

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, requesting the Court and Clerk jointly, pursuant to duties under **Sec. 402.010(a)** of the Texas Government Code, to forthwith issue to the Office of the Attorney General a true copy of this Notice enclosed with, as an integral part and parcel of, the fully completed official Texas state form filed herein required for raising constitutional challenges to state statutes, attached hereto as **Exhibit A**, 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 said official state form attached hereto as **Exhibit A**.

2. Both the Court and Clerk have clear and parallel legal duty to forthwith comply and effect said issuance; The Texas Judicial Branch officially states upon its relevant website page, at <https://www.txcourts.gov/rules-forms/challenging-the-constitutionality-of-a-state-statute>, the following formal directions:

A party challenging the constitutionality of a Texas statute must file a “Challenge to the Constitutionality of a State Statute” form with the court in which the claim is pending. (Gov’t Code Sec. 402.010 (a-1).

If a party indicates on the form that the Office of the Attorney General is not a party to or counsel in the case, **the clerk of the court** must forward the completed form and a copy of the petition, motion or pleading to the Office of the Attorney General. The OAG has created the following email account for receipt of these forms: [const\\_claims@texasattorneygeneral.gov](mailto:const_claims@texasattorneygeneral.gov). A clerk may also send the information by certified or registered mail.

3. Likewise, **Sec. 402.010(a)** of the Texas Government Code clearly commands:

**The court** shall, if the attorney general is not a party to or counsel involved in the litigation, serve notice of the constitutional challenge and a copy of the petition, motion, or other pleading that raises the challenge on the attorney general either by certified or registered mail or electronically to an e-mail address designated by the attorney general for the purposes of this section.

4. Hence, at present “the Office of the Attorney General is not a party to or counsel in the case” and therefore that status triggers duty under law for either the Clerk and/or the Court to now forthwith issue proper formal Notice unto the Attorney General.

SUMMARY OVERVIEW OF FACIAL CHALLENGES  
RAISED AGAINST STATE STATUTORY SCHEMES

5. 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:

6. 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;

7. 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;

8. 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;

9. 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,

10. 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.

11. 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.

12. 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.

13. 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 raised to state statutes and jurisdiction herein, and prays the Court and/or Clerk now so issue out said required paperwork in this matter to the Office of Attorney General Ken Paxton.

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

/s/ FirstName LastName

---

FirstName LastName