

***MODEL LITIGATION TEMPLATE – FOR EDUCATIONAL AND  
DRAFTING PURPOSES ONLY.***

*ALL BRACKETED FIELDS MUST BE COMPLETED BY COUNSEL BEFORE FILING.  
THIS DOCUMENT DOES NOT CONSTITUTE LEGAL ADVICE.*

---

**[NAME OF COURT]**

**[STATE / DISTRICT]**

---

**[PLAINTIFF / PETITIONER],  
Plaintiff/Petitioner, v.  
[DEFENDANT / RESPONDENT],  
Defendant/Respondent.**

**Case No. [XXXX-XXXX] Hon.  
[JUDGE'S NAME] MOTION  
DEMANDING IDENTITY HEARING  
AND REQUIRING GOVERNMENT  
TO ESTABLISH LEGAL IDENTITY,  
STATUTORY STATUS, CAPACITY,  
CONSENT, AND JURISDICTION  
BEFORE PROCEEDING Hearing  
Date: [DATE] Hearing Time:  
[TIME]**

---

**MOTION DEMANDING IDENTITY HEARING AND REQUIRING  
GOVERNMENT  
TO ESTABLISH LEGAL IDENTITY, STATUTORY STATUS, CAPACITY,  
CONSENT, AND JURISDICTION BEFORE PROCEEDING**

COMES NOW **[MOVING PARTY]**, by and through undersigned, and respectfully moves this Court pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 12(b)(1), 12(b)(2), and 17(a) — and any applicable state equivalents — for an order requiring the government or opposing party to establish, on the record and before this proceeding advances to the merits, the true legal identity of the named party, the statutory status conferring jurisdiction, the legal

capacity of the named party, the existence of lawful consent, and the constitutional and statutory basis for jurisdiction. In support thereof, **[MOVING PARTY]** states as follows:

---

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

This motion is filed to compel the government — or any opposing party acting under color of governmental authority — to discharge its threshold obligation to establish, with specificity and on the record, five foundational elements before this proceeding may continue: (a) the true legal identity of the party whose name appears in the caption of this action, and whether that name corresponds to the living natural person now before this Court; (b) the specific statutory status under which jurisdiction over that party is claimed; (c) the legal capacity of the named party to be made subject to and bound by any order, decree, or judgment; (d) whether lawful, voluntary, knowing, and affirmative consent has been given by the natural person to submit to these proceedings; and (e) the precise constitutional and statutory authority conferring subject-matter and personal jurisdiction upon this Court with respect to this matter and this party.

To proceed without first resolving each of these threshold questions is to proceed in the absence of a lawful foundation. Courts of limited jurisdiction — federal courts and, in many instances, state courts — may not adjudicate a matter simply because a case has been filed and a name has been entered in a caption. Due process, as guaranteed by the Fifth and Fourteenth

Amendments to the United States Constitution, demands that before any person is deprived of life, liberty, or property by operation of judicial authority, that person must be properly identified, the court must possess and demonstrate lawful authority to act, and the named party must have the legal capacity and have provided lawful consent to be bound. These are not technicalities; they are the constitutional prerequisites of lawful adjudication.

This motion is brought in good faith and in the interest of ensuring that these proceedings, if they are to continue at all, rest upon a legally sound and constitutionally adequate foundation. **[MOVING PARTY]** does not seek to obstruct or delay proceedings without cause. Rather, **[MOVING PARTY]** seeks to ensure that this Court — and the opposing party — discharge the obligations that the Constitution, the Federal Rules, and fundamental principles of lawful authority impose before any further action is taken that could affect the rights, liberty, or property of the natural person standing before this Court.

---

## II. ISSUES PRESENTED

1. **Issue 1:** Whether the government has established the true legal identity of the party named in this proceeding, and whether that identity corresponds to the living natural person before this Court.
2. **Issue 2:** Whether the party named in the caption exists as a legal fiction, artificial person, or trust entity distinct from the natural person, and if so, what is the legal basis for conflating or equating the two without evidence or consent.

3. **Issue 3:** Whether the government has identified the specific statute or constitutional provision conferring subject-matter jurisdiction over this matter and over the party as named.
  4. **Issue 4:** Whether the named party has the requisite legal capacity to be bound by any judgment, order, or decree entered in this action, and whether that capacity has been established on the record.
  5. **Issue 5:** Whether any implied or express consent by **[MOVING PARTY]** has been lawfully obtained, and whether such consent may be presumed by the Court absent an affirmative, particularized showing.
  6. **Issue 6:** Whether this Court possesses personal jurisdiction over the natural person, and by what specific constitutional and statutory authority such jurisdiction attaches.
- 

### **III. GOVERNING DOCTRINE**

#### **A. The Doctrine of Legal Identity**

Courts of law have long recognized a fundamental distinction between the natural person — the living man or woman possessed of inherent constitutional rights — and the legally constructed entity that may bear a similar or identical name but exists as a creature of statute, contract, or administrative designation. This distinction is not merely academic; it is operative in determining who or what is properly subject to a court's authority. A natural person and a juridical person — whether a corporation, a statutory trust, a registered entity, or other artificial construct — are distinct

in law, possessed of different rights, different obligations, and different relationships to governmental authority.

It has been argued in legal scholarship and in litigation that names rendered in all capital letters in government instruments, court filings, commercial documents, and administrative records may signify a legal fiction, trust, or statutory entity rather than the living natural person. Whether or not one subscribes to any particular theory of this distinction, the operative legal point remains: the identity of the party being proceeded against is a threshold factual and legal question that must be resolved on the record. A court cannot lawfully exercise power over a party whose legal identity has not been established with specificity. Where ambiguity exists as to whether the named party is a natural person or a legal construct — and where the moving party affirmatively raises that ambiguity — the ambiguity must be resolved before the proceeding advances.

## **B. The Presumption Against Jurisdiction**

Federal courts are courts of limited jurisdiction. They possess only that authority expressly granted by the Constitution and by Congress, and they may not expand their own jurisdiction by implication, convenience, or assumption. *Kokkonen v. Guardian Life Ins. Co. of Am.*, 511 U.S. 375, 377 (1994). Many state courts are similarly courts of limited jurisdiction with respect to particular subject matters or parties. It is a foundational principle that jurisdiction, wherever it is invoked, must be affirmatively demonstrated — not merely asserted in conclusory terms. The burden of establishing jurisdiction rests at all times upon the party invoking the court's power; that

burden does not shift to the opposing party to disprove what has not yet been proven. Jurisdiction is not a formality to be addressed after the merits; it is a threshold matter to be decided first, for without jurisdiction, nothing that follows has legal effect.

### **C. Due Process and Fundamental Fairness**

The Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution provides, in terms that admit of no exception, that no person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law. The Fourteenth Amendment extends the same guarantee against state action. These provisions are not satisfied by the mere conduct of proceedings according to prescribed procedural form. Due process requires, at its irreducible minimum, that the party against whom action is taken be properly and accurately identified, be given meaningful notice and an opportunity to be heard, and be subjected only to the authority of a court that has lawfully acquired jurisdiction over that party and that subject matter. Where the identity of the party, the existence of jurisdiction, the capacity to be bound, or the presence of lawful consent are in question and unresolved, the due process guarantee operates as a bar to further proceedings until those deficiencies are cured.

---

## **IV. CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY AUTHORITIES**

- **U.S. Const. art. III, § 2** — The judicial power of the United States is expressly limited to defined cases and controversies. Federal subject-matter jurisdiction does not exist by default; it must be affirmatively

established by reference to this constitutional grant and to the congressional statutes implementing it.

- **U.S. Const. amend. V** — No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a Grand Jury, nor shall any person be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law. This guarantee is a threshold constraint upon governmental authority, not a post-merits consideration.
- **U.S. Const. amend. XIV, § 1** — No State shall deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws. This provision applies the due process requirement to all state-court proceedings and all exercises of state governmental authority.
- **28 U.S.C. § 1331** — Federal question jurisdiction confers original jurisdiction on district courts over all civil actions arising under the Constitution, laws, or treaties of the United States. This jurisdiction must be affirmatively established by demonstrating that the plaintiff's claim arises under federal law; it is not self-executing.
- **28 U.S.C. § 1332** — Diversity jurisdiction requires complete diversity of citizenship between the parties and an amount in controversy exceeding \$75,000. Both prerequisites must be demonstrated on the record; neither is presumed.
- **Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(1)** — A party may move to dismiss an action for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction at any time. The Court has an independent and non-waivable obligation to confirm that subject-matter jurisdiction exists before proceeding to the merits.
- **Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(2)** — A party may move to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction. Unlike subject-matter jurisdiction, personal

jurisdiction may be waived, and the moving party expressly preserves and does not waive this objection.

- **Fed. R. Civ. P. 17(a)** — Every action shall be prosecuted in the name of the real party in interest. This rule ensures that only the party possessing the substantive right at issue may proceed, and it requires that the identity and capacity of that party be established before the action may be maintained.
- **Fed. R. Civ. P. 17(b)** — Capacity to sue or be sued is determined by the law of the individual's domicile (for natural persons) or by applicable entity law (for legal constructs). Capacity is a distinct legal question from identity and must be separately established.
- **[STATE EQUIVALENT STATUTES — PLACEHOLDER] — [MOVING PARTY]** expressly reserves the right to supplement this motion with applicable state constitutional provisions, jurisdictional statutes, procedural rules, and case law governing identity, capacity, consent, and jurisdiction under the law of **[STATE]**.

---

## V. ARGUMENT

### I. THE GOVERNMENT MUST ESTABLISH THE LEGAL IDENTITY OF THE NAMED PARTY BEFORE THIS PROCEEDING MAY CONTINUE.

#### A. The Party Identified in the Caption May Be a Legal Construct, Not the Natural Person Before the Court.

The name that appears in the caption of this action — **[PARTY NAME AS STYLED IN CAPTION]** — has not been established to be identical, in legal contemplation, to the natural person who is the living man or woman now

before this Court. Names written in all capital letters in government documents, court filings, tax instruments, and commercial instruments have been argued in legal scholarship and in litigation to denote a fictional legal entity — a trust, a corporation, a registered statutory person, or an administrative construct — rather than the living man or woman. Whether the Court accepts any specific doctrinal formulation of this argument, the underlying legal point is sound and well-established in general principle: the identity of the party being proceeded against is a threshold factual and legal question, not a matter of assumption. **[MOVING PARTY]** has a fundamental right to demand clarity and specificity regarding which legal entity — the natural person or a legal construct — is being haled into court, and on what basis that determination has been made.

## **B. The Government Bears the Burden of Establishing Identity with Specificity.**

Identity is a foundational issue that precedes all others. Before a court may exercise authority over a party, it must know, with legal precision, who or what that party is. Without a clear and established answer to this question, any judgment entered is potentially void for want of a proper party before the court. Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 17(a) codifies the requirement that every action be prosecuted in the name of the real party in interest. This rule is not merely a procedural technicality; it is a substantive requirement that the actual legal entity possessing the relevant rights or obligations be identified and placed before the court. The government or opposing party, as the invoking party, bears the burden of establishing this element. It has not

done so here, and this motion demands that it be required to do so before proceeding.

### **C. Conflating the Natural Person with a Legal Fiction Constitutes a Deprivation of Due Process.**

If the government proceeds against a legal fiction — a trust, statutory person, or administrative construct — while treating the natural person standing before this Court as though they are one and the same, without evidence establishing that equivalence and without the natural person's knowing and voluntary consent to that treatment, the natural person's constitutional rights are directly implicated and potentially violated. The natural person possesses inherent rights under the Constitution that a legal fiction does not. To impose upon the natural person the legal consequences directed at a fictional construct — without establishing the legal basis for that equivalence on the record — is to deprive the natural person of liberty or property without due process of law, in violation of the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments. This conflation, if it exists here, must be corrected before the proceeding may continue.

## **II. THE COURT MUST CONFIRM ITS SUBJECT-MATTER JURISDICTION BEFORE PROCEEDING.**

### **A. Jurisdiction Is a Threshold Matter, Not a Formality.**

Courts of limited jurisdiction — federal courts and, in many contexts, state courts — may only hear matters over which authority has been expressly granted by the Constitution or by statute. This is not a principle that the Court

may defer to a later stage of the proceedings. The Supreme Court of the United States has been unambiguous on this point: a federal court must satisfy itself of its jurisdiction over the subject matter before it may proceed to the merits of any claim. *Steel Co. v. Citizens for a Better Environment*, 523 U.S. 83, 94 (1998) ("Without jurisdiction the court cannot proceed at all in any cause. Jurisdiction is power to declare the law, and when it ceases to exist, the only function remaining to the court is that of announcing the fact and dismissing the cause.") (internal citation omitted). The existence of subject-matter jurisdiction is not a matter of the parties' agreement or of procedural convenience; it is a non-waivable prerequisite to any lawful judicial action.

**B. The Government Must Identify the Specific Statute or Constitutional Provision Authorizing This Action.**

Conclusory assertions of jurisdiction — the mere invocation of a statutory citation in a pleading without particularized demonstration that its requirements are satisfied — are legally insufficient to establish subject-matter jurisdiction. **[MOVING PARTY]** is entitled to know, with specificity, what law authorizes this proceeding, why the requirements of that law are met with respect to the precise claims asserted and the precise party named, and how the facts of this case bring the matter within the scope of the invoked jurisdictional grant. The government must do more than cite a statute; it must demonstrate, on the record, that the cited statute applies to these facts, these parties, and this claim.

### **C. Absent Proof of Subject-Matter Jurisdiction, All Proceedings Are a Nullity.**

A judgment entered by a court that lacked subject-matter jurisdiction is void *ab initio* — null and of no legal effect from the moment of entry — and may be challenged at any time, including collaterally and on appeal. *Ins. Corp. of Ir. v. Compagnie des Bauxites de Guinee*, 456 U.S. 694, 702 (1982). This Court has an independent, non-delegable obligation to confirm that it possesses subject-matter jurisdiction before taking any action that could affect the rights or obligations of the parties. **[MOVING PARTY]** respectfully invokes that obligation and requests that the Court exercise it here, prior to any further proceedings on the merits.

### **III. PERSONAL JURISDICTION OVER THE NATURAL PERSON HAS NOT BEEN ESTABLISHED.**

#### **A. Personal Jurisdiction Requires Either Consent, Domicile, or Constitutionally Adequate Service and Minimum Contacts.**

The Supreme Court's seminal decision in *International Shoe Co. v. Washington*, 326 U.S. 310, 316 (1945), and its extensive progeny establish that the exercise of personal jurisdiction over a defendant requires, at minimum, that the defendant have sufficient contacts with the forum such that the maintenance of the suit does not offend "traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice." This standard applies with full force to natural persons. For a court to exercise general or specific personal jurisdiction over a natural person consistent with constitutional due process, one of the following must be affirmatively established: (1) the natural person is

domiciled within the forum; (2) the natural person has consented to jurisdiction; (3) the natural person was personally served with process within the forum; or (4) the natural person's contacts with the forum are sufficient, with respect to the specific claims asserted, to satisfy constitutional minimum contacts analysis. None of these prerequisites has been established on the record in this proceeding.

**B. The Moving Party Has Not Consented to This Court's Jurisdiction.**

**[MOVING PARTY]** has not consented to this Court's personal jurisdiction. The filing of the instant motion to contest jurisdiction does not constitute a waiver of the jurisdictional objection. *Ins. Corp. of Ir.*, 456 U.S. at 703. Where a party appears solely and specifically to contest jurisdiction — as **[MOVING PARTY]** does here — that limited appearance does not submit the party to the Court's general jurisdiction. **[MOVING PARTY]** expressly preserves, and does not waive, all objections to personal jurisdiction, and demands that the government affirmatively demonstrate the basis on which personal jurisdiction over the natural person is claimed.

**C. The Manner and Sufficiency of Service of Process Must Be Demonstrated.**

Proper service of process is a prerequisite to the Court's acquisition of personal jurisdiction over a defendant. A court may not exercise power over a party who has not been properly served in accordance with applicable rules. The government must demonstrate compliance with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4 — or, in a state court proceeding, the applicable state rule governing service of process — including the specific manner of service, the

identity of the person served, and the date, time, and location of service. If service was not effectuated upon the natural person in a constitutionally and procedurally adequate manner, personal jurisdiction has not attached, and the proceeding may not continue against the natural person on that ground alone.

#### **IV. THE LEGAL CAPACITY OF THE NAMED PARTY MUST BE AFFIRMATIVELY ESTABLISHED.**

##### **A. Capacity to Be Sued Is a Distinct Legal Question from Identity.**

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 17(b) addresses the capacity of a party to sue or be sued. Capacity is determined, for natural persons, by the law of the individual's domicile; for legal entities, by the law under which the entity was created or organized. Capacity is a distinct legal question from the question of identity. Even if the government were to establish that the named party is a particular legal entity, it would still be required to separately establish that the legal entity has the capacity to be bound by this Court's orders and judgments. Where the named party may be a legal fiction, trust, or statutory construct — distinct from the natural person — the question of capacity becomes especially critical: a legal fiction's obligations are defined and circumscribed by the instrument or statute that created it, and those limitations may not be imposed upon the natural person without additional legal justification.

## **B. A Natural Person Possesses Inherent Rights That a Legal Fiction Does Not.**

A natural person's inherent rights under the Constitution — including the rights to due process, equal protection, freedom from unreasonable governmental intrusion, and the full panoply of protections guaranteed by the Bill of Rights — differ fundamentally from the rights and obligations of a juridical person created by statute, by contract, or by administrative act. A legal fiction has only those rights the law has expressly granted it; a natural person has rights that inhere in the person by virtue of humanity and that no governmental act can abrogate without constitutional justification. Before this Court can proceed, it must determine with certainty which stands before it — the natural person, possessed of constitutional rights, or a legal construct, subject to the law of its creation — and it must ensure that the protections appropriate to whichever entity is present are fully honored.

## **V. CONSENT CANNOT BE PRESUMED AND MUST BE AFFIRMATIVELY DEMONSTRATED.**

### **A. No Valid Consent to This Proceeding Has Been Given by the Natural Person.**

Consent is a foundational element of lawful authority in a constitutional republic. The government's authority to subject a natural person to its processes rests, in significant part, upon the consent — actual, knowing, and voluntary — of the governed. In the context of judicial proceedings, consent to jurisdiction, consent to be bound by particular legal obligations, and consent to waive constitutional rights must be established by clear and affirmative

evidence. Presumed, implied, or constructive consent — absent an unequivocal, particularized showing of actual agreement — does not satisfy the requirements of constitutional due process. **[MOVING PARTY]** has not given any such consent with respect to these proceedings, and demands that the government demonstrate any consent it claims exists.

**B. Prior Conduct, Registration, or Licensing Does Not Constitute Perpetual or Blanket Consent to Government Jurisdiction.**

Any argument by the government that **[MOVING PARTY]** consented to this Court's jurisdiction, or to the government's authority over the subject matter of this action, by virtue of prior registration, licensing, contracting, or commercial activity must be supported by specific and particularized evidence. The waiver of a constitutional right requires a demonstration that the waiver was knowing, voluntary, and intelligent. *Brady v. United States*, 397 U.S. 742, 748 (1970). A general and historical act of registration or licensing — particularly one undertaken without specific awareness that it constituted a waiver of constitutional rights — does not satisfy this standard. The government may not infer blanket, perpetual jurisdictional consent from a party's participation in regulated activity, absent clear and specific evidence of a knowing and voluntary agreement to submit to jurisdiction in the precise context at issue.

**C. Constructive or Implied Consent Is Constitutionally Inadequate.**

The government may not infer consent from silence, from the use of a birth certificate, from the possession of a social security number, from the use of government-issued identification, or from any other administrative act or

government-issued instrument, without affirmative proof that the natural person voluntarily, knowingly, and with full understanding of the consequences, agreed to subject themselves to governmental authority in the manner and to the extent now asserted. The use of government-issued instruments or identifiers is, in modern society, a practical necessity rather than a deliberate act of legal submission. Constructive consent inferred from practical necessity is not consent as the Constitution requires; it is compulsion by another name, and it does not provide lawful authority for these proceedings.

## **VI. AN IDENTITY HEARING IS NECESSARY AND APPROPRIATE.**

### **A. The Court Has Authority to Conduct an Evidentiary Hearing on Threshold Identity and Jurisdictional Questions.**

Federal and state courts regularly and appropriately hold evidentiary hearings to resolve contested threshold questions of jurisdiction, standing, and the identity of the real party in interest. Where material facts relevant to a threshold issue are in dispute, the Court may receive evidence, hear testimony, and make findings before ruling on the threshold question. *Sizova v. Nat'l Inst. of Standards & Tech.*, 282 F.3d 1320, 1325 (10th Cir. 2002). The questions raised in this motion — the legal identity of the named party, the basis for jurisdiction, the capacity of the named party, and the existence of consent — are precisely the kinds of threshold factual and legal questions that an evidentiary hearing is designed to resolve. **[MOVING PARTY]** respectfully requests that such a hearing be scheduled at the Court's earliest

convenience and that the government be required to present its evidence at that hearing.

**B. The Hearing Should Address Each of the Five Threshold Elements.**

At the identity hearing requested by this motion, the government should be required to present competent, admissible evidence establishing each of the following threshold elements with specificity: (1) the precise legal identity of the named party and whether it is a natural person or a legal construct; (2) the specific constitutional and statutory basis for subject-matter jurisdiction over this matter; (3) the legal capacity of the named party to be bound by any order or judgment of this Court; (4) the existence of lawful, voluntary, knowing, and affirmative consent by the natural person to these proceedings; and (5) the specific constitutional and statutory authority for personal jurisdiction over the natural person. The government must be prepared to demonstrate each element independently and by competent evidence; a conclusory pleading or legal argument standing alone shall not suffice.

**C. Until the Identity Hearing Is Held and All Threshold Questions Resolved, All Further Proceedings Should Be Stayed.**

To permit the merits of this proceeding to advance while fundamental threshold questions of identity, jurisdiction, capacity, and consent remain unresolved would prejudice **[MOVING PARTY]** by requiring defense of the merits under the shadow of unresolved jurisdictional defects, would risk the entry of a judgment that is void or voidable for want of jurisdiction or proper party, and would undermine the integrity of the judicial process itself. A stay of all further proceedings — including all deadlines, discovery obligations,

response obligations, and the entry of any orders — pending the completion of the identity hearing and the Court's resolution of each threshold question is both necessary and appropriate. **[MOVING PARTY]** respectfully requests that the Court enter such a stay forthwith.

---

## **VI. REQUEST FOR RELIEF / PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

**WHEREFORE, [MOVING PARTY] respectfully requests that this Court enter an Order granting the following relief:**

7. Order and schedule an identity hearing at which the government or opposing party must establish on the record, by competent and admissible evidence: (a) the true legal identity of the party named in the caption of this action, and whether that party is the living natural person before the Court or a legal fiction, trust, or artificial entity; (b) the specific constitutional and statutory basis for subject-matter jurisdiction over this matter and over the named party; (c) the specific constitutional and statutory basis for personal jurisdiction over the natural person; (d) the legal capacity of the named party to be bound by any order, decree, or judgment entered in this proceeding; and (e) evidence of lawful, voluntary, knowing, and affirmative consent by the natural person to submit to these proceedings and to be bound by the authority of this Court.
8. Stay all further proceedings in this action — including all pleading deadlines, discovery obligations, response periods, motion deadlines, and the entry of any orders or judgments on the merits — pending the scheduling and conclusion of the identity hearing and this Court's

issuance of findings of fact and conclusions of law addressing each of the threshold elements set forth above.

9. Order the government or opposing party to provide written disclosure, no fewer than **[X]** days before the scheduled identity hearing, of all evidence — including documents, records, statutes, regulations, and any witness testimony — upon which it intends to rely to establish each of the required threshold elements, so that **[MOVING PARTY]** may have meaningful opportunity to review, evaluate, and respond to that evidence.
  10. Upon conclusion of the identity hearing, enter written findings of fact and conclusions of law that specifically and individually address each of the five threshold elements: identity, subject-matter jurisdiction, personal jurisdiction, legal capacity, and consent. The findings shall be sufficiently specific to permit meaningful appellate review.
  11. If the government or opposing party fails to establish, by a preponderance of competent evidence, any one of the required threshold elements, dismiss this action in its entirety with prejudice, without costs to **[MOVING PARTY]**, and enter judgment in favor of **[MOVING PARTY]** on all claims and all causes of action asserted herein.
  12. Grant such other and further relief as this Court deems just, proper, and consistent with the constitutional and statutory obligations set forth in this motion.
-

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on **[DATE]**, a true and correct copy of the foregoing Motion Demanding Identity Hearing and Requiring Government to Establish Legal Identity, Statutory Status, Capacity, Consent, and Jurisdiction Before Proceeding was served upon **[OPPOSING COUNSEL / PARTY NAME]**, at **[ADDRESS / EMAIL ADDRESS]**, by **[METHOD OF SERVICE: e.g., U.S. First-Class Mail / Electronic Mail / CM/ECF / Personal Delivery]**, in accordance with the applicable rules governing service of court documents in this proceeding.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct.

---

**[SIGNATURE OF MOVING PARTY OR COUNSEL]**

Date: **[DATE]**

---

Respectfully submitted,

---

**[MOVING PARTY NAME]**

**[Street Address]**

**[City, State, ZIP Code]**

Telephone: **[PHONE NUMBER]**

Email: **[EMAIL ADDRESS]**

Bar Number (if applicable): **[BAR NUMBER]**

Date: **[DATE]**

---

MODEL LITIGATION TEMPLATE — FOR EDUCATIONAL AND DRAFTING PURPOSES ONLY.

ALL BRACKETED FIELDS MUST BE COMPLETED BY COUNSEL BEFORE FILING.

THIS DOCUMENT DOES NOT CONSTITUTE LEGAL ADVICE.

*Motion Demanding Identity Hearing / Case No. **[XXXX-XXXX]** / **[COURT  
NAME]***