

RECORDING REQUESTED BY:

Zhanna Bright Izotov

AND WHEN RECORDED MAIL TO:

Zhanna Bright Izotov
c/o 12545 Arboleda Vista Drive
Valley Center, California [92082-9998] – without US

SPACE ABOVE THIS LINE FOR RECORDER'S USE

DECLARATION OF ASSIGNEES UPDATE OF LAND PATENT

PATENT NUMBER: #4891 (Dated March 7, 1892)

KNOW ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS THAT **Zhanna Bright Izotov** DO SEVERALLY CERTIFY AND DECLARE THAT I BRING UP THIS LAND PATENT IN MY NAME. THE CHARACTER OF SAID PROPERTY SO SOUTH TO BE PATENTED, AND LEGALLY DESCRIBED AND REFERENCED UNDER PATENT NUMBER ABOVE IS:

(1) THE CHARACTER OF SAID PROPERTY SO SOUTH TO BE PATENTED, AND LEGALLY DESCRIBED AND REFERENCED UNDER PATENT NUMBER ABOVE IS:

At the intersection of N1°03'04" W and S89°54'53"W, on the corner of Parcel 1 and Parcel 2 1" iron pipe with tag R.C.E 6486 per P.M. 15040, turn S89°54'53"W and go west 64.22' to the southwest corner of Parcel 2 then turn right to S1°01'37"E for 380.75', then turn left S88°58'23"W and go 326.00', then make left S1°01'37"E for 376.50', then turn left S89°54'53"W and go 258.03' back to the point of beginning

(2) NOTICE OF PRE-EMPTIVE RIGHT. PURSUANT TO THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE [1776], THE TREATY OF PEACE WITH GREAT BRITAIN (8 STAT. 80) KNOWN AS THE TREATY OF PARIS [1793, AN ACT OF CONGRESS [3 STAT. 566, APRIL 24, 1824], THE TREATY OF GUADALUPE HIDALGO [FEBRUARY 2, 1848], THE HOMESTEAD ACT [12 STAT. 392, 1862] AND 43 USC SECTIONS 57, 59, AND 83; THE RECIPIENT HEREOF IS MANDATED BY ART. VI SECTIONS 1, 2, AND 3; ART. IV SECTIONS I CL. 1, & 2; SECTION 2 CL. 1 & 2; SECTION 4; THE 4TH, 7TH, 9TH, AND 10TH AMENDMENTS [U.S. CONSTITUTION, 1781-91] TO ACKNOWLEDGE ASSIGNEE'S UPDATE OF PATENT PROSECUTED BY AUTHORITY OF ART. III SECTION 2 CL. 1 & 2 AND ENFORCED BY ORIGINAL/EXCLUSIVE JURISDICTION THEREUNDER AND IT IS THE ONLY WAY A PERFECT TITLE CAN BE HAD IN OUR NAMES, WILCOX vs. JACKSON, 13 PET. (U.S.) 498, 101. ED. 264; ALL QUESTIONS OF FACT DECIDED BY THE GENERAL LAND OFFICE ARE BINDING EVERYWHERE. AND INJUNCTIONS AND MANDAMUS PROCEEDINGS WILL NOT LIE AGAINST IT, LITCHFIELD vs. THE REGISTER, 9 WALL. (U.S.) 575, 19 L. ED. 681. THIS DOCUMENT IS INSTRUCTED TO BE ATTACHED TO ALL DEEDS AND/OR CONVEYANCES IN THE NAMES) OF THE ABOVE PARTIES AS REQUIRING RECORDING OF THIS DOCUMENT, IN A MANNER KNOWN AS **NUNC PRO TUNC** [AS IT SHOULD HAVE

BEEN DONE IN THE BEGINNING], BY ORDER OF UNITED STATES SUPREME LAW MANDATE AS ENDORSED BY CASE HISTORY CITED.

(3) NOTICE AND EFFECT OF A LAND PATENT. A GRANT OF LAND IS A PUBLIC LAW STANDING ON THE STATUTE BOOKS OF THE CALIFORNIA STATE, AND IS NOTICE TO EVERY SUBSEQUENT PURCHASER UNDER ANY CONFLICTING SALE MADE AFTERWARD; WINEMAN vs. GASTRELL, 54 FED 819, 4 CCA 596, 2 US APP 581. A PATENT ALONE PASSES TITLE TO THE GRANTEE; WILCOX vs. JACKSON, 13 PET (U.S.) 498, 10. L. ED. 264. WHEN THE UNITED STATES HAS PARTED WITH TITLE BY A PATENT LEGALLY ISSUED, AND UPON SURVEYS LEGALLY MADE BY ITSELF AND APPROVED BY THE PROPER DEPARTMENT, THE TITLE SO GRANTED CANNOT BE IMPAIRED BY ANY SUBSEQUENT SURVEY MADE BY THE GOVERNMENT FOR ITS OWN PURPOSES; CAGE vs. DANKS, 13, LA. ANN. 128. IN THE CASE OF EJECTMENT, WHERE THE QUESTION IS WHO HAS THE LEGAL TITLE. TILE PATENT OF THE GOVERNMENT IS UNASSAILABLE, SANFORD vs. SANFORD, 139 US 642. THE TRANSFER OF LEGAL TITLE (PATENT) TO PUBLIC DOMAIN GIVES THE TRANSFEREE THE RIGHT TO POSSESS AND ENJOY THE LAND TRANSFERRED, GIBSON vs. CHOUTEAU, 80 US 92. A PATENT FOR LAND IS THE HIGHEST EVIDENCE OF TITLE AND IS CONCLUSIVE AS EVIDENCE AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT AND ALL CLAIMING UNDER JUNIOR PATENTS OR TITLES, UNITED STATES vs. STONE, 2 US 525. ESTOPPEL HAS BEEN MAINTAINED AS AGAINST A MUNICIPAL CORPORATION (COUNTY). BEADLE vs. SMYSER, 209 US 393. UNTIL IT ISSUES, THE FEE IS IN THE GOVERNMENT, WHICH BY THE PATENT PASSES TO THE GRANTEE, AND HE IS ENTITLED TO ENFORCE POSSESSION IN EJECTMENT, BAGNELL vs. BRODERICK, 13 PETER (US) 436. STATE STATUTES THAT GIVE LESSER AUTHORITATIVE OWNERSHIP OF TITLE THAN THE PATENT CANNOT EVEN BE BROUGHT INTO FEDERAL COURT, LANGDON vs. SHERWOOD, 124 U.S. 74, 80. THE POWER OF CONGRESS TO DISPOSE OF ITS LAND CANNOT BE INTERED WITH, OR ITS EXERCISE EMBARRASSED BY ANY STATE LEGISLATION; NOR CAN SUCH LEGISLATION DEPRIVE THE GRANTEES OF THE UNITED STATES OF THE POSSESSION AND ENJOYMENT OF THE PROPERTY GRANTED BY REASON OF ANY DELAY IN THE TRANSFER OF THE TITLE AFTER THE INITIATION OF PROCEEDINGS FOR ITS ACQUISITION. [GIBSON vs. CHOUTEAU.13 WAL. (U.S.) 92, 93.

(4) LAND TITLE AND TRANSFER. THE EXISTING SYSTEM OF LAND TRANSFER IS A LONG AND TEDIOUS PROCESS INVOLVING THE OBSERVANCE OF MANY FORMALITIES AND TECHNICALITIES, A FAILURE TO OBSERVE ANY ONE OF WHICH MAY DEFEAT THE TITLE. EVEN WHERE THESE HAVE BEEN MOST CAREFULLY COMPLIED WITH. AND WHERE THE TITLE HAS BEEN TRACED TO ITS SOURCE, THE PURCHASER MUST BE AT HIS PERIL, THERE ALWAYS BEING IN SPITE OF THE UTMOST CARE AND EXPENDITURE- THE POSSIBILITY THAT HIS TITLE MAY TURN OUT BAD: YEAKLE, TORRENCE SYSTEM. 209. PATENTS ARE ISSUED (AND THEORETICALLY PASSED) BETWEEN SOVEREIGNS LEADING FIGHTER vs COUNTY OF GREGORY, 230 N. W.2d 114, 116.

THE PATENT IS PRIMA FACIE CONCLUSIVE EVIDENCE OF TITLE, MARSH vs

BROOKS, 49 U.S. 223,233.

AN ESTATE IN INHERITANCE WITHOUT CONDITION. BELONGING TO THE OWNER AND ALIENABLE BY HIM, TRANSMISSIBLE TO HIS HEIRS ABSOLUTELY AND SIMPLY, IS AN ABSOLUTE ESTATE IN PERPETUITY AND THE LARGEST POSSIBLE ESTATE A MAN CAN HAVE. BEING IN FACT ALLODIAL IN ITS NATURE, STANTON vs SULLIVAN, 63 R.I. 216 7 A. 696. THE ORIGINAL MEANING OF A PERPETUITY IS AN INALIENABLE, INDESTRUCTIBLE INTEREST. BOUVIER'S LAW DICTIONARY, VOLUME III P. 2570, (1914).

IF THIS LAND PATENT IS NOT CHALLENGED, AS STATED ABOVE, WITHIN 60 DAYS IT THEN BECOMES OUR PROPERTY, AS NO ONE ELSE HAS FOLLOWED THE PROPER STEPS TO GET LEGAL TITLE, THE FINAL CERTIFICATE OR RECEIPT ACKNOWLEDGING THE PAYMENT IN FULL BY A HOMESTEADER OR PREEMPTOR IS NOT LEGAL EFFECT A CONVEYANCE OF LAND. U.S. vs STEENERSON. 50 FED 504,1 CCA 552,4 U.S. APP. 332.

A LAND PATENT IS A CONCLUSIVE EVIDENCE THAT THE PATENT HAS COMPLIED WITH THE ACT OF CONGRESS AS CONCERNS IMPROVEMENTS ON THE LAND, ETC JANKINS vs GIBSON, 3 LA ANN 203.

(5) LAW ON RIGHTS, PRIVILEGES, AND IMMUNITIES; TRANSFER BY PATENTEE....."TITLE AND RIGHTS OF BONA FIDE PURCHASER FROM PATENTEE.....WILL BE PROTECTED". UNITED STATES vs DEBELL, 227 F 760 (C8 SD 1915), UNITED STATES vs. BEAMON, 242 F 876, (CA8 COLO. 1917): STATE vs HEWITT LAND CO., 74 WASH 573, 134 P 474. FROM 43 USC & 15 n 44. AS AN ASSIGNEE, WHETHER HE BE THE FIRST, SECOND OR THIRD PARTY TO WHOM TITLE IS CONVEYED SHALL LOSE NONE OF THE ORIGINAL RIGHTS, PRIVILEGES OR IMMUNITIES OF THE ORIGINAL GRANTEE OF LAND PATENT. "NO STATE SHALL IMPAIR THE OBLIGATIONS OF CONTRACTS". UNTIED STATES CONSTITUTION ARTICLE I SECTION 10.

(6) EQUAL RIGHTS: PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES ARE FURTHER PROTECTED UNDER THE 14TH AMENDMENT TO THE U.S. CONSTITUTION, " NO STATE.... SHALL DENY TO ANY PERSON WITHIN ITS JURISDICTION THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS".

IN CASES OF EJECTMENT, WHERE THE QUESTION IS WHO HAS THE LEGAL TITLE THE PATENT OF THE GOVERNMENT IS UNASSAILABLE. SANFORD vs. SANFORD, 139 U.S. 642, 35 L ED 290 IN FEDERAL COURTS THE PATENT IS HELD TO BE THE FOUNDATION OF TITLE AT LAW. FENN vs. HOLMES, 21 HOWARD 481.

IMMUNITY FROM COLLATERAL ATTACK: COLLINS vs. BARTLETT, 44 CAL 371; WEBER vs. PERE MARQUETTE BOOM CO.,62 MICH 626, 30 N. W. 469; SURGET vs. DOE, 24 MISS 118; PITTSMONT COPPER CO. vs. VANINA, 71 MONT. 44, 227 PAC 45; GREEN vs. BARKER 47 NEB 934 66 NW 1032

(7) DISCLAIMER; ASSIGNEE'S SEIZEN IN DEED, AND LAWFUL ENTRY IS INCLUSIVE OF SPECIFICALLY THAT CERTAIN LEGALLY DESCRIBED PORTION OF THE ORIGINAL LAND GRANT OR PATENT NO. #5091 AND NOT THE WHOLE THEREOF, INCLUDING HEREDITAMENT, TEMEMENTS, PRE-EMPTION RIGHTS APPURTENANT THERETO. THE RECORDING OF THIS INSTRUMENT SHALL NOT BE CONSTRUED TO DENY OR INFRINGE UPON ANY OTHERS RIGHT TO CLAIM THE REMAINING PORTION THEREOF. ANY CHALLENGES TO THE VALIDITY OF THIS DECLARATION & NOTICE ARE SUBJECT TO THE LIMITATIONS REFERENCED HEREIN. ADDITIONALLY; A COMMON COURTESY OF SIXTY (60) DAYS WAS STIPULATED FOR ANY CHALLENGES HERETO. OTHERWISE. LACHES/ESTOPPEL SHALL FOREVER BAR THE SAME AGAINST ALLODIAL FREEHOLD ESTATE; ASSESSMENT LIEN THEORY TO THE CONTRARY (ORS 275.130), INCLUDED.

THE FOLLOWING DOCUMENTS ARE ANNEXED AND MADE PART TO THIS DECLARATION: CERTIFICATE OF ACCEPTANCE OF DECLARATION OF LAND PATENT, CERTIFIED COPY OF ORIGINAL LAND PATENT, CORRECTED DEED AND RE-CONVEYANCE OF TITLE, LAND GRANT AND PATENT ALLONGE.

Dated this 26 day of August, 2022

Landlord Signature: ALL RIGHTS RESERVED WITHOUT PREJUDICE.

/s/


Zhann Bright Izotov, Woan, Sui Juris

CALIFORNIA NOTARIAL CERTIFICATE (JURAT)

A notary public or other officer completing this certificate verifies only the identity of the individual who signed the document to which this certificate is attached, and not the truthfulness, accuracy, or validity of that document.

State of California
County of SAN DIEGO

Subscribed and sworn to (or affirmed) before me on this 26 day of August,
2022, by Zhanna Bright Izotov, proved to me on the basis of satisfactory
evidence to be the person(s) who appeared before me.

Signature _____

(Seal)

