[09:46:40] dingosskype: [06:37] Faith2Trust:

<<< A man's name is his own property, and he has the same right to its use and enjoyment as he has to that of any other species of property.

Howe Scale Co. v. Wyckoff, Seamans & Benedict, 198 US 118 - Supreme Court 1905

http://scholar.google.com/scholar\_case?case=44211513244458211&q=unfair&hl=en&as\_sdt=4,44,110,125,277,278,279,282,283,304,305,306,307,340,341,342,345,346,367,368,369,370&as\_ylo=1880&as\_yhi=1926— Faith2Trust, Today 06:37nice find!!!!

[01/06/2013 12:42:59] vin james: it also says basicly no one can have exclusive control,ownership or copyright over a first/christian or family/surname copyright law is as non senseicle as it gets in legal land you cannot claim theft over a name or for copying anything, becuase to do so means to take something from somebody or something that they cannot use again, copying something, is just that making a copy not taking away.

[01/06/2013 12:51:19] vin james: Accepting that conclusion, it follows that complainant's case must stand or fall on the possession of the exclusive right to the use of the name "Remington."

But it is well settled that a personal name cannot be exclusively appropriated by any one as against others having a right to use it; and as the name "Remington" is an ordinary family surname, it was manifestly incapable of exclusive appropriation as a valid trade-mark, and its registration as such 135\*135 could not in itself give it validity. Brown Chemical Company v. Meyer, 139 U.S. 540; Singer Manufacturing Company v. June Manufacturing Company, 163 U.S. 169; Elgin National Watch Company v. Illinois Watch Case Company, 179 U.S. 665.

The general rule and the restrictions upon it are thus stated in Brown Chemical Company v. Meyer. There plaintiff had adopted as a trade-mark for its medicine the words "Brown's Iron Bitters," and the defendants used upon their medicine the words "Brown's Iron Tonic." This court, after commenting upon the descriptive character of the words "Iron Tonic," and confirming the defendants' right to the use of these, said:

"It is hardly necessary to say that an ordinary surname cannot be appropriated as a trade-mark by any one person as against others of the same name, who are using it for a legitimate purpose

[01/06/2013 12:53:25] vin james: i hope this case can let some people in the freeman/trust law community see the mis-guided notion of claiming you can argue copyright/crown copyright issues in court.

[01/06/2013 12:55:52] vin james: the people who do business as the state/crown are pretty much of the deluded opinion we are their property to do with as they wish, problem with that is, they can only enforce such an opinion useing coerction and violence, hardly evidence of ownership, but evidence of insanity and tyranny.