

## THIS COURT's Perverse Reasoning

Below, 16A Am. Jur. 2d § 175 illustrates THIS COURT's misguided allegiance and warped rationale:

*16A Am. Jur. 2d § 175: “Where the validity of a statute is assailed and there are two possible interpretations, by one of which the statute would be unconstitutional and by the other of which it would be valid, a court should adopt the construction which will uphold it, even though the construction which is adopted does not appear to be as natural as the other.”*

## THIS COURT's Perverse Reasoning

*Thus, a reviewing court is barred from lightly choosing that reading of a statute's setting which will render it unconstitutional over that which will save it. Stated differently, the courts must give the force of law to an act of the legislature whenever it can be fairly so construed and applied as to avoid conflict with the constitution. However, the construction that is given must be a plausible one, and it must be consistent with sound sense and wise policy, and with the legislative intent. Thus, a court's duty to construe statutes so as to avoid constitutional problems does not require the court to adopt a construction that renders a statute meaningless or nonsensical, nor does it require the court to interpret the statute in a manner clearly contrary to congressional intent. The rule that a statute will be given that construction which will render it valid if it is susceptible of different constructions is, of course, also applicable to ordinances.”*

## THIS COURT's Perverse Reasoning

(a) Precision, not "*interpretation*" for "*reconstruction*",  
belongs in OUR Library of LAWS.

Judicially conjured "*interpretations*",

defended by Judicially "*adopted*" (fabricated) unnatural "*constructions*"

buried in obscure Case Law,

fail to nullify globally visible illicit statutes;

thereby suborning executable misdirections having **adverse** "*effects*".

## THIS COURT's Perverse Reasoning

(b) The 16<sup>th</sup> Amendment **DOES NOT HAVE TWO possible interpretations**  
except in the minds of government manipulators.

It explicitly contradicts multiple Fundamental LAWS (detailed throughout this Allegation).

(c) **"a reviewing court is barred from ... choosing"**  
is a self-imposed limitation denouncing Sworn Obligation  
to uphold Fundamental Law.

## THIS COURT's Perverse Reasoning

**It is NOT the Judiciary's Duty to rescue Legislative Subversion:**

*16A Am. Jur. 2d § 176: “The duty of the courts to construe a statute so as to save its constitutionality when it is reasonably susceptible of two constructions includes the duty of adopting a construction that will not subject it to a succession of doubts as to its constitutionality, for it is well settled that a statute must be construed, if fairly possible, so as to avoid not only the conclusion that it is unconstitutional but also grave or serious doubt upon that score. ...”*

On the contrary, it is THIS COURT's PRIMARY Sworn Obligation to Secure OUR Safety.

THIS COURT's rational above is that of a puppet mimicking Legislative tyranny, destroying the trinity-of-balance which made OUR Society unique.