

Bananas, Bikinis, Girls

This author apologizes for the misconception many people elude too, however this author remembers comments made for the years that silliness and sex are most commonly remembered rather than true facts.

There is a conception that if one claims a right to the banana peel, there is also a right to the fruit of the banana, forget not that making a right(s) claim of ownership to the bikini does not include rights to the contents of the bikini. A bikini attacked is entirely different than attacking the girl.

The writer sets aside sex, girls and silliness, whereas attention is directed towards the misapplication of secondary understanding.

The United States of America as a country at founding created the Constitution, whereas most pledges are made to the country and not to the government. In layman's term; the country requires a government that follows the will of the people, the government cannot advance without the country and with the will of the people, furthermore in this country's history courts of law and courts of equity did not have a singular judge wearing both hats. It was in the 1900's the change of courts was engaged to have a judge wear both hats.

The scriptures denote that God gave to mankind the earth and rights to make governing laws, however when man's law(s) discriminates against the freedom of person(s) one needs to not look beyond God's first Commandment, place no other God before God. Could it be master word crafter(s) have failed to realize that the first use of the word God is not that of the true one creating God?

Science has been able to evaluate the moments after creation but have failed to evaluate the moment or the moments before creation of the universe, in short; science has not been able to explain what power existed to allow for the creation of the universe, Could it be that God never in man's world intended for man to know, but was such so that man could choose to believe as man wishes?

There is an equitable maxim that one cannot utilize a court(s) equitable power to assure that an unconscionable contract is enforceable, elevator version is that a party that lacks equitable rights

cannot invoke a court's jurisdiction, whereas an Article III court lacks statutory jurisdiction and a non-Article III court (court of equity-common law) also lacks standing due to equitable maxims has not the right to invoke a prudential standing court's jurisdiction.

Within Texas Court of Appeals opinion of September 24, 2015, No. 09-12-00573-CV is the definition of a "Partial Interest". One needs not to have attended a brick and mortar law school to have knowledge that a "Partial Interest" equals that of a general intangible-payment intangible as it defined being that of a right to receive a payment stream. There is a common belief that a Tangible Obligor (maker of a note [secured]) is obliged to the Intangible Obligee (purchaser of the payment stream). There is the common belief that UCC Article 9 [Secured Transaction grants statutory and equitable rights to the Intangible Obligee to allow standing and the capacity to file suit against the Tangible Obligor, whereas this belief is misplaced it remains an argument before the court whether or not it is a court of law or a court of equity.

Where the Intangible Obligee lays claims of rights to the banana as a whole, if one part of the banana has failed to ripen or has ripened beyond an edible stage, the purchaser of the banana has only rights to sue he who sold the banana per a legal equitable contract. In short the banana purchaser has no rights to sue the shipper, grower or the banana tree itself.

Where if a bikini fails and exposes the fruits of a girl: the girl has a right of claim against the seller but not the maker, unless such girl has an enforceable equitable claim against those not the seller.

Regardless of whether a banana or bikini: to allow the purchaser to sue the banana grower of bikini manufacturer would require an enforceable contract being either statutory in nature or in equity.

There is a choice of statutory or equity but failure would be imminent to argue a singular, therefore it is a necessity to argue both statutory and equity as judges may switch hats from being an Article III judge to a common law judge.

This article does not address as to why it is so adamant that financial stability (so stated) outweighs statutory and equitable law thus trashing the United States Constitution, believe as you wish and forget not to vote evil out of government.

Forget not a Government needs a Country whereas a Country creates the Government. Belief is as one chooses and forget not scriptures and the like of Comments (official or otherwise), Restatements and statutory law are written by Man maybe judicial notice but are clearly hearsay to what one chooses to believe.

**Choice is yours,
In electing leaders,
And belief in God.**

Eternal Rest

“or”

**Eternal Unrest
Choice is Yours**