

Adrian Pritchard

Colchester Borough Council
Rowan House
33 Sheepen Road
Colchester
CO3 3WG

Many thanks for your invite to the house of the dead, although I must respectfully decline this offer. I have visited the council office today and dropped off a highlighted version of the 'summons' for your attention. This document seems never to have been before a Magistrate or Justice of the peace, and the name that appears to have signed off this document I'm told is a solicitor who is not even based at Colchester Magistrate Court!

I have tried my utmost to get in touch with the officer to understand if my case has been individually considered, as per the due process? I have been in contact with Colchester magistrate's court who advised me that they had no liability order or summons for the fictitious name on record. As I wish to remain in honor and settle any lawful obligations I would appreciate it if you could provide me with the sight of all documentation in relation to this matter including our contract/agreement be that expressed or implied. As I have made it clear that I do not consent, please provide me with the Law, not Legislation that dictates that I, as you put it MUST.

As we can clearly see from the reply address this document has been issued by a private company that trades under the name Colchester Borough Council.

I have highlighted some of the grammatical errors you clown's use and some of the key legalese words.

1. UNHYPENATED ALL CAPITAL TEXT 'Dog Latin'. Maxim: Glossa: A poisonous GLOSS which corrupts the essence of the text.

::Removed from document::

2. Bold Text – Legally 'Bold' stands out from the page, and what stands out does not stand in.

::Removed from document::

3. Estoppel Line – Legally and grammatically the line separates the parts of text meaning that the text either above or below the estoppel line is effectively on a different page. There is no continuation of the facts or the jurisdiction.

:: Removed from document::

4. [4 Corners] or [boxing] – Anything inside a [box] cannot be seen, heard or tendered as evidence; this is true both in a physical courtroom and on paper. Grammatically anything [inbox] is considered to be [boxed off] or separated from the rest of the document: no contract, no continuation of facts and no jurisdiction.

:: Removed from document::

Relevant Maxims

Maxims of Law -Volenti non fit injuria. There is no injury to one who consents. Ignorance of the

Law does not excuse misconduct in anyone, least of all a sworn officer of the law.

- A general appearance cures antecedent irregularity of process, a defective service, etc. •
- Certain legal consequences are attached to the voluntary act of a person. • The presence of the

body cures the error in the name; the truth of the name cures an error in the description

- An error in the name is immaterial if the body is certain.
- An error in the name is nothing when there is certainty as to the person.
- The truth of the demonstration removes the error of the name.
- A fiction is a rule of law that assumes something which is or may be false as true. •

Where truth is, fiction of law does not exist.

- There is no fiction without law.
- Fictions arise from the law, and not law from fictions
- Fiction is against the truth, but it is to have truth.
- In a fiction of law, equity always subsists.
- A fiction of law injures no one.
- Fiction of law is wrongful if it works loss or injury to anyone.

More on Styles

- For the Appellations used by your company - Mr, Ms, Mrs or Miss are military titles Refer (Style manual) is there claiming that if the man is in the military?

- Use of Surname (Byname)

Name, title or epithet added to a person's name.

For the use of the surname is a convention rather than a legal necessity, and the Surname is never formally bestowed on a person but acquired by reputation. At common law an adult may assume any surname by using such name and becoming known by it. A surname is not a matter of law but a matter of repute

- Surname / Family Name is Crown copyrighted

Is it illegal to use the 'Crown © legal name'?

- Family Name - by its own definition is incorrect unless I choose to be your franchised and/or bonded slave/servant. By requesting the "Family Name" are you enticing me to be your slave/servant?

Use of Surname (Byname) Nomen / Cognomen. The use of surnames appears to be more a response to needs of state and church administration (the exchequer, legal transactions, and tenants' rolls) than for purposes of self-identification.

The use of a surname is a convention rather than a legal necessity, and the surname is never formally bestowed on a person but acquired by reputation. In the most recent

- Family Name

family (noun) early 15c., "servants of a household," from Latin familia "family servants, domestics collectively, the servants in a household," thus also "members of a household, the estate, property; the household, including relatives and servants," abstract noun formed from famulus "servant, slave," which is of unknown origin.

The Latin word rarely appears in the sense "parents with their children," for which domus (see domestic (adj.)) was used. Derivatives of famulus include famula "serving woman, maid," famulanter "in the manner of a servant," famulitas "servitude," familiaris "of one's household, private," familiaricus "of household slaves," familiaritas "close friendship."

Black's Law Dictionary, 4th Edition, 1968, Page 727.

- Gender - Male/Female. Are we cattle or farmyard animals? Would not Man/Woman or Boy/Girl be

more fitting?

- People – Man/Woman, Persons – Artificial/Natural & Private.

For the Vatican created the “Person”, it is not the living man; it is the rank in society, a military account holder. By consenting to hold any form of account, thee has agreed to act as the person and thus be deceived to serve the false GOD and pay the accounts of Rome. For i the man, neither consent nor agree. For the ‘legal person’ is also the “vessel” in which the State has a security interest, via the Birth Bond. Upon reaching the full legal age, we become the Master, (Mr/Mrs/Ms) of that “vessel” that has “gone to sea”, and under the Admiralty Maritime jurisdiction, which is the “Law of the Sea” and the Cestui Que Vie Act 1666 (chapter 11 18 and 19 Cha 2) ‘persons’ are considered ‘lost at sea’ and can be salvaged. For i the man am not lost at sea, and i do not consent to being salvaged under any law and or jurisdiction.

- Person = Debtor = Trustee = Payer = Under Admiralty/Martial Law (Vatican) •
Surname capitalised = Ledger Account Holder (inc. address or part thereof in caps.) •
Man/Woman = Creditor = Beneficiary = Receives Benefits = Under Common Law/

Constitution. (Un)der the God, the Man has the dominion over the whole Earth and the contents.

Question – Is this a ploy by you and/or your corporation to trick thee into being a Vatican Account holder (person) and thereby losing our God-given creditor-status?

- Date-of-Birth/Berth (D.O.B.)

For the ‘Date Born’ and the ‘Date-of-Birth’ seem to be different events. The Date Born – requires no further explanation, and the date-of-birth for the surname is the date born. Moreover, the Date-of-Birth for the ‘Court Christian’ (uses Given name/s only) and is the date when the birth was registered. - Refer Black’s Law Dictionary, 4th Edition, 1968, Page 472 under DATE.

- Postal Address - Delivery of the Postal Articles to the Street address and/or the Post Office Box is also deemed Military.

Residential Address - “Persons” have “Residency” with the State. For i the man “Sojourn”.

- Postcodes are Military Divisions also used to discriminate for insurance purposes
School funding, home loans etc., and to determine Centre of Main Interest.

- Four Corners Rule

Anything inside a box or square brackets creates an implied "inner box"
That is separated from the "outer box" grammatically and thus legally isolates the contents
Of the "inner box," - rendering what is in the “inner box” as mere reference or
Comment, but non-substantial to the outlying text of the contract in the “outer box”.

- Four Corners Rule

The Use of Brackets and the Four Corners Rule - Featured Content
FOUR-CORNERS RULE. 1. The principle that a document's meaning is to be gathered from the entire document and not from its isolated parts. ... 2. The principle that no extraneous evidence should be used to interpret an unambiguous document.

Black's Law Dict. 8th Edition, Page 1941.

For the use of brackets on certain information on a form combines a grammar device with legal theory to legally isolate whatever is in the brackets from (thus, render it legally inapplicable and insubstantial to) the body of text within the surrounding contract.

Four Corners Rule (cont.)

For the legal theory of this comes from the Four Corners Rule in law: Under "four corners rule", intention of parties, especially that of grantor, is to be gathered from instrument as a whole and not from isolated parts thereof. *Davis v. Andrews*, Tex.Civ.App., 361 S.W.2d 419,423. (Black's Law Dictionary, 5th ed. p. 591)

- **DOG-LATIN.** The Latin of illiterate persons; Latin words put together on the English Grammatical system. Black's Law Dictionary, 4th Edition, 1968, Page 569.
and/or -
- **GLOSSA VIPERINA EST QUIE CORRODIT VISCERA TEXTUS.** 11 Coke, 34. It is a poisonous gloss which corrupts the essence of the text.
and/or - Black's Law Dictionary, 4th Edition, 1968, Page 820.
- **CAPITIS DIMINUTIO MAXIMA.** The highest or most comprehensive loss of status. This occurred when a man's condition was changed from one of freedom to one of bondage, When he became a slave. It swept away with it all rights of citizenship and all family rights.
and/or - Black's Law Dictionary 4th Edition, 1968, Page 264.

- **Personation in general**

Any person who, with intent to defraud any person, falsely represents himself or herself to be some other person, living or dead, real or fictitious, is guilty of an offence which, unless otherwise stated, is a misdemeanour, and the person is liable to imprisonment for 3 years

- **People – Man/Woman, Persons, - Artificial, Natural & Private.**

There is a common misinterpretation by people in general as to the difference between a man/woman, a person, an artificial person, a natural person, and a natural & private person. "JOHN HENRY DOE" is a corporate artificial person, a citizen, and a 'legal entity' created by the government as an agent/employee to collect revenue for the federal, state, and local governments and whose future earnings are pledged to these ruling corporation/s by tacit hypothecation.

An "entity" can also be called a "natural person" Refer Black's Law Dictionary, 4th Edition 1968, ARTIFICIAL

PERSONS

Page 145, CORPORATION – Page 409, INDIVIDUAL- Page 913, PERSON – Page 1299, The (State owned) full name "John Henry Doe" is a 'citizen', a 'resident', a 'natural person', a 'trustee' and 'usufruct', consenting to accept and cover all debts of the State administrator by the use of 'their' surname. As a 'slave' J.H.D. consents to enter private international contracts and forgo all rights to natural justice (Common Law and Human Rights). Date Born used as D.O.B Birth.

A representative in unlimited capacity as a driver, taxpayer, rate-payer, etc. (jobs ending in er/or). The (Court Christian) Given name "John Henry", in basic English grammar, is a name styled in title (upper and lower) case and is indicative of a living, breathing, flesh and blood man, created by God and able to exercise all his God-given inalienable rights and is the only correct true full name to use. It is not our property. It is a creation of government, subject to security and is copyright

SIGN

To make any mark, as upon a document, in token of knowledge, approval, acceptance, or obligation.

SIGNATURE.

A "signature" may be written by hand, printed, stamped, typewritten, engraved, photographed, or cut from one instrument and attached to another, and a signature lithographed on an instrument by a party is sufficient for the purpose of signing it; it being immaterial with what kind of instrument a signature is made. And whatever mark, symbol, or device one may choose to employ as representative of himself is sufficient.

Black's Law dictionary, 4th Edition, 1968, Page 1553.

- AUTOGRAPH. One's handwriting.

Black's Law Dictionary, 4th Edition, 1968, Page 169.

- ALLOGRAPH. A writing or signature made for a person by another; opposed to autograph.

Black's Law Dictionary, 4th Edition, 1968, Page 100.

- Underlined, Underscored, Italics, and Bold.

Underlined, underscored - has the same grammatical effect as Italics and/or bold.

Refer (Government) Style manual- For authors, editors and Printers.

- Italics means removed from the page, or text that belongs in the margin, or from another place. It has no jurisdiction with the original content – rendering separation. (Italics seem to be the 'language' of the Vatican.)

- Bold – Highlighted, up off the page, thus it is not on the page - rendering separation.

Courts, Venues and Jurisdiction.

The Judiciary comprises two types of court venues; a corporate “administrative court”, and a Common Law “court of record”. A judge in an “administrative court” does not act judicially but as an administrator to settle contractual disputes. A judge in a “court of record” sits judicially with a “jury of the People” to remedy harm to other living people. The courts are attended by “Commercial List Judges”, some of whom are designated as “jury” judges able to sit in a Common Law “court of record”. Common Law acknowledges the LAWFUL Rights possessed by living Men and Women. Statutes prescribe Legislation to administer artificial LEGAL “Persons”.

A Statutory “administrative court” is for commerce, in practice (de facto). It is a place of corporate banking offering “a dispute resolution service for consenting parties”, where living men and women (unwittingly) consent to be party (joined) to an artificial legal “person”, obligated to settle the accounts of commercial (adhesion) contracts. The Judge does not sit “judicially” but acts as a corporate “administrative officer”. “Administrative courts” are not sanctioned by Parliament and are not part of the de jure laws and usages of the realm. All “administrative courts” are UNLAWFUL because they do not have a jury present.

ANY COURT WITHOUT A JURY PRESENT IS AN ADMINISTRATIVE COURT! 'The law is

absolutely clear on this subject. There is NO authority for administrative courts In this

country and no Act can be passed to legitimise them.' - Halsbury's Law 2011

A Common Law “court of record” is for justice with a jury, in law (de jure). It is a place of real-world criminal evidence where a jury of one's peers examines what is true in fact, in order to determine what is right or wrong, just and fair. The parties are living men and women, and their decisions attempt to remedy harm or loss suffered by one or more injured parties, and to provide protections for living people and their community of life. The Judge sits “judicially”.

The only venue of “justice” for a living man or woman is a constitutionally sanctioned Common Law “court of record” with a jury of one's peers.

A Common Law court de jure, with a Jury, is the only venue of “Justice” for a living Man or Woman.

Administrative courts operate on assumptions and presumptions. The Crown makes the presumption that you are “acting” in “joinder” to the “artificial person” NAME. When you answer to the NAME, you

are joining the action involving the NAME, such that the man/woman and the NAME are joined in a single case. But that case is in legal fiction commerce, in the Admiralty Maritime jurisdiction, which is the International Law of the Sea. Having joined the case by your "agreement by conduct", there is the presumption of your "implied agency" for the vessel NAME (i.e. JOHN DOE) on the sea of commerce, including your willingness to settle its account liabilities in court as the Trustee of the vessel's Estate Trust (i.e. MR JOHN DOE TRUST).

Whereas, as an aware man/woman, you are the rightful controlling Agent, Beneficiary, Executor/Executrix for MR JOHN DOE TRUST. You are not the liable Trustee.

All legal jurisdiction arises from the consent of a man/woman to be party to an "artificial person" NAME. Without consent, there can only be the "presumption" of consent. So, when you "rebut the presumption" they have no jurisdiction and cannot proceed. Any further action is fraudulent.

To Rebut the Presumption, it is only necessary to correct the mistake in the NAME.

Presumption n. a rule of law which permits a court to assume a fact is true until such time as there is a preponderance (greater weight) of evidence which disproves or outweighs (rebutts) the presumption. Each presumption is based upon a particular set of apparent facts paired with established laws, logic, reasoning or individual rights. A presumption is rebuttable in that it can be refuted by factual evidence. One can present facts to persuade the judge that the presumption is not true. Jurisdiction is over the NAME, Liability is attached to the NAME, so correct the "mistake in the matter of the NAME"

Furthermore, all Judges and magistrates are actors who are acting on behalf of the Banks. (Who is going to pay the charges, or what body is going to jail as surety to be placed in a cell to recharge the trust account or bond. Then there is the so called 'Jury' which today sits 6 on top of 6 to break the continuation of the facts. This seating arrangement turns a common law 12-man jury into a petite jury. Moreover, the Jury sit in a box: legally anything [in a box] cannot be seen nor heard, likewise it can't see nor hear the evidence. (No Contract) This is why the courts look at art-icles, not facts. Art (No contract) Art is an opinion. O=No, pin=to attach, ion=contract.

Finally on courts, we know they summons the dead and then usher the dead into a [box] to have them dead 'RISE' what many miss is the maxim of law that says "the presence of the body corrects the fault in both the grammar and the names". Meaning if we attend these so-called courts, it makes no odds what we say we have consented to the fraud and we are either going to pay the charges or go to jail!

The difference between law and legislation! One is Facts and the other is very Deceptive All Acts of Parliament are 'Statutes' known variously as Legislation's Legal Law Society, meaning it's all merely Regulations or Rules. They are not laws. Statutes are often far too often incorrectly referred to as laws by 'trained' Barristers and Solicitors whom have a duty to know better, however the correct interpretation would be Halsbury's laws, as ""legislative rule of a society given the force of law by the consent of the governed, they are not law and now government act can be passed to make them law (meaning Statutes) which are distinguishable from 'law' i.e. common law – and for a purpose, the purpose being that Statutes and laws are different. If Acts of Parliament were laws, they would be called 'Laws of Parliament.' Parliament knows the distinction which it quite rightly maintains.

Look at any Act of Parliament and you will notice the absence of the word common law -LAW – that will give you the first clue that there is a difference. Parliament maintains the distinction between Statutes and laws because those 'in the know' use this knowledge for their personal benefit. A 'Statute' is defined as a Rule or Regulation of a society – they are edicts of Legislation Legal law Society used to govern that society. All Statutes are subject to the consent of the society and this is individual consent and not collective consent. We belong to society as a matter of choice I choose not to. The distinction between a law and a Statute is that a law applies equally to us all but Statutes can be made to favour one sector of society over others, for example, people with disabilities are given preferential parking privileges (which is fair enough) and politicians have given themselves special

dispensations re their expenses which the rest of us do not have (which is outrageous) and some within the Government whom are all also in Office if they work for any Government run sector now will even commit crimes and follow the Government claiming that they have to obey and follow the law and then enforce this on to the public and even use threats and will take away their right to some things as punishments.

There is a compulsion to obey laws (meaning common law) and never to a Legislation's, Legal Law Society. Laws defend our freedoms and liberties and through them we live in peace and harmony with our neighbours. Failure to comply with common laws would render an individual an outlaw. If you do not respect the law, then it can afford you no protection. Obeying Statutes is voluntary i.e. with each of our consent. Any individual can withdraw their consent to being governed at any time (controlled) by the Government legislative Statutes of a society. This might involve their exclusion from that society and the loss of benefits, ONLY if the man/woman never paid into it, otherwise the Government is then Obligated, and has the Responsibility and the Duty to pay back in full all payments due to man/woman whom made years of payment into a form of TAXES from all the years of service he paid in threw working, but when the imposition of the liabilities outweighs the benefits, then that might be a price worth paying.

The choice is mine and mine alone. Consent must be given by the individual and not by a collective on behalf of the individual – this would be Dictatorship by the Majority. There is no freedom in having to do whatever you are told. Each individual must have the absolute right to give and withhold their consent. This is the basis of our constitution! if services are imposed upon a person inappropriately or against ones will the Government is again Obligated and has a duty pay back and compensate IN FULL, Government is elected into 'Office' not 'power' as they frequently like to claim including all those whom work at any Government building are all in Office thus these all come under the law of the seven principles of public life i.e. in public Office, breaking any of these is a common law offence and anyone can be held accountable.

The ultimate constraint on the abuse of authority (Office) is the people's ability to withdraw their consent to being governed – and at any time, not just at elections. Without consent, authority enforced becomes power and Government then becomes tyrannical. thus, this is then RAPE which is a criminal offence and can be jailed for life and unlimited amount of fines added on top. people foolish enough to give authority to known lyres (who's spin doctor (public relations officer) places they get out clause in their manifesto pledges are not subject to reasonable expectations) they never give 'power' to those they foolishly believe they elect they merely give them AUTHORITY to act on their behalf and have Duty, Obligations, and Responsibility to serve and protect man and property and nor more than this. they can only control those who work for the Government, and control the Commercial side's, Today's Governing bodies are slowly mutating into tyrannies, because they are ignoring the principles of consent and are securing 'power' for themselves and those that help them and all Outlaws all now think there are all above the law, these are all criminals and shall be brought to justice by a trial by Jury.

All must be brought to Jury trail the means by which the abuse of Office is dealt with. A rejection of Statutes does not imply a rejection of the law. A rejection of Statutes is a rejection of Governance.

The distinction between laws and Statutes appears to have been lost. Many long-in-the-tooth 'Legal' Practitioners will argue that Statutes are laws – but if Statutes were laws, they would be described as such to avoid ambiguity. The 'Legal' profession has failed in its Duty, Obligations, and Responsibility, to maintain and understand the distinction between laws and Statutes – through ignorance – but also because ignorance of the distinction has given the 'Legal' Society profession enhanced their Authority – why would they promote knowledge of the difference? It isn't in their interest to do so.

It is after all, the Legal Society Profession that now runs the Legal Court System – with Magistrates (our representatives) having been pushed to the side by Statute. (The Magistrate Court Act 1980). Magistrates having been made subservient to the decision of the Legal Legislative Society Adviser in Court. This was a power-grab Statute. Statutes do not apply equally to us all. Some sectors of society are given preferable treatment under Statutes. Politicians for example have given themselves pension

provisions which the rest of us can only dream of. The EU common agriculture policy (a Statute) rewards wealthy landowners – but not tenant or farmers. The police can park on double yellow lines (which we are told is dangerous) even when they are on duty – we can't when we are on duty they can! meaning one law for them another law of the public to whom there are there to serve and protect saying this one has to see that these are all public servants i.e. in Office only. Special interest groups often benefit from Statutes – Banks being a notable example.

Politicians on leaving Politics will often be rewarded by these Special interest groups by way of Generous Salaries, Director's Fees and Perks as a 'thank you' for passing Preferential Legislation. A disproportionately large number of Ex-Ministers of the Crown now work (I use that word advisedly) for the Banks. Some would describe this as a 'Perk' I have another word in mind. If a Statute is passed transferring their Authority (to Brussels for example) It has become the habit of the Legal profession to describe Statutes as laws which of course it is not. Habits, no matter how entrenched do not however create facts. Statutes are not laws those who try to be enforced this as law on to any public member should be held accountable for their actions.

Statutes are supposed to protect society and help in fair and just Governance, but from time to time (over centuries) Statutes mutate to become more and more Oppressive and work against the wider interest of the community and invariable only benefit small sections of society meaning themselves. During these times these groups will work hard to defend the privileges they have accumulated for themselves.

Statutes refer to Acts of Parliament and Legal Legislation.

Statutes do not protect – they are used to keep control. Statutes are often unjust – they can be Punitive, Unfair, Unreasonably Prescriptive and Authoritarian. We are all equal in the eyes of the law. (Common law) those whom are outside of it are now classed as Outlaws Criminals. We are not all equal in the eyes of Legislative Legal Statutes. Law: - Law refers to common law. - Laws are always just – they protect our rights and freedoms. - Law is based on principles – Legal Statutes are based on practicalities, albeit not always fairly assessed. - Laws take time to evolve and remain for long periods of time.

Statutes often come and go on a whim. - Laws may NOT be taken into Statutes but if repealed in Legal Statute, common law they remain in force in law, it is the only force that you hear so much, of so many public servants speak off, and only threw consent of the people and that is not by the migratory each man/woman has the right to consent or not to consent and is protect by the law. - Lawful and unlawful refers to the law. Legal and illegal refers to Legislation Legal Law Society. - Laws are used to keep the peace. - Without law we have Anarchy. - The people make the law – by acceptance and validation by jury decisions. - Nobody is above the law. The law applies equally to us all. - Parliament does not make law – it makes Legislation Legal for the Public Servants and Commercial side only. - Judges do not make the law – they interpret Legal Legislation and keep a record of laws. - Our constitution is the foundation of our law. Most in the Legal profession are not even taught about our constitution.

Courts, Judges and Juries: - If Parliament made a Statute and a man charged with an offence of breaking that Rules & Regulation was found not guilty – that Statute would be struck down. A Jury is not beholden to the system. A judge is. A jury is thus more reliable than a Judge in the handing down of justice. - Judges can be bought, blackmailed, intimidated (and have been). It is easier to corrupt a Judge than a whole jury. Common Law vs. Statutes and under-standing it our jury system is protected by our constitution. It is our right to be tried by jury.

The jury system protects us from arbitrary power and bent, crooked, deceitful Judges. Statutes must be in harmony with the common laws to be enforceable. If unfair Statutes are pursued by the Authorities a defendant can nominate to be tried by jury – which in seeing the injustice of the Statute (and the potential of themselves being its victim) would find the defendant not guilty and thus strike down the Statute. This is the power of a jury. Power belongs to the people only thus all powers they speak of all come derived from the people only.

The fact is if it has not been judged by a Court de-jure it is nothing more than hearsay in law, heck the lower administrative court de-facto's as defined by Halsbury's laws "" The law is absolutely clear on this subject, No administrative court has any authority in this country and no government act can be found to legitimise them because of the constitutional restraints pleased upon the monarch at her coronation, The collection of revenue by such means is extortion and extortion has been found reprehensible since ancient times, "Common law trumps Statutes it's that simple in anything and in all things. Some in the Legal profession have been heard to take a contrary view... but common sense tells us that common law is and must be superior. If a Government passed Legislation making itself Permanent i.e. declaring itself a dictatorship (as Hitler did) The jury is the highest authority in the land – but beneath the law. - A jury can stand in judgement of anybody... nobody is above the law. - If the Government makes Legislation or Legal and a jury thinks it is unjust, through finding a defendant not guilty they are able to demonstrate the Authority of the jury over Government.

A Judge cannot direct a jury in its decisions – many try but in so doing they are in breach of the law. Judges must not lead a jury to a decision. A Judge must only give direction in the interpretation of the common law. The jury is entirely independent of the Judge. The jury must make its own mind up and not be led by any Judge. The people make the law through the validation or the rejection of Statutes. Juries re-validate or dispense with old established laws through their verdicts. Juries are the people's protection against the arbitrary power of the ruling class.

Juries are a common law right and are protected by our constitution – they cannot be tampered with by Government, nor the Police, Judges, or Solicitors, although it has done so, their meddling is unlawful. The removal of jury trials is unlawful and unconstitutional. The 'powers that be' are desperately trying to dismantle our jury system – to secure more 'power' for themselves. What we are witnessing is a blatant power grab by the political establishment... which we must challenge. Magistrates Courts are Statute courts and are illegal they have no standing in law ... mostly ignorant of and thus ignoring our common law rights.

Magistrates and Judges make rulings on their interpretation of Statutes and their Legal laws – their decisions are not always fair. Juries give verdicts on the basis of their interpretation of justice and are mostly fair.

Magistrates are now trained to do the bidding of the Legal Adviser in Court. It is questionable that they have any real value in the absence of autonomy and with limited discretion. Magistrate's Courts are being closed down in large numbers and so-called justice is being delivered by Royal Mail in the form of 'Penalty Charge Notices' imposed by Statutes. These may be Legal, but they are not lawful. PCN's are not enforced with consent without consent, our law (specifically – the Petition and Declaration of Rights) forbids fines and forfeiture without justice in a court constitutionally convened court of law with a jury of 12.

The Judge that ruled that a PCN is not a fine may have had 'other things' on his mind when he made that ruling. (See) PCN's are unlawful. Magistrate's autonomy and full discretion must be returned to them and Legal Advisers Subjugated to the Authority of Magistrates once more. PCN's must be abandoned as an unlawful instrument of Oppression. If a defendant claims his 'common law' (or inalienable) rights in a court – it becomes a common law court. The courts belong to the people – they do not belong to the ushers, private security personnel nor Magistrates, Legal Advisers, District or Circuit Judges – most of whom have forgotten or probably never knew this anyway. Our Monarch represents the power of the people without the people a King or Queen is nothing more than a dreamer, thus the people and the common law comes from the people the public as she take an Oath under the common law, and (not the Government) in our courts. The courts do not get their Authority from the Government.

Magistrates and Judges give allegiance to Her Majesty if not then they have no authority at all and if the King or Queen has Broken that Oath of the people and its laws, thus this then reverts all back to the people to redo everything that remove all from office and rebuild their communities and societies they way the people want it by law they have this freedom and rights to do so. They are in effect submitting to the power and authority of the people. Neither Judge nor Legal Adviser nor Government nor the Monarch can tell the people the public by whom we can be represented.

The 'right of audience' that is claimed by the Legal Law society profession in a Court is a 'Statute' imposed, unwittingly and without consent – and not written by the people in common law but only by the Legal Law Society is thus fraternity. I would call this 'a protection racket.' The courts are there to serve the interest of justice... they are being used as tools to extract money and services. It also enforce Slave Labour of working for 30 hrs a week for no payment, and those whom are will into pushing people into this are Guilty of a Criminal offence.

In each Magistrate's Court there is an automatic right to appeal... without any reason given. This projects the case into a Higher Court where a jury trial will be available, but there should be a jury trial on all based cases. The withholding of a jury trial is unlawful. It is a deliberate power grab and an attempt to subvert common law to Statutes – this is the thin end of a very thick (and dangerous) wedge of the Government Legislative Legal Law Society at using threats in all manner to be JUDGE, JURY, & EXECUTIONER, towards the people this would clearly be very wrong to do so but it been happening for too long at great expense to myself and family. In claiming common law jurisdiction in court – all Statutes cannot be imposed without the consent of the defendant. You do not need permission to claim common law rights it is an innate right to do so.

To deny common law rights in court – Is contempt of court... and that includes judges. Consent can be withheld and their assumption of the existence of the authority of others over them. Just because the political establishment refuses to acknowledge and obey our constitution and the rule of law (common law) – does not make them invalid. If they ignore the constitution and the rule-of-law then I have a right (and a duty) to ignore their Statutes... all of their statutes of Legislation Legal Law society. Governments do not make law, nor can they change, Amend, nor remove any laws.

They make and change Legislation's Legal Law Society for the public servants it's the only thing there are allowed to control, but never the people the public. - Governments are not above the law (they clearly think they are) – but they can and do make themselves exempt from (i.e. they are above) the provisions of their Statutes of their Legislative Legal Law Society. It is probable that because they know they are above Statutes (which they are we all are if we so chose – Only they make and enforce them) that they have come to assume they are also above the law. The truth is the truth even if no one believes it,

A lie is a lie even if everyone believes it.

"A legislative rule of society given the force of Law by consent of the governed" This is the commonly used definition of the word 'Statute'. It raises some questions as most of us live our lives according to the rules of our various statutes and Acts they derive from, and yet in no part of that definition does it suggest that it is a Law. Rather it is a rule. Aren't rules made to be broken? I would certainly say so; the more rules you break, the more you have to pay to the court! Rather than finding the precise source, let's discover whether this much used definition is acceptable. So, can this much quoted definition be either disproved and discarded or confirmed and accepted? First, let's look at a sourced definition of "statute". Statute. An act of the legislature as an organized body. Washington v Dowling, 92 Fla 601, 109 So 588.

The written will of the legislative department expressed according to the form necessary to constitute it a law of the United States or of the state and rendered authentic by certain prescribed forms and solemnities.

In a broader sense, inclusive of an act of the legislature, an administrative regulation, or an enactment, from whatever source originating, to which the state gives the force of law. 50 Am J1st Stat § 2. (Ballantines, 3rd edition, Page 1212) Let's now use this as our base to work from ... In a broader sense, inclusive of an act of the legislature, an administrative regulation, or an enactment, from whatever source originating, to which the state gives the force of law. Act, n. A thing done or established; a deed or other written instrument evidencing a contract or an obligation. A statute; a bill which has been enacted by the legislature into a law, as distinguished from a bill which is in the form of a law presented to the legislature for enactment. Anne 5 ALR 1422. (Ballantines, 3rd edition, Page 16-17) Legislature. - Broadly, any body having legislative power. 49 Am J1st States § 28. (Ballantines,

3rd edition, Page 724) Regulation. - Control or direction by restriction or rule of something permitted or suffered to exist. 30 Am J rev ed Intox L § 22. Any rule for the ordering of affairs, public or private, whether by statute, ordinance, or resolution. *Kepner v Commonwealth*, 40 Pa St 124, 129. Ballantines, 3rd edition, Page 1081) State. - A body politic or 'society' of men united together for the purpose of promoting their mutual safety and advantage by their combined strength, occupying a definite territory, and politically organized under one government. *McLaughlin v Poucher*, 127 Conn 441, 17 A2d 767. ... A political community of free citizens, occupying a territory of defined boundaries, and organized under a government sanction and limited by a written constitution, and established by the consent of the governed. *Coyle v Smith*, 221 US 559, 55 L Ed 853, 31 S Ct 688. (Ballantines, 3rd edition, Page 1210) Summary An act of the legislature = legislative an administrative regulation = a rule the state = a political community, organized under a government, established by the consent of the governed. In a broader sense, inclusive of an act of the legislature (legislative), an administrative regulation (rule), or an enactment, from whatever source originating, to which the state (political community established by the consent of the governed) gives the force of law. Connect the dots; A legislative rule, given the force of law by the political community established by the consent of the governed. Compare this to; a legislative rule of society given the force of law by the consent of the governed. A pretty close match.

Canon 3228

A Roman Court does not operate according to any true rule of law, but by presumptions of the law. Therefore, if presumptions presented by the private Bar Guild are not rebutted, they become fact and are therefore said to stand true [Or as truth in commerce]. There are twelve (12) key presumptions asserted by the private Bar Guilds which if unchallenged stand true being Public Record, Public Service, Public Oath, Immunity, Summons, Custody, Court of Guardians, Court of Trustees, Government as Executor/Beneficiary, Executor De Son Tort, Incompetence, and Guilt:

Public Record

1. The Presumption of Public Record is that any matter brought before a lower Roman Courts is a matter for the public record when in fact it is presumed by the members of the private Bar Guild that the matter is a private Bar Guild business matter. Unless openly rebuked and rejected by stating clearly the matter is to be on the Public Record, the matter remains a private Bar Guild matter completely under private Bar Guild rules.

Public Service

2. The Presumption of Public Service is that all the members of the Private Bar Guild who have all sworn a solemn secret absolute oath to their Guild then act as public agents of the Government, or public officials by making additional oaths of public office that openly and deliberately contradict their private superior oaths to their own Guild. Unless openly rebuked and rejected, the claim stands that these private Bar Guild members are legitimate public servants and therefore trustees under public oath.

Public Oath

3. The Presumption of Public Oath is that all members of the Private Bar Guild acting in the capacity of public officials who have sworn a solemn public oath remain bound by that oath and therefore bound to serve honestly, impartiality and fairly as dictated by their oath. Unless openly challenged and demanded, the presumption stands that the Private Bar Guild members have functioned under their public oath in contradiction to their Guild oath. If challenged, such individuals must recuse themselves as having a conflict of interest and cannot possibly stand under a public oath.

Immunity

4. The Presumption of Immunity is that key members of the Private Bar Guild in the capacity of public

officials acting as judges, prosecutors and magistrates who have sworn a solemn public oath in good faith are immune from personal claims of injury and liability. Unless openly challenged and their oath demanded, the presumption stands that the members of the Private Bar Guild as public trustees acting as judges, prosecutors and magistrates are immune from any personal accountability for their actions

Summons

5. The Presumption of Summons is that by custom a summons unrebutted stands and therefore one who attends Court is presumed to accept a position (defendant, juror, witness) and jurisdiction of the court. Attendance to court is usually invitation by summons. Unless the summons is rejected and returned, with a copy of the rejection filed prior to choosing to visit or attend, jurisdiction and position as the accused and the existence of guilt stands

Custody

6. The Presumption of Custody is that by custom a summons or warrant for arrest unrebutted stands and therefore one who attends Court is presumed to be a thing and therefore liable to be detained in custody by Custodians. [This includes the dead legal fiction non-human PERSON that corporate governments rules and regulations are written for.*] Custodians may only lawfully hold custody of property and things not flesh and blood soul possessing beings. Unless this presumption is openly challenged by rejection of summons and/or at court, the presumption stands you are a thing and property and therefore lawfully able to be kept in custody by custodians

Court of Guardians

7. The Presumption of Court of Guardians is the presumption that as you may be listed as a resident of a ward of a local government area and have listed on your passport the letter P, you are a pauper and therefore under the Guardian powers of the government and its agents as a Court of Guardians. Unless this presumption is openly challenged to demonstrate you are both a general guardian and general executor of the matter (trust) before the court, the presumption stands and you are by default a pauper, and lunatic and therefore must obey the rules of the clerk of guardians (clerk of magistrates court)

Court of Trustees

8. The Presumption of Court of Trustees is that members of the Private Bar Guild presume you accept the office of trustee as a public servant and government employee just by attending a Roman Court, as such Courts are always for public trustees by the rules of the Guild and the Roman System. Unless this presumption is openly challenged to state you are merely visiting by invitation to clear up the matter and you are not a government employee or public trustee in this instance, the presumption stands and is assumed as one of the most significant reasons to claim jurisdiction simply because you appeared

Dual Role

9. The Presumption of Government acting in two roles as Executor and Beneficiary is that for the matter at hand, the Private Bar Guild appoint the judge/magistrate in the capacity of Executor while the Prosecutor acts in the capacity of Beneficiary of the trust for the current matter. Unless this presumption is openly challenged to demonstrate you are both a general guardian and general executor of the matter (trust) before the court, the presumption stands and you are by default the trustee, therefore must obey the rules of the executor (judge/magistrate)

False Executor

10. The Presumption of Executor De Son Tort is the presumption that if the accused does seek to assert their right as Executor and Beneficiary over their body, mind and soul they are acting as an Executor De Son Tort or a false executor challenging the rightful judge as Executor. Therefore, the judge/magistrate assumes the role of true executor and has the right to have you arrested, detained, fined or forced into a psychiatric evaluation. Unless this presumption is openly challenged by not only asserting one's position as Executor as well as questioning if the judge or magistrate is seeking to act

as Executor De Son Tort, the presumption stands and a judge or magistrate of the private Bar guild may seek to assistance of bailiffs or sheriffs to assert their false claim Incompetence.

11. The Presumption of Incompetence is the presumption that you are at least ignorant of the law, therefore incompetent to present yourself and argue properly. Therefore, the judge/magistrate as executor has the right to have you arrested, detained, fined or forced into a psychiatric evaluation. Unless this presumption is openly challenged to the fact that you know your position as executor and beneficiary and actively rebuke and object to any contrary presumptions, then it stands by the time of pleading that you are incompetent then the judge or magistrate can do what they need to keep you obedient

Guilt

12. The Presumption of Guilt is the presumption that as it is presumed to be a private business meeting of the Bar Guild, you are guilty whether you plead guilty, do not plead or plead not guilty. Therefore unless you either have previously prepared an affidavit of truth and motion to dismiss with extreme prejudice onto the public record or call a demurrer, then the presumption is you are guilty and the private Bar Guild can hold you until a bond is prepared to guarantee the amount the guild wants to profit from you.

Please Note: the claimant wishes to deal with this matter in writing and the claimant does not give your organization or any of its agents the permission to make contact by telephone or face-to-face. Should you or any of your agents do so, I must warn you that the contact or calls could constitute 'harassment' and I may take action using the Harassment Act 1997.

Adrian Pritchard we look forward to your response

WITHOUT PREJUDICE

Jamie Bennett: _____