

For clarity, I'm not a lawyer and I didn't play one on TV but here's what I've found of interest that likely should be reviewed by a lawyer, but who do your trust these days and the courts are also a mess and seem to be compromised so, FOR ENTERTAINMENT PURPOSES, let's review and see where this takes us:

It all began when I printed and read this 257-page document titled, "Legal, Constitutional and Human Rights Violations of the Smart Grid and Smart Meters <https://tinyurl.com/33rnjtaf>

I've been giving a copy of this document from 2010 (?) to several officials because it seems to detail not just one crime but a set of crimes. I could hardly believe it, but let's go over a bit of what it reveals.

For those who don't know, the 2005 Energy Policy Act stated that these digital electric meters **COULD NOT BE FORCED ON CUSTOMERS**. They could only be OFFERED or placed upon request.

Since that's not at all what happened it made me go do some more looking around and this little beast document shows that some people actually deceived the government saying these meters would "create jobs" when they actually took away meter reader jobs. They did this to access grant money that was absolutely forbidden to do with regard to these meters specifically if they were being FORCED on customers. So, they hid their dirty deeds by using a secret bank named in this document.

## **FRAUD HAPPENED!**

"Wouldn't there be laws against this kind of fraud perpetuated on citizens?"

## **Then I found the Uniform Commercial Code**

**The Uniform Commercial Code (UCC)** is a widely used set of rules that helps standardize commercial transactions in the United States, especially deals involving goods, payments and financing.

**The UCC is a model code that states adopt into law.** That means the rules are broadly consistent across the country, but the version that matters is the one adopted by **the state that governs** your contract.

Is the Uniform Commercial Code legally binding?

★ AI Overview

The **Uniform Commercial Code (UCC) is not binding on its own**, as it is a model set of laws rather than a federal statute.  Georgetown University +1

However, the UCC **becomes legally binding** once it is enacted and adopted as state law. All 50 states, the District of Columbia, and U.S. territories have adopted versions of the UCC (though individual states may have minor local variations or omissions).  LawShelf +2

## Key Facts About UCC Enforceability

- **Model Code Status:** As drafted by the [Uniform Law Commission](#) and the American Law Institute, the UCC is merely a template or recommendation.  Uniform Law Commission +1

So, I went over and asked Google if Ohio had adopted the UCC into its laws and sure enough this is what I found:

has Ohio adopted the UCC into it's laws specifically UCC 1-103 (b)

All Forums Shopping Images Videos News More ▾ Tools ▾

★ AI Overview

Yes, Ohio has adopted UCC § 1-103 into state law under **Ohio Revised Code (O.R.C.) Section 1301.103**.  Ohio Laws (.gov)

### Key Details of Ohio's Adoption

- **Statutory Codification:** Ohio Revised Code § 1301.103 mirrors UCC § 1-103.  Ohio Laws (.gov)
- **Supplemental Principles (UCC 1-103(b)):** Subsection (B) of Ohio Revised Code § 1301.103 explicitly states that unless displaced by the particular provisions of the Ohio UCC chapters (Chapters 1301 through 1310 and 1314), the principles of law and equity—including the law merchant, contract capacity, agency, estoppel, fraud, misrepresentation, duress, coercion, mistake, and bankruptcy—continue to supplement the statutory code.  Ohio Laws (.gov) +2
- **Liberal Construction (UCC 1-103(a)):** Subsection (A) mandates that the commercial code be liberally construed to simplify, clarify, and modernize commercial law, permit expansion through custom and agreement, and promote uniformity across jurisdictions.  Ohio Laws (.gov) +1

AI responses may include mistakes. For legal advice, consult a professional. [Learn more](#)

# Then I asked Google to show me this for Arkansas:

has Arkansas adopted the UCC codes specifically the UCC 1-103(b) X | 🔊 | 🔄

◆ AI Overview

Yes, Arkansas has adopted the Uniform Commercial Code (UCC) and codified its equivalent of UCC § 1-103 under **Ark. Code Ann. § 4-1-103**. Justia Law

### How Arkansas Codified UCC 1-103

- **Code Section:** Arkansas codified the rule under [Arkansas Code § 4-1-103](#) (part of Title 4, Subtitle 1, Chapter 1 regarding General Provisions). Justia Law
- **Structure Note:** While the model Uniform Commercial Code (Revised Article 1) labels the supplemental principles provision as subsection (b) (UCC § 1-103(b)), the Arkansas statute is structured into numbered subsections (1) and (2) rather than lettered paragraphs. LII | Legal Information I... +1
- **Substantive Content:** Subsection (2) of Arkansas's statute mirrors the substance of UCC § 1-103(b), stating that unless displaced by the particular provisions of the subtitle, principles of law and equity—including the law merchant, capacity to contract, principal and agent, estoppel, fraud, misrepresentation, duress, coercion, mistake, bankruptcy, and other validating or invalidating causes—supplement its provisions. Justia Law

Then a book I have reported that the UCC 1-103(b) provides that, Fraud Vitiates Everything It Touches (Marbury v Madison 1803) so I went to see if that was correct and found it a bit more involved, but generally yes contracts and actions based on fraud are VOIDABLE:

DOES FRAUD VOID AN ACT BY A UTILITY COMPANY IN ARKANSAS X | 🔊 | 🔄

◆ AI Overview

In Arkansas, fraud or material misrepresentation generally makes a contract **voidable**—not automatically void. LII | Legal Information I... +1

### Key Legal Principles in Arkansas

- **Voidable vs. Void:** Under Arkansas contract law (and established rulings like *Clay v. Brand* and *Allen v. Overturf*), a contract induced by fraud is voidable at the option of the injured party. This means the victim can choose to rescind (cancel) the agreement or waive the fraud and enforce the contract. It does not become a nullity on its own without legal action or a proper election by the affected party. batesvilleattorneys.com +4
- **Elements of Fraud/Deceit:** To prove fraud or fraudulent inducement in Arkansas (such as under civil jury instructions like AMI 2433), a party must establish five core elements:
  - 1. A false representation of a material fact.
  - 2. Knowledge or belief by the maker that the representation is false (or reckless disregard).
  - 3. Intent to induce the other party to act or enter the contract.
  - 4. Justifiable reliance on the false statement by the injured party.
  - 5. Resulting damage or injury. govt.westlaw.com +1
- **Regulated Utilities:** Utility companies in Arkansas operate under the oversight of the [Arkansas Public Service Commission](#). If a customer commits fraud or makes false statements to obtain or keep utility service, the utility has specific regulatory backing (such as the authority to suspend service or require higher deposits under Commission rules) rather than the entire service relationship automatically being voided. Conversely, if a utility itself engaged in actionable fraud regarding a binding agreement, the customer would typically have to pursue rescission or damages in court or through the appropriate regulatory channels rather than treating the utility's acts as automatically void. Arkansas.gov +2

*Note: Specific outcomes depend heavily on the exact nature of the act, whether it involves a private contract, and the rules of the Arkansas Public Service Commission. Consulting a licensed Arkansas attorney is recommended for specific disputes.*

All responses may include mistakes. For legal advice, consult a professional. [Learn more](#)

So, the next question is, “Where is Our Remedy” to have these toxic electric meters that were FORCED on us in violation of the 2005 Energy Policy Act removed? I’ve already found out that the Arkansas Public Service Commission isn’t going to do ANYTHING. Apparently nobody in the entire state is going to come against this widespread agenda. One of many being passed along by guys in suits in boardrooms who historically have a bad habit of not being able to stand up to fellow men in business suits, especially if they have more power, money, or status. NOBODY seems to be reading up on what the guys in suits taking them to lunch are up to, which amazes me.

From what I can see it looks like our remedy is in a Federal Court, which is expensive and if you don’t know what you’re doing it can be like putting a match to your money. I’m willing to launch a podcast and think I can raise \$100k by asking 1000 people to put in \$100 each, BUT I’m still looking for assurances that the whole British Accreditation Registry (American BAR Association) isn’t completely compromised now and watching informational videos about Common Law so we’ll see where this takes us.

It does seem that PUBLIC OFFICIALS can be held personally and criminally liable for any actions taken that are outside their authority in office. Violating someone’s Constitutional Rights would absolutely fall into that category.

## **Oaths of Office**

**Can the city officials be held legally liable?**

<https://www.justia.com/civil-rights/government-violations-of-civil-rights/>

## **Government Violations of Civil Rights**

People who work for the government hold substantial authority due to their position, but this authority is not unlimited. **Government officials and employees generally cannot violate the civil rights of people who interact with them. Someone who has suffered a violation of their civil rights at the hands of a state or local government official can bring a Section 1983 claim.** Section 1983 (**42 U.S.C. Section 1983**) is a federal law that allows citizens to sue in certain situations for violations of rights conferred by the U.S. Constitution or federal laws. Section 1983 only provides a right of access to state or federal courts, rather than any substantive rights.

**A plaintiff who prevails in a Section 1983 claim may be awarded monetary damages, and a court also may issue an injunction. Damages may cover items such as medical bills to treat any injuries, lost wages caused by time missed from work, and any pain and suffering or emotional distress.** Punitive damages may be awarded in especially extreme cases. An injunction is a court order that tells someone to do or stop doing something. A court might order a change to policies or procedures that would prevent future violations.

### **Examples of Potential Section 1983 Claims**

- **Excessive force** and other forms of police misconduct
- Violations of prisoner rights
- Restrictions on free speech in government workplaces or public schools
- Due process or **equal protection** violations by state, city, or county officials

### **Establishing Liability Under Section 1983**

The key to holding a government defendant liable under Section 1983 involves showing that they were acting under color of law at the time of the violation. **“Acting under color of law” is a technical phrase that essentially means an abuse of power.** This requirement thus excludes actions by a government official in a private role, outside the scope of their job. Showing that an official was acting under color of law may involve proving that they were carrying out one of their central duties, they were wearing a

uniform associated with their job, they were using property or equipment provided by their job, or they showed proof of their official status or claimed to be a government official, among other indicators.

However, once a plaintiff sets out the elements of a Section 1983 claim, they still may need to overcome an additional hurdle known as qualified immunity.

### **The Qualified Immunity Defense to Section 1983 Claims**

Accountability for abuses of power is vital in a democracy. At the same time, government officials cannot effectively do their jobs if they are worried about being sued at every step of the way. The qualified immunity defense responds to this concern.

Qualified immunity allows government officials to avoid liability under Section 1983 if their actions did not violate a clearly established right. This is a right that would be known to a reasonably competent government official in their situation, such that they should have been aware that their conduct was unlawful. (The right must have been clearly established at the time of the violation.) The conduct resulting in the Section 1983 claim must have clearly violated the right. This means that questionable or mildly dubious behavior usually does not lead to liability. Instead, government officials tend to be held liable only for egregious misconduct, and the plaintiff generally needs to produce case precedents based on facts very similar to their case.

### **Appeals Involving Qualified Immunity**

If a trial court finds that qualified immunity does not apply, a government defendant may appeal that decision to a higher court before the case goes to trial. This can extend Section 1983 litigation and increase costs.

### ***Bivens* Actions: Suing Federal Officials**

Section 1983 applies only to misconduct by state or local government officials. This does not mean that citizens lack recourse when federal government officials violate their rights. In a case known as *Bivens v. Six Unknown Federal Narcotics Agents*, the U.S.

Supreme Court ruled that citizens can bring civil rights claims against federal officials in narrow situations. *Bivens* claims may be brought when federal law has not provided a separate way to address a violation of the right at issue. They are generally based only on constitutional violations, rather than violations of federal statutes. *Bivens* claims thus are less common than Section 1983 claims.

*Last reviewed May 2026*

AI Overview

**The punishment or legal consequence for violating constitutional rights depends on whether the violation is handled through criminal prosecution, civil lawsuits, or federal civil rights statutes.** Department of Justice (.gov) +2

## 1. Criminal Penalties (Under Color of Law)

When public officials (such as police officers, prison guards, or judges) willfully violate a person's constitutional rights while using their official authority, they face federal criminal charges under **18 U.S.C. § 242** (Deprivation of Rights Under Color of Law):

LII | Legal Information Institute +2

- **Standard violation (no injury):** Fines and up to **1 year** in prison.
- **With bodily injury or use of a dangerous weapon:** Fines and up to **10 years** in prison.
- **Resulting in death, kidnapping, or aggravated sexual abuse:** Up to **life imprisonment** or the **death penalty**.

Department of Justice (.gov)

Under **18 U.S.C. § 241** (Conspiracy Against Rights), two or more people who conspire to injure or intimidate someone in the free exercise of their constitutional rights face up to **10 years in prison, or life imprisonment/death** if aggravating factors or death result. These criminal cases are investigated and prosecuted exclusively by the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ). Congress.gov +2

## 2. Civil Liabilities and Damages (Section 1983)

Individuals whose constitutional rights have been violated by state or local government officials can file a civil lawsuit under **42 U.S.C. § 1983**:

American Civil Liberties Union

- **Money Damages:** Plaintiffs can sue for compensatory and punitive damages in federal court to recover for financial loss, physical injury, or emotional distress.

- **Qualified Immunity Barrier:** Government agents are often protected by **qualified immunity**. Under this doctrine, officials cannot be held personally liable unless the plaintiff can prove that the violated right was "clearly established" at the time of the incident.

### **3. Exclusionary Rule (Courtroom Remedy)**

In criminal proceedings, if law enforcement violates a defendant's constitutional rights (such as an illegal search and seizure violating the Fourth Amendment), the primary legal remedy is the **Exclusionary Rule**. This prevents prosecutors from using evidence obtained through the unconstitutional conduct in court.

**So, that's where I am at this point of my research.**

**If you have any connections to people who can provide legal advice on this please reach out or have them contact us:**

<https://neighborsorganizingagainsttrespassingtechnology.blog/contact/>