Ralph Winterowd Show, hour 2 – June 19, 2011

[Ralph] Welcome back to the 2nd hour of the Ralph Winterowd with Ralph Kermit Winterowd 2nd, truth seeker of the far North. We’re going to talk about the Internal Revenue Service and I’m telling you what, we are going to get these guys, these criminals, the Internal Revenue Service, with their notices of levy and their notices of federal tax liens, we are going to have some fun with these suckers this year. And, of course, like I’ve told people before, I’ve made application to the CIA and the FBI and I got turned down by both of them—haven’t any idea why. ‘Oh, you really didn’t, surely.’ I said, ‘you bet, I have loose lips. I cannot keep government secrets.’ And I’m telling you what, I got some more information. I put out an e-mail and I got some interest out there and I had a couple people sent back and said I need to look at this to make sure that what I’m doing is right and anybody that’s got any information that thinks that I’m right or wrong or whatever, I want to hear from you. I deal in facts as best I can. I check everything out. I don’t hold a grudge against anybody that says I’m wrong. I don’t hold a grudge….if you’re right. I’m going to pursue the truth and I’m telling you what. It is becoming clearer and clearer that all of these notices of levy without a warrant of distraint is totally illegal and unconstitutional. There are no notice and demand letters. They’re supposed to do Notice and Demand within ten days if the Form 3552 and these notices of federal tax lien I think I have a way to attack them.

I’m going to talk about the Internal Revenue Service and this is starting to get to be fun as I really start to understand how corrupt these bastards are. It shocks the conscience. In reality I don’t think there is one levy in America letter of the law, not even close. Notices of federal tax lien, same nonsense. I got a document somebody had sent me, forward one, where a guy had done a lot of research into the levy stuff and something that piqued my interest because I’m always checking things out and I want to get the documents. I want to read it myself. I don’t want secondhand knowledge. I want to get it… By the way, I do want to say Dave Gladden in Dillingham, the felony charges they finally decided to do, it’s called a Rule 43a where the prosecutor says, ‘we don’t want to play with you anymore,’ so they dismissed the two felony charges against Dave Gladden. The 33 misdemeanors, they did a motion in limine. First of all, there was all sorts of motions in. They waited until he couldn’t do an interlocutory or anything. Last Monday he goes in and he gets in the mail the same day the denial of all the motions so there’s no interlocutories or anything, writ of mandamus, nothing could be done, and said, ‘oh, by the way, Dave, we denied everything and, oh by the way, you’re going to trial tomorrow.’ This is Dave Gladden in Dillingham. And so the next day he gets in there and the contract, there is no prosecutor for Dillingham so they have a contract law firm out of Anchorage and Montgomery is a woman that’ in this. And, anyway, she had put in a motion in limine to censor—in other words, you can’t talk about what. You cannot talk about the fact that there is no in 1977 Dillingham repealed all taxation ordinances on sales and property and the new one was according particularly as shown in Exhibit A and…adopted. Nobody’s seen Exhibit A. The question becomes, how did you know what to print for the sales and property tax? Where’s the law, where’s the ordinance? Can’t talk about that. And the judge said, ‘I am going to enforce you cannot bring in anything to do with the ordinance, whether it exists or not. The only question is did you fill out the sales tax form?—that’s it. Now whether you’re mandated to do it, whether there’s a law that requires you to do it, did you fill it out, yes or no?’ And, of course, Dave said, ‘well what am I doing here? I have no defense.’ We don’t need to have a legal duty? Legal duty is an important issue. It’s either by contract or by law, a legal duty. That’s what our whole republic is sitting on. Do I have a legal duty to do something or to not do something? And couldn’t do that so in the interim I was up all night putting in proposed jury instructions and stuff together for Dave and he submitted that. And in open court he asked the judge Suddock. Never met the man because I’ve been out of the loop in Anchorage. I used to know every one of them almost. But anyway, he asked him after he did that he had nothing to lose. So he asked him if he was a public officer of the State of Alaska with a oath and a civil commission. The judge wouldn’t answer the question. So then he read into the record that he’s not because we already know he has no civil commission which requires a document and the civil commission sealed with a signature, the signature is the appointment and the evidence is the civil commission. None of the judge have it. Does he have a proper oath of office as a public officer? No. They changed the words because they can’t do it and it’s in quotation marks—they can’t change the words. They all have employee affidavits. And then the judge was concerned that he might be sued in his individual or official capacity that the clerk over there that has no power to issue complaints—she’s a private prosecutor doing it all on her own that she would be sued and that the prosecutor, the pretend prosecutor that’s by civil contract could be sued. He was concerned about all them. I haven’t listened to the tape yet here. Isn’t it interesting the judge would be concerned…all these people. So, anyway, what he offered him was a conditional plea of guilty which is something I’ve not researched out yet. I’ve heard of them and there’s no written anything, it’s just a verbal thing and the judge said, ‘that’s the best I can offer you, Dave.’ But this was after he had read the proposed jury instructions. The proposed jury instructions would hang the bastards over there. Most people don’t get around but you have a right to put in proposed jury instructions for any trial as long as it’s backed up by statute or by holdings of Supreme Court or some other court. And all of the patterned jury instructions of Alaska which are another joke just like the pattern jury instruction that they use in the district courts for the different circuits. They’re a joke if people would ever take the time to read them and have some sort of an understanding and that’s what really irritates me is Joe Banister’s is the only one ever without exception that they actually put the Code sections and stuff in the jury instructions and, of course, he won. What does that tell you? Do you think it might be rigged? Raises doubt in my mind when somebody gets special treatment.

Anyway, enough of that—that’s the up-to-date. Now, I had gotten in information about the United States Code Congressional and Administrative News and this is for the 83rd Congress, 2nd session, 954, volume 3. And this was some research that somebody had done. I forget what his name was. I think he was an attorney, actually. I don’t remember now, but I’ve got the document here. But anyway, and he was quoting the same thing that I had found in the House Report 1337 about the fact that the 1939 Code, 3690 and 3692 about levy and distraint are alive and well and working. So, I called the UAA, the University of Alaska in Anchorage and thanks to good old Senator Ted Stevens, no longer with us, but, God, he loved to spend taxpayers money out of the lower 48 and bring it to Alaska, way more than they put in. So, anyway, we have an excellent research facility there over by Providence Hospital. So I called and see if they have the book. ‘Oh, yeah, we got it.’ So I got a ride; Tom gave me a ride and I gave him $50 for gas and away we went and got there with about two and a half hours left yesterday and I got busy. And the first thing that I went to was because I found out there was a Senate report also—this I had not seen yet, was not aware there was a Senate report. And they had it in this book. This is extremely, extremely interesting. And this is on page 5225 and it’s the technical, the same thing, a technical analysis of 6331, Levy and Distraint, that the House did also.

And then they did a conference bill where they agreed to disagree or whatever which I also have. This is evidence. These were attached to the bill—it’s House Bill 8300—they were attached to it. So what does it say? It’s only about 2/3 of a page and I’m quoting here:

This section—this is under Section 6331, Levy and Distraint. And first of all, what is distraint so we understand that is. Distraint, of course, is a writ or a precept by somebody who has the authority to do it and distraint or distress is the taking of property. So it’s a means to take possession of private or real property, personal property.

So what’s it say?

*This section corresponds to that of the House bill except for the revision noted below in a clerical change. The section continues in effect. The provisions of existing law relating to distraint and levy, see sections 3690 and 3692 of the present Internal Revenue Code.’*

Well, I wonder what those two sections which I’ve talked about before. What is 3690? Well, 3690 is authority to distraint. And it says here, *if any person liable to pay any taxes neglects or refuses to pay the same within ten days after notice and demand—*there has to be a notice and demand. While I was doing the research I tripped across 3552—somebody gave me the information actually—3552 form for notice and demand. Has anybody ever seen one? I haven’t ever seen one. I even went to the IRS’s home page for all of their documents and there’s no 3552 and it’s 14 places in the Internal Revenue Manual. Of course, we know the Internal Revenue Manual is not law. That’s where the IRS can lie to you and get away with it, the same as their publications. There’s nothing that you can hold them to in the Internal Revenue Manual or in the publications—extremely difficult. Anyway, it says here: *Ten days after notice and demand it shall be lawful for the collector or his deputy to collect said taxes with such interest and additional amounts as are required by law—*you got to be careful of that one—*by distraint.* So, after ten days Notice and Demand collected by distraint. Is there anything complicated about that? That is right out of the Senate Report and it’s right out of the House Report and sale and the manner provided in this subchapter of the goods, chattels and effects including stocks, securities, bank accounts—oh, they love those bank accounts and their little crookies do. “An evidence of debt of the person delinquent as foresaid.”

Talking about what I found in the University of Anchorage, Alaska in Anchorage law library. And I went in and got the Senate Report and it gets better. Now, it says, also—that’s just 3690 and 3692. And the 1939 Code is alive and well and one of the cases I’ll get to in a minute here. Somebody has sent me about somebody 2009 who took on the company and the judge in his…statement, they’re dismissing the case so the 1939 Code has been repealed. That’s not so. It’s still alive and well, many parts of it. So, with that said, this gets even more interesting. This is still on the bottom of page 5225 of volume 3 of the Administrative News. *“You are committing—*and I’m quoting—*as clarified the provisions of the House Bill by expressly providing that accrued salary and wages of any officer, employee or elected official of the United States or the District of Columbia or any agency or instrumentality thereof may be levied upon by serving a Notice of Levy on the employer as defined in Section 3401d of such officer, employee or elected official.* Does it get any clearer than that, folks? This is the one that’s on the back, 6331a, that they leave off. They’re saying right here, it doesn’t say anything about an individual it’s specifically is only for those people. It doesn’t say includes. There it is, right in the Senate Report, *of such officer, employee or elected official*. Does it say individual? You and me? No, no, no. The change in this section makes unnecessary the change from existing law the definition of person in 6332c of the House Bill and accordingly that section has been amended to restore the definition of person to restore the definition of person contained in 3710c of the 1939 Code. I haven’t researched that yet. I just got that this all scanned and, well, I’m not quite done yet. The provisions as to levy on salaries of government employees are the same as those applicable to any other delinquent taxpayer. That statement is not true because you’ve got to be real careful about delinquent taxpayer. Well, a delinquent taxpayer could be true, it’s illegal aliens—absolutely. Citizens of the United States abroad—absolutely. You can do all those sorts of things but it doesn’t say individual. That’s the game. Oh, it gets better yet. This is the next paragraph, paragraph 3. The section retains the rule of present law which permits seizure immediately after Notice and Demand in the case of jeopardy. Jeopardy is, I’m getting ready to skip out, whatever. I’m leaving the country, I’m hiding all my assets or something, but it says immediately after Notice and Demand in the case of jeopardy. Here’s where it gets really juicy. Oh, this is good stuff. And in cases not involving jeopardy permits seizure only after the expiration of a ten-day period following the issuance of a Notice and Demand. Have you seen a Notice and Demand? Have you seen a 3552 form? No. I have seen, we have issued you a Notice and Demand. We have asked you where is the true Notice and Demand? I’ve never seen one yet. Has anybody out there’s got one, a true form 3552 where it actually says Notice and Demand under 6303 Code Section? Please get a hold of me. I’d love to see one. Well, guess what, they’re in trouble and we’re going to get to that, what happens if there’s no Notice and Demand. However, reading—continuing—*existing law provides for immediate seizure only with respect to taxes other than income, state and gift. This section changes present law with respect to jeopardy cases—*now, read this here, this is real careful, this is good. Let me start over and pay attention—real careful. *However existing law provides for immediate seizure only with respect to taxes other than income, state and gift taxes. This section changes present law with respect to jeopardy cases by permitting seizure immediately after a Notice and Demand in the cases of all taxes including income, estate and gift taxes.* So, if there’s a jeopardy immediate seizure after Notice and Demand—it’s jeopardy cases. *Existing law requires the levy proceedings must be carried on against personal property and then used against real property. Under this section real property may be levied upon without first proceeding against personal property.* So they changed that. This is a killer part in the Senate Report—killer thing. They reaffirmed that the by distraint is alive and well, 3690 and 3692. How do they get away with this?

I’m going to go over these again because I’m telling you, I was just clicking my heels when I saw this in this Senate Report. This is just absolutely astounding information and it’s in page 5225 and 5226. And it’s right there. It’s United States Code Congressional and Administrative News. This will be going out –an except of it will be going on my special list but it’s going to be incorporated in my IRS package because I am going to get all of this that we’re going to talk about here in time as soon as I get through going over this again. Some finer points of stopping all these banks and garnisheement stuff. This is just absolutely astounding information. And there are three major parts in this thing and the first one is it says in here absolutely that sections 3690 and 3692 of the Internal Revenue Code just continues into effect. Existing law, distraint and levy. Those say they’re going to by distraint and by distraint is in their definitions back in the 1939 Code there has to be a Warrant of Distraint. Now, the 2nd one which people have been aware of for a long time—I’m not the first person to talk about this—is this next part and this is a killer and I’m going to read it again because it’s really important. It says, *your committee has clarified the provisions of the House bill by expressly providing that accrued salary and wages of any officer, employee or elected official of the United States or the District of Columbia or any agency or instrumentality thereof—*that’s who they’re talking about, what can happen to them—*may be levied upon by serving a Notice of Levy.* So we can do a Notice of Levy only on whom? On the employer as defined in 3401d. That’s all a federal… And here’s the killer, prepositional phrase, of such officer, employee or elected official. The Notice of Levy on government employer of such and it limits it to officer, employee or elected official. There it is. They’re explaining. So, the question becomes, why are they not putting that on the back of the Notice and Levy? Because they don’t want you and me to maybe question and start checking into what these guys are up to. And the third thing of this that’s really important, *this section contains the rule of present law which permits seizure immediately after Notice and Demand in the case of jeopardy. And in cases not involving jeopardy permits seizure only after the expiration of the ten-day period following the issuance of Notice and Demand.* Does it get any clearer? Where is your Notice and Demand? Form 3552 is the best I’ve been able to come up with in the Internal Revenue Manual 14 damned times. Where is it? There’s no Notice and Demand letter. And they’ve changed that. I think it went up to—well, the ten days is still there.

So, anyway, let’s get onto another finer point of this. I’ve got to find the right case here. It is out of the District of Maryland and it’s Blackston v. United States 778 F supp 244. Now, this is really interesting because in here they’re talking about the fact of the Notice of Federal Tax Lien and a Notice and Demand. And it says here, *without a valid demand there can be no tax lien. Without a tax lien the IRS cannot levy against the taxpayer’s property. The IRS’s failure to serve a timely Notice and Demand does not prevent the government from instituting a judicial proceeding to collect the tax liability.* What does that mean? What are they trying to tell us? Ok. There’s two ways they can legally by law get our property away from us if we actually have assessment. Now, assessment I have proven conclusively there are no regulations under 6203 to assess. So, I’ve killed the assessment side of it. What I’m working on now is the Notice of Levy, Warrants of Distraint and Notices of Federal Tax Lien. So the bottom line is if there is no Notice and Demand there is no tax lien. And without a tax lien they can’t levy. And with no power to levy you can’t do a Warrant of Distraint or do anything. You’d be done. Now, what this also said is they can judicially proceed to court based on there was a proper assessment. An assessment is considered in tax world the same as a judgment. So they could do a reduce to judgment. Of course, we can tackle that now and in the Vernon’s case in Fairbanks when that was brought forward, reduce to judgment, the judge and the Department of Justice said, ‘oh, by the way, guess what, we do not have to provide you one document from the IRS or Department of Treasury. We are not going to answer your interrogatories. We are not going to answer your admissions and you can’t depose anybody and shut the hell up—so much for due process of law there. Now, with that said, the bottom line is where’s you Notice and Demand? Now, I got to find the other case here. That was a 7th Circuit case. It is really interesting because what happens in these cases then us, guess what, what happens when they just do a Notice and Demand and they don’t do a Notice of Levy? That’s what they do*.* They do a Notice of Levy to the bank account. What does that actually do if there is nothing behind it to enforce it? Guess what, and this case here is 7th Circuit. It’s a 1951 case and it’s Givan v. Kripe 187 F2d 225. What happened? It says here and I’m reading down in this and it says, as we interpret the facts the Notice of Levy operated to freeze the assets of the taxpayer in the hands of the bank and no more. That’s all it does. It freezes the assets. And they go on. You’re talking about the only way that they can get possession of the assets is with a warrant of distraint. So, the levy, all it does is freeze the assets and they only have so many days. And if there’s no warrant of distraint the bank should release the freeze. There’s never going to be a Warrant of Distraint but they can’t do it. They don’t have the authority to do it. They’re operating under the fact in 6331b that levy includes the power of distraint and then what they did, they took the word, levy, and imbedded in it the power of distraint which says, oh, that makes it all legal then. So now, like in 6332 where the word, subject to distraint, we put subject to levy because subject to levy includes the power of distraint. These guys are good. What a bunch of word smithing, lying, treasonous, despotic SOBs. That’s what they’re doing. So what I’m working on is getting the cases behind especially with this latest information I got in the Senate Report to put these banks on notice and also to take on, because I’ve got to find the thing here, something else we found out. This was going up on Dave Gladdens to the challenging, from Dillingham, the Notices of Federal Tax Lien. We were going to use federal court just challenging the Notices of Federal Tax Lien because they’re illegal and we used the Code sections and they didn’t want to talk about all three of them but they came back and they gave us another jewel and it’s all about their procedural because it’s a non-judicial administrative procedure. And they have to very, very religiously follow each and every step and they don’t do it. There’s never a Notice and Demand—I’ve never seen one yet. There’s never a Warrant of Distraint. They do Notice of Levy but there’s never a Warrant of Distraint. There’s no assessment because, you see, if they do a Notice and Demand which is 6303 Code Section it says there has to be assessment in compliance with 6203. Well, 6203 says there’s got to be regulations with the liability promulgated and those according to the Federal Register Act and 1 CFR 21.43 has to be behind the Table of Contents. There are no regulations for Part 1, Individual Income Tax. And the regulations that do show up there you do the final test, are they in compliance with the Administrative Procedures Act and have the force and effect of law and the IRS admits in their CFRs they’re all interpretive regs. And you can go look at the reg and you can prove it’s interpretive—it has no force and effect of law in violation of *Chrysler v. Brown*, 1979 Supreme Court case. But now, interestingly enough, is what came up here is a quiet title action may only—now, this is in case here of 3:10-CV-267. This is in Alaska. I don’t normally give out case numbers but Dave Gladden has given me permission. That’s 3:10-CV-267 and it’s docket 37. And it says here, *as the United States knows a quiet title action may only contest the procedural validity of a tax lien.* Oh, damn, that’s good, that’s really good. And they cite *Comforte v. US and it’s 979 F2d 1375,* a 9th circuit 1992 case—page 1377. I love it. Do you think we might have some way to go after them procedurally the validity of a Notice of Federal Tax Lien? Well, first of all, the first jugular is where is your Notice and Demand? They can’t do it. Where is your Warrant of Distraint? They’re going to garnishee wages. Now, they might give a Notice of Levy to an employer but they got so much time to work on that and if they don’t do a warrant of distraint they can’t turn the “wages” of money, the Federal Reserve notes, the funny money, over to the IRS. They can’t take that out of the bank account. They can’t do it. But we don’t know that, but based on the Senate Report is extremely clear that a Notice of Levy which we already knew but this reinforces it in plain English only works on officers, employees and elected officials—that’s it. Senate Report—I believe those people. This is going to get to be really, really interesting because we can attack them understanding how the law works but then using the law along with the fact that they—and it’s not exhausting all my administrative nonsense—it’s they have mandatory non-judicial administrative procedural processes that they much adhere to and they don’t do them because they can’t. They can never assess, do any lawful assessments, technically against any “individual” because the regulations don’t even exist and if they did exist they’re not behind the Table of Contents as mandated in the 13 volumes of the Part 1, Individual Income Taxes and if they did exist then they wouldn’t pass having force and effect of law because in 1953 they got around and said, ‘we’re not doing that stinkin’ APA, force and effect of law.’ They passed the 1954 Code and they turn around and said, ‘all these regulations, ah, it’s just too much bother. We’re not going to do that APA. We don’t have to have the force and effect of law.’ Then they came along in 1960, republished all of Part 1 in November and then in December they said, ‘oh, by the way, let’s go back to that 1954 and we’ll use that one and as an escape clause and we’re not doing that stinkin’ APA and then to add insult to injury anybody can go down to the law library or as part of my IRS package I give this information out. In volume 1 they cite the 1954 Federal Register that says we’re not doing the APA except the last paragraph. They just forgot—they ran out of ink I’ll bet. I’ll bet you that’s what it was—saving on ink, you think? They leave that part out. Now, tell me this isn’t treason. It’s beyond treason. These guys are going to have one hell of a time here now because we’re getting around. I got another case that was given to me. It’s 54BR bankruptcy case 626. This is out of Missoula region in Montana and they’re talking about the fact, here, that they have to do this and they talk about the things that they must do to get property. These are things that they must prove. That assessment of tax has been made against the taxpayer including the date in which the assessment was made, the amount of the assessment and the tax period for which the assessment was made—they can’t do it. They can’t do any assessment at all—ever. Number two, Notice and Demand have been properly made including the date of such Notice and Demand and the manner in which the notice was given and demand made—they can’t do that either. They don’t do it. The taxpayer has neglected or refused to pay said assessment within ten days after Notice and Demand. Well, I can’t get around and refuse to do something of which I did not receive a Notice and Demand.

Four, property subject to seizure and particularly described presently exists that the premise was thought to be served and that that property either belongs to or the taxpayer or is a property of which a lien exists for the payment of taxes. How are they going to do that one?

Five, facts establishing the probable cause exists to believe the taxpayer is liable for the tax assessed. They can’t do that either.

Are we going to have fun?

I want to summarize what’s going on here. Internal Revenue Service only has interpretive regs, proven conclusively. Internal Revenue Service has no assessment for individual income taxes, proven conclusively. I have never seen a Notice and Demand letter yet under the authority of 6303 code section. I’d love to see one and with no Notice and Demand there can be no Notices of Federal Tax Liens, there can be no levies, there can be no levies that don’t have Warrants of Distraint. If they send out Notice of Levies that does freeze accounts, does freeze money for a limited period of time and then they have to have the Warrant of Distraint to get possession of it—that’s conclusive. That is in the House Report. It is in the Senate Report and it’s agreed to in a conference report and it’s part of House Bill 8300. It’s not discretionary on the judges. They’re stuck with it. And in the Senate Report it conclusively proves out that the Notice of Levy works only on officers, employees and elected officials. It says so in plain English. That’s what it says in 6331a and that’s what it says on the Senate Report. I believe those guys. It’s their stuff. They wrote it. Can I not believe it? And, of course, there’s supposed to be after an assessment within sixty days a Notice and Demand. Is there one? No. So we can’t do assessments because there are no regulations. We’re not going to within sixty days do a Notice and Demand because I’ve never seen one. There is no Notice and Demand. You can’t do a Notice of Tax Lien. You can’t do levies. And I’m going to put this together in a one-line that all of this will be available and all of these supporting documents because you need to read it. You need to understand it. You need to see it—take my word for nothing. That’s part of my IRS $250 donation package. Hopefully, by Wednesday I will accomplish this, Thursday at the latest barring any other major crises going on in my life up here. I’m going after the IRS in my own stuff. I got enough funds now I think to tackle those bastards. And we’re going to have some fun with these guys. I got my driver’s license case sitting in the Supreme Court though they kicked it back twice. Once I didn’t do it right they didn’t think. It went into the index and they said they didn’t because I’ve done a lot of appeal stuff. They sent it back, made changes, they didn’t like the changes so I sent it back with a motion to accept the changes. So we’ll see if they’re going to accept it or not. I don’t have a driver’s license here because I’m basically under house arrest and that’s another interesting thing because they tried a felony on a moose incident was something that I didn’t own but one of my vans and they tried a felony indictment, couldn’t make it stick. I wouldn’t talk to the cop. They came out and arrested me in the middle of the winter on a misdemeanor. Of course, that requires first-hand knowledge. They couldn’t make that stick. They tried an insurance and a $1000 fine, six points, they couldn’t make that stick. I wouldn’t talk to them. Why would I talk to these guys and confess? But then they did a, oh, guess what, we have a report in Juneau and you can’t see it. Would you like to be part of an inquisitorial, an inquisition, and we’ll call and prove that you’re innocent? I said, ‘not going to happen.’ So they pulled the driver’s license. So, we’re going to see on this right to travel issue because that’s become a hot button now and another friend of mine, Davis’ which we also know too. That’s one of the things we’ll start doing and all these traffic things now because they’re enforcing the commercial interest only in these “quasi-criminal, quasi-baloney courts”. The commercial interest of the State of Alaska and the judges paid by the State of Alaska to enforce their commercial interest, so they have a financial interest in this. Anyway, thanks for listening. I hope you enjoyed the show and as I always say, ‘watch out for the Federales, they’re everywhere. Happy father’s day—stay safe. See you next Sunday.