

## Dave Champion's Response to the Government's Injunction

Many of you who are about to read this have just finished reading the government's injunctive order barring me from providing assistance to Americans who have determined that the law has never imposed the Income Tax upon them. I think it is fair to assume that most Americans imagine that if a federal court issues such an injunction, then the enjoined person must be doing something wrong. That perception is due to the fact many Americans still foolishly trust the federal government, no matter how many times it proves itself untrustworthy.

In a general sense, each individual must decide for himself whether or not he should consider the issuance of a federal injunction an indicator of wrongdoing by the party enjoined. However, when it comes to injunctions regarding tax matters, there is no doubt that such injunctions are issued pro forma, without the government ever being required to meet any of the legal burdens imposed by the statutes that authorize such injunctions. I know this because I've been watching the government issue injunctions in tax matters for the last 15 years. I can assure you that the process is an ugly, illegal, immoral, mess. However, I DO NOT want you to take my word for it! Read on and judge for yourself.

First, you'll notice that I said the "government" issues these injunctions. Some will balk at that characterization, preferring to say that the government is the Plaintiff and injunctions are issued by the court. Let me state this plainly from the start: The federal judges who hear these cases are selected in advance for their willingness to give the government what it asks for without the actual law playing any significant role in the process. It is merely the facade of law. But again, don't take my word for it, read on and decide for yourself.

Let's look at the particulars of the injunction issued against me.

United States District Court judge Percy Anderson issued the order. In such matters, Percy is the government's whore in a black robe. With Percy, what the government wants, the government gets. But again, don't take my word for it... Let's examine what Percy has to say.

In the opening paragraph of his order, Percy writes, "Champion's theories concerning the Government's taxing authority are wrong." Here's the problem; no evidence was ever submitted to the court concerning what my "theories" are other than a single declaration by an IRS officer who has for a number of years been assigned to the team tasked with shutting me (and the message) down. This "honorable" IRS employee uses the pseudonym "Thomas Chung". How do we know it is a pseudonym? Because he admits in his declaration to the court that it is not his real name. So, how much credibility do you think you should impart to the words of a man who has been specifically tasked for years with shutting me down, and who refuses to disclose his real name - even when filing declarations in court? You may defer responding to that question until more of the facts are laid before you. Keep reading.

Now that I have said only Chung's declaration was before the court, I should tell you that the government did depose three former clients of mine; three out of thousands. If there are so many clients who could be deposed, how come the government chose only these three? Good question! And there is a simple answer. These three were clients who the IRS's Criminal Investigation Division (CID) had made contact with prior to initiating its suit to enjoin me. In each of these cases no one was taken to trial. Coincidentally - or

maybe I should say, miraculously - these three ended up being the ones the government called to give testimony against me. Funny how that works. I should add that after being approached by IRS CID each of these three decided not to stand upon the law and defend their positions, but instead to throw themselves at the feet of the IRS and beg for mercy. Given the power of the United States government and the corruption of judges such as Percy Anderson, I do not fault these three for cutting a deal, but I do point out to the reader that they did cut a deal - and ended up testifying against me.

So what did these fine upstanding folks say about me and my "theories"? Two of the three said that they independently verified all the significant points I shared with them, and found them all to be true and credible. They did however say that once they had been approached by IRS CID, and had retained criminal defense counsel, their counsel had convinced them that what they'd found in their own research was mistaken.

During their depositions, when I asked what their counsel had shown them that had altered their previous confidence in the material they'd researched for themselves, they stated that they could not remember. Imagine spending YEARS researching the intricacies of tax law for yourself and coming to your own conclusions on the matter. Then you sit down with your newly retained criminal defense attorney and he shows you why all of that research is wrong - but somehow you can't remember the magic words he said to up-end all that research you'd done! I think it is safe to say that what their attorney showed them that changed their "position" was the possibility of going to jail if they didn't capitulate and play ball with the government.

The third fellow was a particular disappointment to me. We had been close friends for 20 years prior to him retaining a criminal defense attorney. From that day forward he and I never spoke again - until I questioned him in the deposition. This fellow took a different path than the previous two. He repeated again and again that I was the "expert". When I asked if he had ample opportunity to verify anything and everything I'd ever said to him with any and every resource of his own choosing, including the IRS, he admitted that he did indeed have that opportunity but saw no reason to do so because I was the "expert". Unlike the other two, this fellow thoroughly abdicated his self-responsibility in favor of the blame game. Go figure.

I know what my former friend was told by his attorney. How do I know? Because I've known his attorney for roughly 15 years before my former friend hired him. I've known this attorney since before he was an attorney! I've had a number of discussions with him over the years regarding his view of U.S. tax law. He believes precisely what I believe! However, since becoming an attorney and practicing criminal tax defense law, his view is that federal judges are thoroughly corrupt and there is not a single federal judge who will rule in favor of the truth about the income tax - EVER! He once told me that he tells his clients there is no way to win a criminal tax case in federal court. I must presume that is exactly what he told my former friend once he was retained as counsel.

Now that we understand the dynamic that the only witnesses against me was a lying, pseudonym-using, IRS employee and three former clients obviously testifying under duress, let's look at what the government says my theories are. For that, let us return to the Court's injunctive order. We should recall that Percy said my theories are "wrong".

Percy writes "Views such as those advanced by Champion have been rejected as frivolous by all courts that have analyzed similar arguments." First you will note that Percy has still not stated what these theories are that I hold, which have been so often adjudicated as frivolous. Second, he doesn't say that previous courts have analyzed any of MY theories. He says "similar" arguments have been analyzed. A small deviation can make a huge

difference. If I told you I saw your 13-year-old daughter working a 10 inch crock (as in "pot"), that's something entirely different than saying I saw her working a 10 inch... You get my point. Small details can make a huge difference. I could care less what courts have said about "similar" arguments. The fact is, not one of my "points of understanding" (they're not "theories") about tax law has EVER been ruled upon by any court!

At this point, "Percy the Corrupt One" begins to list the theories that he and the U.S. DOJ have conspired to misrepresent as coming from me. Here they are, direct from the order:

1. Filing an income tax return is purely voluntary. FACT: Not only have I NEVER said that, but I've consistently stated exactly the opposite. More on that as we proceed.
2. An individual is not a "person" (as "person" is used in tax law). FACT: That's a completely nutty argument. And needless to say, since I find it completely nutty, I have never said such a thing.
3. Wages do not constitute income subject to federal income taxation. FACT: You guessed it. I've never once said that either.

That's it! Those are the three "theories" Percy says I've promoted. Problem is, I've never once said or written any of those ridiculous things, and I can prove it!

However, before I get to proving it, let us ask and answer why the United States government, which includes Percy acting as a partner with the U.S. DOJ in this prosecution, would claim I say and promote theories concerning which it is so easy to prove I do not? That's an easy one. Because federal courts have indeed ruled repeatedly that the theories falsely attributed to me are frivolous. And I agree with those courts; those theories ARE frivolous! So, the pseudonym-using IRS employee Chueng, the attorneys from the DOJ tax division, and Percy the Corrupt One, have all agreed to lie about what I've said (or written) so they can falsely attribute positions to me that are, in fact, frivolous. Now here's the kicker: Why would they make shit up if the positions I actually promote are frivolous?

I said earlier, I can prove I've never said any of the things Chueng, the DOJ attorneys, and Percy said I said. How can I do that? Easy! I wrote a book containing all my positions concerning the income tax. It's called "Income Tax: Shattering The Myths". Its website is [www.incometaxtruth.com](http://www.incometaxtruth.com).

The book is 419 pages. It contains all my views on the income tax and every point it contains is proven by statute, regulations, Congressional statements, U.S. Supreme Court rulings, etc. There is nothing in the book in which I ask the reader to believe me. At the beginning of the book I specifically ask the reader NOT to believe me, but to test everything in the book by his own research. To this day, no one - repeat, NO ONE - has contradicted any of the conclusions contained in the book. In fact, attorneys have read the book and said that it is all true, but they can't think of any way to get a judge to rule properly on it. Think about that.

The attorney retained by my former friend was one of the first people to purchase my book when it was first published. He has my personal phone number and can call me any time if he found anything inaccurate in the book or disagrees with the conclusions stated therein. I've never heard from him. Another attorney in Utah agrees with everything in the book, but won't represent anyone using the material because he fears being sanctioned for bringing the truth into court. Yet another criminal tax defense attorney in the South East U.S. heard me speaking about the positions contained in the book. Afterward, he rushed up to me and said, "You nailed it! You got it exactly right!" Interestingly, I've

never heard him make the arguments in court. One might consider the implications for freedom in this nation if attorneys all agree the material is factual, but fear speaking it in court.

So why do I bring up the book? In the government's Motion for Summary Judgment, the government states that it possesses a copy of "Income Tax: Shattering The Myths". Despite admitting that it has the book, the government never introduced a single word from my book in court!

Think about this: You want to prove a man's theories are frivolous. That man has published a book containing his theories you say you want to silence. BUT, instead of bringing the man's own words into court, you bring in nothing more than a declaration and a couple of depositions that only demonstrate (at best) what third parties allege the man said.

In law there is something called the "Best Evidence Rule". That rule states that if you wish to prove the content of a writing or recording, or photograph, the original is required. While the "Best Evidence Rule" is not wholly applicable in the case for injunction against me, the principle is still noteworthy. If the government wants to assert my "theories" are frivolous, why would they not use the "best evidence" - the most authoritative source for my "theories" - which is my own words?

One must ask one's self why the government ignored the most authoritative source of my "theories" and instead relied on a third party offering second-hand accounts of my views from its own pseudonym-using employees, and three people testifying under duress. The answer is simple. Not only is there NOTHING in my book that has EVER been adjudicated by a federal court as frivolous, but the government is deathly afraid of having to rule - on the record - on the positions I actually promote!

But let's go a bit further. Other than the pseudonym-using paid professional liar assigned to shut me down, none of the other three witnesses ever testified that I said any of the items (1-3 above) that Percy stated I said!

So, in the final analysis, no one other than the government ever claimed I said those ridiculous things. The IRS wants me silenced and discredited. The IRS tells one of its people to lie under oath in a declaration to a court. He gladly does so. The Tax Division attorneys of the DOJ (who have ready access to my book) cheerfully submit the perjured affidavit. None of my three former clients who testify substantiate any of the claims of the IRS's paid professional liar. Percy then takes the statements of the IRS's paid professional liar and puts them in his injunctive order as being my views. All the while my REAL positions are sitting right there on their desks - being studiously ignored.

Now tell me again how righteous this injunctive process is.

*Dave Champion*

(And that's my real name because I stand honorably behind every word I say!)