The following are just a small sample of the many cases that uphold the requirement that anytime jurisdiction is challenged it must be proven.

* *The law provides that once State and Federal Jurisdiction has been challenged, it must be proven.* **Main v. Thiboutot, 100 S. Ct. 2502 (1980)**
* Jurisdiction can be challenged at any time and once challenged, cannot be assumed and must be decided. ***Basso v. Utah Power & Light Co*., 495 F 2d 906, 910**.
* "...there is, as well, no discretion to ignore that lack of jurisdiction." ***Joyce v. US*, 474 F2d 215**
* “A court lacking jurisdiction cannot render judgment but must dismiss the cause at any stage of the proceedings in which it becomes apparent that jurisdiction is lacking.” **Bradbury v. Dennis, 310 F.2d 73 (10th Cir. 1962)**
* The burden shifts to the court to prove jurisdiction. ***Rosemond v. Lambert*, 469 F2d 416**
* ...if the issue is presented in any way the burden of proving jurisdiction rests upon him who invokes it. ***Latana v. Hopper*, 102 F. 2d 188**
* When it clearly appears that the court lacks jurisdiction, the court has no authority to reach the merits. In such a situation the action should be dismissed for want of jurisdiction.” ***Melo v. United States, 505 F. 2d 1026***
* Court must prove on the record, all jurisdiction facts related to the jurisdiction asserted. ***Latana v. Hopper*, 102 F. 2d 188; *Chicago v. New York*, 37 F Supp. 150**
* No officer can acquire jurisdiction by deciding he has it. The officer, whether judicial or ministerial, decides at his own peril." ***Middleton v. Low*(1866), 30 C. 596, citing *Prosser v.* *Secor*(1849), 5 Barb.(N.Y) 607, 608**
* Where a court has jurisdiction, it has a right to decide any question which occurs in the cause, and whether its decision be correct or otherwise, its judgments, until reversed, are regarded as binding in every other court. But if it acts without authority, its judgments and orders are regarded as nullities. They are not voidable, but simply void, and form no bar to a remedy sought in opposition to them, even prior to a reversal. They constitute no justification, and all persons concerned in executing such judgments or sentences are considered in law as trespassers. ***Elliott v Peirsol*, 1 Pet. 328, 340, 26 U.S. 328, 340, 7L.Ed. 164 (1828)**
* Thus, where a judicial tribunal has no jurisdiction of the subject matter on which it assumes to act, its proceedings are absolutely void in the fullest sense of the term*."****Dillon v. Dillon*, 187 P 27**
* A court has no jurisdiction to determine its own jurisdiction, for a basic issue in any case before a tribunal is its power to act, and a court must have the authority to decide that question in the first instance*."****Rescue Army v. Municipal Court of Los Angeles*, 171 P2d 8; 331 US 549, 91 L. ed. 1666, 67 S.Ct. 1409**
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