Samuel Girod
Satterfield Naturals
409 Satterfield Lane
Owingsville, Kentucky 40360

February 13, 2014

U.S. Food and Drug Administration
10903 New Hampshire Avenue
Silver Spring, MD 20993

CERTIFIED MAIL -
RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

U. S. Food and Drug Administration
6751 Steger Dr.
Cincinnati, OH. 45237-3097

CERTIFIED MAIL -
RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

Re: Notice of Satterfield Naturals to Sell and Market Products to Private Members Only in the Priva Domain

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter is our official notice to your agency concerning our First and Fourteenth Amendmer Private Membership Association. This association will be marketing products to our private members only i the private domain. The U.S. Supreme Court has mandated and ruled in numerous cases that there exists public domain and a private domain in the Unites States. Again, our private association and members hav decided to operate also in the private domain only under the liberty clause of the right to due process of law under the Fifth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution.

As in N.A.A.C.P. v. Button, 371 U.S. 415 at 421, in the public domain, a person who advises anothe that his legal rights have been infringed and refers him to a particular attorney has committed a mala prohibita felony crime in the State of Virginia. But in the private domain of a First Amendment legal membership association, the state, "...in the domain of these indispensable liberties, whether of...association, the decisions of this Court recognize that abridgment of such rights." N.A.A.C.P. v. Button, supra at 421. The "modes of...association protected by the First and Fourteenth (are modes) which Virginia may not prohibit. N.A.A.C.P. v. Button, supra at 415. In other words, a private mode or domain is protected and is a different domain than a public domain. What was a mala prohibita felony criminal act in the public domain became a legally protected

act in the private domain or private association. A mala in se crime is not legally protected in the priv domain or private association.

Also, the private domain is referred to as a "sanctuary from unjustified interference by the State" Pierce v. Society of Sisters, 268 U.S. 510 at 534-535. And as a "constitutional shelter" in Roberts v. Unit States, 82 L.Ed.2d 462 at 472. And again as a "shield" in Roberts v. United States, supra at 474.

In addition, the U.S. Supreme Court in Thomas v. Collins, 323 U.S. 516 at 531, specifically refers to t "Domains set apart...for free assembly." The First Amendment right to association creates a "preserve" Baird v. Arizona, 401 U.S. 1.

The private domain of an association is a sanctuary, constitutional shelter, shield, and domain set apa and a preserve according to a number of U.S. Supreme Court decisions.

Please be informed that Satterfield Naturals is a 1st and 14th Amendment private association that only ha private contract members and does not involve public persons in any manner. Your Agency and others do nc have jurisdiction or authority to even investigate our private health association unless you have some reasonabl suspicion or evidence that our private members are being subjected to a clear and present danger of substantiv evil within our private health association. We assure you that our private members are not being harmed in an manner. Your mandate from the Federal legislature is only to protect the public, not private members. Ou right to set up a 1st and 14th Amendment private health association and the public member's right to change himself or herself into a legal private contract member of our associations has been upheld by numerous U.S. Supreme Court decisions. Also, you are hereby put on notice that any interference with our private association activities may result in a Federal Civil and Constitutional Rights lawsuit under Title 42 U.S.C. § 1983 by suing the persons involved in their "individual capacities" under Hafer v. Melo, 502 U.S. 25.

If your agency decides to defy the Supreme Law of the Land and U.S. Supreme Court as was done did in the case of Cooper v. Aaron, 358 U.S. 1. In Cooper v. Aaron, supra, the U.S. Supreme Court stated that,

> 'It follows that the interpretation of the Fourteenth Amendment enunciated by this Court...is the supreme law of the land and Art. 6 of the Constitution makes it of binding effect on the States "anything in the Constitution or Laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding."'

"Every state legislator and executive and judicial officer is solemnly committed by oath pursuant to Art. 6, cl. 3 to support this Constitution."

"No state legislator or executive or judicial officer can war against the Constitution without violating his (or her) undertaking to support it."
The same principles also apply to federal.

Again, the U.S. Supreme Court has upheld First and Fourteenth Amendment association rights.

"This Court has repeatedly held that rights of association are within the ambit of the constitutional protections afforded by the First and Fourteenth Amendments. NAACP v. Alabama, 357 U.S. 449, 2 L.Ed2d 1488, 78 S.Ct. 1163; Bates v. Little Rock, 361 U.S. 516, 4 L.Ed.2d 480, 80 S.Ct. 412; Shelton v. Tucker, 364 U.S. 479, 5 L.Ed.2d 231, 81 S.Ct. 247; NAACP v. Button, 371 U.S. 415, 9 L.Ed.2d 405, 83 S.Ct. 328. The respondent Committee does not contend otherwise, nor cold it, for, as was said in NAACP v. Alabama (US) supra, 'It is beyond debate that freedom to engage in association for the advancement of beliefs and ideas is an inseparable aspect of the 'liberty' assured by the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, which embraces freedom of speech.'" 357 U.S., at 460. Gibson v. Florida Investigation Committee, 9 L.Ed.2d 929.

Although most of these U.S. Supreme cases dealt with private legal membership associations, we know that th principle applies to private health and medical membership associations. In United Mine Workers v. Illino State Bar Assoc., 389 U.S. 217, a private association case, the court stated that,

"And the rights of free speech and a free press are not confined to any field of human interest." Thomas v. Collins, 323 U.S. 516 at 531, 65 S.Ct. 315, 89 L.Ed. at 441."

'It is beyond debate that freedom to engage in association for the advancement of beliefs and ideas is an inseparable aspect of the "liberty" assured by the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, which embraces freedom of speech.' 357 U.S. at 460. Gibson v. Florida Investigation Committee, supra.

'The First and Fourteenth Amendment rights of free speech and free association are fundamental and highly prized, and "need breathing space to survive."' NAACP v. Button, 371 U.S. 415, 433, 9 L.Ed.2d 405, 418, 83 S.Ct. 328. Gibson v. Florida Investigation Committee, supra.

"It was not by accident or coincidence that the rights to freedom in speech and press were coupled in a single guaranty with the rights of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition for redress of grievances. All these, though not identical, are inseparable. They are cognate rights, cf. De Jonge v. Oregon, 299 U.S. 353, 364, 81 L.Ed. 278, 282, 57 S.Ct. 255, and therefore are united in the First Article's assurance. Cf. 1 Annals of Congress, 759, 760. Thomas v. Collins, supra.

It is evident that free speech and association rights are similarly treated as the same. If your agency allows fre speech, then it must allow freedom of association concerning this field of human interest.

Our intent is to operate under our First and Fourteenth Amendment private membership association private members only unless you furnish us legal and valid objections to same within ten (ten) days from receipt of this letter.

Sincerely,

Samuel Girod

SATTERFIELD NATURALS
By Samuel Girod
Samuel Girod, Trustee