
UNIFIED LEGAL ARTIFACT PACKAGE

Capacity Challenge, Status Correction & Doctrinal Analysis

Prepared for Litigation Research, Administrative Challenge, and Doctrinal Study

April 2026

FOR LEGAL RESEARCH AND LITIGATION PREPARATION PURPOSES

MASTER TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXHIBIT A: Model Brief — Challenging Imputed Statutory Capacity (PUB/PRI Framework)

- I. Preliminary Statement
 - II. Statement of the Capacity Doctrine
 - III. The Effective-Connection Requirement
 - IV. Argument: The Imputation Is Unlawful
 - V. Prayer for Relief
- Signature Block

EXHIBIT B: Capacity-Challenge Template for Administrative and Judicial Proceedings

Section 1: Identification of Parties

Section 2: Jurisdictional Challenge Statement

Section 3: Specific Grounds for Challenge

Section 4: Demand for Production

Section 5: Reservation of Rights

Signature and Date Block

EXHIBIT C: Status-Correction Affidavit with Factual Declarations and Notary Block

Preamble

Factual Declarations (¶¶ 1-15)

Signature Block

Notary Block (Jurat)

EXHIBIT D: Flowchart — Lawful Attachment of Federal Civil Capacity and Failure Points

Stage 1: Initial Status

Stage 2: Registration Event

Stage 3: Effective Connection Analysis

Stage 4: Consent Validation

Stage 5: Scope Limitation

Stage 6: Capacity Identification

Terminal Outcomes

EXHIBIT E: Litigation-Ready Doctrinal Matrix

Doctrinal Matrix: Capacity Analysis for Litigation Preparation (8 Analytical Dimensions)

APPENDIX: Notes on Use and Limitations

EXHIBIT A

MODEL BRIEF — CHALLENGING IMPUTED STATUTORY CAPACITY (PUB/PRI Framework)

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE *[DISTRICT]*

[Declarant Name], in propria persona,
appearing in private capacity (Person_{PRI}),

v.

[Agency/Officer Name], in official capacity,

Case No. *[_____]*

BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF CHALLENGE TO
IMPUTED STATUTORY CAPACITY

I. PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

1. This brief is submitted on behalf of the Declarant, appearing in propria persona and solely in private capacity (hereinafter "Person_{PRI}"), to challenge the imputation of statutory public capacity (hereinafter "Person_{PUB}") upon a private individual without evidence of informed, voluntary consent or lawful jurisdictional attachment. The foundational issue presented is whether a government agency or officer may lawfully treat a natural person as a statutory subject without first establishing, through affirmative evidence,

that a valid jurisdictional connection exists between the individual and the regulatory scheme invoked.

2. Capacity is not a presumption — it is a jurisdictional prerequisite that must be affirmatively established before any regulatory authority can attach. Every interaction between the individual and the state occurs within a specific legal capacity. The failure to identify, verify, and correctly assign that capacity renders any subsequent exercise of authority jurisdictionally defective. Jurisdiction assumed rather than established is jurisdiction that does not exist.

3. Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 17(b), the capacity of an individual to sue or be sued is determined by the law of the individual's domicile, except for those acting in a representative capacity. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 17(b)(1). This rule acknowledges that capacity is a distinct legal question — separate from standing, subject-matter jurisdiction, and the merits — that must be resolved at the threshold of any proceeding. The government cannot bypass this threshold inquiry by presuming that every natural person within its territorial boundaries operates in a statutory capacity.

4. Declarant respectfully submits that the continued imputation of Person_{PUB} status without a demonstrated factual and legal basis constitutes a deprivation of due process and an exercise of authority beyond the lawful scope of the officers and agencies involved. This brief sets forth the doctrinal framework for the capacity distinction, the effective-connection requirement, and the specific grounds upon which the imputation is challenged.

II. STATEMENT OF THE CAPACITY DOCTRINE

5. **Person_{PRI} — Private Capacity.** The living human being operating in natural, private capacity is the holder of unalienable rights existing prior to

and independent of any government grant. The private individual is the constitutional principal — the original source of all delegated governmental authority. The relationship between Person_{PRI} and the state is defined not by administrative enrollment but by actual, informed, voluntary consent. In the absence of such consent, Person_{PRI} stands outside the regulatory jurisdiction of any statutory scheme, retaining the full measure of rights recognized by the Constitution.

6. **Person_{PUB} — Public/Statutory Capacity.** The juridical entity generated through state registration systems — including birth certificates, Social Security enrollment, licensing regimes, and taxpayer identification systems — exists as a creature of statute. Person_{PUB} exists within the regulatory jurisdiction of the creating authority, and the relationship is one of legislative grant and legislative regulation. What the state creates, the state may condition; what the legislature grants, the legislature may regulate. The rights and obligations of Person_{PUB} are defined and bounded by the statutory framework that gave rise to that capacity.

7. These are not two different people — they are two different capacities of the same individual. The critical doctrinal question is always: *In which capacity is the individual operating, and in which capacity is the state addressing them?* The failure to ask and answer this question at the threshold of every government interaction is the root of the jurisdictional defect challenged herein.

8. The distinction between Person_{PRI} and Person_{PUB} is not merely theoretical. It carries concrete consequences for the standard of review applicable to government action, the burden of proof in jurisdictional disputes, the scope of authority exercisable by government officers, and the remedies available to the individual. The conflation of these two capacities — treating a private individual as though the individual were a statutory subject — constitutes the specific doctrinal error known as *capacity inversion*.

9. The capacity doctrine does not deny the existence or legitimacy of Person_{PUB}. It insists only that the transition from Person_{PRI} to Person_{PUB} must be accomplished through a lawful mechanism — the effective connection — and that such transition cannot be presumed, imposed, or accomplished by administrative fiat.

III. THE EFFECTIVE-CONNECTION REQUIREMENT

10. The state must establish a valid "effective connection" — the jurisdictional mechanism by which the state links Person_{PRI} to Person_{PUB} — before regulatory authority can lawfully attach to the natural person. The effective connection is the jurisdictional bridge between private and public capacity. Without it, the state possesses no lawful basis to exercise regulatory authority over the individual in a statutory capacity. The effective connection must be specific, demonstrable, and grounded in an identifiable act, event, or agreement.

11. **Registration as Connection Mechanism.** The primary mechanism by which the state claims to establish an effective connection is registration — the enrollment of the individual in a government database or system. Birth registration, Social Security enrollment, driver's license applications, voter registration, and taxpayer identification number issuance are all forms of registration that the state may invoke as the basis for jurisdictional attachment. However, registration alone is not self-executing as a jurisdictional instrument. The question is whether the registration was accompanied by the informed, voluntary consent of the individual whose private capacity is thereby affected.

12. **Consent Mechanics.** Three forms of consent are relevant: (a) *actual consent* — informed, voluntary, specific, and revocable — which satisfies

constitutional requirements for jurisdictional attachment; (b) *constructive consent* — inferred from conduct, participation, or acceptance of benefits — which raises due process concerns when used as the sole basis for jurisdictional attachment over Person_{PRI}; and (c) *presumed consent* — attributed to the individual based solely on status, residence, or registration — which is constitutionally inadequate as a jurisdictional basis because it inverts the burden, requiring the individual to prove non-consent rather than requiring the state to prove consent.

13. **The Identification Trap.** A particularly significant mechanism of capacity assignment is the demand for state-issued identification. When a government officer demands that an individual produce a driver's license, Social Security card, or other government-issued credential, the demand functions as a de facto capacity assignment — it compels the individual to identify as Person_{PUB} as a precondition to the interaction. This mechanism bypasses the threshold capacity inquiry and treats the production of identification as an implicit admission of statutory capacity, regardless of the individual's actual intent or understanding.

IV. ARGUMENT: THE IMPUTATION IS UNLAWFUL

14. **The government bears the burden of establishing jurisdiction.** It is a foundational principle of constitutional governance that the government bears the burden of establishing that a valid effective connection exists before exercising regulatory authority over the individual. Jurisdiction is never presumed. The party asserting jurisdiction must prove it. This principle applies with full force to the capacity question: the government must demonstrate, by affirmative

evidence, that Person_{PRI} has been lawfully connected to the statutory scheme under which jurisdiction is claimed.

- 15. Registration does not equal consent.** Registration in a government database — whether through the assignment of a Social Security Number, the filing of a birth certificate, or any other administrative enrollment — does not, standing alone, constitute voluntary consent to regulatory jurisdiction over the natural person. Registration is an administrative act, often performed by third parties (parents, hospitals, employers) without the knowledge, participation, or capacity to consent of the individual whose status is affected. To treat registration as consent is to impute a contractual obligation without a meeting of the minds, without consideration, and without the voluntary assent that is the *sine qua non* of legitimate consent.
- 16. Constructive or presumed consent fails the constitutional standard.** Constructive or presumed consent fails to satisfy the constitutional standard for jurisdiction over Person_{PRI} because it inverts the burden of proof. Instead of requiring the state to demonstrate that the individual consented to the regulatory scheme, it requires the individual to prove that the individual did *not* consent. This inversion violates the most basic principle of due process: the government must justify its exercise of authority, not the individual.
- 17. Capacity inversion is a due process violation.** Capacity inversion — treating Person_{PRI} as though the individual were Person_{PUB} — constitutes a due process violation under both the Fifth Amendment (as applied to the federal government) and the Fourteenth Amendment (as applied to state governments). The deprivation occurs because the individual is subjected to regulatory authority, statutory obligations, and administrative processes without the government having established a valid jurisdictional connection. No person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law — and due process

requires, at minimum, that the government establish the basis for its authority before exercising it.

18. Ultra vires action by ministerial officers. The ministerial officer's authority is bounded by statute; acts beyond that boundary are ultra vires. Officers have a ministerial duty to correctly identify and respect the capacity in which an individual appears. When an officer treats Person_{PRI} as Person_{PUB} without verifying the capacity in which the individual operates, the officer exceeds the lawful scope of delegated authority. An officer cannot create jurisdiction through the officer's own presumption; jurisdiction must exist as a matter of law and fact before the officer acts.

19. Systematic administrative overreach. The systematic failure to conduct capacity analysis before imposing statutory obligations constitutes a pattern of administrative overreach that violates the structural separation between sovereign individuals and administered subjects. When every person encountered by a government agency is automatically treated as a statutory person — without inquiry, without verification, without any opportunity to assert private capacity — the administrative apparatus has exceeded its lawful mandate and is operating as though the distinction between Person_{PRI} and Person_{PUB} does not exist. This is not a case-by-case error; it is a structural defect in the exercise of government power.

V. PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Declarant respectfully requests that this Honorable Court grant the following relief:

1. **Declaratory Judgment** — that the imputation of Person_{PUB} capacity upon Declarant without evidence of informed, voluntary consent is

unlawful and violates Declarant's rights under the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States;

2. **Injunctive Relief** — prohibiting the continued treatment of Declarant as a statutory person absent affirmative proof of voluntary jurisdictional attachment through a valid effective connection;
3. **Order Requiring Production of Evidence** — directing the government to produce evidence of the specific act of informed, voluntary consent by which Declarant allegedly submitted to the regulatory jurisdiction at issue, including identification of the date, circumstances, and terms of such consent;
4. **Such other and further relief** as this Court deems just, equitable, and proper under the circumstances.

Respectfully submitted,

[Declarant Name], in propria persona
Appearing in Private Capacity (Person_{PRI})

Date: _____

Address: *[Address]*

Telephone: *[Phone]*

Email: *[Email]*

EXHIBIT B

CAPACITY-CHALLENGE

TEMPLATE

For Administrative and Judicial Proceedings

CHALLENGE TO IMPUTED STATUTORY CAPACITY

Administrative and Judicial Use — Reusable Template

Section 1: Identification of Parties

Field	Entry
Name of Challenging Party (in private capacity)	<i>[Full Legal Name]</i> , appearing as Person _{PRI}
Name/Title of Responding Agency or Officer	<i>[Agency Name or Officer Name and Title]</i>
Docket / Case / File Number	<i>[Docket No. / Case No. / File No.]</i>
Forum	<i>[Administrative Tribunal / U.S. District Court / Appellate Court]</i>

Section 2: Jurisdictional Challenge Statement

The undersigned, appearing **specialy and solely** for the purpose of challenging jurisdiction, hereby contests the imputation of statutory public capacity (Person_{PUB}) and demands that the ***[Agency/Court]*** produce evidence establishing a lawful effective connection between the undersigned's natural private capacity (Person_{PRI}) and the statutory regulatory scheme under which jurisdiction is claimed. This special appearance shall not be construed as a general appearance, as consent to jurisdiction, or as a waiver of any right, privilege, or immunity to which the undersigned is entitled in private capacity.

Section 3: Specific Grounds for Challenge

The undersigned challenges the imputed statutory capacity on the following specific grounds (check all that apply):

<input type="checkbox"/>	No.	Ground for Challenge	Explanatory Note
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	No evidence of informed, voluntary consent to statutory enrollment	The government has produced no evidence that the undersigned knowingly and voluntarily consented to enrollment in the statutory scheme at issue.
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	No valid effective connection established between Person _{PRI} and Person _{PUB}	No jurisdictional bridge linking the undersigned's natural capacity to the claimed statutory framework has been identified or demonstrated.
<input type="checkbox"/>	3	Reliance on presumed or constructive consent rather than actual consent	The jurisdiction claimed rests upon presumed or constructive consent, which fails to satisfy constitutional due process requirements.
<input type="checkbox"/>	4	Capacity inversion: private individual addressed in public capacity without jurisdictional basis	The undersigned has been treated as Person _{PUB} without verification that the undersigned operates in that capacity for the purpose at issue.
<input type="checkbox"/>	5	Registration does not constitute consent to plenary regulatory jurisdiction	Administrative registration (SSN, birth certificate, license) is not an act of consent to unlimited regulatory authority over the natural person.

<input type="checkbox"/>	No.	Ground for Challenge	Explanatory Note
<input type="checkbox"/>	6	Officer exceeded ministerial authority by failing to conduct capacity analysis	The officer or agent failed in the ministerial duty to verify the capacity in which the individual appears before exercising authority.
<input type="checkbox"/>	7	Due process violation: burden improperly placed on individual to disprove statutory capacity	The burden of establishing jurisdiction lies with the government. Requiring the individual to disprove statutory capacity inverts this burden in violation of the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments.
<input type="checkbox"/>	8	Ultra vires action: officer acted beyond scope of delegated statutory authority	The officer or agent exercised authority beyond the scope delegated by statute, acting without verified jurisdictional basis.

Section 4: Demand for Production

Respondent is hereby required to produce, within **[number]** days of service of this challenge, the following:

5. The **specific statutory provision** that establishes jurisdiction over the undersigned in the capacity claimed;
6. **Documentary evidence** of the undersigned's informed, voluntary consent to the regulatory scheme at issue, including the date, form, and circumstances of such consent;
7. Identification of the **specific act, registration, or event** that created the effective connection between the undersigned and the statutory

EXHIBIT C

STATUS-CORRECTION

AFFIDAVIT

With Factual Declarations and Notary Block

AFFIDAVIT OF STATUS CORRECTION AND DECLARATION OF CAPACITY

STATE OF [_____] /

COUNTY OF [_____] /

BEFORE ME, the undersigned Notary Public, personally appeared ***[FULL LEGAL NAME]***, known to me (or proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence) to be the person whose name is subscribed below, who being duly sworn, deposes and states as follows:

FACTUAL DECLARATIONS

1. I am a living, breathing man/woman, competent to testify to the matters stated herein, and I make this affidavit based upon my own personal knowledge.
2. I was born on ***[DATE]*** in ***[CITY, STATE]***, a living human being possessed of unalienable rights recognized — not granted — by the Constitution for the United States of America and the constitution of the State of ***[STATE]***.
3. I am not a corporation, trust, partnership, legal fiction, or any other form of juridical entity created by legislative act.

4. I distinguish between my natural, private capacity (Person_{PRI}) and any juridical, public capacity (Person_{PUB}) that may have been created through state registration systems.
5. I acknowledge that a birth certificate was filed in connection with my birth. I declare that this registration was performed by others without my knowledge, consent, or capacity to consent, and does not constitute my voluntary submission to plenary regulatory jurisdiction.
6. I acknowledge that a Social Security Number was obtained in connection with my name. I declare that this enrollment, if performed during my minority, was done without my informed, voluntary consent and does not establish an irrevocable effective connection between my private capacity and the federal regulatory framework.
7. I have not knowingly, voluntarily, and with full informed disclosure consented to the conversion of my private capacity into a public, statutory capacity for all purposes.
8. I do not contest that I may operate in a public capacity (Person_{PUB}) for specific, limited, and clearly defined purposes where I have given actual informed consent.
9. I do contest any blanket presumption that my registration in any government database constitutes consent to unlimited regulatory jurisdiction over my natural person.
10. I declare that any government officer who addresses me in a public capacity bears the burden of establishing a valid effective connection between my private person and the statutory scheme under which jurisdiction is claimed.
11. I declare that capacity inversion — the treatment of a private individual as a statutory subject without establishing a valid jurisdictional connection — violates my rights under the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution.

- 12. I reserve all rights, waive no rights, and make no admissions by the filing of this affidavit.
- 13. This affidavit is made for the purpose of correcting the record and establishing my status as a private individual operating in private capacity unless and until I voluntarily and with informed consent enter a specific public-capacity relationship.
- 14. I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief.
- 15. FURTHER AFFIANT SAYETH NAUGHT.

Affiant Signature

Printed Name: *[FULL LEGAL NAME]*

Date: _____

NOTARY ACKNOWLEDGMENT (JURAT)

Subscribed and sworn to (or affirmed) before me this *[_]* day of *[MONTH]*, *[YEAR]*, by *[AFFIANT NAME]*, who is:

- personally known to me
- proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence: *[IDENTIFICATION TYPE]*

to be the person whose name is subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged that he/she executed the same.

Notary Public Signature

Printed Name: _____

Commission Number: _____

My Commission Expires: _____

[NOTARY SEAL]

EXHIBIT D

FLOWCHART — LAWFUL ATTACHMENT OF FEDERAL CIVIL CAPACITY

Decision Tree and Failure Points

STAGE 1: INITIAL STATUS

Individual exists as natural person (Person

PRI

)

Holder of unalienable rights — No statutory obligations attach



STAGE 2: REGISTRATION EVENT

State registration event occurs

(Birth certificate, SSN, licensing application)



DECISION:

Was registration performed with the individual's informed, voluntary consent?

YES → Proceed to Stage 3

NO → FAILURE POINT 1

FAILURE POINT 1:

Registration without consent does not establish a valid effective connection.

Capacity attachment fails. Individual remains in Person

PRI

status.

Doctrinal basis: Consent is a prerequisite to jurisdictional attachment; registration by third parties without the individual's knowledge or voluntary participation cannot bind the natural person to a statutory framework.



STAGE 3: EFFECTIVE CONNECTION ANALYSIS

DECISION:

Does a valid effective connection exist linking Person

PRI

to a specific statutory scheme?

YES → Proceed to Stage 4

NO → FAILURE POINT 2

FAILURE POINT 2:

No jurisdictional bridge exists. Regulatory authority cannot lawfully attach. Any exercise of authority over Person

PRI

under a statutory scheme to which no effective connection has been established is ultra vires.

Doctrinal basis: Jurisdiction must be established, not assumed; the absence of an effective connection is a jurisdictional defect that cannot be cured by administrative presumption.



STAGE 4: CONSENT VALIDATION

DECISION:

Is the consent actual (informed, voluntary, specific) rather than merely constructive or presumed?

YES → Proceed to Stage 5

NO → FAILURE POINT 3

FAILURE POINT 3:

Constructive or presumed consent fails the constitutional standard. Due process requires actual consent for jurisdictional attachment over Person

PRI

.

Doctrinal basis: The Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments require that the government establish — not presume — the factual basis for its authority over a natural person.

Constructive consent inverts the burden of proof.



STAGE 5: SCOPE LIMITATION

DECISION:

Is the regulatory authority limited to the specific purpose for which consent was given?

YES → Proceed to Stage 6

NO → FAILURE POINT 4

FAILURE POINT 4:

Scope exceeds consent. Authority exercised beyond the specific consented purpose is ultra vires. Capacity inversion occurs when limited consent is treated as

blanket consent to plenary regulatory jurisdiction.

Doctrinal basis: Consent to one regulatory purpose does not constitute consent to all regulatory purposes; the scope of the effective connection is bounded by the scope of the consent.



STAGE 6: CAPACITY IDENTIFICATION

DECISION:

Has the government correctly identified and documented the capacity (Person

PRI

vs. Person

PUB

) in which it is addressing the individual?

YES → LAWFUL ATTACHMENT

NO → FAILURE POINT 5

FAILURE POINT 5:

Capacity misidentification. The officer or agency failed its ministerial duty to verify and correctly record the capacity in which the individual appears. The proceeding is jurisdictionally defective.

Doctrinal basis: Officers have a ministerial duty to correctly identify capacity; failure

to do so renders all subsequent actions taken under the wrong capacity classification void for lack of jurisdiction.

TERMINAL OUTCOMES

LAWFUL ATTACHMENT

Statutory capacity lawfully attaches. Person

PUB

obligations apply within the scope of consent.

Person

PRI

rights preserved for all non-consented matters.

UNLAWFUL ATTACHMENT (Triggered by Any Failure Point)

Statutory capacity does NOT lawfully attach.

Any exercise of regulatory authority in the absence of lawful attachment constitutes:

9. **Jurisdictional overreach** — authority exercised without a valid jurisdictional basis;
10. **Due process violation** — deprivation of rights without establishing lawful authority;

11. Capacity inversion — treatment of Person_{PRI} as Person_{PUB} without consent.

Remedies available: Jurisdictional challenge (Exhibit B), Status-correction affidavit (Exhibit C), declaratory judgment, injunctive relief, 42 U.S.C. § 1983 claims, Bivens actions.

EXHIBIT E

LITIGATION-READY

DOCTRINAL

MATRIX

Capacity Analysis for Litigation Preparation

Analytical Dimension	Person _{PRI} (Private Individual)	Person _{PUB} (Statutory Capacity)	Statutory Trigger / Mechanism	Government Presumption	Challenge Point / Litigation Strategy
1. Source of Rights	Unalienable; inherent in natural personhood; pre-constitutional; recognized but not granted by government	Statutory; conferred by legislative act; subject to conditions and revocation	Birth registration, SSN enrollment, licensing application	Registration equals consent to statutory framework; all rights are regulable privileges	Demand proof that specific rights at issue are statutory rather than natural; challenge conflation of recognition with creation
2. Jurisdictional Basis	Consent-based; requires actual, informed, voluntary consent for each exercise of authority	Status-based; jurisdiction attaches automatically upon registration or enrollment	Issuance of identifying number or document (SSN, EIN, license)	Possession of identifying documents equals submission to regulatory jurisdiction	Require production of evidence of actual consent; challenge sufficiency of constructive/presumed consent under due process standards
3. Burden of Proof	Government bears burden of establishing valid effective connection and actual	Individual bears burden of demonstrating non-applicability of statutory	Administrative assertion of jurisdiction; filing of administrative action	Jurisdiction is presumed; individual must rebut	Invoke due process to shift burden back to government; demand affirmative

Analytical Dimension	Person ^{PRI} (Private Individual)	Person ^{PUB} (Statutory Capacity)	Statutory Trigger / Mechanism	Government Presumption	Challenge Point / Litigation Strategy
	consent	scheme			proof of jurisdictional basis before imposing any obligation
4. Consent Standard	Actual consent: informed, voluntary, specific, revocable	Constructive/presumed consent: inferred from registration, participation, or failure to opt out	Participation in any government program, benefit acceptance, form submission	Silence equals consent; participation equals waiver of capacity distinction	Challenge constitutional adequacy of constructive consent; invoke contract principles requiring meeting of minds, consideration, and absence of duress
5. Rights Framework	Constitutional rights apply with full force; strict scrutiny for any infringement; rights are not privileges	Statutory rights apply; rational basis or intermediate scrutiny; rights may be conditioned on compliance	Assertion of any statutory obligation (tax, licensing, registration, reporting)	All individual activities are regulable under the commerce clause or police power	Require government to identify specific constitutional authority for each regulatory assertion; challenge overbreadth; demand strict scrutiny for natural rights
6. Officer Authority	Officer must verify capacity before proceeding; ministerial duty to recognize private capacity; ultra vires doctrine applies	Officer exercises full statutory authority; administrative discretion applies	Officer encounter (traffic stop, audit, administrative proceeding, court hearing)	Officer may presume public capacity and demand identifying documents as precondition to any interaction	Challenge officer's failure to conduct capacity analysis; assert ministerial duty to verify capacity; invoke ultra vires doctrine for acts beyond verified capacity
7. Due Process	Full procedural and substantive due process required	Administrative due process; notice-and-comment; administrative	Any government action affecting life, liberty, or property	Administrative process satisfies due process; exhaustion of administrative	Challenge adequacy of administrative process for natural rights; assert right to

Analytical Dimension	Person _{PRI} (Private Individual)	Person _{PUB} (Statutory Capacity)	Statutory Trigger / Mechanism	Government Presumption	Challenge Point / Litigation Strategy
	before any deprivation of life, liberty, or property (5th/14th Amendments)	due hearing rights		due remedies required	judicial determination of capacity before administrative jurisdiction attaches
8. Remedies	Constitutional remedies: declaratory judgment, injunctive relief, 42 U.S.C. § 1983 claims, habeas corpus, Bivens actions	Statutory remedies: administrative appeal, APA judicial review, statutory claims	Any adverse government action or ongoing regulatory burden without established consent	Statutory remedies are exclusive; constitutional claims are not available for regulatory disputes	Assert constitutional remedy pathway; challenge exclusivity of statutory remedies for capacity disputes; invoke equity jurisdiction

APPENDIX

NOTES ON USE AND LIMITATIONS

1. **Purpose.** This document is prepared for legal research, litigation preparation, and doctrinal analysis purposes. It presents a capacity-based analytical framework derived from constitutional principles, including the distinction between private capacity (Person_{PRI}) and public capacity (Person_{PUB}) as developed within the FTSIG doctrinal framework. The exhibits contained herein are designed to provide a comprehensive, integrated set of tools for analyzing, challenging, and correcting the imputation of statutory capacity upon private individuals.

2. **Adaptation Required.** The templates, arguments, and analytical tools contained herein are designed to be adapted to specific factual circumstances. Users should modify bracketed fields, supplement with

jurisdiction-specific authority, and tailor arguments to the particular statutory scheme being challenged. Nothing in this document constitutes legal advice for any specific case or proceeding. Each exhibit should be reviewed and revised by the user to reflect the particular facts, jurisdiction, and legal issues relevant to the user's situation.

3. Doctrinal Foundation. The doctrinal positions presented reflect a structural analysis of the relationship between individual capacity and government authority. They are grounded in constitutional text, historical practice, and principled analysis of the consent requirement that underlies legitimate governance. Users are encouraged to conduct independent research and consult qualified legal counsel before using these materials in any judicial or administrative proceeding. The arguments set forth herein are presented as a framework for analysis and advocacy, not as a guarantee of any particular legal outcome.

— END OF UNIFIED LEGAL ARTIFACT PACKAGE —

Prepared April 2026

For Legal Research and Litigation Preparation Purposes