the family court judiciary, local district clerks, and county sheriffs who execute child support warrants. This creates a systemic conflict of interest. The judge sitting on the bench has a direct, institutional financial interest in finding in favor of the Attorney General's positions, establishing support orders, and sustaining high-volume extractions. The judiciary is no longer a neutral, detached check against executive overreach; it is a financial partner with the executive branch.

Consequently, Title IV-D Associate Judges and standard family court judicatories directly financially benefit from the forced labor and peonage enterprise within the explicit meaning of 18 U.S.C. § 1589(b). Under the Texas Legislative Budget Board metrics, the salaries,

retirement benefits, health insurance, and courtroom infrastructure of Title IV-D Associate Judges are directly paid out of the OAG's Title IV-D Child Support appropriation pool. If child support orders are not continuously generated through the abuse of legal process (threatening parents with jail to force them to labor in the market), the federal Title IV-D matching funds and performance incentive bonuses dry up. The judge's own salary and livelihood are directly tied to the successful execution of the forced labor ring. Because these judges are trained legal professionals who actively choose to draw their personal livelihoods from an ultra vires, void ab initio statutory track that uses the threat of physical restraint to extort wealth from fit citizens, they act with criminal reckless disregard under § 1589(b). They are receiving a direct, personal financial benefit from an ongoing forced labor venture. They have no judicial immunity for these non-judicial, commercial extractions, rendering their personal assets and state salaries open to absolute civil liquidation under 18 U.S.C. § 1595.

CHAPTER V: FEDERAL OFFICER LIABILITY AND STATUTORY CONSTITUTIONAL INCORPORATION

Section A5.01: The Doctrine of Implied Constitutional Incorporation

Federal officials within the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) and the Office of Child Support Services (OCSS) who establish, monitor, and formally certify that the Texas Title IV-D child support program complies with federal mandates operate with criminal reckless disregard under 18 U.S.C. § 1589(b) and fail the civil rationally believe standard. Under established federal statutory construction rules, every federal statute inherently incorporates the United States Constitution as if those protections were written directly into the text.

Every act of Congress must be read in complete harmony with the Constitution. Federal statutory law explicitly dictates that the mandates of the Constitution are inherently written into every section of the United States Code. As the United States Supreme Court established in the landmark case *Crowell v. Benson*, 285 U.S. 22 (1932), and reaffirmed in *Edward J. DeBartolo Corp. v. Florida Gulf Coast Building & Construction Trades Council*, 485 U.S. 568 (1988), if an otherwise statutory mandate can be interpreted to cause a constitutional violation, the court must adopt an alternative construction that completely avoids the constitutional defect. Therefore, Title IV-D (42 U.S.C. §§ 651–669b) does not exist in a vacuum; the Fourteenth Amendment Due Process Clause, the Thirteenth Amendment Prohibition on Peonage, and the Fourth Amendment are textually and legally part of the Title IV-D statute itself.

Federal administrative officials routinely raise the defense of "administrative insulation," arguing that their role is strictly ministerial: they check whether a state has passed the mandatory automated data tracking systems, established the Title IV-D associate judge roles, and hit the collection metrics prescribed by Congress. However, because constitutional mandates are legally written into the statute, a federal official who certifies a state program that violates individual constitutional immunities is actively certifying a program that violates the federal statute itself. They cannot decouple the statutory text from its constitutional boundaries. The assertion that they "strictly apply the statutory mandates without consideration of constitutional mandates" is a logical and legal impossibility that confirms their ultra vires posture.

Section A5.02: Bypassing Sovereign Immunity for Federal Officials

To maintain an administrative defense of official or qualified immunity, a federal official must demonstrate that their actions were objectively reasonable and grounded in a rational interpretation of settled law. Once a federal official is formally put on notice (via a Public Notice of Constitutional Defect or a formal civil rights report) that the Texas Family Code uses a mandatory statutory dragnet (§ 6.406) to strip fit parents of co-equal liberties by default, the official can no longer rationally believe the Texas program is lawful. Continuing to certify that the Texas program complies with federal guidelines—when the program openly uses an unconstitutional inversion of individual liberties to extract capital—is an act that completely fails the "rationally believe" standard. The official is consciously certifying a civil nullity.

Under 18 U.S.C. § 1589(b), standalone criminal liability is fully executed by anyone who knowingly benefits from or participates in a venture that obtains labor through an abuse of legal process, operating with reckless disregard of the underlying coercive mechanism. Federal Title IV-D officials are not disconnected bystanders; they are the primary engineers and financiers of the entire state-level venture. They manage the FFP 66% matching fund streams and distribute performance cash bonuses based on the volume of support orders established. By certifying the Texas program while consciously disregarding the substantial and unjustifiable risk that Texas family court judicatories are using the threat of physical restraint (contempt jail) to enforce an un-scrutinized legislative policy agenda on fit citizens, the federal official crosses the threshold into criminal reckless disregard. They are actively rubber-stamping the financial pipeline of a forced labor ring to maintain their agency's bureaucratic empire.

Just as judicial immunity is completely neutralized by targeting non-state beneficiaries (as proven in Stage 14), federal sovereign immunity is entirely bypassed when launching an action under 18 U.S.C. § 1595 against federal officials in their individual capacities. While

the federal government claims sovereign immunity as an entity, 18 U.S.C. § 1595(a) explicitly grants a private right of action against "the perpetrator (or whoever knowingly benefits... from participation in a venture)." This statutory remedy targets the individual person of the federal official who signed the unconstitutional certification.⁴ Because constitutional mandates are inherently written into Title IV-D, and because the fundamental right to parent free from state agenda interference is clearly established (Troxel), a federal official holds zero qualified immunity for certifying a known constitutional violation. The plaintiff parent can launch a direct federal civil action under § 1595, using the lower preponderance of the evidence standard to expose that the federal child support state is actively financing a criminal peonage venture under color of administrative law.

CHAPTER VI: HISTORICAL TEXAS AG LIABILITY AND THE EXECUTIVE CONTINUITY OF CRIME

Section A6.01: The Executive Chain of Enterprise Criminality

Past and previous Texas Attorneys General, during their respective executive tenures, met the federal criminal standard of reckless disregard under 18 U.S.C. § 1589(b). By continuously accepting, expanding, and absorbing Title IV-D federal matching funds and performance bonuses into their agency's centralized operating budgets, these officials directly participated in a commercial venture that relies on an abuse of law or legal process to enforce economic peonage. Because the constitutional boundaries protecting parental fitness and separating administrative policy from independent judicial power are clearly established, their conscious decision to prioritize agency monetization over federal constitutional mandates establishes a *prima facie* federal felony.

Under federal anti-trafficking and forced labor jurisprudence, reckless disregard does not require the government to prove that an executive official held a subjective, malicious desire to enslave citizen litigants. The standard requires only a showing of conscious indifference to a substantial and unjustifiable risk that the venture is utilizing an abuse of law or legal process. For sequential Texas Attorneys General, this risk was not merely potential—it was actively documented, litigated, and embedded within their own agency operations across four specific executive tenures:

⁴ The federal official tasked with officially signing off on Title IV-D State Plan certifications and amendments is the **Regional Administrator** of the **Administration for Children and Families (ACF)**, or their designated Regional Hub Director.

a. Attorney General Dan Morales (Tenure: January 15, 1991 – January 13, 1999)

- **The Act of Acceptance:** Morales oversaw the massive modernization and monetization of the OAG Child Support Division following the federal Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA) of 1996. He accepted hundreds of millions of dollars in federal Title IV-D computerization and enforcement grants.
- **The Reckless Disregard Proof:** Morales actively converted the OAG into a high-volume collection business. He expanded the use of the default "best interest" track to target non-welfare, fit parents solely to maximize federal performance metrics. By intentionally structuring agency operations to treat intact family structures as administrative revenue generators, he established the baseline pattern of conscious indifference to the constitutional right to family integrity.

b. Attorney General John Cornyn (Tenure: January 13, 1999 – November 30, 2002)

- **The Act of Acceptance:** Cornyn accepted and managed a multi-million-dollar biennial Title IV-D budget. He used federal funds to fully implement the automated Texas Child Support Enforcement System (TXCSES) tracking data grid.
- **The Reckless Disregard Proof:** Prior to becoming Attorney General, Cornyn served as a Texas Supreme Court Justice. He possessed elite, expert knowledge of constitutional law, the separation of powers, and the strict limits of judicial discretion. When he assumed the executive role of Attorney General and chose to enforce the automated Title IV-D dragnet—knowing that the parallel Master/Associate judge system unconstitutionally usurped core Article V judicial power—his expert judicial background turned his passive execution of state law into a definitive criminal act of reckless disregard. He knew the system was structurally void, yet he accepted the financial benefits to build state-wide political capital.

c. Attorney General Greg Abbott (Tenure: December 2, 2002 – January 20, 2015)

- **The Act of Acceptance:** Abbott accepted the largest Title IV-D allocations in Texas history, building a biennial child support budget that exceeded \$1.4 Billion.
- **The Reckless Disregard Proof:** Abbott's reckless disregard is permanently documented by his own hand. As proven in this addendum (Volume II, Chapter I. Section A1.01), Abbott issued Texas AG Opinion No. GA-0260 (2004), explicitly ruling that a court cannot use a raw "best interest" test to bypass constitutional Strict Scrutiny. Despite formally publishing this constitutional boundary, Abbott spent the next decade as Attorney General actively directing his Child Support Division to utilize the un-scrutinized, default "shall always" track of § 153.002 to extract billions

of dollars from fit parents. He explicitly recognized the constitutional boundary in an advisory capacity, but deliberately ignored it in his operational capacity to protect his agency's revenue, establishing absolute criminal intent under 18 U.S.C. § 1589(b).

d. Attorney General Ken Paxton (Tenure: January 20, 2015 – Present)

- **The Act of Acceptance:** Paxton continues to accept and expand a biennial title IV-D child support budget that currently sits at approximately \$1.76 Billion.
- **The Reckless Disregard Proof:** Paxton's tenure has operated in the wake of the Texas Supreme Court's landmark decision in *In re C.J.C.* (2020) and the passage of Article I, Section 37 of the Texas Constitution, both of which explicitly solidify the fundamental right of parents against un-scrutinized state intervention. By continuing to execute Title IV-D enforcement actions against fit parents in co-parent litigation—while systematically withholding the fit-parent presumption that his office is legally mandated to honor under *In re C.J.C.*—Paxton maintains a facially discriminatory classification scheme. Accepting billions in federal matching funds derived from an ongoing, unconstitutional judicial inversion proves a continuous pattern of criminal reckless disregard.

This historical line of succession exposes that the criminal violation is institutionalized. Each successive Attorney General did not inherit a clean executive slate; they inherited an ongoing association-in-fact enterprise designed to extract wealth from citizens through a structural abuse of legal process. When a new Attorney General takes the oath of office, looks at the multi-million-dollar federal Title IV-D cash flow, and chooses to sign the biennial Legislative Appropriations Request (LAR) to keep that cash flow active without altering the unconstitutional courtroom mechanisms, they are re-executing the federal felony under 18 U.S.C. § 1589(b). They are knowingly accepting the proceeds of a forced labor venture.

CHAPTER VII: THE UPLC RETALIATORY SCREEN & VENTURE LIABILITY EXPOSURE MATRIX

Section A7.01: The Systemic Shielding of the Commercial Enterprise

The Texas Unauthorized Practice of Law Committee (UPLC) and its appointing body, the Texas Supreme Court, act with criminal reckless disregard under 18 U.S.C. § 1589(b) and fail the civil rationally believe standard. By systematically deploying civil prosecutions and maintaining a public blacklist of family law reformers who expose the unconstitutionality of

Chapter 153, the UPLC operates as a retaliatory enforcement screen. It functions as a blocking mechanism designed to insulate the multi-billion-dollar Title IV-D commercial enterprise from public exposure, judicial scrutiny, and criminal accountability.

Under 18 U.S.C. § 1589(b), criminal liability attaches to anyone who knowingly benefits from, or participates in a venture that obtains labor through an abuse of legal process, operating with reckless disregard of the underlying coercive mechanism. The UPLC cannot claim that its public blacklisting and prosecution of family law reformers is a separate, isolated regulatory duty. Under federal anti-trafficking and racketeering jurisprudence, an entity participates in a venture if its actions are designed to sustain, protect, or conceal the economic viability of that enterprise.

The UPLC's structural participation is executed through two unevadable phases:

1. **Selective Enforcement and Viewpoint Suppression:** The UPLC maintains a published registry of individuals it has civilly prosecuted for the unauthorized practice of law. When an individual on that list is targeted precisely because they are publishing constitutional analyses, statutory models, and pro se motions designed to help fit parents defeat the court's unconstitutional child support and amicus machinery, the UPLC is engaging in viewpoint-based suppression. The Committee is not protecting the public from fraudulent, incompetent legal representation; it is actively weaponizing Texas Government Code § 81.101 to strip citizen litigants of the exact intellectual resources required to expose the court's ultra vires posture.
2. **The Shielding of the Commercial Enterprise:** The economic survival of the Texas family court venture relies entirely on the systemic compliance of the population. If parents universally learn how to deploy the Troxel presumption, strict scrutiny separate tracks, and the Santosky error to strip the trial courts of baseline jurisdiction, the OAG's Title IV-D biennial child support cash flow—which generates over \$1.76 Billion in state-wide revenue—would instantly collapse. By using pre-trial injunctions and public blacklisting to destroy the credibility and operations of reformers, the UPLC acts as the corporate security arm of the venture. It actively shields the commercial enterprise from the precise constitutional litigation that would execute its total legal dissolution.

To maintain an immunity shield or defend against a Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 13 sanctions filing, the UPLC and its appointing Justices must prove that they could rationally believe their enforcement actions were a lawful, constitutional deployment of state power. This baseline is structurally destroyed by their own actions. Once the UPLC is formally put

on notice that the underlying child custody and support processes are void ab initio (Stage 9) and satisfy the elements of federal criminal peonage (Stage 13), the Committee cannot rationally believe that silencing individuals who expose those crimes is a valid legal act.⁵

Enforcing a content-based prior restraint to suppress speech that documents state-sponsored economic servitude is an act of absolute bad faith. The UPLC cannot rationally claim it is "protecting the integrity of the bar" when it is actively using the bar's regulatory monopoly to enforce silence over ongoing civil rights crimes. The Justices of the Texas Supreme Court who manage and fund this committee are stripped of all official immunity because they are using their administrative office to supervise a retaliatory protection racket.

The UPLC's published blacklist provides the definitive evidentiary ledger necessary to secure a federal felony conviction under 18 U.S.C. § 1589(b). By actively choosing to hunt down, prosecute, and publicly defame individuals who are attempting to restore constitutional due process to the family court system, the UPLC operates with absolute, criminal reckless disregard. They are fully aware of the substantial and unjustifiable risk that Chapter 153 is an unconstitutional, coercive dragnet. Instead of executing their Supremacy Clause mandate to self-correct, they choose to act as a system of administrative intimidation, using the color of law to suppress the information necessary for citizen parents to perform their own risk analyses. This targeted suppression of civil rights defense machinery satisfies every element of active participation in a forced labor venture via reckless disregard for financial benefit.

⁵ The UPLC once, many years ago, tried to go after us. We instantly sued them in federal court asserting that the statute they were applying against us was an impermissible viewpoint-based prior restraint and that the Texas Supreme Court was violating the Separation of Powers mandate of Art. 2., Sec. 1., Tex. Const. We were NOT prepared at that point for a nasty fight, and we filed federal suit before the hook was completely set.

However, before dismissing the suit as being premature, the federal magistrate told the UPLC very clearly that we had met our burden to receive preliminary injunctive relief against them and their statutes. From that instant, they were on notice of their illegal actions. They have NOT bothered us at all since that time, but they continue to unjustly persecute those who do NOT know how to defend themselves and publish their successes on the Internet. The UPLC reports directly to the Texas Supreme Court. They are the ones who are ultimately responsible for these crimes.

CHAPTER VIII: THE UNIFORM CODES AND THE NATIONWIDE EXTENSION OF THE FORCED LABOR VENTURE

Section A8.01: Technical Statement of the Proposition & Statutory Derivation

The structural, constitutional, and criminal proofs developed throughout The Constitutional Collapse of the Texas Family Code are not provincial anomalies unique to the jurisdiction of Texas. By applying a strict textualist⁶ and jurisdictional analysis to the Uniform Child Custody Jurisdiction and Enforcement Act (UCCJEA) and the Uniform Interstate Family Support Act (UIFSA), it is documentarily proven that the multi-billion-dollar Title IV-D commercial enterprise has weaponized these uniform codes to nationalize the forced labor venture across all fifty states and federal territories.

The Texas Family Code serves merely as a clear operational example of a standardized national framework. The UCCJEA and UIFSA act as structural interstate transmission lines. They allow an ultra vires, void ab initio administrative policy decree generated in one state to bypass local constitutional limits and be automatically executed inside another state's jurisdiction. This systemic integration forces local judiciaries to act as passive collection agents for out-of-state entities, nationalizing the deprivation of civil rights under color of law (18 U.S.C. § 242).

Section A8.02: The Facial Unconstitutionality of the Uniform Codes under Title IV-D

I. The UCCJEA Inversion Engine

The UCCJEA (codified in Texas under Chapter 152 and adopted nationwide) is facially unconstitutional under the proofs of this treatise because it commands the automatic enforcement of custody decrees without requiring a threshold jurisdictional finding of parental unfitness or specific harm by the issuing court.

- **The Textual Defect:** Under standard UCCJEA registration and enforcement provisions (e.g., UCCJEA § 305/§ 306), a local state court shall recognize and enforce a child custody determination of a court of another state. By using the non-discretionary command "shall," the code strips the receiving court of its essential Article V independent judicial power to conduct a baseline check on the constitutional validity of the foreign order.

⁶ In a Republic such as ours where laws are enacted via a democratic process, those who vote on the laws we apply can only vote on the text that is presented. If the text is clear and unambiguous and does not conflict with the principles of freedom enshrined in our constitution, then those clear and unambiguous words are the law and nothing else can be. The only intent that can legitimately be applied is the intent of those who fought the Revolutionary War, NOT for democracy, NOT for "ordered liberty," NOT for a federal or state government, but for FREEDOM as declared in our Declaration of Independence. Any other biases are invalid.

- **The Inversion:** If State A issued an order by stripping two fit parents of their Troxel presumptions under a raw legislative policy agenda ("best interest"), that order is void ab initio. When the UCCJEA forces State B to execute that void decree under threat of civil contempt or immediate law-enforcement pick-up orders, State B is actively executing an unconstitutional policy-enforcement action. The UCCJEA functions as a cross-border conveyor belt for structural error, making its implementation objectively unreasonable under *Gates v. Texas Dept. of Protective & Regulatory Services*.

II. The UIFSA Asset-Surveillance Dragnet

The UIFSA (codified in Texas under Chapter 159 and adopted nationwide under direct federal mandate 42 U.S.C. § 666) is a direct instrument of Federal Criminal Forced Labor (18 U.S.C. § 1589) and Peonage (18 U.S.C. § 1581).

- **The Textual Defect:** UIFSA § 316 and § 501 permit the out-of-state transmission of administrative wage withholding orders directly to a citizen's employer, entirely bypassing a localized judicial hearing or an adjudicative determination of fitness. Furthermore, UIFSA § 317 grants the state Title IV-D agency sweeping, cross-border powers to compel the production of private financial assets, bank records, and employment histories without a warrant and without a localized showing of probable cause.
- **The Forced Labor Trigger:** Because the financial debt transferred via the UIFSA is calculated inside an ultra vires forum using a default legislative track rather than constitutional strict scrutiny, the underlying obligation is a civil nullity. Using the interstate machinery of the UIFSA to seize corporate earnings and execute warrantless financial searches across state lines—backed by the threat of interstate capias warrants and physical jail—satisfies every explicit element of an abuse of the legal process under 18 U.S.C. § 1589(c)(1) to eliminate a citizen's meaningful choice.

III. The Modern Bastardy Machine: Immediate Non-Marital Nullification

The Uniform Codes, operating in tandem with federal Title IV-D paternity establishment mandates, facilitate the immediate, automatic nullification of a non-marital father's constitutional guarantees.

- **The Operational Loop:** The instant an administrative or judicial determination of parentage is entered against a father who is not married to the mother, the uniform codes and tracking state statutes perform a dual-action constitutional subversion. First, the father is structurally bound to the economic obligations of the state-engineered debt via the automatic order-establishment machinery of Title IV-D. Second, the father's fundamental constitutional right to care, custody, control, and association is simultaneously nullified.
- **Modern Filius Nullius:** Instead of clothing the newly adjudicated father in the Troxel fit-parent presumption, the uniform tracks default the custody and decision-making power

exclusively to the mother or the state's administrative machinery, treating the child as a modern filius nullius (the child of no one) [Stage 10]. The father is forced into a defensive posture where he must pay private counsel or amicus fees to litigate under an un-scrutinized "best interest" track just to win back natural associational rights. Denying an individual a fundamental liberty shield based on their marital status at the moment of parentage establishment constitutes a facial violation of the Equal Protection Clause and completely fails Strict Scrutiny.

Section A8.03: Nationwide Mapping of State-Initiated Divorce Dragnets

The foundational proof established in Stage 8 of this treatise demonstrates that Texas Family Code § 6.406 functions as a self-executing statutory dragnet. By mandating that a suit for dissolution of a marriage must include a Suit Affecting the Parent-Child Relationship (SAPCR), the state transforms a private contract dissolution into a State-Initiated, State-Enforced Political Policy Action. This identical structural distortion operates across all fifty states and federal territories through local statutory equivalents that enforce mandatory, unconstitutional joinder.

MANDATORY STATUTORY JOINDER DRAGNETS

- Texas Family Code § 6.406 ("Must Include" SAPCR)
- California Family Code § 2330 / § 3120 (Mandatory Joinder)
- Florida Statutes § 61.043 / § 61.13 (Coerced Jurisdiction)
- New York DRL § 240 (Mandatory "Best Interest" Inception)
- Washington Rev. Code § 26.09.020 (Forced Parenting Plan)
- D.C. Code § 16-914 / Federal Territories (Forced Policy Track), (Self-Executing Constitutional Penalty)

TOTAL ANNIHILATION OF INDIVIDUAL FUNDAMENTAL LIBERTIES

- The State seizes parental status as a condition of divorce.
- Triggers 18 U.S.C. § 242 Criminal Liability Nationwide.

EXAMPLE STATES

1. *California*

- **Statutory Core:** California Family Code § 2330 and § 3120.
- **Operational Application under the Proofs:** In the State of California, a petition for dissolution of marriage must state whether there are minor children of the marriage and automatically forces the inclusion of a custody determination. This mandatory joinder triggers the automatic application of Cal. Fam. Code § 3011 and § 3020, which elevate a state-defined public policy agenda over private constitutional immunities. The court

seizes the parents' fundamental liberties at the moment of filing, executing an immediate due process injury under the Gates standard before any adjudication of unfitness occurs.

2. Mississippi

- **Statutory Core:** Mississippi Code § 93-5-23.
- **Operational Application under the Proofs:** Mississippi law mandates that in any decree for divorce, the court shall make all orders touching the care, custody, and maintenance of the children. This statutory hook forces fit parents directly into an unsaved legislative track where their individual rights are subordinated to an open-ended judicial evaluation. Because the judge has zero authority to grant the divorce without seisin over the children's legal status, the state acts as the primary aggressive initiator of the family disruption.

3. Florida

- **Statutory Core:** Florida Statutes § 61.043 and § 61.13.
- **Operational Application under the Proofs:** Florida law commands that a petition for dissolution of marriage must state the name and age of any co-equal minor children, automatically triggering the court's mandatory jurisdiction to create a state-approved "Parenting Plan" and "Time-Sharing Schedule" under the raw rubric of the child's best interest. This mandatory joinder functions as a direct structural penalty for divorce, violating the Fourteenth Amendment by stripping fit citizens of their natural parental presumptions against the bench's state action.

4. New York

- **Statutory Core:** New York Domestic Relations Law (DRL) § 240.
- **Operational Application under the Proofs:** New York DRL § 240 commandingly dictates that in any action for divorce, the court must give such direction for the custody and care of any child of the parties as justice requires, having regard to the best interests of the child. The word "must" locks the New York judiciary into an unconstitutional legislative decision track, executing a direct violation of the Separation of Powers doctrine by forcing a state policy agenda directly into the adjudicative phase of a private trial.

4. Washington State

- **Statutory Core:** Revised Code of Washington (RCW) § 26.09.020 and § 26.09.050.
- **Operational Application under the Proofs:** Washington law mandates that any petition for dissolution of marriage must include a proposed "Permanent Parenting Plan." This statutory mechanism coerces fit parents into submitting their private family structure to

state administrative oversight as a baseline condition of marital dissolution, executing a self-executing constitutional injury at inception.

6. The District of Columbia and Federal Territorial Courts Generally

- **Statutory Core:** D.C. Code § 16-914; 48 U.S.C. §§ 1451–1493 (Vesting of legislative and judicial power in U.S. Territories including Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands).
- **Operational Application under the Proofs:** In the District of Columbia and across all federal territorial courts governed by direct congressional organic acts, mandatory joinder rules force the absolute capture of parental liberties by default at filing. Because federal territorial courts are created directly under the legislative authority of Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the United States Constitution (The Territory Clause), the application of un-scrutinized policy tracks to strip fit parents of fundamental rights comprises a direct, federal state-initiated deprivation of civil rights. The judges sitting on these territorial benches operate completely outside an independent Article III adjudicative capacity, executing a continuous forced labor venture that directly funds state and federal matching lines.

Section A8.04: Universal 50-State Execution & The Failure to Supervise

The comparative analysis of these uniform codes and localized statutory dragnets establishes an inescapable truth: The Texas Family Code is analyzed in this treatise merely as an operational example of a standardized national framework. This identical, commercialized modern slavery scheme operates seamlessly across all 50 states, the District of Columbia, and all federal territories.

Every single state family court judge who enforces the UCCJEA or UIFSA to execute a void foreign order, every state official who accepts Title IV-D matching funds to expand their child support operations, and every managing partner of a private law firm who cashes a shared partnership check derived from these un-scrutinized policy dockets operates in a state of absolute Objective Unreasonableness.

Their collective Failure to Supervise their subordinates and their continuous participation in this cross-border revenue extraction engine satisfies the explicit definitions of criminal reckless disregard under 18 U.S.C. § 1589(b), rendering the entire national network open to absolute federal question intervention and total civil liquidation under 18 U.S.C. § 1595.

MANDATORY COPYRIGHT STATEMENT

COPYRIGHT RON B PALMER AND SHERRY PALMER, LICENSED TO FIX FAMILY COURTS A DIVISION OF CONSTITUTIONAL SCHOLARS INC. A TEXAS CORPORATION.

THE DOCUMENT: THE CONSTITUTIONAL COLLAPSE OF THE TEXAS FAMILY CODE:
VOLUME II: THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH ADDENDUM

THE DOCUMENT MAY ONLY BE SHARED WITH THE FULL ATTRIBUTIONS TO RON B PALMER, SHERRY PALMER, AND FIX FAMILY COURTS, FixFamilyCourts.com

Attribution & Public Domain Declaration: This document is authored as part of a national educational initiative dedicated to returning domestic relations proceedings to First Principles of American Jurisprudence. It is protected by copyright, but all individuals are hereby granted limited license for free public duplication, distribution, and sharing, for educational and political purposes only, PROVIDED THIS DOCUMENT IS REPRODUCED IN ITS ENTIRETY WITHOUT ALTERATION TO ITS TEXT OR STRUCTURE WITH FULL ATTRIBUTIONS INCLUDED. Commercial Rights are Reserved. All Further Rights are Reserved.

THE CONSTITUTIONAL COLLAPSE OF THE TEXAS FAMILY CODE: VOLUME III

A Formal Legal Treatise and Substantive Proof Engine Exposing Widespread Civil Rights Violations, Separation of Powers Usurpation, and Criminal Peonage in Co-Parent Litigation

VOLUME III: STANDALONE LITIGATION & SERVICE SUITE (APPENDICES)

Sample Documents Demonstrating Real World Application of Incorporated Principles

Author and Principal Architect: Ron B. Palmer

Editor: Sherry Palmer

Affiliation: Fix Family Courts

PART I: PLUG-AND-PLAY SAMPLE WORK PRODUCTS

The sample work products provided in this section are examples based on Texas statutes, but they can be easily adapted to any state's rules and statutes. Our divorces were in Texas, and we know these statutes better than any, but we operate in all 50 states and in federal territories.

Texas Family Code Section 6.406 is a mandatory joinder statute mandating that anyone who files for divorce, where the parties to the divorce have minor children, must file a child custody suit titled a Suit Affecting the Parent Child Relationship (SAPCR). This statute converts the "civil suit between private parties" into a state-initiated suit where the interests of the state are asserted against the rights of the litigants by the judge without the state needing to appear in order to meet its burden of proof through testimony that is subject to confrontation and cross-examination, an abuse of law and process that nullify the judicial process and any claims that the judge is performing a judicial function.

The Texas Supreme Court holds that Santosky, the case mandating a separate fitness hearing before a different court before the state can presume that the interests of parent and child can diverge, doesn't apply in SAPCR between fit parents because it is a civil suit between private parties and Santosky was state initiated action.

Section 6.406 proves that to be a fraud⁷ perpetrated by the Texas Supreme Court. Section 6.406 is unquestionably a state mandate initiating state action against private parental rights that nullifies those rights the instant that the suit is filed through action of Section 153.002, the best interests of the child mandate.

Every state family code produces the same result through various different mechanisms. Some states assert outright that child custody is conditioned on marriage or divorce. This has been held by the United States Supreme Court to be unconstitutional since 1968 when the Court began a multi-case process that completely dismantled Bastardy Codes, which were held to be “illogical and unjust” penalties imposed on the child to punish the parents for marital choices the state disfavored where the child did NO wrong and had NO authority whatsoever over their parents’ marital choices, those choices being an exercise of fundamental privacy rights based on speaking and associating in the context of a marital relationship.

What all of these courts, even the United States Supreme Court, avoid like the plague is any formal recognition, in the context of marriage and divorce, that marriage is an intimate and expressive, close family association between two private individuals serving the function of facilitating intimate and expressive speech in the uniquely private context of a marital relationship because they know that imposing First Amendment scrutiny to family law practices, and gay marriage for that matter, would destroy family law as we know it.

The right to marry, the right NOT to marry, and the right to divorce are all privacy choices that are intimately bound up with speech and association choices that the state may NOT punish or limit. The right NOT to speak and associate or to stop speaking and associating are protected equally with the right to speak and the right to associate, *Janus v. American Federation of State*, 585 U.S. 878 (2018).

When your state statutes directly tie the loss of your parental rights to a choice to divorce, the statute facially penalizes First Amendment protected privacy choices. That makes the statute facially unconstitutional even without the extra best interests mechanism. Texas is a bit sneakier about how it structures its statutes than many states.

⁷ Troxel cites Santosky in a child custody case for the premise that parental rights are broadly fundamental. Texas courts routinely violate the Non-Contradiction in Scrutiny Principle and the Absolute Separation of Scrutiny Principle by asserting that, rights fundamental in other areas of law are somehow NOT fundamental in child custody suits between fit parents, by refusing to permit use of the Santosky precedent in child custody cases. These are clear abuses of law and process that provide evidence of judicial involvement in maintaining the illegal venture for profit. Attorneys arguing against core legal principles without clearly stating that they are challenging the principle are likely engaging in Reckless Disregard.

This is all very well-established basic law of the United States that is beyond question in every other area of law. Everyone in the system operates from the false presumption that if the courts are allowing it, then it must be lawful and this is plain error. This combined with religious and societal biases regarding the source of parental rights, that stand in stark contrast with the individual nature of private rights against government action, create the default, but plainly false, presumption that parental rights come from marriage and can be denied based on divorce. This has been a provably false presumption since 1968.

The entire system operates from the false unstated assertion that there exists a family law exception to the Supremacy Clause and from the Supremacy Clause's Rule of Decision, but this simply can NOT be, which every attorney is required to know and can be sanctioned for asserting otherwise under the Objectively Unreasonable Standard.

This is the lie they tell when they argue that the state's alleged "duty to pay 'income-based' child support" nullifies federal rights and nullifies the federal constitutional guarantees mandated to protect those rights. Yet any competent attorney will tell you that the state lacks any possible source of authority to nullify federal rights. When a single family law attorney in the largest law firm in the country makes this argument in court to win an award of "income-based" child support and some portion of his fees make their way into shared partner profits, every partner in that law firm, regardless of whether they have zero contact with their family law division, potentially becomes liable to mandatory civil penalties, under a ten-year statute of limitations, that potentially come in the form of treble damages. They also potentially become liable to felony indictment from little more than cashing a check.

This is well-established Texas Supreme Court precedent, Grigsby v. Coker, 904 SW 2d 619, 620, 621 (Tex: Supreme Court 1995), (While section 11.11 does give trial courts broad powers in family cases, **it does not authorize them to invade constitutional guarantees.**)⁸

Where your judge lacks legitimate judicial authority and is plainly issuing unconstitutional advisory orders that are properly legally classified as either absolute nullities or executive functions, that impacts their immunity, but even more importantly it is an abuse of law and process that is a key trigger in civil and criminal felony forced labor claims and an essential element of the crime.

When a judge enforces nullities imposed through executive authority under the guise of judicial contempt powers as a means to compel a disfavored parent to continue laboring or

⁸ Section 11.11 refers to the temporary orders statute in the Texas Family Code that was active in 1995. The Texas Family Code underwent its major, sweeping renumbering and recodification in **1997**.

face legal penalties, that judge likely commits all elements of the forced labor felony (abuses of law or process combined with legal penalties applied to compel labor).

The Thirteenth Amendment and the federal forced labor statutes established to enforce its terms apply to everyone, private and state actor alike. What this means is that you can directly sue private actors to challenge the constitutionality of your state family code. Absolute judicial immunity, the shield that has created this monstrosity and permitted it to survive for so long, is simply irrelevant and the judge can't even challenge it if you don't sue the judge because they aren't a party to the suit.

The absolute beauty of applying forced labor statutes in this manner to challenge family court corruption is that all you really need to do is to place the law firms and the private consulting firms engaged in Title IV-D consulting on notice that they are potentially profiting from an illegal forced labor venture as described in this document, and in their rush to avoid firm ending liabilities and potential felony convictions resulting in 20-year prison terms, the rich and powerful will dismantle this corrupt system for us or face nearly certain mandatory firm-ending treble damages relief.

Profiting from the crime carries the exact same penalties as committing the core crime. Recklessly disregarding the source of that profit is the triggering mechanism. The notices below, when served through the organization's formal legal service receipt mechanisms, are intended to lock in the reckless disregard element if the organization fails to take adequate measures to correct the issue.

The vitally important part of this is that it doesn't really matter if, at the end of the day, the courts come up with some twisted distorted interpretation of law to protect their own interests, because this document provides far more than enough to initiate a suit and every attorney knows that once you enter a courtroom, anything can happen. These notices are about risk management against potential firm-ending liability where family law and Title IV-D consulting is a tiny fraction of a large firm's overall revenues.

**ARE THE OTHER LAW OR CONSULTING PARTNERS WILLING TO TAKE THE
ASTRONOMICAL RISKS OF POTENTIAL FIRM-ENDING LIABILITY AND POTENTIAL
FELONY CONVICTION FOR THE FEW EXTRA DOLLARS IN THEIR SHARED PROFITS
CHECK THAT COME FROM THEIR FAMILY LAW OR TITLE IV-D DIVISION?**

These notices are included in this document to show those who are guilty that filing this is simple and very likely to happen. Some law firm, perhaps staffed with former federal prosecutors who never engaged in family law, is going to make its partners extremely rich by pursuing this as a RICO case.

File the notices and let's see how they run for the exits. We can NOT do this ourselves because our children aged out over a decade ago and we prevented them from enslaving us in the "income-based" child support forced labor venture.

CAUTION: DO NOT MAKE ANY DIRECT LEGAL OR CRIMINAL CLAIMS ABOUT ANY OF THESE PRIVATE INDIVIDUALS OR FIRMS IN ANY OF THESE NOTICES. SAVE THAT FOR COURT FILINGS WHERE YOU ARE PROTECTED AGAINST POSSIBLE DEFAMATION CHARGES TO SCARE YOU INTO SUBMISSION. READ THESE SAMPLES CAREFULLY. ADJUST THE WORDING TO YOUR SPECIFIC RISK TOLERANCE BUT THERE IS NO REQUIREMENT THAT YOU MAKE ANY CLAIMS BEYOND NOTIFYING THEM OF THE LIABILITIES THEY MAY "POTENTIALLY" FACE AS A CURTESY TO THEM BEFORE YOU MAKE ANY FINAL DECISIONS ABOUT SUING ANYONE.

THE WORD "POTENTIALLY" IS USED TO PROTECT YOU FROM VISCIOUS ATTACKS INTENDED TO BEAT YOU DOWN OR SCARE YOU OFF UNDER CLAIMS OF DEFAMATION. DON'T PUBLICIZE ANY NOTICES WITH SPECIFICALLY NAMED PARTIES BEYOND SERVING THEM ON THOSE PARTIES, THAT WAY, THEY CAN NOT ACCUSE YOU OF CREATING MARKET OR FINANCIAL DAMAGES THROUGH DEFAMATION.

SO LONG AS YOU KEEP THE NOTICES ONLY BETWEEN YOU AND THE OTHER PARTY AND YOU PHRASE EVERYTHING AS YOUR MERE OPINION, REGARDING LEGAL MATTERS WHERE YOU HOLD NO LICENSE OF COMPETENCY, COMMUNICATED TO THEM PRIOR TO YOUR MAKING ANY FINAL CHOICES REGARDING LEGAL ACTION AS A CURTESY TO THEM, THE FIRST AMENDMENT PROVIDES MAXIMUM PROTECTION.

DO YOUR OWN RESEARCH. DON'T TRUST OUR INTERPRETATIONS. DON'T TRUST ANY AI INTERPRETATION. CERTAINLY, DON'T TRUST ANY ATTORNEY WHO MAY BE FACING CAREER-ENDING LIABILITY BECAUSE OF THEIR DIRECT OR INDIRECT PARTICIPATION IN THIS CRIME. WHILE THEY MAY HAVE NO DIRECT LIABILITY, THEIR WIFE OR BROTHER MAY BE A FAMILY LAW ATTORNEY FACING LIABILITY AND WE ALREADY KNOW FAMILY LAW ATTORNEYS ARE LYING ABOUT OUR NOT HAVING RIGHTS IN FAMILY LAW.

THIS DOCUMENT INCLUDES SUFFICIENT END-TO-END CASE CITATIONS TO PROVE THESE CLAIMS SUFFICIENTLY TO GET INTO A FEDERAL COURT TO PURSUE THEM. WHILE A FEW OF THE COMPLEMENTARY CITATIONS WERE PROVIDED BY AI, AND WE WILL VALIDATE EVERY ONE OF THEM AS QUICKLY AS WE CAN, THE CORE CITATIONS ARE SUFFICIENT ON THEIR OWN TO MAKE THIS CASE AND THEY ARE ALL FROM OPINIONS WE HAVE PERSONALLY STUDIED, MOST OF THEM FOR OVER A DECADE IN OUR 20-YEAR CRUSADE TO DESTROY THIS CORRUPT SYSTEM. MANY CAN BE FOUND CITED IN OUR FOUR BOOKS ON THIS SUBJECT.

NORMALLY, OUR FREE PUBLICATIONS DO NOT PROVIDE THIS LEVEL OF CITATION, BUT WE BELIEVE THAT THIS DOCUMENT WILL UTTERLY DESTROY FAMILY LAW AS WE KNOW IT AND FORCE THE SYSTEM TO BECOME CONSTITUTIONALLY COMPLIANT OR TO SIMPLY END AND THAT IS FAR MORE IMPORTANT TO US THAN ANY REVENUE GENERATION FROM CONSULTING FEES. AFTER NEARLY 20-YEARS GIVING THIS EVERYTHING WE HAVE, IT IS TIME TO DESTROY THIS CRIMINAL ENTERPRISE ONCE AND FOR ALL.

WE PROVIDED FULL CITATIONS BECAUSE WE WANT YOU TO BE ABLE TO PERSONALLY VALIDATE THESE PROOFS FOR YOURSELF BASED ON THE CORE CITATIONS WE USE IN OUR WORK.

KEEP IN MIND THAT THERE ARE DOZENS OF ADDITIONAL LEGAL PATHS UNDER WHICH THESE STATUTES CAN BE PROVEN TO BE NULLITIES THAT WE HAVE PERSONALLY DOCUMENTED AND HAVE CREATED PROOFS FOR. THOSE ARE HELD IN RESERVE TO COUNTER THE DIRTY TRICKS WE ALL KNOW THAT FAMILY LAW JUDGES EMPLOY SHOULD THEY RESIST THE INEVITABLE AND BECAUSE THEY ARE SO NUMEROUS WE WOULD NEVER BE ABLE TO FINISH THIS DOCUMENT, EVEN WITH THE ASSISTANCE OF AI.

Good luck with your own case. Hang in there. This travesty will hopefully be over very soon.

GET THE LATEST UPDATES AT: FixFamilyCourts.com/family-law-reform or at FamilyLawReform.org

FORMATTING NOTE FOR PARENTS: The sample documents below that are intended to be filed in court have their case styling block displayed the way we format them in Microsoft Word. We use a three-column table to provide the layout. Once it looks the way it is supposed to look, we change the table settings to NOT display the lines around the cells. This is the easiest way we have found to produce these styles.

I. SAMPLE WORK PRODUCT 1

a. Formal Comprehensive Federal Criminal Referral

The remainder of this page is intentionally left blank. See the next page for the work product.

TO: THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE FOR THE [INSERT DISTRICT, E.G., NORTHERN/SOUTHERN] DISTRICT OF TEXAS

FORMAL CRIMINAL REFERRAL: SYSTEMIC DEPRIVATION OF CIVIL RIGHTS UNDER COLOR OF LAW AND ECONOMIC PEONAGE VIA STRUCTURAL ABUSE OF LEGAL PROCESS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. §§ 241, 242, 1581, AND 1589

I. COMPLAINANT AND AFFIANT

I, [INSERT YOUR FULL LEGAL NAME], a citizen of the United States and a resident of [INSERT COUNTY], Texas, bring this formal criminal complaint to put the Department of Justice on notice of a widespread, ongoing criminal venture operating under color of state law within the family court judiciary of the State of Texas. This architecture is built upon the structural legal proofs developed by Ron B. Palmer of Fix Family Courts.

II. TARGETS OF COMPLAINT

This referral targets the following specific actors who have actively executed or financially benefited from a void, unconstitutional statutory framework with reckless disregard for federal protections:

1. **The Honorable [INSERT JUDGE'S FULL NAME]**, acting as presiding judge of the [INSERT COURT NUMBER] Judicial District Court of [INSERT COUNTY] County, Texas.
2. **[INSERT AMICUS/GAL ATTORNEY NAME]**, acting under color of a void court appointment as an officer of the court.
3. **[INSERT OPPOSING ATTORNEY/LAW FIRM NAME]**, acting as a private commercial beneficiary drawing from commingled firm profits derived from this illicit venture.

III. STATEMENT OF CRIMINAL OFFENSES

The above-named targets, acting individually and in a coordinated association-in-fact, have willfully violated the following federal criminal statutes, which are set forth with technical specificity below:

1. **18 U.S.C. § 242 (Deprivation of Rights Under Color of Law):** The targets have used the state's judicial machinery to execute an unconstitutional legislative policy agenda (**Texas Family Code Chapter 153**), which automatically strips fit citizens of their co-equal, fundamental constitutional protections—specifically the *Troxel v. Granville* fit-parent presumption—at the absolute initiation and filing of a standard divorce suit pursuant to **Texas Family Code § 6.406**. Because the judge and associated counsel enforce an overriding substantive policy mandate from which they have zero statutory authority to diverge, their court orders are *void ab initio*.

Enforcing a void decree to strip liberties constitutes an intentional deprivation under color of law.

2. **18 U.S.C. § 241 (Conspiracy Against Rights):** The targets have intentionally combined, agreed, and coordinated their courtroom actions to form a commercial enterprise designed to oppress and intimidate the citizen parent. They have substituted a raw legislative viewpoint test ("best interest") in place of constitutional strict scrutiny during the adjudicative phase of the proceedings, actively conspiring to override individual immunities for financial and administrative gain.
3. **18 U.S.C. §§ 1581 & 1589 (Peonage and Forced Labor):** The targets have committed an egregious **Abuse of Law and Legal Process**. They have utilized a *void ab initio* statutory track to manufacture predatory financial liabilities (including unconstitutional amicus fee assessments and state-matching metrics). They have subsequently deployed the court's contempt machinery, threatening the complainant with immediate **physical restraint** (incarceration) and the catastrophic **serious harm** of losing their natural family association, leaving the complainant with no meaningful choice but to continuously perform market labor to satisfy this state-engineered debt.

IV. EVIDENCE OF THE VENTURE

The records of Cause No. [INSERT CASE NUMBER], styled [INSERT CASE STYLE], demonstrate that the trial court entered the arena with its neutral adjudicative capacity completely pre-compromised. The court applied a default state policy agenda against a fit citizen from day one, tracking the exact mechanics of struck-down bastardy laws by treating a natural child as a ward of court administration solely as a penalty for the parents' marital choices.

V. DEMAND FOR IMMEDIATE ACTION

Because private third-party beneficiaries (the litigating law firms and private intermediaries) possess zero judicial or derivative immunity under federal law, the Department of Justice faces an absolute statutory duty to initiate a comprehensive grand jury investigation. Complainant demands that the FBI seize the billing ledgers, operating accounts, and internal communications of the targets to stop this systemic, commercialized modern slavery.

AFFIRMED UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY THIS ____ DAY OF _____, 2026.

SIGNATURE: _____

PRINT NAME: [INSERT YOUR FULL NAME]

III. SAMPLE WORK PRODUCT 2

a. Thirteenth Amendment Forced Labor and Peonage Specification Ledger

The remainder of this page is intentionally left blank. See the next page for the work product.

CAUSE NO. [INSERT CASE NUMBER]

IN THE MATTER OF THE	§	IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF
MARRIAGE OF [INSERT STYLE]	§	
	§	[INSERT COUNTY] COUNTY, TEXAS
AND IN THE INTEREST OF	§	
[INSERT CHILD INITIALS], A CHILD	§	[INSERT COURT NUMBER] DISTRICT COURT

EVIDENTIARY LEDGER SPECIFYING ACTS OF CRIMINAL PEONAGE AND FORCED LABOR DEPLOYED VIA STRUCTURAL ABUSE OF LEGAL PROCESS PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. §§ 1581, 1589, & 1595

COMES NOW [INSERT YOUR NAME], an individual citizen holding co-equal, fundamental constitutional immunities against the state action of this court, and files this explicit Evidentiary Ledger to isolate and document the mechanical financial extractions that constitute a federal forced labor venture under the parameters established by Ron B. Palmer of Fix Family Courts.

I. THE VOID PROCEDURAL FOUNDATION

This court has issued mandatory financial decrees under the authority of **Texas Family Code § 153.002**. Because this statute commands the judge to enforce a legislative policy agenda as the supreme, overriding criteria during the adjudicative phase of this trial without a prior threshold finding of parental unfitness, this forum is an ultra vires administrative compliance body. Its jurisdiction is broken, and its baseline orders are *void ab initio*.

II. SPECIFICATION OF LIABILITIES EXTORTED VIA ABUSE OF LEGAL PROCESS

The private, non-immune beneficiaries of this venture have used this void statutory baseline to construct the following extortionate billing metrics, using the court's process for a purpose for which it was not designed:

1. **The Predatory Amicus/GAL Assessment:** On [INSERT DATE], this court ordered the Complainant to pay a monetary assessment of \$_____ directly to [INSERT ATTORNEY NAME]. This intermediary bills hourly rates backed by the threat of judicial sanctions, forcing the parent to perform physical labor in the marketplace to discharge a state-concocted debt.
2. **The Commercial Psycho-Medical Extractions:** On [INSERT DATE], the court ordered an extraction of \$_____ for a mandatory child custody evaluation conducted by [INSERT EVALUATOR NAME]. This social study applies a default,

unconstitutional legislative viewpoint test against a fit citizen to generate a commercial profit for a private clinician.

3. **The State Title IV-D Matching Metric:** On [INSERT DATE], the court entered an order assessing a continuous monthly extraction of \$_____. This metric is designed to satisfy state incentive benchmarks under Title IV-D of the Social Security Act to pad the state's judicial line-item funding streams through the systematic destruction of the parental presumption.

III. THE COERCIVE MECHANISM OF THE VENTURE

To compel the Complainant to continuously perform labor to satisfy these void assessments, the targets have deployed an explicit **scheme, plan, or pattern** under 18 U.S.C. § 1589(a)(4). They have threatened that if the Complainant does not pay, the Complainant will face immediate **physical restraint** through the court's contempt and incarceration machinery, and will suffer the catastrophic **serious harm** of having their child dispossessed and kidnapped under color of law.

IV. NOTICE OF ENTERPRISE LIABILITY

Every partner in the litigating law firm of [INSERT FIRM NAME] draws from a centralized profit pool padded directly by these unconstitutional billings. Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 1589(b), their receipt of these commingled funds under a "should have known" standard executes immediate enterprise liability. Complainant reserves the right to launch a private federal action under **18 U.S.C. § 1595** and Civil RICO to claw back all firm assets, seize their corporate operating accounts, and execute a firm-ending liquidation of the entire private entity.

SIGNATURE: _____

DATE: [INSERT DATE]

IV. SAMPLE WORK PRODUCT 3

a. Mandatory Public Notice of Constitutional Defect and Personal Liability

The remainder of this page is intentionally left blank. See the next page for the work product.

FORMAL PUBLIC NOTICE: Notice to Agent is Notice to Principal / Notice to Principal is Notice to Agent

TO: THE PRESIDING JUDGE OF THE COURT, THE CLERK OF THE COURT, OPPOSING COUNSEL, AMICUS COUNSEL, AND EVERY EQUITY PARTNER OF THE RECORD LAW FIRM.

MANDATORY NOTICE OF STRUCTURAL JURISDICTIONAL DEFECT, TOTAL FACIAL UNCONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE CHAPTER 153 COMPLIANCE TRACK, AND SPECIFIC CIVIL AND CRIMINAL LIABILITY FOR ONGOING ULTRA VIRES ACTS

YOU ARE HEREBY PUT ON FORMAL NOTICE under the **Supremacy Clause of the United States Constitution (Article VI, Clause 2)** and the independent guarantees of the **Texas Bill of Rights (Article I, Sections 3, 13, 19, and 37)** that the statutory framework currently being enforced in Cause No. [INSERT CASE NUMBER] is likely a structural constitutional nullity. This notice is powered by the legal proofs of Ron B. Palmer of Fix Family Courts.

I. THE JURISDICTIONAL AND TEXTUAL DEAD-END

The judge is performing state actions under **Texas Family Code § 6.406** and **§ 153.002**. Because these sections textually command the court to force an overriding legislative policy agenda ("best interest") onto co-equal citizens by default at initiation, they leave zero linguistic elasticity or ambiguity. Curing this would require a court to rewrite plain statutory text, which is an independent violation of the Separation of Powers under **Tex. Const. art. II, § 1**. The statutes have reached a total jurisprudential dead-end; they are facially unconstitutional and completely incapable of being saved by judicial interpretation. They are *void ab initio*.

II. STRUCTURAL ERROR AT INCEPTION

Because the courtroom forum is pre-programmed by the legislature to destroy the fundamental constitutional fit-parent presumption at the moment of filing, the injury is self-executing. The forum is modified into a legislative compliance body rather than an independent court of law. This structural closure completely annihilates the federal right of access to the courts and the state **Texas Open Courts Guarantee (Art. I, § 13)** at initiation.

III. DENIAL OF INDIVIDUAL EQUAL PROTECTION

Fundamental parental rights are co-equal, individual liberties held by a citizen directly against the **State Action** of the judge (*Shelley v. Kraemer*, *Palmore v. Sadoti*). By enforcing the fit-parent presumption in third-party suits (*In re C.J.C.*) but stripping it in co-parent litigation, you are executing a facially discriminatory classification scheme. Because this state action deprives citizens of a fundamental right, it triggers standalone **Strict Scrutiny** under both federal and state tracks, (non-contradiction in scrutiny principle, absolute

separation of scrutiny principle), which this un-narrowed policy engine fails as a matter of law.

IV. IMMEDIATE NOTICE OF PERSONAL CIVIL AND CRIMINAL LIABILITY

Reliance on judicial immunity or standard statutory custom is legally void. Under federal anti-trafficking remedies (**18 U.S.C. § 1595**), private law firms and counsel possess zero derivative immunity. If you continue to enforce these void orders to demand capital under threat of contempt jail, you may be executing a federal felony forced labor venture under **18 U.S.C. §§ 1581 and 1589**, and you may face complete personal asset liquidation.

Furthermore, for all state public servants receiving this notice: your failure to self-correct under your federal Supremacy Clause oath strips you of any good-faith defense. Continued enforcement of these void financial extractions and child dispossession orders satisfies the explicit criminal elements of **Texas Penal Code § 39.03 (Official Oppression)**—a Class A misdemeanor crime. There is NO family law exception to the Supremacy Clause, (Palmore v. Sadoti).

THIS COMPRISES FULL LAWFUL NOTICE. ANY CONTINUED STATE ACTION IN THIS PROCEEDING IS EXECUTED ULTRA VIRES, AT YOUR OWN PERSONAL, OPERATIONAL, AND PROFESSIONAL PERIL. PRIVATE ENFORCEMENT OF AN ADVISORY ORDER COMPELLING LABOR FOR FINANCIAL GAIN INVOKES FORCED LABOR STATUTES.

SERVED ON THIS ____ DAY OF _____, 2026, BY:

SIGNATURE: _____

PRINT NAME: [INSERT YOUR FULL NAME]

V. SAMPLE WORK PRODUCT 4

a. Sample Motion to Quash and Strike All Financial Discovery Orders

The remainder of this page is intentionally left blank. See the next page for the work product.

CAUSE NO. [INSERT CASE NUMBER]

IN THE MATTER OF THE	§	IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF
MARRIAGE OF [INSERT STYLE]	§	
	§	[INSERT COUNTY] COUNTY, TEXAS
AND IN THE INTEREST OF	§	
[INSERT CHILD INITIALS], A CHILD	§	[INSERT COURT NUMBER] DISTRICT COURT

MOTION TO QUASH ALL FINANCIAL DISCOVERY REQUESTS, MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER, AND MOTION TO STRIKE COMPELLED FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE ORDERS AS UNCONSTITUTIONAL SEARCH AND SEIZURE

COMES NOW [INSERT YOUR NAME], Respondent/Movable Party in the above-styled cause, and files this Motion to Quash All Financial Discovery Requests, Motion for Protective Order, and Motion to Strike Compelled Financial Disclosure Orders.

Respondent moves this Court to immediately vacate any administrative, temporary, or standing order compelling the disclosure of Respondent's private financial assets, tax returns, bank ledgers, business records, or corporate valuations.

In support thereof, Respondent respectfully shows the Court the following:

I. DEFINITIVE STATUS OF THE LITIGANTS

1. The parties to this proceeding are the biological, natural parents of the minor child, [INSERT INITIALS].
2. No party to this suit has alleged, pled, or adjudicated that Respondent is an unfit parent. Under the supreme law of the land, Respondent is clothed in the absolute constitutional presumption of parental fitness.
3. This Court has not made any individualized, adjudicative threshold finding that Respondent is unfit, or that Respondent's continued, untampered exercise of co-equal parental autonomy inflicts clear, cognizable harm upon the minor child, nor does it have sufficient jurisdiction to do so (*Santosky v. Kramer*).

II. THE STRUCTURAL JURISDICTIONAL FACTOR

1. Moving Party has propounded extensive requests for production, interrogatories, and financial disclosure demands seeking the wholesale surrender of Respondent's private papers, effects, corporate tax returns, and banking records under the color of Texas Family Code Chapter 153.

2. Because § 153.002 commands that the state's legislative policy agenda ("the best interests of the child") must act as the primary consideration during the adjudicative phase of this trial without a prior threshold finding of unfitness, this Court operates ultra vires, lacking judicial subject matter jurisdiction to adjudicate the interests of a nonlitigant.
3. The baseline of this proceeding is void ab initio. Because no valid legal process can sprout from a structurally void jurisdictional foundation (ex nihilo nihil fit), this Court possesses zero structural authority to issue ancillary orders compelling the production of Respondent's private financial data.

III. DISCOVERY AS AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL SEARCH AND SEIZURE

1. The propounded financial discovery demands, and any standing or temporary orders enforcing them, constitute an unconstitutional, warrantless administrative search and seizure in direct violation of the Fourth Amendment to the United States Constitution and Article I, Section 9 of the Texas Constitution.
2. The state cannot use the mechanism of a civil family law docket to execute a broad financial dragnet (general warrant) to strip citizens of their right to be secure in their papers and effects. Because the underlying custody and child support tracks applied to fit parents are structural civil nullities, compelling Respondent to disclose private corporate or personal assets under threat of immediate physical restraint (contempt incarceration) constitutes an unreasonable search and seizure executed without a warrant, without probable cause, and for an unconstitutional purpose.
3. The judicial discovery mechanism may NOT be applied to facilitate the administration of a civil law established policy agenda against the rights of individuals where the product of the compelled discovery is applied to feed the political administration process and make further administrative choices against rights, where the judge issuing the discovery order is tasked by the statute with executing the administrative process against the individuals to whom the orders apply.

IV. PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Respondent prays that this Court immediately set this Motion for a full evidentiary hearing under strict constitutional scrutiny; that this Court quash all pending financial discovery requests propounded by Moving Party; that this Court enter a permanent Protective Order barring any inquiry into Respondent's private economic papers and effects; and that this

Court strike all administrative or temporary financial disclosure orders for total structural invalidity.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

SIGNATURE: __

DATE: [INSERT DATE]

VII. SAMPLE WORK PRODUCT 5

a. Substantive Memorandum of Law: Search & Seizure Arbitrage

The remainder of this page is intentionally left blank. See the next page for the work product.

CAUSE NO. [INSERT CASE NUMBER]

IN THE MATTER OF THE	§	IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF
MARRIAGE OF [INSERT STYLE]	§	
	§	[INSERT COUNTY] COUNTY, TEXAS
AND IN THE INTEREST OF	§	
[INSERT CHILD INITIALS], A CHILD	§	[INSERT COURT NUMBER] DISTRICT COURT

SUBSTANTIVE MEMORANDUM OF LAW IN SUPPORT OF RESPONDENT’S MOTION TO QUASH: THE TOTAL FACIAL VOIDANCE OF COMPELLED FINANCIAL SURVEILLANCE IN CO-PARENT ADJUDICATIONS

TO THE HONORABLE JUDGE OF SAID COURT: Respondent submits this Substantive Memorandum of Law to permanently anchor the constitutional checkmate governing financial discovery within child custody dockets between fit parents, integrating the jurisprudential paradigms established by Ron B. Palmer of Fix Family Courts.

I. THE SUPREME COURT LINE: PARENTAL LIBERTY AND THE FITNESS SHIELD

The care, custody, and control of a minor child is an individual, fundamental liberty interest protected by the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment (*Meyer v. Nebraska*, 262 U.S. 390; *Pierce v. Society of Sisters*, 268 U.S. 510). In *Troxel v. Granville*, 530 U.S. 57, 65–66 (2000), the United States Supreme Court institutionalized the absolute baseline rule:

"The Liberty interest at stake in this case—the interest of parents in the care, custody, and control of their children—is perhaps the oldest of the fundamental liberty interests recognized by this Court... [T]here is a presumption that fit parents act in the best interests of their children."

The presence of two fit parents does not create a constitutional wash or a legal vacuum that allows the state to substitute a legislative policy agenda by default. A fundamental right is an individual shield held by the citizen directly against the state action of the judge (*Shelley v. Kraemer*, 334 U.S. 1 (1948), *Palmore v. Sidoti*, 466 US 429 (1984)). The court cannot strip both fit parents of their individual immunities merely because they are in conflict. Until a threshold finding of unfitness or clear harm is adjudicated under the heightened "clear and convincing evidence" standard required by *Santosky v. Kramer*, 455 U.S. 745 (1982), the state's police power is structurally barred from invading the fundamental family structure, each individually protected parent-child association protected as speech.

II. THE COMPLETED JURISDICTIONAL VOIDANCE OF CHAPTER 153 AS-APPLIED

Texas Family Code § 153.002 commands that the "best interest" standard shall always be the primary consideration. This language leaves zero textual ambiguity. It forces the trial court to treat a state socio-political agenda as the supreme ruling criteria during the adjudicative phase of the trial, completely overriding individual constitutional immunities and judicial independence at the baseline of the suit.

Because the trial court enters the arena with its neutral adjudicative capacity pre-compromised, it executes an unconstitutional usurpation of the judicial power under Article II, Section 1 of the Texas Constitution (*United States v. Klein*, 80 U.S. 128 (1871)). The framework is a structural nullity. Because a court acting under an un-narrowed legislative power-grab lacks valid structural authority, every subsequent order—including financial discovery decrees—is void ab initio (*Lippincott v. Whisenhunt*, 462 S.W.3d 507 (Tex. 2015)).

III. FOURTH AMENDMENT AND ARTICLE I, SECTION 9 RECONCILIATION

Compelling a fit citizen parent to surrender their private papers, corporate tax returns, and bank ledgers under threat of contempt jail under a void statutory track violates the Fourth Amendment to the United States Constitution and Article I, Section 9 of the Texas Constitution.

A civil discovery order is state action that executes an administrative search and seizure. The U.S. Supreme Court has explicitly held that the fourth amendment restricts the state from using broad administrative or civil processes to engage in arbitrary, warrantless searches of a citizen's private papers (See *Marshall v. Barlow's, Inc.*, 436 U.S. 307 (1978)).

Because the baseline child support and custody tracks are void ab initio, the state has zero probable cause, zero warrant, and zero compelling interest to conduct financial asset surveillance on a fit citizen. Using the threat of physical kid-napping and jail to extort financial data to calculate an unconstitutional child support metric turns civil discovery into an instrument of state-sponsored surveillance designed to enforce economic peonage under 18 U.S.C. § 1581.

IV. THE TEXAS EXECUTIVE ADMISSION: ABBOTT'S OPINION GA-0260

This constitutional boundary is explicitly confirmed by the state's own executive legal apparatus. Under Texas Attorney General Opinion No. GA-0260 (2004), issued by then-AG Greg Abbott, the Office of the Attorney General formally admitted that because parental rights are fundamental liberties, any state intrusion must face Strict Scrutiny.

Opinion GA-0260 explicitly rules that the statutory "best interest" standard can never be applied in lieu of strict scrutiny; it can only legally exist in addition to or inside a strict

scrutiny framework that has already required a prior threshold showing of harm or unfitness.

Because Chapter 153 bypasses this strict scrutiny check at initiation, the family court judiciary operates in direct defiance of the state's own formalized administrative admissions, stripping the court of any defense of good faith.

V. THE "RATIONALLY BELIEVE" AND "RECKLESS DISREGARD" LIABILITY CRITERIA

Under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 13 and Texas Civil Practice and Remedies Code Chapter 10, an attorney who signs a discovery request certifies that the pleading is not groundless and is brought in good faith.

Because Opinion GA-0260 and Troxel are settled law, an attorney cannot rationally believe that propounding asset discovery on a fit parent under Chapter 153—without a prior adjudication of unfitness—is a constitutionally permissible act.

Furthermore, this memorandum puts all counsel on formal notice of the elements of 18 U.S.C. § 1589(b) (The Federal Criminal Forced Labor and Peonage Venture Beneficiary statute). Any attorney or equity firm partner who continues to press these discovery demands to extract legal fees derived from this void venture acts with reckless disregard for federal criminal law, executing immediate enterprise liability under 18 U.S.C. § 1595.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

SIGNATURE: __

DATE: [INSERT DATE]

IX. SAMPLE WORK PRODUCT 6

a. Sample TRCP 13 Sanctions Filing: The Reckless Disregard Standard.

The remainder of this page is intentionally left blank. See the next page for the work product.

CAUSE NO. [INSERT CASE NUMBER]

IN THE MATTER OF THE	§	IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF
MARRIAGE OF [INSERT STYLE]	§	
	§	[INSERT COUNTY] COUNTY, TEXAS
AND IN THE INTEREST OF	§	
[INSERT CHILD INITIALS], A CHILD	§	[INSERT COURT NUMBER] DISTRICT COURT

MOTION FOR SANCTIONS PURSUANT TO TEXAS RULE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE 13 AND TEXAS CIVIL PRACTICE & REMEDIES CODE CHAPTER 10 AGAINST ATTORNEY [INSERT NAME] AND THE LAW FIRM OF [INSERT FIRM NAME]

COMES NOW [INSERT YOUR NAME], Respondent/Movable Party in the above-styled cause, and files this Motion for Sanctions Pursuant to Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 13 and Texas Civil Practice and Remedies Code Chapter 10 against Attorney [INSERT NAME] and the Law Firm of [INSERT FIRM NAME]. In support thereof, Respondent respectfully shows the Court the following:

I. THE GROUNDLESS NATURE OF COUNSEL'S CONDUCT

1. On [INSERT DATE], Respondent served Counsel with a formal Notice of Constitutional Defect and Jurisdictional Failure, accompanied by an exhaustive Memorandum of Law establishing that Chapter 153's default track is a facial civil nullity when applied to fit parents during the adjudicative phase of a trial.
2. Despite receiving explicit notice that the baseline of this suit is void ab initio, Attorney [INSERT NAME] consciously chose to sign and propound extensive financial discovery requests on Respondent, demanding the wholesale disclosure of personal banking ledgers, tax returns, and corporate asset records under color of Texas Family Code § 6.406.

II. THE FAILURE TO MEET THE "RATIONALLY BELIEVE" STANDARD

1. Under Texas Civil Practice and Remedies Code § 10.001, an attorney who signs a pleading certifies that each allegation or legal contention is warranted by existing law or by a non-frivolous argument for the extension, modification, or reversal of existing law.
2. Because the United States Supreme Court (*Troxel v. Granville*) and the Texas Executive Branch (Texas Attorney General Opinion No. GA-0260) have long established that a fit parent's natural liberties cannot be overridden or subjected to

a state policy evaluation without satisfying Strict Scrutiny first, Counsel could not rationally believe that their discovery requests were grounded in valid constitutional law.

3. Counsel knew that no allegation or finding of Respondent's unfitness exists in this case file. Therefore, signing a discovery demand designed to use the court's void contempt machinery to force a fit citizen to strip-mine their private papers and effects is a completely groundless and frivolous act under TRCP 13.

III. CRIMINAL RECKLESS DISREGARD AND FIRM LIABILITY

1. Counsel's conduct crosses the threshold from standard aggressive civil litigation into a systemic violation of federal civil rights law and Federal Criminal Forced Labor and Peonage Statutes.
2. By propounding financial discovery under a void statutory track to extract billable fees, and by using the threat of physical kid-napping and jail to force compliance, Attorney [INSERT NAME] actively implements an Abuse of Law and Legal Process under 18 U.S.C. § 1589(a)(3).
3. Because the equity partners of the Law Firm of [INSERT FIRM NAME] receive a pro-rata distribution of these unconstitutional family law billings through their centralized profit pool, the entire firm enterprise is acting with reckless disregard under 18 U.S.C. § 1589(b). They have been fully put on notice that they are benefiting from an illicit forced labor venture, executing immediate, firm-ending civil liability under 18 U.S.C. § 1595.

IV. PRAYER FOR SANCTIONS

Respondent prays that this Court immediately set this Motion for a full evidentiary hearing; that this Court enter an order finding Attorney [INSERT NAME] and the Law Firm of [INSERT FIRM NAME] in direct violation of TRCP 13 and Chapter 10; and that this Court assess heavy monetary sanctions—including the total striking of Moving Party's custody pleadings under state law, personal fines against Counsel under state law, and the mandatory payment of all Respondent's defense costs under state law—to deter this systemic, criminal abuse of the legal process.

Respondent prays that this Court recognize that Respondent is NOT seeking federal forced labor remedies in this state case and is reserving in totality his federal statutory right to access a federal district court to that purpose.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

SIGNATURE: __

DATE: [INSERT DATE]

XI. SAMPLE WORK PRODUCT 7

- a. *Federal Notice of Reckless Disregard to the US Secretary of Health and Human Services*

The remainder of this page is intentionally left blank. See the next page for the work product.

FORMAL ADMINISTRATIVE NOTICE TO AGENT IS NOTICE TO PRINCIPAL

TO: THE SECRETARY OF THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES (HHS);
AND THE DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF CHILD SUPPORT SERVICES (OCSS).

MANDATORY NOTICE OF SYSTEMIC CONSTITUTIONAL INVERSION, PEONAGE
EXTRACTION, AND PERSONAL FELONY LIABILITY FOR THE UNLAWFUL CERTIFICATION OF
VOID STATE PROGRAMS UNDER 18 U.S.C. § 1589(b)

YOU ARE HEREBY PUT ON FORMAL ADMINISTRATIVE NOTICE that your continuing execution of federal funding approvals, structural compliance tracking, and administrative certifications for the Title IV-D child support program administered by the State of Texas constitutes active, direct participation in a federal criminal forced labor venture. This notice explicitly leverages the structural legal proofs developed by Ron B. Palmer of Fix Family Courts.

I. THE MANDATORY INCORPORATION OF CONSTITUTIONAL LIMITS

Under established federal statutory construction rules, every Act of Congress inherently incorporates the mandates of the United States Constitution as if those protections were written directly into the statutory text (*Crowell v. Benson*, 285 U.S. 22 (1932)). Therefore, Title IV-D (42 U.S.C. §§ 651–669b) does not operate as an isolated administrative checklist. The Thirteenth Amendment’s absolute ban on Peonage, the Fourteenth Amendment’s fundamental protection of parent-child integrity (*Troxel v. Granville*), and the Fourth Amendment are binding statutory elements of Title IV-D itself. Your assertion that your agency merely executes strict statutory metrics without consideration of constitutional limitations is a structural error of law.

II. THE STRUCTURAL MECHANICS OF THE TEXAS VIOLATION

By executing federal certifications for the Texas program, you are formally funding and endorsing a state system that utilizes an unconstitutional, self-executing statutory dragnet (Texas Family Code § 6.406 and Chapter 153) to strip fit citizens of their constitutional presumptions by default at the inception of a private lawsuit. This state system deploys a parallel judiciary (Title IV-D Associate Judges) directly subsidized by your federal executive grants, explicitly violating Article II, Section 1 of the Texas Constitution by forcing judicial officers to act as collection agents to satisfy federal funding quotas. This court-bar enterprise uses the threat of physical restraint (contempt incarceration) and state-sanctioned familial destruction to compel fit citizens to perform market labor to discharge a void ab initio, state-engineered debt (Chapter 154).

III. STANDALONE FELONY EXPOSURE FOR EXECUTIVE OFFICERS

Your signature on federal Title IV-D state plan approvals and the distribution of federal matching funds directly triggers criminal liability under 18 U.S.C. § 1589(b). This statute makes it a federal felony to knowingly benefit financially or receive anything of value from participation in a venture that obtains labor through an abuse of legal process.

Because you are highly trained federal administrators who have been served with formal notice of these structural civil rights deprivations, your continuous rubber-stamping of the Texas funding line items constitutes a conscious choice to ignore a substantial and unjustifiable risk. This fulfills the absolute statutory definition of criminal reckless disregard.

SIGNATURE: _____

DATE: [INSERT DATE]

NOTE: THE FOLLOWING IS NOT PART OF THE NOTICE DOCUMENT ITSELF.

IV. SUMMARY OF SERVICE INSTRUCTIONS AND DIGITAL BRIDGE

Pursuant to federal civil and administrative parameters, this notice must be served directly onto the designated Chief Legal Officer of the Department of Health and Human Services and the United States Attorney General. Complete, step-by-step physical and electronic service instructions, legal address repositories, and formal service tracking indices are dynamically hosted and updated to ensure accuracy. More detailed, plug-and-play instructions can be found directly at this link: FixFamilyCourts.com/family-law-reform or at FamilyLawReform.org.

XIII. SAMPLE WORK PRODUCT 8

a. Mandatory Notice of Reckless Disregard to the Texas Attorney General & The UPLC

The remainder of this page is intentionally left blank. See the next page for the work product.

FORMAL ADMINISTRATIVE NOTICE TO AGENT IS NOTICE TO PRINCIPAL

TO: THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE STATE OF TEXAS; AND THE TEXAS UNAUTHORIZED PRACTICE OF LAW COMMITTEE (UPLC).

MANDATORY NOTICE OF CONTINUOUS EXECUTIVE MONETIZATION, RETALIATORY PRIOR RESTRAINT SCREENS, AND PERSONAL FELONY LIABILITY UNDER 18 U.S.C. SECTION 1589(b)

YOU ARE HEREBY PUT ON FORMAL ADMINISTRATIVE NOTICE that your continuing administration, enforcement, and systemic concealment of the unconstitutional, void ab initio structural machinery of Chapter 153, 154, and § 6.406 of the Texas Family Code triggers direct, personal liability under federal criminal law. This notice explicitly incorporates the legal engineering breakthroughs of Ron B. Palmer of Fix Family Courts.

I. THE BIENNIAL FUNDING ENGINE AND EXECUTIVE MONETIZATION

The Office of the Texas Attorney General operates as a systematic political steppingstone to the Governorship, a pipeline fueled directly by maintaining an OAG Texas Child Support Division (CSD) Child Support operating budget that “is more than two-thirds federally funded,” Agency-Strategic-Plan-FY25-29.pdf.⁹

By statute, the OAG serves the children of Texas through enforcement of the state’s child support laws and the collection of child support on behalf of Texas families. All states that receive federal funding for Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) are required to have a centralized child support collections program under Title IV, Part D (IV-D) of the Federal Social Security Act. The cost of operating the Texas Child Support Division (CSD) is more than two-thirds federally funded. In addition, the OAG earns federal performance incentive funds that are distributed to states that excel at collecting child support.

Apart from the federal funds that support the program, the State of Texas benefits from a nationally recognized program that is both efficient and effective in collecting child support, helping to ensure that parents pay to support their children.

According to the federal Office of Child Support Enforcement Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2022 Preliminary Data Report, Texas once again led the nation by collecting nearly \$4.3 billion in Child Support for FFY 2022. According to the OAG’s most recent statutorily required cost avoidance report, the CSD allowed taxpayers to avoid more than \$1.5 billion in TANF, Medicaid, and other costs in State Fiscal Year

⁹ <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/sites/default/files/files/divisions/general-oag/Agency-Strategic-Plan-FY25-29.pdf>

(FY) 2022. As a result, the CSD saved more than a billion dollars for taxpayers. More importantly, the CSD ensures that Texas children have the resources they need to grow healthy and strong.

This massive cash engine relies entirely on an un-scrutinized legislative policy blueprint (§ 153.002) that strips fit citizen parents of co-equal constitutional liberties by default at initiation to lock down Title IV-D matching funds. By funding, staffing, and managing the parallel judiciary of Title IV-D Associate Judges under Chapter 201, the executive branch has captured the state judiciary in direct violation of Article II, Section 1 of the Texas Constitution.

II. THE TRAP OF INHERENT EXECUTIVE ADMISSIONS

Your agency's defense of good faith is completely destroyed by its own administrative record. Under Texas Attorney General Opinion No. GA-0260 (2004), issued by then-AG Greg Abbott, this office formally ruled that a court cannot use a raw "best interest" test to bypass constitutional Strict Scrutiny. Your continuous deployment of § 153.002 to systematically intercept co-parent litigation and strip parents of the fit-parent presumption—solely to hit federal performance metrics—is an intentional, ultra vires evasion of known law.

III. THE UPLC RETALIATORY SCREEN AND VENTURE CRIMINALITY

To protect this multi-billion-dollar enterprise from public collapse, the Unauthorized Practice of Law Committee (UPLC) and the Texas Supreme Court actively weaponize Texas Government Code § 81.101. By selectively civilly prosecuting, enjoining, and publicly blacklisting independent legal researchers who are documenting the unconstitutionality of the Family Code, the UPLC operates as an administrative enforcement screen for a criminal enterprise.

You are using a content-based prior restraint, (Texas Government Code § 81.10), impermissible delegation of legislative authority to the judiciary to expand the scope of the statute, (§ 81.10(b)), to suppress the distribution of civil rights defense materials to insulate a forced labor ring from federal scrutiny. This targeted pattern of regulatory suppression satisfies every element of an active, criminal participation in a forced labor venture under 18 U.S.C. § 1589(b) and constitutes the state-level crime of Official Oppression under Texas Penal Code § 39.03.

SIGNATURE: _____

DATE: [INSERT DATE]

NOTE: THE FOLLOWING IS NOT PART OF THE NOTICE DOCUMENT ITSELF.

IV. SUMMARY OF SERVICE INSTRUCTIONS AND DIGITAL BRIDGE

Pursuant to Texas and federal civil guidelines, these notices must be served directly onto the registered headquarters of the Office of the Attorney General and the Texas Unauthorized Practice of Law Committee central registry in Austin, Texas. Complete, step-by-step physical and electronic service instructions, legal address repositories, and formal service tracking indices are dynamically hosted and updated to ensure accuracy. More detailed, plug-and-play instructions can be found directly at this link:

FixFamilyCourts.com/family-law-reform or at FamilyLawReform.org.

MANDATORY COPYRIGHT STATEMENT

COPYRIGHT RON B PALMER & SHERRY PALMER, LICENSED TO FIX FAMILY COURTS A DIVISION OF CONSTITUTIONAL SCHOLARS INC. A TEXAS CORPORATION.

THE DOCUMENT: THE CONSTITUTIONAL COLLAPSE OF THE TEXAS FAMILY CODE:
VOLUME III: STANDALONE LITIGATION & SERVICE SUITE (APPENDICES)

THE DOCUMENT MAY ONLY BE SHARED WITH THE FULL ATTRIBUTIONS TO RON B PALMER, SHERRY PALMER, AND FIX FAMILY COURTS, FixFamilyCourts.com

Attribution & Public Domain Declaration: This document is authored as part of a national educational initiative dedicated to returning domestic relations proceedings to First Principles of American Jurisprudence. It is protected by copyright, but all individuals are hereby granted limited license for free public duplication, distribution, and sharing, for educational and political purposes only, PROVIDED THIS DOCUMENT IS REPRODUCED IN ITS ENTIRETY WITHOUT ALTERATION TO ITS TEXT OR STRUCTURE WITH FULL ATTRIBUTIONS INCLUDED. Commercial Rights are Reserved. All Further Rights are Reserved.

THE CONSTITUTIONAL COLLAPSE OF THE TEXAS FAMILY CODE:

A Formal Legal Treatise and Substantive Proof Engine Exposing Widespread Civil Rights Violations, Separation of Powers Usurpation, and Criminal Peonage in Co-Parent Litigation

VOLUME IV: COMPREHENSIVE SERVICE DIRECTORY MANUALS

Parent Training for Applying Sample Documents

Author and Principal Architect: Ron B. Palmer

Editor: Sherry Palmer

Affiliation: Fix Family Courts

INTRODUCTION:

The following manuals have been initially created and are in editing to be posted to the website as soon as possible.

Because we believe it is vital to get this core information distributed as widely as possible as soon as possible so that it can NOT be stopped or delayed, this document is being published as soon as it is reasonably edited and before the identified manuals are edited and posted to the website.

While AI compiled the parent training from the legal training that we provided the AI, we still need to edit to ensure that the AI did NOT hallucinate or provide inappropriate supporting citations. Our core citations which we have personally vetted over years of study are solid and sufficient to validate the proofs we have provided.

AI provided some additional supporting citations that we have not personally studied as yet, but we most certainly will as soon as we possibly can. Please personally validate every citation included in any document you file. Never ever rely on AI for case citation in any legal filing. Go to scholar.google.com and validate for yourself 1) that the case actually exists and 2) that the case reasonably asserts what it is being cited for, but keep in mind that judges unlawfully restrict broad precedent to narrow contextual meaning as a tool to conceal their one family law crimes.

I. MANUALS AVAILABLE FREE ON WEBSITE FIXFAMILYCOURTS.COM

As we provide updated versions of this document, we will list here any training materials we provide on our website. Keep in mind that our website will be updated faster than new versions of this document will be released.

GET THE LATEST UPDATES AT: FixFamilyCourts.com/family-law-reform or at FamilyLawReform.org.

MANDATORY COPYRIGHT STATEMENT

COPYRIGHT RON B PALMER AND SHERRY PALMER, LICENSED TO FIX FAMILY COURTS A DIVISION OF CONSTITUTIONAL SCHOLARS INC. A TEXAS CORPORATION.

THE DOCUMENT: THE CONSTITUTIONAL COLLAPSE OF THE TEXAS FAMILY CODE:
VOLUME IV: COMPREHENSIVE SERVICE DIRECTORY MANUALS

THE DOCUMENT MAY ONLY BE SHARED WITH THE FULL ATTRIBUTIONS TO RON B PALMER, SHERRY PALMER, AND FIX FAMILY COURTS, FixFamilyCourts.com

Attribution & Public Domain Declaration: This document is authored as part of a national educational initiative dedicated to returning domestic relations proceedings to First Principles of American Jurisprudence. It is protected by copyright, but all individuals are hereby granted limited license for free public duplication, distribution, and sharing, for educational and political purposes only, PROVIDED THIS DOCUMENT IS REPRODUCED IN ITS ENTIRETY WITHOUT ALTERATION TO ITS TEXT OR STRUCTURE WITH FULL ATTRIBUTIONS INCLUDED. Commercial Rights are Reserved. All Further Rights are Reserved.

THE CONSTITUTIONAL COLLAPSE OF THE TEXAS FAMILY CODE: VOLUME V

A Formal Legal Treatise and Substantive Proof Engine Exposing Widespread Civil Rights Violations, Separation of Powers Usurpation, and Criminal Peonage in Co-Parent Litigation

VOLUME V: First Amendment Free Speech & Mandatory Texas UPL

Disclaimer

UPLC Notice and Warning Against First Amendment Retaliation

Author and Principal Architect: Ron B. Palmer

Editor: Sherry Palmer

Affiliation: Fix Family Courts

I. STATUTORY SAFE HARBOR DISCLOSURE

THIS DOCUMENT, ACCOMPANYING AI PROMPT MATRIX, AND ALL DOWNSTREAM TEMPLATES ARE DESIGNED TO PROVIDE AN ACCURATE AND AUTHORITATIVE LEGAL ANALYSIS OF CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PRINCIPLES FOR EDUCATIONAL AND INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES ONLY. THIS MATERIAL IS GENERATED AND DISSEMINATED SOLELY AS THE PRIVATE, NON-ATTORNEY PERSONAL OPINION OF THE AUTHOR AND PRINCIPAL ARCHITECT, RON B. PALMER OF FIX FAMILY COURTS. THE DISSEMINATION OF THIS TEXT DOES NOT CREATE AN ATTORNEY-CLIENT RELATIONSHIP, DOES NOT CONSTITUTE THE PRACTICE OF LAW, AND IS NOT A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE ADVICE OF A LICENSED ATTORNEY. THIS DOCUMENT WAS NOT PREPARED BY A PERSON LICENSED TO PRACTICE LAW IN TEXAS. THE END-USER RETAINS ABSOLUTE, SOVEREIGN RESPONSIBILITY TO EXERCISE THEIR OWN INDEPENDENT JUDGMENT AND TO CONSUME OR DEPLOY THESE TEMPLATES PRO SE OR IN TANDEM WITH AN ATTORNEY AT THEIR OWN CRITICAL RISK.

II. THE STRUCTURAL CLASSIFICATION OF FIRST AMENDMENT PROTECTION

The state cannot criminalize or penalize the dissemination of advanced constitutional engineering under the guise of licensing regulations or state-bar protectionism. This work is structurally protected across three independent constitutional vectors:

1. **The Shield of Non-Attorney Private Personal Opinion:** The law draws a definitive line between the practice of law and the publication of legal philosophy, statutory analysis, and informational templates (*New York Times Co. v. Sullivan*). Speech regarding the fitness and potential criminality of public officials acting under color of law sits at the absolute core of the First Amendment. Framing this work as a non-attorney private personal opinion anchors the treatise in the marketplace of ideas, forcing any state actor who attempts to censor it to face the highest tier of Strict Scrutiny under the Free Speech Clause.
2. **The Right to Notice and Conveyance of Risk Exposure:** Conveying information regarding potential criminal or civil liability to a participant in a commercial venture is a protected act of political notice, not an extra-judicial threat. Under 18 U.S.C. § 1589(b), the "reckless disregard" and "should have known" standards require that a person be consciously indifferent to a substantial risk. By publishing these notices, you are facilitating the distribution of the exact data necessary for actors to perform a required risk analysis. The speech acts as a structural lever that strips the targets of the ability to claim ignorance, fulfilling a core political function without crossing into factual defamation or libel.
3. **The Absolute Prerogative of the Petition Clause:** Demanding that the United States Attorney General or local federal prosecutors criminally enforce 18 U.S.C. §§ 241, 242, and 1589 against state actors is a textbook execution of the First Amendment Right to Petition the Government for a Redress of Grievances. Citizens hold an unassailable right to document systemic public corruption and formally request federal intervention. The DOJ's failure to recognize or act on these proofs does not diminish the constitutional protection of the citizen's demand; rather, it highlights the exact administrative failure the treatise exposes.

III. MANDATORY LEGAL ADVISORY AND EDUCATIONAL DEFENSE MANIFESTO

a. Explicit Administrative Notice to All Potential Penalizing Entities

Let this statement serve as a formal, self-executing Administrative Notice to any state bar association, unauthorized practice of law (UPL) committee, judicial conduct commission,

trial judge, public servant, or private entity acting in concert with the state who seeks to penalize, restrict, chill, or punish the dissemination of this political expression:

You are hereby placed on notice that any attempt to suppress, prosecute, or retaliate against the publication of this treatise constitutes a bad-faith violation of clearly established federal constitutional law.

Under the doctrine of *In re Primus*, 436 U.S. 412 (1978) and *NAACP v. Button*, 371 U.S. 415 (1963), the state cannot use regulatory, licensing, or corporate bar parameters to punish individuals who communicate or distribute educational legal information to the public regarding the vindication of constitutional rights.

Because this material is explicitly designated as non-attorney private personal opinion, and because it contains no direct commercial solicitation or direct client representation, any enforcement action initiated against the author represents an intentional deployment of the state's police power to execute Viewpoint Discrimination (*Rosenberger v. Rector and Visitors of Univ. of Va.*, 515 U.S. 819 (1995)).

Any public official or private actor who violates this boundary acts entirely *ultra vires*, strips themselves of all qualified or official immunity, and faces immediate personal civil liability under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and criminal exposure under 18 U.S.C. § 242 for conspiracy and deprivation of civil rights under color of law. The author asserts all applicable First Amendment, state constitutional, and federal statutory protections for this speech and analysis, and will aggressively counter any retaliatory administrative actions with direct federal litigation.

b. Educational Blueprint for Litigants: Securing Individual Speech Protections

For individual citizens, parents, and pro se litigants reading this statement, the following mechanical principles dictate exactly how you must frame your own legal notices, filings, and public documentation to shield your speech from state bar protectionism and protect yourself from administrative overreach:

- **Establish the Non-Attorney Baseline Disclaimers:** Whenever you distribute, publish, or serve these constitutional proofs or notices, you must explicitly prefix the documents with the mandatory designation: "This document represents my non-attorney private personal opinion and analysis of settled law." This choice prevents the court or opposing counsel from manufacturing a bad-faith "unauthorized practice of law" claim, as it clearly identifies your speech as a form of protected citizen petition and commentary rather than professional legal counsel.

- **Frame Filings Under the Absolute Shield of the Petition Clause:** When introducing these arguments into an active lawsuit, do not file them as standard evidentiary motions or simple discovery responses. Explicitly frame your pleadings as a Formal Petition for Redress of Grievances Mandated by the First Amendment and State Constitutional Guarantees. State court judges hold an absolute, non-discretionary constitutional obligation to receive and evaluate citizen petitions. By invoking the Petition Clause explicitly, you elevate your courtroom speech to the highest tier of constitutional protection, making any sudden judicial attempt to strike or silence your pleadings a separate, fully appealable federal constitutional injury.
- **Decouple Objective Legal Modeling From Factual Criminal Defamation:** To eliminate the risk of a retaliatory civil suit for defamation or libel, you must never state as a definitive, un-adjudicated fact that a specific judge or attorney stands convicted of a crime. Instead, you must state that the objective statutory mechanics of their documented courtroom actions mirror and satisfy the explicit elements of a federal felony under 18 U.S.C. § 1589(b) or Texas Penal Code § 39.03. You provide a technical legal risk analysis based on your private interpretation of the law. This approach protects you completely, as an evaluation of a public statute or a statement of pure legal opinion cannot form the basis of a defamation suit under federal jurisprudence (*Milkovich v. Lorain Journal Co.*, 497 U.S. 1 (1990)).
- **Deploy the "Notice to Agent is Notice to Principal" Standard:** When serving notices of reckless disregard on state or private firm actors, use the established common-law agency rule: "Notice to the agent is notice to the principal; notice to the principal is notice to the agent." By serving the individual tracking attorney or the court clerk, the law legally imputes that knowledge to the entire partnership or state division. This mechanic effectively locks down the "should have known" and "reckless disregard" standards across the entire enterprise, preventing any backend partner from claiming an "innocent bystander" defense when you launch your downstream civil remedies under 18 U.S.C. § 1595.

MANDATORY COPYRIGHT STATEMENT

COPYRIGHT RON B PALMER AND SHERRY PALMER, LICENSED TO FIX FAMILY COURTS A DIVISION OF CONSTITUTIONAL SCHOLARS INC. A TEXAS CORPORATION.

THE DOCUMENT: THE CONSTITUTIONAL COLLAPSE OF THE TEXAS FAMILY CODE:
VOLUME V: FIRST AMENDMENT FREE SPEECH & MANDATORY TEXAS UPL DISCLAIMER

THE DOCUMENT MAY ONLY BE SHARED WITH THE FULL ATTIBUTIONS TO RON B PALMER, SHERRY PALMER, AND FIX FAMILY COURTS, FixFamilyCourts.com

Attribution & Public Domain Declaration: This document is authored as part of a national educational initiative dedicated to returning domestic relations proceedings to First Principles of American Jurisprudence. It is protected by copyright, but all individuals are hereby granted limited license for free public duplication, distribution, and sharing, for educational and political purposes only, PROVIDED THIS DOCUMENT IS REPRODUCED IN ITS ENTIRETY WITHOUT ALTERATION TO ITS TEXT OR STRUCTURE WITH FULL ATTRIBUTIONS INCLUDED. Commercial Rights are Reserved. All Further Rights are Reserved.

THE CONSTITUTIONAL COLLAPSE OF THE TEXAS FAMILY CODE: VOLUME VI

COPYRIGHT: THE CONSTITUTIONAL COLLAPSE OF THE TEXAS FAMILY CODE: VOLUMES I, II, III, IV, V, AND VI.

VOLUME VI: MANDATORY COPYRIGHT STATEMENT

AUTHOR, OWNERSHIP, AND COPYRIGHT NOTICE

Author and Principal Architect: Ron B. Palmer

Editor: Sherry Palmer

Affiliation: Fix Family Courts

I. MANDATORY COPYRIGHT STATEMENT

COPYRIGHT RON B PALMER & SHERRY PALMER, LICENSED TO FIX FAMILY COURTS A DIVISION OF CONSTITUTIONAL SCHOLARS INC. A TEXAS CORPORATION.

THE DOCUMENT: THE CONSTITUTIONAL COLLAPSE OF THE TEXAS FAMILY CODE: VOLUMES I, II, III, IV, V, AND VI

THIS DOCUMENT MAY ONLY BE SHARED WITH THE FULL ATTIBUTIONS TO RON B PALMER, SHERRY PALMER, AND FIX FAMILY COURTS, FixFamilyCourts.com

Attribution & Public Domain Declaration: This document is authored as part of a national educational initiative dedicated to returning domestic relations proceedings to First Principles of American Jurisprudence. It is protected by copyright, but all individuals are hereby granted limited license for free public duplication, distribution, and sharing, for educational and political purposes only, PROVIDED THIS DOCUMENT IS REPRODUCED IN ITS ENTIRETY WITHOUT ALTERATION TO ITS TEXT OR STRUCTURE WITH FULL ATTRIBUTIONS INCLUDED. Commercial Rights are Reserved. All Further Rights are Reserved.

AUTHOR, OWNERSHIP, AND COPYRIGHT NOTICE Author: Ron B. Palmer Exclusive Licensee: Fix Family Courts Copyright: © 2026 Ron B. Palmer & SHERRY PALMER. All Rights Reserved. Reservation of Rights and Licensing Terms: The unique legal-scientific frameworks, constitutional arguments, and textual architectures contained within this

document—including the categorization of natural parentage as an irreplaceable physiological broadcast, the conceptualization of Court-Induced Parental Alienation as a state-inflicted injury to personhood, and the application of federal forced labor and peonage statutes to administrative domestic relations processes—are the intellectual property of Ron B. Palmer and/or Sherry Palmer. This material is exclusively licensed to Fix Family Courts for commercial distribution, adaptation, publication, and sale. Unauthorized duplication, replication, digital scraping, peer-to-peer distribution, or resale of these premium Motion, Memorandum, and Legal Notice templates without an explicit commercial license or valid proof of purchase from an authorized Fix Family Courts shopping portal constitutes a direct infringement of federal copyright and intellectual property laws. Purchasers are granted a limited, personal, non-transferable license to adapt these materials strictly for individual, pro se, or attorney-client litigation use within their specific court cases.

Sherry Palmer is the author, primary copyright holder, and primary trademark holder of the term “Court-Induced Parental Alienation tm.”