

Joie Blessett Seeks Permanent Injunction United States' 42 U.S.C. 666 of the Title IV-D child support law

SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS, UNITED STATES, March 1, 2022 /EINPresswire.com/ -- The child support private debt collection business expanded using the provisions of [42 U.S.C. 666](#) of the Title IV-D of the Social Security Act is not a protected entitlement program of the federal government. The U.S. Congress entrusted the U.S. Dept of HHS, to whom the current Secretary [Xavier Becerra](#) is responsible for protecting the United States' interest. The lack of oversight of the Secretary of U.S. Dept. HHS has caused the cascade of problems associated with the Title IV-D child support program in its enforcement and collections, causing injury primarily to the non-custodial parent, thus creating the Child Support Debtors group.



JOE BLESSETT ®

Excerpted from the Amended Complaint: "The child support debt collection business, via Title IV-D of the Social Security Act, starts at the top with the United States. The United States has contracted with the States, in Joe Blessett's case, the state of Texas, using Title IV-D of the Social Security Act. Initially, the program was created to offset expenses for Title IV-A, the welfare program, by using Title IV-D thru the State governments to recover monies spent on welfare recipients. However, in 1993 the talks began to implement the provisions of 42 U.S.C. 666. As a result, the Title IV-D program of the Social Security Act was expanded to include child support debt collection into a nationwide program, allowing pursuance across state lines. This includes the gradual expansion of child support debt collection into non-Title IV-A recipients. This was indeed a lucrative business for attorneys on both sides of the marital conflict. However, the State government and its contractors have now edged out private divorce support agreements, private agreements between unwed parents, and private debt collection agencies. This is in direct violation of the Sherman Act."



When bad people flourish,
the good people must act;
or they will fall, one by one,
as an unnecessary sacrifice
in a disgraceful silence.”

Edmund Burke

“Now, to be clear, the states have engaged in the business of child support private debt collection. It has enrollment fees for the mother, it has applied penalties on non-custodial parents for delinquencies, it has finance charges with interest applied on child support delinquent debt, and it has profited from block grants from the United States government, earned in 2 ways: first, thru administrative reimbursements and secondly, the incentive payment program in place. The Texas state government and other

State governments set up in a similar way shows itself as a private debt collection business.”

“By virtue of the United States Title IV-D program of the Social Security Act used by the Texas State government in the child support private debt collection, the United States is not exempt from the Clearfield Trust Doctrine. Both the United States and the Texas State and other state governments, that have descended down to the level of private businesses, must be defined and categorized as a business entity themselves.”

“Both the United States and the Texas State have violated the Sherman Act. Both the United States and the Texas State have engaged in private business, specifically the child support private debt collection business. It is nothing but a private debt collection business.”

“The United States application of [Cooperative-Federalism](#). and Title IV-D contract as it applies to the Texas Family Code Sec. 158.210 and Sec.232.0022 demonstrates unequal treatment and denies liberties towards the child support debtors as a special group. Child Support debt is nothing but a commercial debt that does not merit special discriminatory treatment to enforce this specific U.S. Congressional Act. The United States is the source of this unequal treatment. The legislation of the Title IV-D of the Social Security Act is repugnant to the U. S. Constitution. “

Furthermore, Who is the primary lender? If the father/noncustodial parent (NCP) gets behind, he pays interest on the arrearage, which is his own money in the first place. The father/NCP is the source of the loan. The primary lender, in this case, the father/NCP, should set up the terms of the loan. And he is made to pay interest on his own money that he is loaning himself? This shows the deceptive evil of this 42 U.S.C. 666 of the Title IV-D of the Social Security Act, as was written & created, and nothing of benefit to the father/NCP. Ultimately allowing an opening for-profit downline from the United States to the States and its contractors, to the municipal governments and its subdivisions, and the attorneys on both sides of the conflict, at the cost of misery and the broken families.

Excerpted from the Amended Complaint: “Xavier Becerra, the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, has failed in his duties to oversee the Texas plan for compliance with the Title IV-D of the Social Security Act. However, more significant than this is the fact that Becerra is not interested in the real oversight and compliance issues of the States and its

contractors because the United States, which he represents primarily, is the more significant beneficiary of a successful Title IV-D collection program, that circles back to the prime reason of the creation of Title IV-D to offset the expenses of Title IV-A welfare program. The success of Title IV-D is a success to Title IV-A for the United States.”

Finally, it is contract law. The Final Divorce Decree is a contract that must be followed until there is another controlling legal instrument. A man cannot be bound to a contract that he has not made or authorized. Free consent is an indispensable element in making valid contracts.”

Quoting Dred Scott v. Sanford, 60 U.S. 393 (1857)

In the Amended Complaint, Blessett seeks declaratory judgment and injunctive relief towards the HHS (Health and Human Services) for the application of Title IV-D Child Support penalties and certifying an invalid debt with various government agencies without evidence of a debt.

Also, Blessett seeks a permanent injunction against the United States Government to stop Title IV-D Child Support penalties for the lack of full disclosure.

Joe Blessett has the right to his 5th, 9th, 10th, and 14th amendment rights to enjoy his Final Divorce Decree.

Joe Blessett

Joe Blessett Music

+1 281-667-1174

[email us here](#)

Visit us on social media:

[Facebook](#)

[Twitter](#)

This press release can be viewed online at: <https://www.einpresswire.com/article/564343268>

EIN Presswire's priority is source transparency. We do not allow opaque clients, and our editors try to be careful about weeding out false and misleading content. As a user, if you see something we have missed, please do bring it to our attention. Your help is welcome. EIN Presswire, Everyone's Internet News Presswire™, tries to define some of the boundaries that are reasonable in today's world. Please see our Editorial Guidelines for more information.

© 1995-2022 IPD Group, Inc. All Right Reserved.