

Conduct that is intended to and reasonably understood to convey a message falls within the free speech guarantees of the First Amendment. ACORN V. CITY OF TULSA, 835 F2d 735 (10th Cir. 1987)

**Notice Against Unlawful Enforcement Of Forced Medical Protocol Regulations
Title 18 U.S.C. § 4 - Misprision of Felony Criminal and/or Civil Liabilities
And Demand To Cease and Desist**

This is notice to cease and desist any and all attempts at imposing on me and other people forced medical protocols, including but not limited to, mandating one wear a mask, or take medically related tests or treatments, and/or take vaccines, or medications, and the like or similar.

**People Have a Right To Reject Unwanted Medical Protocols
Like Wearing Masks Or Medical Tests**

The government is prohibited from requiring people to do something like wearing masks or taking a vaccine or a medical tests that may be contaminated, etc., that can be harmful to ones health and/or taking temperatures which is a violation of privacy. **Men and women have a due process liberty interest in rejecting unwanted medical protocols.** Compassion in Dying v. State of Wash., 79 F3d 790 (9th Cir. 1996).

Where Forcible medication (a testing solution to diagnose a condition is included as medication) is considered, the law intends that an individual's right to freedom from physical invasion protected by the Constitution and the common law be recognized by application of due process of law. US v. Charters, 829 F2d 479 (4th Cir. 1987).

People have a due process liberty interest in rejecting unwanted medical treatment. Compassion in Dying v. State of Wash., 79 F3d 790 (9th Cir. 1996)

Civil commitment for any purpose constitutes a significant deprivation of liberty that requires due process protections. US V. Mc ALLISTER, 225 F3d 982 (8th Cir. 2000)

Citizen's liberty interest in personal dress is protected by due process. DeWeese V. Town Of Palm Beach, 812 F2d 1365 (11th Cir. 1987). So face-coverings cannot be forced on someone.

Potentially contaminated testing solutions used for diagnostic purposes that may contain dangerous viruses or bacterial or other harmful toxins cannot be forced on men and women and children. **People have a constitutionally protected interest in making his or her own decision** whether to accept or reject the administration of potentially dangerous medications/drugs. Fields v. Gander, 734 F2d 1313 (9th Cir. 1984). Bee v. Greaves, 744 F2d 1378 (10th Cir. 1980).

Liberty interest protected under or arising from due process clause may be either interest protected by due process clause itself or interest created by state or federal law. Caldwell V. Millers, 790 F2d 589 (7th Cir. 1986); Price V. Barry, 53 F3d 369 (D.C. 1995).

Title 18 Notice Regarding Criminal Violation of Constitutional Rights:

18 USCC Section 241: If two or more persons conspire to injure, oppress, threaten, or intimidate any Citizen in the free exercise or enjoyment of any right or Privilege secured to him by the Constitution or laws of the United States..., they shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both, and if death results they shall be subject to imprisonment for any term or for life.

18 USCC Section 242: **Whoever, under color of law, statute, ordinance, regulation, or custom willfully subjects any Inhabitant of any State.... to the deprivation of any Rights, Privileges or Immunities secured or protected by the Constitution or laws of the united States.. shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both, and if death results they shall be subject to imprisonment for any term ...**

Demand:

I have showed you what the law says above and, I hereby demand you to cease and desist any and all actions to force me to engage in any medical/health related protocols against my will which is against my constitutional rights and/or state and federal laws. The black letter law maxim states. **"One who commands lawfully must be obeyed."**

Conduct that is intended to and reasonably understood to convey a message falls within the free speech guarantees of the First Amendment. ACORN V. CITY OF TULSA, 835 F2d 735 (10th Cir. 1987)