

CAUSE NO. #####

YOUR CASE STYLING GOES HERE	§	IN THE DISTRICT COURT
	§	
EXACTLY AS IT NORMALLY ALSO	§	999th JUDICIAL DISTRICT
	§	
APPEARS ON OTHER CASE DOCS	§	XXXXXX COUNTY, TEXAS

Notice of Constitutional Challenges to Texas State Statutory Schemes

COMES NOW FirstName LastName, PartyLabel herein, giving Notice to the Court, Clerk, and all parties of this formal raising of facial challenges to state statutes, by stating:

1. The undersigned now formally raises a set of constitutional (“facial”) challenges against two (2) general sets of Texas state statutory schemes, as indicated upon the official state form required by law and attached hereto as **Exhibit A**.

SUMMARY OVERVIEW OF FACIAL CHALLENGES
RAISED AGAINST STATE STATUTORY SCHEMES

2. Because the relevant text box on said official state form is not enough space to provide adequate justice on this occasion, this Notice is filed in its stead and as part of parcel of the same, and the true summary overview, for a reader’s convenience, is provided by the following points.

3. Family courts cannot actually “grant” or “award” child custody rights betwixt any pair of adversarial natural parents, because each and both such parents *already had* full and equally full child custody rights *prior to* that family court, and those rights were never taken away yet;

4. Court matters of just the natural parents themselves, *who are not blood-related*, can be processed under the mere preponderance evidentiary standard, but it is patently unconstitutional to separate *direct-blood relationships*, like parent-child relationships, without using the clear and convincing evidentiary standard, and along with ensuring full due process in that process;

5. Parental rights are *fundamental* rights, not mere privileges. Although Texas allows jury trial option over Parent-v-Parent custody *later on down the line...*, it utterly fails to provide this crucial defense option of jury trial *up front* as is constitutionally required to protect against any arbitrary and/or summary losses of those *fundamental* rights;

6. Parents actually have no valid legal standing to sue each other over child custody rights, in the first place. Again, parental rights are *fundamental* rights... and *only* the State *itself* has any legal standing to attack *fundamental* rights (*see*, a bona fide CPS case); and,

7. The Title IV-D system unconstitutionally creates *direct* pecuniary conflicts of interest in the court officers themselves (judges, clerks, prosecutors), by dividing out financial shares of pass-through bank interest monies earned upon all of the many child support payments therefore always ordered to be paid into specific “SDU” accounts, which is properly called “graft” by law.

8. Each of the above five (5) big issues is another, separate “structural” violation of due process, *each* independently rendering the very foundational framework of the case itself as fundamentally erred from the outset, and so the entire given court case, regardless of whatever supposedly happened therein, is entirely a legal nullity, a “case” that was and is wholly void *ab initio*, not just for any *single* structural violation of due process, but for *each* of those five issues.

9. Therefore, each and every such same Texas court case of any kind betwixt adversarial natural parents (whether via family court, protective order court, child support court, and/or etc.) is absolutely void in all respects to the given natural parent’s fundamental rights of child custody, every such injured parent is manifestly entitled to relief in various forms, and clearly Texas’ state courts must be immediately enjoined into full constitutional compliance with basic fundamental due process, and to respect constitutionally-protected child custody rights of all natural parents.

10. Further details, i.e., expanded arguments, upon each of the above five (5) structural violations of fundamental rights and constitutional due process are duly contained within the contemporaneously-filed Motion to Vacate All Child-Related Orders for Lack of Jurisdiction.

WHEREFORE, the PartyLabel herein, FirstName LastName, provides said Notice and summary overview of the facial challenges now raised to state statutes and jurisdiction herein.

Dated: October 6th, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ FirstName LastName

FirstName LastName
Street Address
City, State, ZIP
Tel: (###) ###-###
Email: myemailaddress@somewhere.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify: that on this _6th_ day of October, 2025, a true and complete copy of the foregoing *notice of constitutional challenges to state statutes*, by e-service to all registered filers of this case automatically provided via the Texas E-File system, has been duly served on:

(for Other Parent's Name Here)
Other Parent or Attorney Name
Address Line 1
Address Line 2 as needed
City, State, ZIP

(for the State of Texas)
State of Texas
c/o Attorney General W. Kenneth Paxton
P.O. Box 12548
Austin, TX 78711-2548

/s/ FirstName LastName

FirstName LastName