

**No. 10-16696**  
**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS**  
**FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT**  
KRISTIN PERRY, et al.,  
*Plaintiffs-Appellees,*  
v.  
ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER, et al.  
*Defendants.*

---

Appeal from United States District Court for the  
Northern District of California

---

Civil Case No. 09-CV-2292 VRW (Honorable Vaughn R. Walker)

---

Letter of Objection

---

Gordon W. Epperly  
P.O. Box 34358  
Juneau, Alaska 99803

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL  
1300 I Street, Suite 125  
P.O Box. 944255  
Sacramento, CA 94244-2550

Gentleman

According to several newspapers for the State of California, the Offices of California Marriage License are poised to start issuing marriage licenses to all who wish to have same sex marriages. It appears that everyone is under

the impression that the U.S. District Court ruling of Judge Walker applies to everyone who were not named as Plaintiffs to the case. This conclusion is in error.

Nowhere may we find in any of the U.S. District Court Pleadings of KRISTIN PERRY, et. al., v. ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER, et. al., that the case was presented to the U.S. District Court as a “*Class Action*” case or controversy nor can we find any “*Order of the Court*” declaring the case to be a “*Class Action*” litigation. There are only four (4) named Plaintiffs to the case and they are: KRISTIN M. PERRY, SANDRA B. STIER, PAUL T. KATAMI, and JEFFREY J. ZARRILLO and the ruling of Judge Walker declaring that Proposition 8 to be unconstitutional can only be apply to the named Plaintiffs.

Newspapers have been reporting that DENNIS HOLLINGWORTH, GAIL J. KNIGHT, MARTIN F. GUTIERREZ, MARK A. JANSSON, AND PROTECTMARRIAGE.COM are not named parties to the case and as such, they have no standing to bring an Appeal as DEFENDANT-INTERVENORS-APPELLANTS to the U.S. Court of Appeals.<sup>1/</sup> But we see the Attorney General manipulating the Court Order of Judge Walker to include everyone in the State of California who are not named Plaintiffs/Appellees to have standing to apply for same sex marriage licenses. As the Court ruling of Judge Walker can only be applied to the named Plaintiffs, any other individuals that believes they have a right to same sex marriage licenses would have to file a Complaint of their own or

---

<sup>1/</sup> See Los Angeles Times (08-15-10) @ <http://www.latimes.com/news/opinion/commentary/la-oe-chemerinsky-gay-marriage-20100815,0,6839883.story>

present a “*Class Action*” litigation in a Court of Law. The Offices of Marriage Licenses have no authority to issue same sex marriage licenses except to the named Plaintiffs of the Case.

There is another problem. The jurisdiction of the U.S. District Court was challenged with a written letter to Judge Walker which was received for the Judge by Anna Sprinkles. A copy of the challenge of jurisdiction was also mailed to all parties of the case. There are no procedures or formats to be followed to challenge jurisdiction nor is the presentation of a challenge of jurisdiction limited to the named Parties of the Case. Judge Walker had a duty to give answer to the challenge before moving forward with the case. There is no such thing as a presumption of jurisdiction.

Judge Walker was given notice that the case was to be founded upon a none existent Amendment to the United States Constitution, the Fourteenth (14<sup>th</sup>) Amendment. Judge Walker was to give a statement as to how he acquired jurisdiction under the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment to the U.S. Constitution when every Federal Judge has full knowledge that the Amendment was founded upon fraud as the Amendment was rejected by more than one-fourth (1/4<sup>th</sup>) of the States in the Union at the time the Amendment was submitted to the States for ratification.

Judge Walker was to give answer to two simple questions: By what authority did the Congress of 1867 rely upon to allow unlawful governments (*as identified by the U.S. Congress*) to cast votes of ratification on proposed Amendments to the United States Constitution? And on what date did

the Southern States of the Union ceased to have lawful governments as proclaimed by the U.S. Congress within the Reconstruction Acts of 1867?


By the “*Oath of Office*” taken by Judge Walker, the Judge has a duty to protect and defend the Constitution of the United States which requires him to give answer to the question of lawful ratification of Amendments to the U.S. Constitution before using those Amendments as the foundation of his Court Rulings. Judge Walker’s duty of “*Oath of Office*” is not a Political Question that can be peddled off to some imaginary authority.

The rejection of ratification of the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment is documented with House and Senate Journals of the States that were in the Union during the year of 1867. These documents are still intact and they may be viewed at:

<http://www.14th-amendment.com>

It is hereby declared that the Ruling of Judge Walker has no standing as the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment is not an Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. It is time to put a stop to the Judicial fraud that has been perpetrated upon the People for over one hundred years.

Sincerely Yours



Gordon Warren Epperly

P.O. Box 34358

Juneau, Alaska 99803

Cc: Judge Vaughn R. Walker