

This is Google's cache of <http://home.swbell.net/truelaw/28USC1915.html>.
 Google's cache is the snapshot that we took of the page as we crawled the web.
 The page may have changed since that time. [Click here for the current page without highlighting.](#)
 To link to or bookmark this page, use the following url: <http://www.google.com/search?q=cache:SE2kQtGDgK0J:home.swbell.net/truelaw/28USC1915.html+hl=en&ie=UTF-8>

Google is not affiliated with the authors of this page nor responsible for its content.

WHAT HAPPENED TO YOUR RIGHT TO COUNSEL ?

For over 2000 years, the English speaking people (and their ancestors) of the world have had the right to counsel before a judge could take their property. In 1981, that all changed. Our U.S. Supreme Court took away the right to counsel that has been the birthright of free men from the very origin of the law. Our United States Congress first adopted the common law right to counsel in the First Congress and then passed a law in 1892 and another in 1948 granting free counsel to all citizens. The words of the law are as follows:

27 Stat. 252, (1892)

Sec. 1. That any citizen of the United States, entitled to commence any suit or action in any court in the United States, may commence and prosecute to conclusion, any such suit or action without being required to prepay fees or costs, or give security therefor before or after bringing suit or action, upon filing in said court a statement under oath, in writing, that , because of his poverty, he is unable to pay costs of said suit or action which he is about to commence, or give security for the same, and that he believes he is entitled to the redress he seeks by such suit or action, and setting forth briefly the nature of his alleged cause or action.

Sec. 2. That after any such suit or action shall have been brought, or that it is now pending, the plaintiff may answer and avoid a demand for fees or security for costs by filing a like affidavit, and willful false swearing in any affidavit provided for in this or the previous section shall be punished as perjury as in other cases.

Sec. 3. That the officers of the court shall issue, serve all processes, and perform all duties in such cases, and witnesses shall attend as in other cases, and the plaintiff shall have the same remedies as are provided by law in other cases.

Sec. 4. That the court may request any attorney of the court to represent such poor person, if it deems the cause worthy of a trial and may dismiss any such cause so brought under this act if it be made to appear that the allegation of poverty is untrue, or if said court be satisfied that he alleged cause of action is frivolous or malicious.

Sec. 5. That judgement may be rendered for costs at the conclusion of the suit as in other cases: Provided, that the United States shall not be liable for any of the costs thus incurred.

The stated purpose of the law, according to the report before the Committee on the Judiciary, was well known. "(T)his bill." according to the Report, "presents the question whether this Government, having established courts to do justice to litigants, will admit the wealthy and deny the poor entrance to them to have their rights adjudicated." Much has been added to the law. Including clear guarantees through out the body of the law expanding the right counsel for prisoners. However not one word has been written in the law denying the right to counsel for civil litigants or taking any right away from a citizen. In fact the law clearly states that all citizens are entitled to the appointment of counsel. 28 USC 1915 Section (a) Expands the right

to all persons including prisoners. Section (b) Further explains the rights of prisoners. Section (c) Explains the benefits.

Section (d) States " The officers of the court shall issue and serve all process, and perform all duties in such cases.

Witnesses shall attend as in other cases, and the same remedies shall be available as are provided for by law in other cases. Section (e) THE COURT MAY REQUEST AN ATTORNEY TO REPRESENT ANY PERSON UNABLE TO AFFORD COUNSEL. Section (f) Allows for costs to be awarded. Section (g) Limits the rights of prisoners. As shown in Section 4, above, the current law states that "The court may request an attorney to represent any person unable to afford counsel." THIS GREATLY EXPANDS THE RIGHT TO COUNSEL TO "ANY" PERSON. There is clearly no denial limit on who should be appointed counsel. There is nothing in the law limiting the right to those who may be imprisoned. Yet our Supreme Court has chosen to steal this right from every citizen simply in an effort to give billions of dollars to lawyers and to make themselves millionaires. In an effort to steal your money in 1981, the court said that the law only allowed the appointment of counsel in cases where a person may be imprisoned. Clearly the intent of the law as passed by Congress was to allow all middle class and poor persons the right to counsel before an attorney could force them into court and take their property. At least that was the belief of our founding fathers, 2000 years of common law, and the earlier United States Congresses. And I have proven that the right to counsel has been a right of the English-speaking people for over 2000 years. And I have proven that the right to counsel is a Constitutional right in the United States. It is clear that the right to counsel belongs to the citizen as it has always belonged to the people. So why did crooked lawyers in the Lassiter case, in 1981, steal a right that belonged to the people for over 2000 years? It is simple. Look at the Tobacco Cases. In those cases billions of dollars were awarded to lawyers. If the law granting free counsel were in effect, the billions of dollars would have been used to pay a fair fee to the lawyers and the remainder could have been used to pay for counsel for the poor. So it is easy to see that if lawyers were required to follow the law as written, then they would have been required to work for fair wages and would not have been entitled to the billions of dollars in fees that they stole from the public. And it is true that the judges share in the billions of dollars in windfall. Every time a judge is up for appointment, he must have the favor of lawyers to be appointed. And to gain their favor he must grant them some favors. As we all know, a Federal Judgeship is worth millions of dollars in wages and retirement benefits. And a Judgeship is only attainable if a judge gets the nod of the bar. So very few judges will ever be appointed that do the will of the people before doing the will of the bar.

So it is clear why the lawyers and judges have hidden your right. They want your money. Check out Adkins v. Dupont at the U.S. Supreme Court by hitting the html below.

<http://caselaw.findlaw.com/scripts/getcase.pl?navby=search&linkurl=http%3a//www.romingerlegal.com/supreme.htm&graphurl=http%3a//www.romingerlegal.com/rlsfndla.gif&court=US&case=/us/335/331.html>

- JOIN AND HELP BY SIGNING MY GUEST BOOK
- RUINING OUR SOCIETY
- HARVARD LAW REVIEW EXCERPT
- JUDGES V. CONSTITUTION
- REPORT OF THE CONTINENTIAL CONGRESS



This page was last updated on July 24, 1999