

# BARON DAVID WARD'S AFFIDAVIT

## Resources and Frequently Asked Questions

The following is a compilation of some of the amazing information from the groups that post about Baron David Ward's Affidavit and the lien process.

These are links to the **BDW Facebook groups**:

[Security by way of a lien](#) (Original UK master group. Public group for perfecting liens)

[Freedom and Justice by way of an Email](#) (MP Lien campaign group)

[The reality of Council rates](#) (Original Australian group – all welcome)

[Bring the Light](#) (UK group – all welcome)

[Correct the Unlawful Legal System](#) (UK group – all welcome)

[Truth and Freedom by way of a meme - BDW Affidavit](#) (Meme group)

It's a great idea to join all groups (well, the meme group is mostly for a little light relief – you may even find you are the inspiration for a meme! 😊).

**Anything underlined is a link to a post or other resource. Click on them to learn more.**

- If there's a linked heading under one with the same name, the one underneath, with a ✖ at the beginning means that the information can be found within this document – so you can click on the first link to take you to the original online post or the second link to have access to the information within this document.

Remember to **read the comments of posts** as a lot of gold can be buried there!

**What is an affidavit?**

[An Affidavit in David's words](#)

An affidavit is a written statement where the contents are sworn or affirmed to be true. An affidavit sets out facts, not opinion.

[Baron David Ward's Definition](#)

✖ [Baron David Ward's Definition](#)

**Why Baron David Ward's Affidavit?**

[How the Affidavit was created and a summary of the Exhibits - BDW \(audio\)](#)

[A Reading of the Affidavit with input from BDW](#)

[A chat with David](#)

[An in-depth interview with Baron David Ward.](#)

'Which part of what legislation do you think actually applies to you? Without your consent to be governed there is no government and when there is no government there is no such thing as legislation that a living breathing being has an obligation to obey.'

'What part of an act or legislation applies to you without your consent? Acts and legislation can only be given force of law BY consent.'

'All acts, statutes and legislation went in the bin in 2013, there are no acts without our consent and without the material evidence of a vote, well then there is no consent of the governed.

All this is besides the fact that EVERY so-called government department have a DUNS registration which makes them all registered businesses carry on a commercial enterprise. We have no government and we have no acts that can be enforced without your consent.' Peter-joseph.

### [In Baron David Ward's Words](#)

✘ [In Baron David Ward's Words](#)

### [The Golden Key](#)

✘ [The Golden Key](#)

### [Statute - A Definition](#)

✘ [Statute - A Definition](#)

### [Everybody is Free!](#)

✘ [Everybody is Free](#)

### [Why Baron?](#)

✘ [Why Baron?](#)

### [Keeper of the Keys Information](#)

✘ [Keeper of the Keys](#)

### [Exhibit B of the Affidavit Explained – Video](#)

#### **Using the Affidavit**

### [The Affidavit](#)

✘ [The Affidavit](#)

Download and print off on your computer (not always accessible via phones).

\*A laser printer is suggested for speedy printing.

**Read, read, read the Affidavit to fully comprehend the facts.**

Or you may prefer to [listen](#). These are audios that can be found in the Guides section of a couple of the groups

## There are two ways of using the Affidavit.

1. Use [Peter-joseph's Affidavit](#) or [Baron David Ward's Affidavit](#)

Send to all [Parliament Members](#) using email (instructions below in 'Sending the Affidavit'). It's suggested to also send to your local council members via email and the C.E.O. of your council via registered mail to have a paper trail. Check [here](#) to see if your council has been served, as the email addresses may be listed for easy reference. If it's not, it'll be awesome if you add them for the next wo/man. Thank you! If you using a published affidavit (with the decree) – [you do NOT change a thing!](#)

2. Use the above linked affidavits and make it your 'own'.

Using Peter's is easier as there are a number of items that needed changing/deleting if using Baron David Ward's Affidavit. The main content is the same, but some information like Baron David Ward being a paralegal has to be taken out (unless of course, you are a paralegal!)

[Click this link to go to a video on a how to Create your crest and seal](#) . You can create curved text within Canva – go to the three dots at the top, click and then click on effects. A menu will pop up on the left. Scroll down and you will find 'curve'.




Delete the crest and seals already in the Affidavit and insert your crest in the Header and your seal in the Footer.


You will need to **keep your seal simple** as it will be made into an embossing stamp to emboss paper documents. More info on this [here](#).

**\*\*Make sure there are NO crest and seal on Exhibit B – Baron David Ward's case.**

Use the Replace tool in the word document and find Peter's name and replace with yours. Do your due diligence and read through to check names have been edited.

Note that if you're making the affidavit your own, there are some points you need to pay attention to:

-  You must NOT put your crest and seal on Exhibit B. (yes, it's repeated! 😊).
-  If you're using Baron David Ward's Affidavit, you must also change the wording in Exhibit A, before the signature where it talks about being a paralegal (unless you are one). Check Peter Joseph's Affidavit for the wording to use ([attached here](#)).
-  Be sure to change the details in Exhibit G – Notice of Removal of Implied Right of Access. It's the last page in Exhibit G and the name and address details need to be edited.

 Also, when making the affidavit your own, you must take the decree off the front and send only the affidavit as a pdf, to the MP's in the beginning. Once the 28 days are up, you change any dates and details in the decree and attach it to the front of your affidavit and resend as a pdf to all who received it in the beginning. You also then publish to a public forum such as the Facebook group Security by way of a lien.

- [ilovepdf.com](https://www.ilovepdf.com) can assist with taking the decree off the affidavit and putting it back on. It's really simple to use and is an online tool – no need to download or install.

[Video instructions on sending the Affidavit and MP lien process.](#) Be sure to read the comments as well as any clarification on points may be found there.

#### [Written instructions on sending Affidavit and the MP lien process](#)

- ✖ [Written instructions](#)

#### [Sending the Affidavit and into a lien Step by Step](#)

- ✖ [Sending the Affidavit and into a lien Step by Step.](#)

#### [Examples of cover letter when sending the Affidavit](#)

- ✖ [Cover Letter Samples](#)

#### [The Decree](#)

- ✖ [The Decree](#)

[Signatures and Embossing Seals](#) - Only the final page with the signature needs the embossed seal if sending via post. All other pages can have a printed one.

- ✖ [Signatures and Embossing Seals](#)

- ✖ [Common Law – Let's put it to rest](#)

#### [Fear](#)

- ✖ [Fear](#)

#### [Remedy](#)

- ✖ [Remedy](#)

#### [Attorney at Law](#)

- ✖ [Attorney at Law](#)

#### [Sovereign](#)

- ✖ [Sovereign](#)

#### [Does this Work?](#)

- ✖ [Does this Work?](#)

#### [The Affidavit and Liens - BDW \(audio\)](#)

#### [The People will Rise - BDW \(audio\)](#)

#### [Fraud by Deception - BDW \(audio\)](#)

#### [The Affidavit - The Funny Side - BDW \(audio\)](#)

#### [The Birth Certificate - BDW \(audio\)](#)

#### [Tax - BDW's beginning \(audio\)](#)

#### [No Such Thing as Law \(audio\)](#)

#### [FAQ](#)

# Lien

## The Lien:

What is a lien?

- A lien is a commercial process
- A security by way of a lien is, first and foremost, an agreement between the parties, as there is no disagreement between the parties.
- That he who stands as surety, by providing the security by way of a lien, stands in honour, as that surety is undertaken by agreement, without coercion, duress, or protest, and without the threat of harm, loss, or injury, and, as such, stands in honour for the harm, loss, or injury by their own hand.

### [Baron David Ward on the Lien](#)

✘ [Baron David Ward on the Lien](#)

To see where the process of a lien begins, pick any lien and go to **Exhibit A**.

This will be where the correspondence containing the claims against the man or woman is evidenced and then the Letters 1, 2,3, asking for the claimant to provide evidence of the claims made, followed by the Opportunity to Resolve, Letter 4 and the Default Notice, Letter 5. Letter 6 ties all this together and goes at the beginning of the lien with all previous correspondence used as evidence.

✘ [Lien info – Adrian James](#)

✘ [Lien info – Peter-joseph](#)

### [Lien Process Video](#)

### [Lien Process Notes](#)

### [Lien Etiquette](#)

## Answers to Questions:

**Q:** For the notification to the media, do you email/mail the whole pack (letter of notification incl letters 1-6 consolidated) to them?

No, you only need to send the letter of notification to the ones being notified.

**Q:** As for posting, do you use registered post or can you just use standard posts?

The lien gets sent to the recipient via registered post. The letters of notification can be sent by standard post.

**Q:** Once that's all completed, do you publish it straight away?

Once posted and you have receipt of the lien postage you can publish your lien.

The Men and Women, the Warriors in the groups are using the Affidavit and perfecting Liens exponentially. Here are some that you will find perfected (publicly published) in the Security by way of a lien group:

### [All published Liens on Security by way of a lien](#)

#### [Baron David Ward's Work](#)

#### **Council Liens:**

[Peter - Martin Cutter City of Greater Geelong](#)

[Peter - Rob Spresser City of Gold Coast](#)

[Peter - Carole Ruitter City of Greater Geelong](#)

[Peter - Dale Dickson City of Greater Geelong](#)

[Peter - Nicole Highfield City of Gold Coast](#)

[Peter - Cherie Watt City of Gold Coast](#)

#### Speeding/Parking/Toll Fine Liens:

#### [Peter - Speeding Fine](#)

**Peter:** no matter what we have been told a picture is not evidence of anything, do you know what a graven image is?

A picture is nothing more than an image taken by a camera and the camera cannot testify that the event happened, a camera cannot give evidence that it has been harmed or injured, a camera cannot give evidence into a case as a camera cannot sign a document verifying the facts.

Read the lien on [Stephen Leane](#) by Tracey-jo and you will have the evidence that a camera cannot provide evidence and I can confirm that the speed camera could not give evidence and the fine has disappeared into the ether.

#### [Peter - Speeding Fine](#)

[Peter - Parking Fine Withdrawal](#)

[Peter - Toll Fine](#)

## NOTES

Bailiffs/Enforcement Agents:

- Read Exhibit G. (Page 56 of this [Affidavit](#))

### Exhibit G Excerpt:

An Englishman's home is his Castle and an assault on the Castle is a recognised Act of WAR. In a time of War then the casualties of War, are just that, the casualties of war. He that knowingly enters into an act of war knowingly or unknowingly has still entered into an act of war of his own volition. The occupants defending the Castle cannot be held culpable for any casualties of war even though these casualties of war should end up dead. This is recognised from the historic — traditions of this land.

The crown has no power of entry. The crown Bailiffs do not have power of entry. It is done.

Any Crown Authority stops at the boundary of the property. To proceed beyond this point is a recognised Act of War. Where no such legal agreement exists then the Bailiff who is only a Bailiff by title has **no powers of entry**, unless that authority can be presented in the form of a legal agreement: which must contain upon it two wet ink signatures, one of which must be yours.

So a Bailiff has no power of entry without your consent to do so and an assault upon the castle is a recognised Act of war.

### Edit Notice of Removal of Implied Rights of Access with your details and have near you.

- When a Bailiff/Enforcement Agent comes to your door – **you are NOT obligated to answer the door**, but if you choose to and the Bailiff/Enforcement Agent asks Are you (your name)?  
You: Who are you? (Always be the one asking the questions where possible).  
Bailiff/Enforcement Agent: Gives their info and then asks again if you are your name.  
You: No/They don't live here. (You are not your name and your name is not living).  
Close the door!
- You can also keep a 'visitor's booklet' near your front door and get them to fill in their details before you speak with them.

Videos: [We have no contract.](#)

[Warrants - are they legal? \(Video\)](#)

Council:

[Council Information](#) – rates.

✘ 

### [Councils Served Reference](#)

Miscellaneous:

[Money, Money, Money \(in a rich man's world\)...](#) Video series that explains what 'money' is and the fact we don't have any!

[MONEY!](#)

✘ 

[Contracts and obligation are the ONLY two words you really need to understand.](#)

[Listed Companies](#)

[Words/Language/Legalese](#)

✘ [Words/Language/Legalese](#)

[Spelling Mishtakes!](#)

[What includes Australia? \(video\)](#)

[Ombudsman Reply to Public Notice](#)

[Ombudsman Reply to Public Notice Response](#)

[Land Tax](#)

[Third party Interlopers – Rachel Stickynose](#)

[State Revenue Rules](#)

From Comments: Peter: where does it say that a company logo is a signature? Please explain how you think a corporation that does not have hands can sign anything. This is where the presumption of law will get you confused, a document can only be signed by a living hand, not a fictional entity with a stamp.

[Forced Entry into your Home](#)

✘ [Forced Entry into Your Home](#)

**Court:**

[Fraudulent Court Order](#)

[Fraudulent summons](#)

[Fraudulent Warrant](#)

[Warrants - are they legal? \(Video\)](#)

✘ [Court Info by Adrian James](#)

[Bar Grievance](#)

✘ [Bar Grievance](#)

✘ [Court Info by Peter Humm](#)

**Words of Wisdom:**

[No CONTEST!](#)

✘ [NO CONTEST](#)

**Tax:**

[Tax Time!](#)

✘ [Tax Time!](#)

[No PAYG](#)

[Paying Tax is Criminal!](#)

[TAX](#)

✘ [TAX](#)



## **An Affidavit**

Let's talk about an Affidavit.

An Affidavit is one of the most powerful legal documents there is. This is why lawyers don't want you to use an Affidavit. An Affidavit is a legal tool by which the facts are established. It's a "This is the way it is MonkeyBoy" Prove me wrong if you can and if you can't then you have agreed to the content of the Affidavit by Default and you only have 28 days to prove me wrong. The clock starts ticking Tick Tock.

Once the 28 days have expired there is a formal agreement between the parties as to what the facts are. This is why the Affidavit is a most POWERFUL weapon. There is a legal and Binding agreement between the parties that can no longer be disputed. There can't be any further arguments after the 28 days. An un-rebutted Affidavit is a formal Contract.

Serve that Affidavit to the 657 MP's in Government (By Email) who have access to the best of the Best Lawyers, Barristers and Judges on the planet and it remains un-rebutted after 28 days THEN you have the most POWERFUL Affidavit of all time that kicks the Magna Carter out of the Ball Park.

Make no mistake. If you get the Affidavit wrong on any point and you are equally going to jail for 6570 Years for Fraud. This is why the Affidavit is so Powerful. DO you not think I knew this when I hit the Email Send button on 657 MP's?? So don't get your Affidavit WRONG.

This 65 Page Affidavit is the foundation to what is now 46 Securitised commercial liens' for circa £2.5 Billion between only 5 people. The other 4 people also used this same Affidavit as this 65 Page Affidavit is the Legally Established and formally agreed FACTS. This 65 page Affidavit can be used by anybody at all because it is Published. 7 Billion People can use this 65 Page Affidavit in any country because the same condition is the same in every country.

So this 65 Page Affidavit can be used by anybody in any country as the foundation of a securitised Commercial Lien in any country.

Now that's the TRUE power of the Affidavit and the pen. AND Email.

It was sent by Email to 657 MP's. The POWER at your fingertips sat in your fat armchair.

Exhibit "C" in the Affidavit covers the Fact that a State is a Company no different to McDonalds and that the Judiciary is a sub office. So the Judge is not a Judge and he has no authority because he is the Company Janitor.

Now that's a POWERFULL Affidavit.

The Executive office has formally agreed that they are a Company no Different to McDonalds with a Company Janitor for a Judge..... With no authority.

Let that fact sink in for a while.



## The Facts

This is the most important group there is on FB.

People say that the Truth will prevail but the Truth and the Facts cannot get up and prevail without People. This is the only group of its kind because this group is built on Facts and facts cannot be stopped.

So here are the facts. (Governed by Consent) (Policed by Consent) This is true and a Fact in every country on this planet. General elections are irrelevant. Without that Legal and signed consent there is no valid government on this planet. The General Election has been a Hoax Scam for 800 years. That case was won seven years ago. There is also a signed and legal declaration of NO CONTEST.

Now here is a fact that the people here don't know. Learning is only the beginning you then have to implement and put that knowledge into action. The legal securitised Lien process is so powerful. When people who think they are good people find out that they are criminal terrorists they quit the job. This is what you don't see and it can't be documented. This was never about the securitised liens and the Millions. It's about the FACTS.

The Facts have 100% Track record because the facts cannot be stopped but it takes people first of all to know what the facts are and then to implement.

Now there are 7 Billion people on this planet that do not know. The people on your street do not know. Everyone in this group is also in many other groups on FB. For the Truth to prevail takes people. People who are actually DOING something to get the truth and the facts out there to the other 7 Billion who don't know what the Facts are. So the truth cannot prevail without people.

The truth and the facts stand for themselves. But if the 7 Billion do not know. You can fire up the printers and have street meetings but the best means to do this right now is FB and all the other groups the people who are here and know who are in other groups. There is hundreds of groups and millions of people in them groups who do not know the most important facts there is today on this planet. How will they know if they don't know??

So draft up a post and make it a good one and don't forget to include the URL links back to this group and the Affidavit which is the most critical affidavit that has ever been written. The truth cannot prevail without people power. How will they ever know?

So let's make it happen. Let's make use of this Lockdown.



## The Golden Key

Now that should get every one's attention because I will give you all The Golden Key. AND the golden egg and the goose that laid it all at the same time.

Knowledge is Power. Yes that old chestnut again because people are not paying attention. You can't do anything without the knowledge and the only way to get that Knowledge is to read the Affidavit and to read the Liens. Then you have all the knowledge and all the power in at most 38 days. The force will be with you forever and ever.

People that READ the Affidavit and some Liens don't ask the 1000 questions. They don't need to because all the questions are already answered. In Fact I have not mentored in any way any of the 30 people in the two groups of 15,000 that are putting securitised Liens against the MP's. I didn't need to. That is a very REAL life testament to the power of just reading. The very REAL life testament to the way these files deprogram all the crap you have been brain washed with. Yes it is that simple. You will fall over laughing.

It is a Dyslexic Pipe fitter who hates the pen that has beat the BEST of the BEST PHD's on the planet. No law Degree, Nothing. Just an average guy. So what do we know??

Well what we do know is that if you do the work you will see the results but if you do nothing then you see nothing because have done nothing and with 15,000 people in two groups that is scandalise. I have seen the results. Adrian James has seen the results. Peter Joseph has seen the results. Mike Watson has single handed made 16 of the 18 directors of SSE quit the job. They are no longer on Companies house. .

That's the Golden Key. That's the Power. That's Jedi Master Light sabre pen and exactly how it works. Bailiffs Quit the Job. Traffic Wardens quit the Job. Enforcement companies run for the hills. They are not Lawyers Barristers or Judges and I have made them shit their knickers as well. MP's are Butchers bakers and candle stick makers. They are not Lawyers or Barristers they are Bill and Ben flowerpot men with no qualifications because they are failed people. So what happens when an MP gets a securitised Lien for £15 Million on his desk for being a criminal?? Nothing at all. They might go running to the Barristers and Judges they have with Poo in their knickers and what will the Barristers and Judges say?? Nothing at all! Sorry guy's there is nothing we can do. I Sorted that in 2015 with the Affidavit.

What do we know?? Well we do know that some of these MP's have quit the job and run for the hills. How do we know that?? Well the Email Exchange reports Email address is not found. That's how we know. Ignore any other Auto responders. That's the Golden Key. That's the tick in the Box. That's the Golden Egg and the Goose that Laid it. That's the Jedi Master light sabre pen and how it all works. This is exactly what we have been saying for 6 years.

So what would happen if MP got 15,000 Securitised Liens in his desk for £15 Million each?? I can Guarantee you they will run for the hills and quit the job. People are doing this in Australia, New Zealand, America and Canada and other countries.

There is 15,000 in two groups and only 657 MP's. One guy cannot change the world. 30 people cannot change the world but 15,000 CAN. So what do you all want??

DO you want to see the end of this prison Planet Lock Down?? Empty Westminster and every other government on this planet will crash and burn Like a house of cards. That's how POWERFUL this is. HOW do we know?? Because the 30 who are doing the work and myself and Mike Watson are still here. We didn't get run down by a Truck. What will it take?? Because these two groups are the only two Groups that CAN. LOOS the Fear. Get OFF your Fat Lazy arse and do something.

**BACK**

## **Everybody is Free!**

Governed by Consent.  
Policed by Consent.  
This is not news to you.

What you are looking for is that exact case where there is a direct challenge to the Claim made under an Act or Statute.

That is Exactly the case Baron David Ward won and How he won it.

Now you might say... "Many other people who have gone down this same path and got a result and the claimants just run away."

Well if the claimants run away there was no official court ruling because the claim in court was withdrawn. ERGO. No formal outcome or paperwork to speak of.

But that is exactly what David got. There is the paper from the tribunal where MR DAVID WARD has no Liability.

The Next Day through his door came the formal and SIGNED declaration of no contest. It's now been 8 years and 5 months.

You must have read this and not realised what you was reading if you HAVE read the Affidavit. That signed Legal Document is exactly what you are looking for...

That's the "WE give up and throw in the Towel" legal document and it CANNOT get any better than that.

What else would you be looking for? What would that Be? I'm not taking the piss or being flippant.

Now Baron David Ward knew that there would be consequences. He knew before he sent in the Tribunal papers that they would eventually come and take his house.

But what else could he do?

Well he could have just paid the £35 and said fuck everyone. But he also knew because of the extensive research into what everyone else had done at that point.

We now have the exact Legal requirement that confirms that the consent of the governed is required to be legally signed formally and on record (the same as at the dentist) and we know without a shadow of a doubt that David was the only guy on the planet at that time that knew this. We know. He told us often. SO not doing something with that was not an option.

Now here is the thing people just don't Grasp. They could have just steam rolled David with any old Bullshit. But they didn't.

They picked up a Pen and signed a Legal Declaration of NO CONTEST.

David got the case results by email PDF which you see in the file. Job done.

So WHY did they pick up that Pen and sign in wet ink a Legal signed Declaration of NO CONTEST. They could have just NOT done that.

The Government made the decision to sign that document. They did this intentionally. Its no Mistake or accident or some kind of fluke case.

The Lord Chief Justice Jack Beatson Speech was intentional.  
The Chandran Kukathas definition of the word State was intentional.  
They did all this on purpose. Jack Beatson and Chandran Kukathas was both in 2008. 5 years before David won the Tribunal case.

They handed all of this to us and threw in the towel. They planned it. Knowing someone like David would come along eventually.

Lord Chief Justice Jack Beatson Formally confirmed the fact that the office of the Judiciary is a sub office of the State. He was told to do that.

It's a Direct conflict of interest. The Judge can no longer be a Judge.

WHERE they had previously maintained that the Judiciary was independent of government, That speech is a 180 degree turn around from what they have said for 800 years.

That's no accident.

It's not like Jack Beatson didn't know what he was saying in the Nottingham and Trent Law University. The rest of that speech is just Jibba Jabba noise.

The same with Chandran Kukathas....

A State is a company? Wow.. so its no different to McDonalds?? Really? Chandran Kukathas knew exactly what he was saying.

He was told to.

None of this is an accident.

So that's how locked down this was. There is nothing David could do different.

There is nothing any of us can do different.

The new foundation is set; Everybody is Free.

**BACK**

## Statute – A Definition

"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, lets 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



## What is a real Baron?

What is a real Baron you will all want to know...

What is it that makes a Baron, a Baron?

Is there a difference between a Hereditary Titled Baron (Nobility) and a real Baron by natural descent?

Is there any subversion where a Titled Baron is less in status to a real Baron?

What is a Titled Baron and where do we look for clues?

What is a Baron.

It is correct to observe that he who gives an oath is in service of that oath, Other wise there would be no point in taking the oath.

There are many oaths. One would be a sworn oath of elegance. An oath of service (Military)

Some US citizens swear an oath of elegance to a flag.

This oath puts them in service to the flag.

And a constitution they never signed that was signed by a load of dead guys.

The queen swore an oath at here coronation. Then the queen is a servant to that oath with a status of servant.

Anybody else who swears an oath to the queen is by default a servants, servant.

Both of which have the status of servant.

Servants cannot create law. They are servants.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OMBHfVjslZo>

1957. I do not give you laws or administer Justice.

It is not possible for a servant to create laws.

HM Courts and tribunal services clearly is not a place of law and justice. But a company that provides a service.

I digress.

An Hereditary Titled Baron is at the barest of the queen who is a servant and a titled Baron is the servant of a servant.

If the Barons of 1215 were servants of the monarch then they would have lost their heads for treason.

Clearly the Barons of 1215 did not lose their heads for treason.

The Barons of 1215 where clearly not hereditary titled Barons at the barest of the monarch who swore an oath to the Monarch. If they was then they would have lost there heads for High treason with the great charter. There would not have been a great charter.

The question is not who the Barons where as we know their names but what is a Baron as clearly a Baron By natural decent is superior to a Monarch who is a servant by way of the oath to become Monarch.

SO what is a Baron?

What is a Baron By natural decent and not a titled Baron?

What is a Baron.

What does the Word Baron mean?

What is the origin of the Word, Where does it come from?

Clearly there is some subversion here.

Baron is a French word. Baron, Baroness, Barony.

It is said that a Baron is a land owner but is that correct.

Can a Man own land?

Does he have a Bill of exchange from God?

Who owns the Dog?



The Dog or the fleas on the Dog?

This claim of ownership of land is nothing more than a claim?

Christopher Columbus was an Italian explorer, navigator, coloniser and citizen of the Republic of Genoa. Under the auspices of the Catholic Monarchs of Spain, he completed four voyages across the Atlantic Ocean. He Claimed the US land in the name of the King.

The guy was a pirate who declared a claim to the land.

I digress again. What is a Baron as clearly this has nothing to do with Land.

Clearly we need a clear definition as to what a Baron is and What a Baron is not.

That took me three solid months work and it was hard earned.

I tracked the etymology of the word through 6 or 7 languages and back to the Latin before I found the definitive answer as to what a Baron is not.

The English for the Latin is Barrow Man

So WTF is a Barrow Man?

A Barrow Man is not in Service (Military)

A Barrow Man is not a paid servant to another.

A Barrow Man is not indentured to another by agreement. (Apprentice)

A Barrow Man is not in service by way of an Oath. (Monarch)

A Barrow Man is not a Slave.

A Barrow Man has no Master.

A Baron by natural decent is the highest Status on the planet.

Superior to a Monarch as a Monarch is a Servant by choice and the oath.

This is why the Barons of 1215 did not lose their heads for treason.

Who is your Master?

A Slave knows his Masters Name.

Clearly there is some subversion as the 64.2 million people on this land have no clue as to who they are.

A Baron would not say that somebody ought to do something about that.

A Baron would sort it out himself.

A Baron has no Master.

A Baron cannot rebel as there is no Master for a Baron to rebel against. There is no such thing as Lawful rebellion. Only Slaves can rebel.

Know thyself First.

What is a Baron? Being a Baron has nothing to do with title.

A Baron is of valour.

A Barons heart knows only virtue.

A Baron defends the helpless.

A Barons might up hold's the weak.

A Barons word speaks only truth.

A Barons wrath undoes the wicked.

Are You A Baron?

When will you become that which you are?

**BACK**

## Keeper of the Keys

Ever wondered why Baron David Ward has inscribed the words "keeper of the keys" on the great seal? You are the highest authority there is and no wo{man} can impose their will on you without your consent.

YOU ARE THE KEEPER OF YOUR KEYS.

Baron David Ward possessed an amazing insight into this fictional world that we live in and has revealed only a small amount of the detail with his affidavit.

His affidavit is the most powerful document you will ever possess but you need to understand WHY you are using his affidavit.

Reading the affidavit will reveal more than just that a parking ticket was fraudulent, it will reveal that the whole world is a stage and that we are the actors complete with a mask and a license to do what is otherwise illegal.

The most amazing thing you will discover is that you are only told that you are the actor and all that is necessary for you to be the living wo{man} that you are is to remove the mask.

No tricks involved, no need to be fearful, just remove the mask.



## Instructions on sending the affidavit to MPs.

A quick post just to clear up some of the confusion about the process of serving the affidavit. Firstly, please read read read the affidavit and understand it. When you are ready, go to the files section and find either the Barons or Adrian James (spell checked) affidavit. These are already served and proven time and again, there is NO need to change anything on them, simply attach.

You can create your own crest and seal from the beginning, changing the personal names within the affidavit of course to your own as I did, but do NOT place your crest and seal on Exhibit B as this is the Barons evidence section. You also need to remove the two page decree before you serve and save until un rebutted and ready for publishing.

For simplicity if you are struggling just attach the proven affidavit as is, and serve with email one, also in the files section, SIMPLE! For THIS process you do NOT have to wait 28 days as it has already been agreed, so you can start the email process below.

However you will need to create your own crest and seal when bonding the document at the end of the email process.

If you have created your own affidavit from the beginning, i.e. with your own crest, seal and edited the personal details within yet with the Barons content then after 28 days when that content has been un rebutted you can then start the email process.

Note: Edit in word but save the document when completed as a pdf, it is less able to be tampered with in this format and simply looks and reads better full stop.

You will need to go to the files section for the addresses of the MPs. This is copy and paste time. You will already have set up your official Gmail account that exists simply for this process. You can copy and paste up to 50 MPs at a time in gmail, they are batched into groups just under fifty in the file for your convenience.

Your cover email (if serving your own) can read something like this:

Dear Sir/Madam,

Please find attached my affidavit, statement of truth and fact. This is a LEGAL document and any rebuttals are to be received within 28 days.

I would like to note here that it is irrelevant which constituency I am from and this will not be accepted as a valid response.

This email is delivered to you and your email address directly and needs to be dealt with accordingly. Without ill will or vexation.

(Insert name)

I've found this helps with the bullshit automated responses and you've covered yourself.

Then wait 28 days. Unless you are using the proven affidavit.

Remember to create folders in your email and keep all correspondence, even automated replies.

Keep folders of the liens, this helps keep you organised.

Use your own references, the Barons refs are 'HOW' which of course stands for House of Ward. My ref is HOH, which is House of Haslam.

You get the idea.

Then you can follow the lien process if you wish to:

I wrote this for simplicity, this overview can be found in the units.

1. Send the affidavit to all 657 MPs in the list (917 on excel doc as this includes house of Lords and police chiefs)

copy and paste, they are batched into groups of fifty in the MPs list in the files section, this is the max Gmail allow in one go, wait 28 days.

2. Send email 1, edit and address this email personally. Change dates to schedule. Wait 7 days. After 28 days publish in group files (if only wishing to serve the affidavit and NOT the Leins).
3. Send email 2... Again address personally, change dates, wait 7 days.
4. Send email 3, again address personally, edit dates. Wait 7 days.
5. Email 4, opportunity to resolve , edit as above and send this email. Wait 7 days.
6. Email 5, Notice of Default. Edit , date correctly, wait 7 days.
7. Email 6, Security by way of a Lien. Again, address personally as with all emails, use your correct dates. Reference the Lein and serve/send.
8. Email 7 to be sent the SAME week as email six.

A Lein is perfected once published.

When sending the final document to the MP, bring all documents sent so far into one full document (made up of the affidavit and emails 1-7, PLUS the two page decree (removed until now from the affidavit, the first two pages, unless you've used the Barons or Adrian James affidavit) ...

A. Copy and paste the agencies (found in email 7) alongside the MPs email you are sending it to (published now perfected).

These are publications that accept public notices. Also publish the Lein in the group healing highs dragons club , or in freedom by way of an email.

B. For legal etiquette the completed published document should look like this:

1. A lien needs a cover page (see files for examples)
2. Then email 6- Binds all the other documents.
3. Then email 1,2,3,4,5,7.
4. Then the affidavit (with your own decree, removed until now if using your own).
5. Combine into one PDF file.

This is the full process.

Let the celebrations commence !!



## Step by Step

This link is for the Affidavit Affidavit of Truth and statement of Fact <http://bit.ly/1WV48PH> Send it to the MPs and in the email state the following...

Please find attached, Affidavit of Truth and Statement of Fact.

A rebuttal on a point by point basis is required within 48 hours.

2 days will pass by and you will hear nothing.

So, amend this document date wise, name wise and create your own reference number. This link will take you to the very first correspondence in this legal process.

<https://www.facebook.com/groups/798269636907862/permalink/3552360194832112>

When another 7 days elapse, the second correspondence must be sent, and here is the link to the second

<https://www.facebook.com/groups/798269636907862/permalink/3552360758165389>

After a further 7 days go by, you will be feeling very ignored by this point. That's fine. You can't expect a brain dead MP to rebut a Fact as it is impossible. Here's Correspondence number 3...

<https://www.facebook.com/groups/798269636907862/permalink/3552361474831984>

Correspondence number 4 is due after another seven days. We have your back here, so it's all prepared ready, just amend dates, names and reference number as you have done the last 3 times.

This is the OPPORTUNITY TO RESOLVE. Which is ALWAYS the 4th step.

<https://www.facebook.com/groups/798269636907862/permalink/3552362321498566>

Ignorant bunch, aren't they? Here's the NOTICE OF DEFAULT, step 5

<https://www.facebook.com/groups/798269636907862/permalink/3552363638165101>

At this point, the agreement is reached. So all that is required now is to wrap this case up. Thus:

<https://www.facebook.com/groups/798269636907862/permalink/3552364274831704>

Don't just send this though. This is the first pages, but you will need to go back into your files, copy and paste letter one, two and three, four and 5, add the affidavit and then the notifications which are....

<https://www.facebook.com/groups/798269636907862/permalink/3552365301498268>

CC all these agencies when you send the final document to whichever MP's you are formally charging.

THANK YOU in advance.

**BACK**

## Cover Letter Samples

The cover letter can be something like...

Please find attached legal document, case law and agreed facts. Any rebuttal should be received within 28 days by return email.

We look forward to your response.

Silence creates agreement

Yours sincerely

### EXAMPLE 1

Dear Sir/Madam.

<https://www.facebook.com/groups/798269636907862/permalink/2547738378627637/>

An Affidavit is one of the most powerful legal documents there is. This is why lawyers don't want us to use an Affidavit. An

Affidavit is a legal tool by which the facts are established. It's a "This is the way it is" prove me wrong if you can and if you can't then you have agreed to the content of the Affidavit by Default and you only have 28 days to prove me wrong. The clock has started.

Once the 28 days have expired there is a formal agreement between the parties as to what the facts are. This is why the Affidavit is

a most POWERFUL legal tool. There is a legal and binding agreement between the parties that can no longer be disputed. There

can't be any further arguments after the 28 days. An un-rebutted Affidavit is a formal Contract.

Serve that Affidavit to the 657 MP's in Government (By Email) who have access to the best of the Best Lawyers, Barristers and

Judges on the planet and it remains un-rebutted after 28 days THEN you have the most POWERFUL Affidavit of all time that

kicks the Magna Carter out of the Ball Park.

Make no mistake. If you get the Affidavit wrong on any point and you are equally going to jail for 6570 Years for Fraud. This is

why the Affidavit is so powerful. Do you not think we knew this when we hit the Email Send button on 657 MP's?? So we don't

get our Affidavit WRONG.

This 57 Page Affidavit is the foundation to what is now 46 Securitized commercial liens' for circa £2.5 Billion between only 5

people. The other 4 people also used this same Affidavit as this 57 Page Affidavit is the Legally Established and formally agreed

FACTS. This 57 page Affidavit can be used by anybody at all because it is Published. 7 Billion People can use this 57 Page

Affidavit in any country because the same condition is the same in every country.

So this 57 Page Affidavit can be used by anybody in any country as the foundation of a securitized Commercial Lien in any

country.

Now that's the TRUE power of the Affidavit and the pen. AND Email.

It was sent by Email to 657 MP's in February 2015. The POWER at your fingertips sat in your fat armchair.

Exhibit "C" in the Affidavit covers the Fact that a State is a Company no different to McDonalds as Confirmed by Chandran

Kukathas PHD of the London School of Economics in 2008.

[http://www.academia.edu/12226898/A\\_Definition\\_of\\_the\\_State...](http://www.academia.edu/12226898/A_Definition_of_the_State...)

**BACK**

This is now doctrine and can be used and referenced by any Law degree student for their thesis. A State is a company and as a State is a company, then a State is no different to McDonalds. Also in Exhibit "C" is a speech made by none less than the Rt. Hon. Lord Chief Justice Sir Jack Beatson FBA who was the chief justice in 2008. <https://www.judiciary.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/JCO/Documents/Speeches/beatsonj040608.pdf...> In this speech he openly revealed the fact that there is no separation of powers which has been long held by the government and the Judiciary that there is a separation of powers between the State and the Judiciary. The Lord Chief Justice Sir Jack Beatson FBA confirmed that the opposite is true and that the office of the Judiciary is a sub office of the State. No Judge including the Lord Chief Justice can preside in a case over his superior in office. Which means that anyone in the executive office can commit any crime they like with complete impunity and there is nothing that can be done about this. Criminal Fraud, Paedophilia, Cold blooded murder, and Genocide and walk away with complete impunity. Now that's a POWERFULL Affidavit. The Executive office has formally agreed that they are a Company no Different to McDonalds with a Company Janitor for a Judge. .... With no authority. The State is NOT a Government. The State is just a company no different to McDonalds and that is a FACT. Have a very nice Day. Cover letter for Affidavit. Original can be found here: <https://bit.ly/3Gd7wRD>

#### EXAMPLE 2

To Whom It May Concern,

I am sending you this Decree and affidavit of Truth and Statement of Facts, which is attached to this letter. I emailed yourself on the 12th April 2021.

An Affidavit is one of the most powerful legal documents there is. This is why lawyers don't want us to use an Affidavit. An Affidavit is a legal tool by which the facts are established. It's a "This is the way it is" prove me wrong if you can and if you can't then you have agreed to the content of the Affidavit by Default and you only have 28 days to prove me wrong. The clock did start, and now has passed the 28 day rebuttal time period, with no replies or rebuttals to date.

Once the 28 days had expired there is a formal agreement between the parties as to what the facts are. This is why the Affidavit is a most POWERFUL legal tool. There is a legal and binding agreement between the parties that can no longer be disputed. There can't be any further arguments after the 28 days. An un-rebutted Affidavit is a formal Contract.

So this 57 Page Affidavit can be used by anybody in any country as the foundation of a securitised Commercial Lien in any country.

This Document (including the Affidavit of Truth and Statement of Facts) will now be kept on file as physical presentable evidence, as it represents the criminal activities of the representatives of The Australian Government

**BACK**

whether they are aware of this transgression or not. Ignorance of the law is no defence and all of the representatives of The Australian Government are now culpable under the current legislation because one individual failed to sign any document. This is a fact which must be understood. This shows an ignorance of current legislation.

Your Twenty-eight (28) days to rebutt all items from the following Affidavit or Truth and Facts, with a sworn affidavit of rebuttal, signed under penalty of perjury, has passed and failure to respond in the allotted time meant your full acceptance and agreement herein of the Affidavit of Truth and Facts.

Without ill will or vexation.

#### EXAMPLE 3

To title/name

We are sending you this Decree and affidavit of Truth and Statement of Facts on this day the 25th day of October

2021, you now have 28 days to rebut point by point, Once the 28 days have expired there is a formal agreement

between the parties as to what the facts are. This is why the Affidavit is a most POWERFUL legal tool. There is a

legal and binding agreement between the parties that can no longer be disputed. There can't be any further

arguments after the 28 days. An un-rebutted Affidavit is a formal Contract.

Silence gives consent.

Silence grants a tacit and binding agreement through acquiescence.

Without ill-will or vexation.

For and on behalf of the Principal legal embodiment by the title of Mr Scott HERBERT.

For and on behalf of the Attorney General of the House of HERBERT.

For and on behalf of Baron Scott of the House of HERBERT.

All rights reserved.

#### EXAMPLE 4

To Title/Name,

Please find attached our affidavit, statement of truth and fact. This is a LEGAL document and any rebuttals must be

received within 28 days./48hrs

We would like to note here that it is irrelevant which constituency we are from and this will not be accepted as a valid response.

This email is delivered to you and your email address directly and needs to be dealt with by way of an affidavit of

rebuttal point for point

Without ill will or vexation.

For and on behalf of the Principal legal embodiment by the title of Mr Scott HERBERT.

For and on behalf of the Attorney General of the House of HERBERT.

For and on behalf of Baron Scott of the House of HERBERT.

All rights reserved.

Then wait 28 days. Unless you are using the proven affidavit.

**BACK**



## EXAMPLE 5

Dear Sir/Madam

We pay Tax for the Teacher, Nurse, Dentist, Doctor, Fireman, Police and 1000 other things. Then the Teacher, Nurse, Dentist, Doctor, Fireman, Police and 1000 other things also pay Tax. Where does this Tax go and what does it pay for?

The Tax was paid for the Teacher, Nurse, Dentist, Doctor, Fireman, Police and 1000 other things so why is all this paying Tax as well because there is nothing else to pay Tax for. Where does the Money go??

When what we pay tax for also pays Tax there is no return Path for these Millions in Tax back into economic circulations so where do these millions in Tax go?? Well, the answer is in front of your eyes because there is no return path which means that Billions in Tax is just flushed down the pan. There is no return path.

Every year Billions of our money just gets flushed down the pan because there is no economic return path so where has it gone?? This is why every country on the planet is in Debt for Trillions and is now circling the drain. Three countries have already gone bust. Greece, Iceland and Venezuela and the UK is now circling the drain what are you going to do about this??

Did you never notice?? Are you supposed to be leaders?? DO you not have some of the finest economist on the planet working for the government?? There are no 300,000 Homeless in the UK it is the highest per populace of homeless on the planet and that includes the third world countries why do you think that is?? Are you sure that 300,000 people have made the life choice to be homeless dropouts?? Or is it more that there is no longer enough means left to live on?? This is not a case of living within our means when 65 Million people in the UK are being Taxed into extinction.

Do you know what happened in 2008? It wasn't just another hiccup in economics. Just another recession. All the countries of the world are having a recession all at the same time. All of the other countries in the world are all in debt for Trillions and going Broke all at the same time. Do you think we are stupid?? Do you think that we cannot do simple Maths?? Do you know what differentiation and integration is because this is level 4 Math taught at collage:

Economics is not difficult Math to do and we are not stupid. So where did the Tax cash go?

Do you actually have the first clue how much tax we pay every year? The UK Chartered accountants do and so do we. The UK chartered accountants have confirmed that 85% of every £1 is Tax. The Tax bubble burst in 2008. There is no longer any means to make new fiat currency that is greater than the Tax that gets flushed down the pan when what we pay Tax for also pays Tax and there is no return path. The £65Billion we sent to the EU is chump change. If you think that leaving the EU is some kind of economic rescue plan well I can assure you this is sticking a plaster on a Brocken leg. 2008 is 12 years ago and the UK government clearly do not have an economic plan. This country is sinking faster than the Titanic.

Attached is a document. It's the loaf of bread document. It was drafted in 2013 and this shows where all the Tax is on a loaf of Bread. 85% of a Loaf of Bread is Tax. So when Grandma picks up her meagre pension and buys a loaf of bread she gets stung for 85% Tax. 85% of Grandmas Pension is raked back in tax on everything she needs to live. 80% Duty on fuel then the VAT on the Duty and the VAT on the fuel are you having a laugh?? We are not laughing.

Have a very nice day.

**BACK**

## EXAMPLE 6

Dear Sir/ Madam,

You are not a government. A General Election does not make a Government. HM Parliaments and Governments is not a Government that can represent anybody never mind 65 Million people. If you need a Lawyer or a Barrister to represent you in court then No Lawyer or Barrister can represent you unless you formally sign a legal Document which is the formal and legal transfer of Power of Attorney. No Government can represent the people without these 65 Million formal legal documents on record every 5 years which is a term of government.

Statute: A Statute is a legislative rule given force of Law by the consent of the governed. You will find this definition of Statute in the Law dictionaries. The word "by" creates a legal dependency which if not fulfilled THEN the legislative rule CANNOT be given force of Law or be acted upon in any way.

65 Million people go to the Dentist at some point and in the Dentist filing cabinet there is the formally signed consent otherwise there will be no dental care. A Dentist cannot touch any one or clean their teeth without this legal document being signed.

It's the same at the Doctors. If when you register at the Doctors you don't sign the consent form which is a legal document the Doctor will throw you out. The Doctor cannot touch you enough to take your temperature if you haven't signed this legal consent form.

Hospital operation or surgical procedure: Once again there is a Mandatory requirement that the legal consent is signed. The "Consent of the governed" is a Mandatory requirement without which there is no legal material evidence of any governed people. If we are policed by consent as Theresa May is on record as confirming then where is the 65 Million formally required "Policed by Consent" Legal documents? Where did all the Tax Money Go and where is the 65 Million legal documents we never signed kept??

Obligations and Liabilities:

These two words do not exist outside of a legal contract signed by the Parties. Where is the 65 Million formally agreed and signed legal contracts where there can be an Obligation or a Liability under the Act's and Statutes??

Contract:

1. A Meeting of the minds.
2. Full disclosure in the terms and conditions.
3. A consideration in both directions.
4. Without coercion or deception.

If any of these requirements are not met then there is no contract that has any Obligations or liabilities agreed to. The Contract is therefore material evidence of fraud by deception should any of this be omitted. Where is the 65 million formally agreed contracts and agreement to be governed?? The authority of the people has never once in 800 years been legally available to Government. There are no governed people and in the absence of a governed people there cannot be a Government. One cannot exist in the absence of the other.

These are called FACTS. These are called Legal Facts. There is a difference between a Fact and an opinion or a Belief.

A Fact can never be an opinion or Belief. They are polar opposites. These two things are not the same and you cannot make Apple pie out of Bananas. You can try but that would be Banana Pie.

Case Law. WI-05257F. 29th May 2013 in a government recognised Tribunal. MR DAVID WARD has no Liability to pay the PCN which is a claim made under the Traffic Management Act 2004. by CEO084. There is also a formally signed Declaration of NO CONTEST which is a legally signed Declaration signed and therefore formally agreed by the Government office.

Have a very nice Day.



#### EXAMPLE 7

Dear Sir/Madam,

<https://www.facebook.com/groups/798269636907862/permalink/2547738378627637/>

An Affidavit is one of the most powerful legal documents there is. This is why lawyers don't want us to use an Affidavit.

An Affidavit is a legal tool by which the facts are established. It's a "This is the way it is MonkeyBoy" Prove me wrong if you can and if you can't then you have agreed to the content of the Affidavit by Default and you only have 28 days to prove me wrong. The clock starts ticking Tick Tock.

Once the 28 days have expired there is a formal agreement between the parties as to what the facts are. This is why the Affidavit is a most POWERFUL legal tool. There is a legal and Binding agreement between the parties that can no longer be disputed. There can't be any further arguments after the 28 days. An un-rebutted Affidavit is a formal Contract.

Serve that Affidavit to the 657 MP's in Government (By Email) who have access to the best of the Best Lawyers, Barristers and Judges on the planet and it remains un-rebutted after 28 days THEN you have the most POWERFUL Affidavit of all time that kicks the Magna Carter out of the Ball Park.

Make no mistake. If you get the Affidavit wrong on any point and you are equally going to jail for 6570 Years for Fraud. This is why the Affidavit is so Powerful. Do you not think we knew this when we hit the Email Send button on 657 MP's?? So we don't get our Affidavit WRONG.

This 65 Page Affidavit is the foundation to what is now 46 Securitised commercial liens' for circa £2.5 Billion between only 5 people. The other 4 people also used this same Affidavit as this 65 Page Affidavit is the Legally Established and formally agreed FACTS. This 65 page Affidavit can be used by anybody at all because it is Published. 7 Billion People can use this 65 Page Affidavit in any country because the same condition is the same in every country.

So this 65 Page Affidavit can be used by anybody in any country as the foundation of a securitised Commercial Lien in any country.

Now that's the TRUE power of the Affidavit and the pen. AND Email.

It was sent by Email to 657 MP's in February 2015. The POWER at your finger tips sat in your fat armchair.

Exhibit "C" in the Affidavit covers the Fact that a State is a Company no different to Confirmed by Chandran Kukathas PHD of the London School of Economics in 2008.

[http://www.academia.edu/12226898/A\\_Definition\\_of\\_the\\_State...](http://www.academia.edu/12226898/A_Definition_of_the_State...)

This is now doctrine and can be used and referenced by any Law degree student for their theses. A State is a company and as a State is a company then a State is no different to McDonalds.

Also in Exhibit "C" is a speech made by none less than the Rt. Hon. Lord Chief Justice Sir Jack Beatson FBA who was the chief justice in 2008. <https://www.judiciary.gov.uk/wpcontent/uploads/JCO/Documents/Speeches/beatsonj040608.pdf>...

In this speech he openly revealed the fact that there is no separation of powers which has been long held by the government and the Judiciary that there is a separation of powers between the State and the Judiciary. The Lord Chief Justice Sir Jack Beatson FBA confirmed that the opposite is true and that the office of the Judiciary is a sub office of the State. No Judge including the Lord Chief Justice can preside in a case over his superior in office.

Which means that anyone in the executive office can commit any crime they like, with complete impunity and there is nothing that can be done about this. Criminal Fraud, Paedophilia, Cold blooded murder, Genocide and walk away with complete impunity.

Now that's a POWERFULL Affidavit. The Executive office has formally agreed that they are a Company no Different to McDonalds with a Company Janitor for a Judge..... With no authority. The State is NOT a Government. The State is just a company no different to McDonalds and that is a FACT.

Have a very nice Day.



#### EXAMPLE 8

Dear Sir/Madam

For 800 years HM Parliaments and Government (State/Company) have ransacked this country by the use of Fraud by Misrepresentation. Never once in 800 years has HM Parliaments and Governments (State/Company) had any legal rights to Govern. For 800 Years there has been no means of redress as the Courts are not a court of law but a company office. For 800 years there have been law universities which have nothing to do with Law and a Law degree or PHD is just a worthless piece of Paper about Company Policy. For 800 years the country called the UK has been ransacked by what is no more than Bandits thieves and psychopathic terrorists and that is the FACT of the matter.

The Facts are conclusive. This will now change.

A Company is a thing. A man made concept in the abstract. Something which has no material substance as confirmed by Chandran Kukathas PHD of the London School of Economics. It is a fantasy, A fairy tale. A fanciful made up Jibba Jabba pile of rubbish and also outright criminal Fraud. Make it all up as you go along and hope no one notices.

Well we did notice. But this is for sure; a fabrication of transcript cannot carry Power of Attorney. No Company position can carry Power of Attorney. Not the Company CEO. Not the Company Judge. Not the Company Court sub office has Power of Attorney. Only a Living Man or Woman has Power of Attorney and is the Attorney General.

The Power of Attorney is the highest authority. Which is why all the legal consents MUST be signed and before any representation can be made then the Legal Power of Attorney MUST be legally transferred. This Power of Attorney and the Power of an Affidavit is all that is needed. We don't need courts. We don't need fake Lawyers who are not Lawyers. We don't need fake Barristers who are not Barristers and we don't need Judges.

There is plenty legal process that can be implemented and the case file which is the recorded facts is the court of records not some building filled with criminals.

The Victim has the legal right to redress. That is a MAXIM in Fact and fraud by misrepresentation is a commercially chargeable criminal offence and the rest is just legal Litigation.

Another Maxim in Fact. "He who makes the claim carries the Obligation (Contractual obligation) To present the material evidence of the claim". Failure to present this mandatory material evidence will enter the claimant into a listing and legally binding agreement that the claim is Fraud By Misrepresentation which is also Malfeasance in the office and a recognised intention to cause distress and alarm which is a wilful and belligerent act of terrorism, AND that the claimant has also agreed to stand for commercial charges to the same degree.

Without the material evidence to support the claim then the claimant has committed wilful Criminal Fraud and Malfeasance by default. There has to be redress because without the redress then the victim has allowed the Crime to be committed and by allowing this the victim is also guilty of the same crime by default. Redress is a mandatory requirement. Crime cannot be left unabated. Legal proceeding will then be legally agreed.

#### Judges

District Judge HOW-LATEEF-LIEN-001

<https://www.facebook.com/groups/798269636907862/permalink/1292888400779314/>

District Judge HOW-LATEEF-LIEN-002

<https://www.facebook.com/groups/798269636907862/permalink/1292886904112797/>

District Judge HOW-LATEEF-LIEN-003

<https://www.facebook.com/groups/798269636907862/permalink/1292876174113870/>

District Judge HOW-GRAY-LIEN-001

<https://www.facebook.com/groups/798269636907862/permalink/1292868254114662/>

District Judge HOW-FITSGERALD-LIEN-001

<https://www.facebook.com/groups/798269636907862/permalink/1292863800781774/>

HOW-WOODWARD-LIEN-001

<https://www.facebook.com/groups/798269636907862/permalink/1292862800781874/>

HOW-MASHEDER-LIEN-001

<https://www.facebook.com/groups/798269636907862/permalink/1292861584115329/>

HOW-BUCKLEY-LIEN-001

<https://www.facebook.com/groups/798269636907862/permalink/1292859867448834/>

MP

HOW-FB-LIEN-0001 Fiona Bruce MP

<https://www.facebook.com/groups/798269636907862/permalink/975342105867280/>

HOW-FB-LIEN-0002. Fiona Bruce MP

<https://www.facebook.com/groups/798269636907862/permalink/975347322533425/>

Lawyers

HOW-HAMLINS-RICHARD-PULL-LIEN-001

<https://www.facebook.com/groups/798269636907862/permalink/1224986927569462/>

HOW-HAMLINS-NEIL-THOMAS-LIEN-001

<https://www.facebook.com/groups/798269636907862/permalink/1224986224236199/>

HOW-HAMLINS-MATTHEW-PRYKE-001

<https://www.facebook.com/groups/798269636907862/permalink/1224985000902988/>

HOW-HAMLINS-DANIEL-BELLAU-LIEN-001

<https://www.facebook.com/groups/798269636907862/permalink/1224984310903057/>

HOW-HAMLINS-CHARLESBEZZANT-LIEN-001

<https://www.facebook.com/groups/798269636907862/permalink/1224979950903493/>

HOW-HAMLINS-ASELLEDJUMABAEVAWOOD-LIEN-001

<https://www.facebook.com/groups/798269636907862/permalink/1224977054237116/>

HOW-HAMLINS-CHARLOTTEALLAN-LIEN-001

<https://www.facebook.com/groups/798269636907862/permalink/1224981397570015/>

HOW-CN-LIEN-0001

<https://www.facebook.com/groups/798269636907862/permalink/975318689202955/>

HOW-CN-LIEN-0002

<https://www.facebook.com/groups/798269636907862/permalink/975319459202878/>

HOW-MROWENS-LIEN-0001

<https://www.facebook.com/groups/798269636907862/permalink/996374820430675/>

HOW-JOHN WHITE-LIEN-0001

<https://www.facebook.com/groups/798269636907862/permalink/996373987097425/>

HOW-C-ANTHISTLE-LIEN-0001

<https://www.facebook.com/groups/798269636907862/permalink/996371597097664/>

HOW-MRTD-LIEN-0001

<https://www.facebook.com/groups/798269636907862/permalink/856315541103271/>

Warrant of arrest.

HOW-HMCTS-ACALLISTER-LIEN-0001

<https://www.facebook.com/groups/798269636907862/permalink/975354235866067/>

HOW-HMCTS-ACALLISTER-LIEN-0002

<https://www.facebook.com/groups/798269636907862/permalink/996369447097879/>

Bailiff

HOW-LIEN-MRWN-0000001

<https://www.facebook.com/groups/798269636907862/permalink/941730645895093/>

HOW-MRKM-LIEN-0001

<https://www.facebook.com/groups/798269636907862/permalink/975368822531275/>

HOW-LIEN- MRMD-0000001

<https://www.facebook.com/groups/798269636907862/permalink/939301839471307/>

HOW-LIEN-MRWN-0000002

<https://www.facebook.com/groups/798269636907862/permalink/1996362483765232/>

HOW-LIEN-MRKN-0000001

<https://www.facebook.com/groups/798269636907862/permalink/941729395895218/>

HOW-MSSW-LIEN-0001

<https://www.facebook.com/groups/798269636907862/permalink/975354499199374/>

HOW-MSSW-LIEN-0002

<https://www.facebook.com/groups/798269636907862/permalink/975361325865358/>

HOW-SPYE-LIEN-0001

<https://www.facebook.com/groups/798269636907862/permalink/830179827050176/>

HOW-SR-LIEN-0001

<https://www.facebook.com/groups/798269636907862/permalink/975370629197761/>

HOW-LAS-LIEN-0001

<https://www.facebook.com/groups/798269636907862/permalink/856318257769666/>

HOW-JUMC-LIEN-0001

<https://www.facebook.com/groups/798269636907862/permalink/856321777769314/>

Parking ticket.

HOW-CEO-084-LIEN-0001

<https://www.facebook.com/groups/798269636907862/permalink/856322781102547/>

HOW-CEO-203-LIEN-0001

<https://www.facebook.com/groups/798269636907862/permalink/856324024435756/>

The above are URL Links to 38 Legal and published Securitised Commercial Liens for £1.98 Billion. Concluded and un rebutted inside two years. Judges, Barristers, Layers, Executive officer of the State/Company.

The case Law that puts ALL the Acts and Statutes in the BIN and guts every Government, every Judge Barrister and Lawyer on the planet like a wet fish.

There is no Government..... THE END.

Have a very nice Day.



## EXAMPLE 9

Dear Sir/Madam,

In the UK there is an Inner city state. People use these words without thinking. It's also called the golden Mile.

This State is not part of the UK. It's an Independent State. This Independent State controls the Planet and the NWO is a rework of the OWO. Same girl Different Party dress. Lots of Smoke and Mirrors. The Fire of London was Land Clearance for the Return of the Roman Empire. This is clearly evident by the use of the Roman Empire Laurel Wreath Emblem. If you don't know what it is then you don't know what it is.

The Roman Empire is now the Great British Empire and make no mistake they do control this planet. The only exception is Iran and a few little places that don't matter. As with the fall of the Roman Empire the COST of maintaining the Empire is nuts. The Romans tried to do this by force of arms and the rerun Great British Empire have tried by economics.

Both have now failed. Every country on the planet now owes Trillions to no one knows who.... There was a planned exodus of the Head office 50 years or so ago to Brussels. This was the start of the Common Market, Later the European Union. The Roman Empire came back to the UK in 1666 because their conker the planet by force had failed and the UK was clearly a defendable location as it was surrounded by water as a natural defence.

Time moves on and what the scum need is a nice place to use as the world's Nuclear waste dump. Oh Look we are sat on it. It's the UK. Location: Location: Location: A Nice little Island surrounded by water would make a great Nuclear waste dump. Let's Build a channel tunnel under the English Channel. This has been planned a long time.

Unfortunately the world's economics has gone completely tits up. Global world of economics is going BOOM. The Bubble burst in 2008. The Banks can't fudge up the books anymore with another quantitative easing scam because they all use the computers. Ooops. The Bubble has burst. Government cutbacks across the board. The scam is over.

..... END GAME....

Still can't see the writing on the wall.....

This is what the Vote got you..... READ it and WEEP.....  
Never in 800 years of history as it been so blatantly obvious that all of this scam called a government is nothing more than a scam. Why do you think that is?

Let's Look...

Withdrawing the funds from government outgoing expenditure. Let's think about this.  
Over the past 50 years the governments regardless of party have continually asset stripped this country. There is no industry left. SO there is no Tax revenue from that industry. Now you are talking Billions in lost Tax revenue. The outcome of which is more unemployed. There aren't enough jobs stacking shelves. The unemployment is way beyond what government would want to publish. SO now the country is asset stripped how else can they screw us? Austerity is wilfully planned and systematically executed poverty.

Ans:- Withdraw government expenditure on services. NHS, DWP, Libraries, Fire Stations. Police. They are now asset stripping the services we pay for with the £115 Trillion every year in Tax. UK funded the EU 65 Billion a Year. There was 6 Treaties keeping us in the EU not just the Lisbon Treaty that

everyone knows about. SO how do you Bin all 6 treaties at once? A Referendum to leave the EU puts all 6 Treaties/agreements in the BIN. You cannot implement article 51 of a Treaty that is in the BIN. Austerity is the new government word for Poverty. That's just word soup. No one ever heard the word Austerity 5 years ago. SO Austerity is the Government manufactured and strategically executed Poverty. Over 300,000 Homeless and that does not include those that have died through Hypothermia and starvation.

What does the bigger picture say? It says that this is a big company that is systematically shutting up shop and withdrawing the cost of company overheads while at the same time milking the incomings for every penny they can. If you think you voted at the Referendum Think again. That was already fixed and in the Bag before you knew about it. They are masters of deception and misdirection. SO where is all this going to lead?? A systematic and strategically executed shutdown of the big company. The Bubble will burst and the shit ball is coming down the pipe. They have also signed the white papers to put the worlds Radio Active Nuclear Waste Down those Fracking holes under your House and we also have a Blinding Distraction of 5G in the fear porn Media. Get ready....

Radio Active Nuclear Waste will kill you. This Island is a nice little Island surrounded by water and a high speed train line under the channel. This has been planned for a very long time. Strategically planned and Strategically executed while keeping you entertained by the Parliament Muppet Show. Get Ready..... The shit ball is coming .....

END GAME....

.....You are NEXT.....

SO which Muppet is going to do what next?? Which of you have a PHD in leadership?

Have a Nice Day.

**BACK**

Example 10 SENDING DECREE WITH AFFIDAVIT AFTER 28 DAYS

To Whom It May Concern,

I am sending you this Decree and affidavit of Truth and Statement of Facts, which is attached to this letter. I emailed yourself on the 12th April 2021.

An Affidavit is one of the most powerful legal documents there is. This is why lawyers don't want us to use an Affidavit. An Affidavit is a legal tool by which the facts are established. It's a "This is the way it is" prove me wrong if you can and if you can't then you have agreed to the content of the Affidavit by Default and you only have 28 days to prove me wrong. The clock did start, and now has passed the 28 day rebuttal time period, with no replies or rebuttals to date.

Once the 28 days had expired there is a formal agreement between the parties as to what the facts are. This is why the Affidavit is a most POWERFUL legal tool. There is a legal and binding agreement between the parties that can no longer be disputed. There can't be any further arguments after the 28 days. An un-rebutted Affidavit is a formal Contract.

So this 57 Page Affidavit can be used by anybody in any country as the foundation of a securitised Commercial Lien in any country.

This Document (including the Affidavit of Truth and Statement of Facts) will now be kept on file as physical presentable evidence, as it represents the criminal activities of the representatives of The Australian Government whether they are aware of this transgression or not. Ignorance of the law is no defence and all of the representatives of The Australian Government are now culpable under the current legislation because one individual failed to sign any document. This is a fact which must be understood. This shows an ignorance of current legislation.



Your Twenty-eight (28) days to rebut all items from the following Affidavit or Truth and Facts, with a sworn affidavit of rebuttal, signed under penalty of perjury, has passed and failure to respond in the allotted time meant your full acceptance and agreement herein of the Affidavit of Truth and Facts.

**You have been served LEGAL NOTICE**

Without ill will or vexation.



## **The Decree:**

Ladies and Gentlemen it is our Duty and obligation and very great honour to make the following announcement and Decree

On this Day the 17th Day of May 2021

It is now confirmed Formally, on and for the Record as of this Day the 17th Day of May 2021. Agreed by the State and the Crown By way of un-rebutted Affidavit and statement of Fact and that there is a lasting tacit and binding agreement through Acquiescence and Royal Assent by Default.

That there has never been any such thing as LAW, but only the presumption of law, where a presumption is nothing of material substance and any presumption can be dismissed by a formal challenge.

It is now confirmed Formally, on and for the Record as of this Day the 17th Day of May 2021. Agreed by the State and the Crown By way of un-rebutted Affidavit and statement of Fact and that there is a lasting tacit and binding agreement through Acquiescence and Royal Assent by Default.

That Parliament does not reign supreme and that any notion of government has no legitimacy without the material evidence that the governed have given their consent and that there cannot be any Government for the one cannot exist in isolation without the other.

Also that any action taken by way of an Act or statute of Parliament is and always has been a criminal offence of FRAUD and Malfeasance in the office, at the very least.

It is now confirmed Formally, on and for the Record as of this Day the 17th Day of May 2021. Agreed by the State and the Crown By way of un-rebutted Affidavit and statement of Fact and that there is a lasting tacit and binding agreement through Acquiescence and Royal Assent by Default.

That the office of the Judiciary is nothing more than a sub office of a commercial body and the status and standing of any Judge or Magistrate currently on this land has no greater status or standing or authority than the Manager of McDonalds.

Also it is formally recognised on and for the record that the state is a legal embodiment by an act of registration which is of no material substance and therefore fraud by default and that the interests of the State are the interests of the State alone to the detriment of anybody and anything else including its own officers of the state. That the actions of the State are now recognised as an unconscionable and criminal fraternity capable of heinous crimes, without measure.

It is now confirmed Formally, on and for the Record as of this Day the 17th Day of May 2021. Agreed by the State and the Crown By way of un-rebutted Affidavit and statement of Fact and that there is a lasting tacit and binding agreement through Acquiescence and Royal Assent by Default.

That any and all executable Orders and Documents must carry an affixed common seal which denotes point of origin and that any and all excitable Orders and Documents must be signed by human hand and in wet ink by a named authoritative living being who takes full responsibility for the content of that formal excitable Order or document.

Any deviation from this standing process where there is no affixed common seal or signature in wet ink by a living hand with the authority to do so will be recognised in perpetuity as a criminal offence.

It is now confirmed Formally, on and for the Record as of this Day the 17th Day of May 2021. Agreed by the State and the Crown By way of un-rebutted Affidavit and statement of Fact and that there is a

lasting tacit and binding agreement through Acquiescence and Royal Assent by Default. That all imposed Taxation and Duty is and always has been not only a criminal offence but is also detrimental to all the people of this planet.

That from this day forward and as of the 17th Day of May 2021 and in perpetuity the enforcement of all Taxation and duty is a recognised Act of Terrorism.

It is now confirmed Formally, on and for the Record as of this Day the 17th Day of May 2021. Agreed by the State and the Crown By way of un-rebutted Affidavit and statement of Fact and that there is a lasting tacit and binding agreement through Acquiescence and Royal Assent by Default.

That there is no such thing as money or commerce. Nobody gets paid or has been paid.

No Body has the capability to Pay anybody or for anything or Item without Money.

All commercial instruments are nothing more than pieces of paper with marks on them.

That there value is only confidence and belief where confidence and Belief is recognised as being of no material substance.

The continued use of these commercial instruments is for the feeble of mind who insist on living in a make believe world of their own making.

Capitalism will forever be recognised and in perpetuity as the exploitation of another for personal gain. This has always been an unconscionable and detrimental activity to the human race since Babylonian times.

It is now confirmed Formally, on and for the Record as of this Day the 17th Day of May 2021. Agreed by the State and the Crown By way of un-rebutted Affidavit and statement of Fact and that there is a lasting tacit and binding agreement through Acquiescence and Royal Assent by Default.

There is no greater Sanctuary than the human home, be this home a castle or a wood hut or a blanket on the ground.

From this day forward as of the 17th Day of May 2021 let it be known that any transgression of this sanctuary other than by invitation, that any transgression of this Sanctuary is a recognised Act of War and aggression.

We have the right by the very fact that we live to protect our life and the life of our loved ones. Any transgression of this Sanctuary can be met with equal or great force with impunity.

This is the long standing law and traditions of this land. So say we all.

It is now confirmed Formally, on and for the Record as of this Day the 17th Day of May 2021. Agreed by the State and the Crown By way of un-rebutted Affidavit and statement of Fact and that there is a lasting tacit and binding agreement through Acquiescence and Royal Assent by Default.

That the practice of election by way of a secret ballot is, and always has been, an abomination and deception with no credibility, or redeeming qualities.

By the very fact that this is a SECRET Ballot by any means of notarisation or recording renders the outcome obsolete by definition that is a secret Ballot.

By the very fact that there is not a recognised un-elective or reverse process of election and by the very fact that there is no such word to this effect in the recognised dictionaries.

Then this elective process by way of secret ballot is and always has been void ab initio. Have a nice day.

On and for the record.

Bring out the town crier and let the Bell ring.

Let it be known across this planet, that from this day the 17th Day of May 2021 that the satanic Roman Empire is no more.

Let it be by Decreed that this is the day and will always be the day in perpetuity when the days of  
austerity and tyranny end for all time to come.

Let this day go down in history across this planet as a day of celebration for all time.

So say we all.

Let the celebrations begin.

So say we all.

No Assured Value. No Liability. Errors and Omissions Excepted. All Rights Reserved.



## Signatures and Embossing Seals

When printing the affidavit or a lien, an embossing stamp with your seal is used to 'sign' the document where your signature is displayed. It only needs to be embossed on the signature page. All other pages have the digital/graphic seal.

The question has been asked about where to get embossing stamps - Australia. You can get them from a number of places. Here's one example: ABC2000.com.au for an embosser \$178.00. and another: <https://www.allstamps.com.au/category/Embossers-and-Seals> \$88.00 If you have information on where to get them, feel free to share.

### **\*\*Seal\*\***

Baron David Ward shared this information on why we put our seal on each page :  
Your email is your address. That's why it is called an Email address. Its sent to their email address.  
Paper is Paper. That needs your Postal address.  
Your Crest and Great seal on every page and page numbering as well.  
Back in the day a document was a long scroll as long as it needed to be. Now we use A4 paper. So that needs each page numbered with the crest and the seal on every page. This is etiquette and protocol. Simply the way things should be done.  
So if you have one you can add your crest and great seal graphics to the email as well.

### **\*\*Signature\*\***

This following information may help people comprehend why the signature is written as it is. Appreciation goes to Andrew Brogden who posted the information and the post can be found here: <https://bit.ly/3E8CV5z>  
There is a very very clever 'motion' for want of a word in David's (your) affidavit that many seem to miss.  
Here is the motion:  
For and on behalf of the Principal legal embodiment by the title of MR DAVID WARD.  
For and on behalf of the attorney General of the House of Ward.  
For and on behalf of Baron David of the House of Ward.  
All rights reserved.  
Why am I saying this?  
We have three strikes here for and on behalf of: For and on behalf of... means for something or someone.  
The PRINCIPAL legal embodiment by the title of MR DAVID WARD means the highest it can be (principal), MR DAVID WARD.  
This means any other MR DAVID, Mr David is within this category and is a servant in title.  
The Attorney General of the House of WARD (note the capitals) is the highest of the high in State & Law & Ministerial terms of that House and (categories) as above is a servant in title.  
The Baron David of the House of Ward is a natural born title as a natural born Baron from Adam has no master, he is the highest he can be in title.  
Each three of these are for and on behalf of each other (three strikes) and yet it is from the House of Ward.  
Somebody must have written these WORDS, it can only be a man that wrote these WORDS.  
An affidavit of truth brings the living (wo)man into ANY court should they so wish to pursue it!  
But who would want to persist with this House of Ward or your House? Is this why there is no resistance?  
Food for thought.

**BACK**

## Baron David Ward's Work

Affidavit of Truth and statement of Fact	<a href="http://bit.ly/1WV48PH">http://bit.ly/1WV48PH</a>
Case Authority WI-05257F	<a href="http://bit.ly/1OaSsqg">http://bit.ly/1OaSsqg</a>
LETTER FROM ARCHBISHOP OF CHICAGO	<a href="http://bit.ly/1T0sVwK">http://bit.ly/1T0sVwK</a>
B&S-05-10-2015	<a href="http://bit.ly/1Ok3nZs">http://bit.ly/1Ok3nZs</a>
Loaf of Bread	<a href="http://bit.ly/1No3fNH">http://bit.ly/1No3fNH</a>
HOW-SPYE-LIEN-0001	<a href="http://bit.ly/1s72PIG">http://bit.ly/1s72PIG</a>
HOW-MRTD-LIEN-0001	<a href="http://bit.ly/1rCwxyc">http://bit.ly/1rCwxyc</a>
HOW-LAS-LIEN-0001	<a href="http://bit.ly/1T6zdjY">http://bit.ly/1T6zdjY</a>
HOW-LIEN- MRMD-0000001	<a href="http://bit.ly/24GihTj">http://bit.ly/24GihTj</a>
HOW-MROWENS-LIEN-0001	<a href="http://bit.ly/24GiohE">http://bit.ly/24GiohE</a>
HOW-JUMC-LIEN-0001	<a href="http://bit.ly/24Giru3">http://bit.ly/24Giru3</a>
HOW-HMCTS-ACALLISTER-LIEN-0001	<a href="http://bit.ly/1T6IISB">http://bit.ly/1T6IISB</a>
HOW-HMCTS-ACALLISTER-LIEN-0002	<a href="http://bit.ly/1Tz8pms">http://bit.ly/1Tz8pms</a>
HOW-CEO-084-0001	<a href="http://bit.ly/1Tz8Ahq">http://bit.ly/1Tz8Ahq</a>
HOW-CEO-203-LIEN-0001	<a href="http://bit.ly/1TOnwes">http://bit.ly/1TOnwes</a>
HOW-C-ANTHISTLE-LIEN-0001	<a href="http://bit.ly/1Ok0h7Y">http://bit.ly/1Ok0h7Y</a>
HOW-CN-LIEN-0001	<a href="http://bit.ly/1OaNfVK">http://bit.ly/1OaNfVK</a>
HOW-CN-LIEN-0002	<a href="http://bit.ly/1s74rMf">http://bit.ly/1s74rMf</a>
HOW-FB-LIEN-0001	<a href="http://bit.ly/1rCxJBP">http://bit.ly/1rCxJBP</a>
HOW-FB-LIEN-0002	<a href="http://bit.ly/1TOnGmm">http://bit.ly/1TOnGmm</a>
HOW-JOHN WHITE-LIEN-0001	<a href="http://bit.ly/1WiFBVy">http://bit.ly/1WiFBVy</a>
HOW-LIEN- MRKN-0000001	<a href="http://bit.ly/21NKUwh">http://bit.ly/21NKUwh</a>
HOW-LIEN- MRWN-0000001	<a href="http://bit.ly/1SYkGok">http://bit.ly/1SYkGok</a>
HOW-LIEN- MRWN-0000002	<a href="http://bit.ly/1TOnR0W">http://bit.ly/1TOnR0W</a>
HOW-MRKM-LIEN-0001	<a href="http://bit.ly/1ZwhrF6">http://bit.ly/1ZwhrF6</a>
HOW-MSSW-LIEN-0001	<a href="http://bit.ly/1rCyz1r">http://bit.ly/1rCyz1r</a>
HOW-MSSW-LIEN-0002	<a href="http://bit.ly/1TzbKBU">http://bit.ly/1TzbKBU</a>
FC-Affidavit	<a href="http://bit.ly/2dmxMQf">http://bit.ly/2dmxMQf</a>
HOW-SR-LIEN-0001	<a href="http://bit.ly/1TxR5hW">http://bit.ly/1TxR5hW</a>
Chief Constable Simon Byrne-06-06-2016	<a href="http://bit.ly/2dmwQXK">http://bit.ly/2dmwQXK</a>
Chief Constable Simon Byrne-28-06-2016	<a href="http://bit.ly/2d49wi5">http://bit.ly/2d49wi5</a>
Cheshire Constabulary-03-02-2016	<a href="http://bit.ly/2azwlLg">http://bit.ly/2azwlLg</a>
Chief Constable Simon Byrne-28-06-2016	<a href="http://bit.ly/2aMUegc">http://bit.ly/2aMUegc</a>
Chief Constable Andrew J Cook SH-CC-28-09-2016	<a href="http://bit.ly/2cNNG0o">http://bit.ly/2cNNG0o</a>



## Council Information

So after not receiving anything in the mail since last year from a council I received a reminder notice that the rates have not been paid and that I should call to organize a payment plan.

Well I decided that a phone call was very much needed so I called and asked the woman on the other end if I could organize a meeting with the City of Greater Geelong as I have a letter of demand and I would like to settle the debt if it indeed exists.

I was asked by the woman who was it that I wanted to speak too and again I stated that I would like to speak to the City of Greater Geelong. The woman then asked if I would like to speak to the finance department and I then asked if the finance department was the City of Greater Geelong, she told me that the finance department represented the City of Greater Geelong.

I told her that I didn't want to speak to a representative that I need to speak to the City of Greater Geelong.

I then told her that I have received a letter signed by the City of Greater Geelong and that it is the City of Greater Geelong that I need to talk to as it is the City of Greater Geelong that have written and signed the letter.

After a lot of um's and r's the woman told me that there is no one called the City of Greater Geelong and that I would probably need to talk to the legal department.

So there you go, there is no one named "your council", it is the people inside the building that are making claims against you in the name of a fictional name on a piece of paper or building.

When was the last time you paid Mickey Mouse or Peter Pan just because Mickey Mouse or Peter Pan sent you a letter of demand?

Are you starting to get it yet, can you see the deception, there is NO SUCH THING as council or government for that matter, it is all in your head, it is just your imagination, nothing more than a presumption, you are getting letters from Mickey Mouse and Peter Pan and you still think that you have to pay them, it's very very simple folks, STOP PAYING Mickey Mouse and Peter Pan.



## Forced Entry into Your Home

Forced entry into your home. Rented or Private it doesn't matter.

No one under any conditions can force entry into your Home.

So let's keep this simple. Are you at War? No. Has there been a declaration of War? No.

So this is a civil matter.

No Force can be used in a Civil matter. That would be an Act of terrorism.

Can a utility Company force entry into your Home. NO. This is a civil matter.

This is a civil matter. NO force can be used in a civil matter. Anyone using force in a Civil Matter is a TERRORIST by default. The Police soon back away when you say this. They cannot use force in a Civil matter. You cannot be held in contempt of Court in a Civil matter. The Judge or Justice of the piece can go swivel. This is a civil matter and NO force can be used as it is an act of terrorism to do so.

It's that simple. Just keep your cool.

The Police cannot adjudicate either. The police cannot argue that the paper is real they cannot adjudicate. So if the Locksmith opens the door. You stand your ground and if the Monkey from the utility company pushes past you. Then THAT is the use of force which is a wilful and belligerent act of terrorism. At that Point the police officer has got to arrest and charge the utility company Monkey-boy.

The utility company never make a claim for breach of contract do they? Think about that. 64.2 million people do not have a valid contract with any of the utility companies. Keep thinking. This is a shitload of fraud country wide by every utility company. Gas, Electric, Water. An Englishman's Home is his castle and any use of force is an act of War.

So the piece of paper they are waving around with a claim under an Act.... IS the valid material evidence that there is NO VALID CONTRACT. The application In Court is vexatious and fraudulent claim. There is no Contract where the claim under the Act can be implemented. No One has a Contract with a utility company.

There was a Guy in Bolton His name was Paul Webster. He defended in court and the Judge threw the case out because the applicant cannot present a valid Claim or contract.

Is this getting big now? All the Utility Companies Guilty of fraud By default as there is no Valid Contract. WE would think That 350,000 Police officers and Gold Commanders would be interested in this FACT because they are getting screwed as well.

What about the Banks? Is that a civil matter? Yes.

Do the Banks ever make claim in court for Breach of Contract? No

You CANNOT be held in Contempt of Court in a Civil Matter. If they did then they would have to arrest you for Contempt of Court and that would be the use of force in a civil matter which would be an act of terrorism by default.

You CANNOT be held in contempt of Court in a Civil matter. The Court Judge would be guilty of an Act of terrorism by default.

Here is the cool part.

Listen very carefully.

The office of the police Cannot adjudicate. The role of the police is to use force... "Police FORCE" The Police have Jurisdictional Boundaries to comply with as well.

This is where it gets really exciting.

The office of the police FORCE is not only crime prevention but it is also to use FORCE to suppress a wilful and belligerent act of terrorism UNDER their Jurisdictional boundaries. That would include the office of the Judiciary. Any Government officer. Any Third party company by way of licence by HM Parliaments and Governments.

The office of the Police FORCE has full and unconditional discretionary powers to use FORCE where needed which falls under their Jurisdiction.

However we do not fall under their Jurisdiction. We are not on the public Parole. We are NOT members of the Public ON the public Payroll. We are in the Private at all times by this fact and the office of the Police FORCE Jurisdiction Does NOT extend into the private.

Knowledge is power. A civil Matter is a Civil matter. The County Court District Judge who grants a warrant for repossession to the Banks can go Swivel. You cannot be in contempt of court in a Civil Matter.



How many more times do I have to use the words...

CIVAL MATTER before the penny drops and the light goes on.

Yes I can here the screams. The Police are compartmentalised Brain dead. OK. I here you. So you draft this up. Ho Yes Copy and Past. Then email all the Chiefs of police. Job done. Now they are de-compartmentalised times a thousand times by email.

How simple is that?

Well if you don't. Then you deserve to get screwed over don't you.

Email:

andy.marsh@avonandsomerset.pnn.police.uk, jon.boutcher@bedfordshire.pnn.police.uk,  
paul.crowther@btp.pnn.police.uk, alec.wood@cambs.pnn.police.uk,  
simon.byrne@cheshire.pnn.police.uk, ian.dyson@cityoflondon.pnn.police.uk,  
iain.spittal@cleveland.pnn.police.uk, jerry.graham@cumbria.pnn.police.uk,  
acpo@derbyshire.pnn.police.uk, shaun.sawyer@devonandcornwall.pnn.police.uk,  
debbie.simpson@dorset.pnn.police.uk, michael.barton@durham.pnn.police.uk,  
simon.prince@dyfed-powys.pnn.police.uk, stephen.kavanagh@essex.pnn.police.uk,  
suzette.davenport@gloucestershire.pnn.police.uk, ian.hopkins@gmp.pnn.police.uk,  
gary.shewan@gmp.pnn.police.uk, jeff.farrar@gwent.pnn.police.uk,  
andy.marsh@hampshire.pnn.police.uk, andy.bliss@Herts.pnn.police.uk,  
justine.curran@humberside.pnn.police.uk, alan.pughsley@kent.pnn.police.uk,  
steve.finnigan@lancashire.pnn.police.uk, simon.cole@leicestershire.pnn.police.uk,  
neil.rhodes@lincs.pnn.police.uk, andrew.j.cooke@merseyside.pnn.police.uk,  
baileysr@norfolk.pnn.police.uk, mark.police@nthwales.pnn.police.uk,  
dave.jones@northyorkshire.pnn.police.uk, simon.edens@northants.pnn.police.uk,  
george.hamilton@psni.police.uk, steve.ashman@northumbria.pnn.police.uk,  
chris.eyre4011@nottinghamshire.pnn.police.uk, phil.gormley@scotland.pnn.police.uk,  
bernard.higgins@scotland.pnn.police.uk, peter.vaughan@south-wales.pnn.police.uk,  
david.crompton@southyorks.pnn.police.uk, jane.sawyers@staffordshire.pnn.police.uk,  
chiefofficer@jersey.pnn.police.uk, gareth.wilson@suffolk.pnn.police.uk,  
surreychiefconstable@surrey.pnn.police.uk, giles.york@sussex.pnn.police.uk,  
francis.habgood@thamesvalley.pnn.police.uk,  
martin.jelley@warwickshireandwestmercia.pnn.police.uk,  
anthony.bingham@westmercia.pnn.police.uk, david.thompson@west-midlands.pnn.police.uk,  
dee.collins@westyorkshire.pnn.police.uk, mike.veale@wiltshire.pnn.police.uk  
If you cant copy and past or use Email then find a good 10 year old Granddad.

[BACK](#)

## BAR GRIEVANCE

Ok brothers and sisters it is time to take the offensive and stop running from these lawyers who presume that they have some sort of authority over we the people. This "lady" is already at letter 3 of a lien but I thought I would add a bit of spice to her life.

Below is a letter that has been sent to the Qld Attorney General, Qld Law Reform Commission and Qld Legal Services Commission regarding a solicitor who assumes that I will bow down to her demands. Baron David Ward always says that these people shit down the pan just like the rest of us.

Shannon Fentiman  
Queensland Attorney General  
1 William Street  
Brisbane  
Queensland 4000

To Shannon Fentiman,

We are writing to Shannon Fentiman via registered Australia Post No RPP446370051003654403606 as the current Queensland Attorney-General and Minister for Justice, Women, and the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence.

We find ourselves the recipient of a threatening letter sent via Australia Post by Cherie Watt in the position of City Solicitor for City of Gold Coast Council.

Cherie Watt has stated in a letter sent by Australia Post (letter included in this bundle) on the 26th February 2021 to Peter Humm that Cherie Watt claims that she is the recipient of private emails and registered post as addressed to Dale Dickson in the position of Chief Executive Officer for the City of Gold Coast Council by private email and Rob Spresser in the position of Coordinator Receivables Management for the City of Gold Coast Council by private email and Nicole Highfield in the position of A/Coordinator Receivable Management Revenue Services for the Chief Executive Officer for the City of Gold Coast Council by registered Australia Post.

The presentable material evidence of the fact that Cherie Watt claims that she is the recipient of private emails and registered Australia Post shows that Cherie Watt in the position of City Solicitor for City of Gold Coast Council does not regard the laws and legislation of this country apply to her.

The very fact that Cherie Watt states that she is in possession of our private emails and registered Australia Post letters proves that Cherie Watt has confirmed that she has illegally obtained our private emails and registered Australia Post which is in direct contravention of the TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND POSTAL SERVICES (TRANSITIONAL PROVISIONS AND CONSEQUENTIAL AMENDMENTS) ACT 1989No. 63, 1989 - SECT 5

Where "85M states:

"85M. A person shall not, by a false pretence or false statement, obtain delivery or receipt of an article in the course of post that is not directed to the person.

Penalty: Imprisonment for 5 years. Wrongful delivery of postal article etc.

We note here also a maxim of law:

Culpa est immiscere se rei ad se non pertinenti –

"It is a fault for anyone to meddle in a matter not pertaining to him"

As Cherie Watt has confirmed in her correspondence via Australia Post that she has committed mail fraud as per current legislation then it is also a confirmed fact that Cherie Watt is in direct contravention of the LEGAL PROFESSION ACT 2007 SECTIONS 27, 46, 418, and 419.

Where section 27 states:

Professional discipline

(1) A contravention of this part by an Australian lawyer who is not an Australian legal practitioner is capable of constituting unsatisfactory professional conduct or professional misconduct.

(2) Nothing in this part affects any liability that a person who is an Australian lawyer but not an Australian legal practitioner may have under chapter 4 , and the person may be punished for an offence under this part as well as being dealt with under chapter 4 in relation to the same matter.

Where section 46 states:

Suitability to hold local practising certificate

(1) This section has effect for the purposes of section 51 and any other provision of this Act where the question of whether or not a person is a fit and proper person to hold, or to continue to hold, a local practising certificate is relevant.

(2) A regulatory authority of this jurisdiction, in considering whether a person is, or is no longer, a fit and proper person to hold a local practising certificate, may take into account any suitability matter relating to the person, and any of the following, whether happening before or after the commencement of this section—

(a) whether the person obtained an Australian practising certificate because of incorrect or misleading information;

(b) whether the person has contravened a condition of an Australian practising certificate held by the person;

(c) whether the person has contravened a relevant law or a corresponding law;

Where section 418 states:

Meaning of unsatisfactory professional conduct

"Unsatisfactory professional conduct" includes conduct of an Australian legal practitioner happening in connection with the practice of law that falls short of the standard of competence and diligence that a member of the public is entitled to expect of a reasonably competent Australian legal practitioner.

Where section 419 states:

Meaning of professional misconduct

"Professional misconduct" includes—

(a) unsatisfactory professional conduct of an Australian legal practitioner, if the conduct involves a substantial or consistent failure to reach or keep a reasonable standard of competence and diligence; and

(b) conduct of an Australian legal practitioner, whether happening in connection with the practice of law or happening otherwise than in connection with the practice of law that would, if established, justify a finding that the practitioner is not a fit and proper person to engage in legal practice.

(2) For finding that an Australian legal practitioner is not a fit and proper person to engage in legal practice as mentioned in subsection (1) , regard may be had to the suitability matters that would be considered if the practitioner were an applicant for admission to the legal profession under this Act or for the grant or renewal of a local practising certificate.

The content of the correspondence via Australia Post by Cherie Watt contains threats of legal action if we do not perform certain tasks and the fact that the correspondence via Australia Post contains threats contravenes the Crimes Act 1900 SECTION 32

Where section 32 states:

Demands accompanied by threats

(2) A person who—

(a) makes a demand of another person; or

(b) resists, prevents or hinders his or her lawful apprehension or detention, or that of another person; or

(c) prevents or hinders a police officer from lawfully investigating any act or matter that reasonably calls for investigation by the officer;

with a threat to endanger the health, safety or physical wellbeing of a person (other than the offender or an accomplice of the offender) is guilty of an offence punishable, on conviction, by imprisonment for 10 years.

It is our opinion that as Cherie Watt in the position of City Solicitor for City of Gold Coast Council has already confirmed via Australia Post on and for the record that she has willingly committed the most serious crimes of mail fraud and threats by mail and has contravened four sections of the LEGAL PROFESSION ACT 2007 as listed above, then it is the duty of Shannon Fentiman in the Office of Queensland Attorney-General and Minister for Justice, Women, and the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence to investigate the most serious confirmed crimes of Cherie Watt in the position of City Solicitor for City of Gold Coast Council.

We await your response in fourteen (14) days

Without ill will or vexation

For and on behalf of the Principle legal embodiment by the title MR PETER HUMM.

For and on behalf of the Attorney General of the House of Humm.

For and on behalf of Peter-joseph of the House of Humm.

No Assured Value. No Liability. No Errors and Omissions accepted.

All Rights Reserved



### **Court by Peter Humm**

The magistrate, lawyers and clerk of the courts must provide the evidence that a man or woman has been injured or harmed in some way or there has been a breach of contract, they must also provide evidence of an eyewitness with first-hand knowledge of this incident.

Without any of this evidence then there is no court case to start with as the court of record should have already been perfected with the men and women making claims from council in the first place.

The court has its own rules and one of those rules is that evidence can only be given by a witness with first-hand knowledge and a lawyer claiming to represent a fictional entity called council of whatever does not and can never have first-hand knowledge because the council cannot communicate with them in the first place. It's all a fiction, it's all make believe bullshit for the gullible people to consume.



## **NO CONTEST!**

MR DAVID WARD has no obligations and Liabilities under the 8 Million Acts and Statutes.

It's a Signed and Legal agreement and Declaration of NO CONTEST.

It's from the Government office.

SO if they want to Drag ANY OF US into their Police Stations or into their Courts and Glass Boxes all Day Long we don't give a shit.

We will rip the Magistrate or the Judge a New spleen and walk out.

Facts are facts at the end and the beginning of EVERY day.

OR They can TRY to throw us in Jail. Happy days.....

Then we will walk out the Jail with an Angry and Dangerous Malisha thousands Strong with the Legal Right to Lock and Load. .... NO CONTEST. ...

People still have not Grasped the full ramifications of that Signed and Legal declaration of NO CONTEST. ...

They are NOT A Government.... NO CONTEST.

They are genocidal psychopathic Terrorists... NO CONTEST..

They are Just a scumbag Company No Different to McDonalds... NO CONTEST...

The Judge is just a Company Janitor... NO CONTEST.

What the fuck do people want?

It just CANNOT get any better than this.

You can Commercially Back Charge them for Criminal FRAUD ... NO CONTEST...

You can Commercially Back Charge them for Malfeasance In the office... NO CONTEST..

You can Commercially Back Charge them for being wilful and Belligerent terrorists... NO CONTEST...

1725 Securitised Commercial Back Charged Commercial Liens for circa £31.95 BILLION... NO CONTEST.

When will people wake the fuck up? This is not Kindergarten or Playschool... NO CONTEST...

Baron David Ward would get a PHD with Honours if he did what he did at University. So the effing job is DONE.

Who do you need to tell this to today?

TELL THEM!



## Words/Language/Legalese

Look Guy's this is simple.

It is all about understanding the words. The words are English words it is not double Dutch. So let's look at some of the words.

**OBLIGATION:** There is only one kind of obligation. An obligation is something you have agreed to do. It is contract. Contract of employment. This is something that you have signed by picking up a pen and you have signed that agreement. You give your work in exchange for cash. The terms of your employment and what you do for that cash is in the terms and conditions. This is something that you have agreed to do in full knowledge and understanding. There is a formal document that is signed by both parties to this agreement. You know what this is. You read it and understand it. You signed that paper material evidence in fact. You can pick it up and read it whenever you like. Its real. It is tangible. You can touch it and read it. It is not a figment of your imagination. There can be no obligation without your formal agreement. Signed in wet ink. Without this formal agreement then there is not and cannot be any obligation. Anyone saying otherwise is committing fraud. OR they are a village idiot. I care not.

**LIABILITY:** There can only be a liability where you have failed in an obligation that you have agreed to in the contract. If you have failed in your agreed obligation by not turning up for work then the liability may be that you will not get paid. It will be in the terms and conditions that you have agreed to.

**CLAIM:** Generally it is only possible to make a claim where there is a formal contract. If someone is making a claim under a contract that does not exist where there is a claim that there is an Obligation or a liability. THEN the claimant is committing fraud.

1. Who is the claimant? What is their name?
2. Do they work for a company or government office?
3. What is their position in that office?
4. What is the company or office of government?
5. What is the claim?
6. Is there any foundation in fact to support this claim?

**FRAUD:** Is a criminal offence. It is a chargeable criminal offence. It is a criminal offence also which can incur a period of incarceration of seven to ten years and the latter where there is multiple instances off.

:

**CHARGEABLE:** What is a charge? This is the cash that you are going to charge them with an obligation to resolve. They have to send you the funds. Why do we use the words resolve instead of pay and funds instead of money. Look at the Bank of England Bank note. This is not a note for money. There is no money. There has been no money for 150 years. It is not backed by sterling silver or gold which is the money. It is a note based upon confidence and belief which is nothing. You cannot pay for anything without money. Take your £20 Note to the Bank of England and see if you can exit with 20 LBS in sterling silver. Good luck. You will be escorted from the bank under force for creating a disturbance of the piece. We do not use the words Pay or Money. That is fraud. This is your wake up call. Get a grip of the facts.

**Maxims of Law:** It is a Maxim that he who makes a claim carries the obligation to present the material evidence of that claim.

**READ THIS 50 TIME OVER.** Know what it means. If someone is making a claim then there had better be a contract in evidence otherwise they have formally agreed to be charged with fraud which is a chargeable criminal offence. NOW there is a contract as the claimant has made a claim which creates an obligation for the claimant and where there is an obligation then there is a contract. The

claim is a contract where there is no foundation in evidence and the claim is fraud. READ THIS AGAIN. And AGAIN.

Legal: There is paper evidence which is formally signed in wet ink and is an agreement between the parties of that formal agreement. WHERE there is no material evidence of this agreement in fact or reality THEN anything else is by default illegal and criminal. When did you sign this contract or agreement? Where is the evidence in fact?

ILLEGAL: = Fraud, Criminal,

Malfeasance: the fact of someone in a position of authority intentionally doing something dishonest or illegal: A Wilful intention to be a criminal. A Wilful intention to cause distress and alarm. A wilful and belligerent act of terrorism. No one walking this earth has any authority over another. They are just people who put their pants on one leg at a time and shit down the pan like anybody else. I will not use politically correct speech here. Politically correct speech sends people to sleep. A spade is a spade and it will be called a spade. They have no authority unless you have signed that formal agreement that they have. They are terrorists. THE END.

STATUTE: A Statute is a legislative rule given force of law by the consent of the governed..... There is a critical word here. "BY" that word "BY" creates a dependency that must be fulfilled. The dependency is that you have agreed to be governed and signed that consent in wet ink. Case in fact MR DAVID WARD Vee Warrington Borough council 30th Day of May 2013. Exhibit "B" in the affidavit. MR DAVID WARD has no liability under the Act (Traffic management Act 2004) WHY???? 64.2 million people have not formally agreed to be governed and signed that agreement to give their consent. FACT.... Get used to the facts. WE only use facts in evidence. The material evidence of the FACTS.

The Government have no authority over you. The Police have no authority over you. The Judges have no authority over you and that is a FACT. Not a belief or my or anybody else's opinion.

OFFICE: Paper shufflers. Useless people who suck the life out of you and call it TAX. It never puts any beans on the table.

Officer: Some one that works in a company office.

This is getting ridicules. These are all words in your native language called English. What the fuck!!!!. There is 40 files in the files tab at the top. Something done 40 times over is cast iron and watertight. 8 with Judges one Barrister and 11 Lawyers. Now get a grip. All you have to do is read them. Keep reading them. This is something I never had.



## **MONEY!!!!**

The foundation to all of the problems on this planet is money. Every problem comes back to "Money". FACT.

Cancer was cured in the 1930's. That is a FACT.

Cancer research is a multi-trillion business. That is also a FACT.

Cancer treatment is a multi trillion business. That is yet another FACT.

Every tiny aspect of your lives is decided for you. There is no escaping the FACT, and this the fifth fact in a mere five paragraphs.

But we shan't stop yet.

It's all about CONTROL Ladies and Gentlemen. And the key to that control is the FAKE money. Sorry, but guess what...This is a FACT.

Killing animals to extinction is also about money. FACT.

Take off the blinkers folks, or you are doomed to run around in a tight circle all life through.

Corporations (Governments) are RAPING our planet. Yes they are. That is a FACT.

So where do we start? What is it that Governments (Corporations) do not control?

WHO pays Big Pharma?

WHO gives Big Pharma a licence?

WHO pays and gives Monsanto a licence?

WHAT is the Control and WHAT is the key?

Well the Fake money is the control AND the key.

WHO funds all this? Well that would be the TAXPAYER. Here's that word again...FACT.

So WHO is the real scumbag here footing the Bill?

It is the spineless TAXPAYER.

This comes right to each of our front doors and to us directly. Each and every one of us.

You can scroll past this post, but there is no real escape from the effing FACTS!





## Baron David Ward

### Common Law

There is no such thing as common Law. No one has agreed and signed the agreement as to what common Law is. Common Law is a Brain washed Belief. Another Cabal conman trick of the mind. So for the very same reason that there is no valid material evidence that the 65 Million people in the UK and the 7 Billion people on the planet have never once signed the CONSENT.

Consent is a legal agreement. The evidence does not exist. So let's spin that around the way it really is. Common Law is a fiction of the mind with no substance in Fact. Common law by default is another fiction and fraud by default. It all comes down to the legal agreement which is signed and there is material evidence of that agreement.

Government do not exist and have no authority. So everything they do is criminal. Paying them is also criminal. So you stand for truth and FACTS. There is no common Law. This is why the common law people hate me. I take away their only lifeboat. But it's only a psychological lifeboat. There is no Lifeboat. But as long as you cling to that psychological lifeboat you are screwed because you are taking your Dominoes into a chess match with the chess Masters of deception.

The FACTS will always prevail. The FACTS is the Master chess set. The light saber pen.



## **Fear.**

Fear is the mind killer.  
Fear of the unknown.  
Fear of what you think might happen.

I read a Book many years ago by Dale Carnegie. "How to stop worrying and start living" It's a powerful read. If there is something that is worrying you then simply do everything you can so it can't happen but the Book is really all about fear.

The Fear of what might happen.

Fear is the mind Killer.

If you let fear control you then it is your own fear that controls your life.

Fear of what people MIGHT think.

People say that love concurs all. Like hell it does it is people fear that is destroying this planet.

So let's do a fear check list.

If you know something that nobody else knows on the planet and you know that this knowledge can destroy Governments then what do you do?? Knowing something that can destroy Governments can quite easily get you a bullet in the head or some other nasty end. It has happened many times before and there is plenty of records to read where this has already happened so what do you do?

Do you let the fear control you and do nothing?? After all that is the easy option Just Keep taking the Blue pill.

Just knowing what you know can get you a bullet in your head never mind doing anything with that knowledge. What do people think I was thinking when I was filling in the paperwork for the Traffic Tribunal case?? I can tell you exactly how that was sat at my computer. ... This case will never be heard at a Tribunal there will be a bullet in my head first OR may be some sort of fatal accident. This is Fear. This is how fear works.

Take the Blue pill just send the £35 it's the easy option. But if I am the only guy on the plane that knows what I know can I do nothing?? IS that an option? DO I let the fear control me? Fear is the mind killer. It's just Fear. When you are 70 feet up on an RSJ beam 4 inches wide what you don't do is let the fear control you. That 70 feet one step down onto concrete will defiantly kill you.

Fear is the mind killer.

I have lost count of the number of times the government scumbags should have put a bullet in my head for what I know and what I was doing with that knowledge but the simple fact is. It never happened. Once you loos that fear nothing can touch you. EVERY time I sat down to write up the next letter. The next part of a Lien there was that fear and nothing happened. I am still here.

In the last 6 years all I have seen is peoples fear. A thousand excuses for taking the Blue pill. I'm too busy, I don't have the time. It's too much work.

In 2015 I sent a devastating 65 page affidavit to 657 MP's. Well I was gutted when I didn't get a bullet in my head I had to carry on. WTF is wrong with these terrorist scumbags they have no spine. How simple would it be just to shut this guy up once and for all after all I had to wait 28 days before I could publish the fact!! What's wrong with these pencil necks do they not have a spine??

What?? Still no bullet in the head?? People have been thrown off the back of trains and been found in ditches with their thoughts cut, Poisoned. Locked up in Jail with no charges and no court case for decades for far less. Still no Bullet in the head?? What the fuck is wrong??  
Fear is the mind killer and that is all it is.

2015 I put the first Commercial Lien and security instrument for £20 Million. £20 Million against an officer of Government. Fraud, Malfeasance in the office, being a wilful and belligerent terrorist all written out in Black and white and published. Shurly that should have got me a bullet in the head?? After all they have full visibility of what I am doing well in advance this is a 6 week process. OMG £20 Million. This has got to get me a Bullet in the head.....

Case Law won. .... Silence ..... No bullet in the head.

Devastating 65 page affidavit on 657 MP's. .... Silence. ... No bullet in the head.  
£20 Million Commercial Lien against an executive officer of Government. ... Silence. ... No bullet in the head. WTF??

2017 there is up to 40 Commercial Liens for circa £1.95 Billion against Judges, Barrister's, Lawyers, Bailiff's and Government officers and still silence. ... No Bullet in the head. No made up crap putting me in Jail. ... No accidents. ... Nothing. .... Just silence. It's not like I haven't published everything on their favourite Spy Tool I did it all on Face Book?? Why am I still here??

Fear is the mind killer.

Fear of what you think might happen.

All I have seen in 6 years is other people's fears and people taking the Blue Pill. I'm too busy and excuses. Its too much work  
What are people scared off??

A Week ago I sent out a Blinder of an unstoppable business plan to 12 PPI Companies worth £Millions in commissions that will keep them busy for another 20 years. What response did I get??  
..... Silence. ... 12 PPI companies took the Blue Pill. Fear is the mind killer.

5 days ago. Tuesday the 24th I sent out a Business Plan worth £Billions to 10 Venture Capitalist Companies. We only need £30,000 and the rest is a walk in the park. It's all been tried and tested in advance. 40 Commercial Liens and Government backed security Instruments for £1.95 Billion with another Business Plan worth £4.5 Trillion included. Well you would think these vultures would be all over this like dog on heat. This is what they do.  
What response did I get?? ..... Silence. ... 10 Venture Capitalist Companies companies took the Blue Pill.

Fear is the mind killer.

It's only fear.



## Remedy

People are still saying there is no Remedy. Well the remedy is right here in the Files repository.

I am one man in 65 Million. One man in 7 Billion. One Man is but a wisper on the wind and he will be ignored.

One Million will be the Tornado. That cannot be ignored. There is Zero fails in the Files repository. Not one. It is cast Iron and nuclier Bomb Proof.

One man is still a wisper on the wind. 65 Million will rock the planet.

So how long is this going to take before some on else grows a spine?? There is no fail here and nothing to lose when there is no fail.

So where is the Remody?? Its right here. There is no other remody. Did you find one that works??

All the Freeman on the land, Common Law, Magnacarter cannot and have not got any results. The results are published rigt here in the files repository.

One man CANNOT Save the world bcause one man is but wisper on the wind.

So how many people do we need for the Tornado?? Im not talking people just reading these files like they are the Hammy Hampster and the Wooden tops Books.. These are not Hammy Hampster and the WoodenTops Books this is the real deal.

This is the indistuctabl foundation.

We can also do this by Email. Paperless. No one need take all the risks I did. There is 650 MP's and they all have published emails. 1% of the population is 65,000 people. Thats the Tornado. There is the Remody.

Then the Banks will cash them in These are securitised commercial instruments.

So its down to you. Every one here can Email. Every one here can type words. One Man CANNOT save the world. But 65,000 can.

What are you waiting for??



## Attorney at Law

How many people have the power of attorney at law in this country??

The answer may surprise you.

There are more than 67.5 million "Attorneys-at-law" in this country, which is pretty much everybody.

The only reason you don't know you are an attorney at law is because nobody ever told you.

Now why would anybody not want you to know you are an attorney at law?

Hmmm! Let me see now.

How could this be of an advantage to somebody else?

Well if you don't know something and somebody else does then they have an advantage over you. Knowledge is power.

The pen is mightier than the sword and it is the brain that drives the pen. So keeping you in the dark like a mushroom is advantageous to others and they can capitalise on this fact and... they DO.

So how would you know that you are an attorney at law?

Well it is simple....

If you engage a lawyer to represent you, you have given that lawyer the power of attorney to act on your behalf.

It is not possible to give somebody something you do not have.

So it would not be possible to give the lawyer power of attorney unless you had this to give in the first place.

THEREFORE: Everybody in the country has the power of attorney by default.

So you can quite legitimately add (after your signature) Attorney at Law. Or legal Attorney at law. This would put the shits up the MPs, DCC's and the Bailiff Companies et alia, because they are as dumb as a box of rocks.

We are all lawyers by default, with or without the qualifications.

So is that not just a cool piece of common sense reasoning or what?



## **Sovereign**

Every time I read that word Sovereign I cringe.

Its the Freeman On The Land buzz word.

Over used Over abused

A Buzz word for the village fools.

Regardless of what the word means is now irrelevant. It has been Commonised.

It was Commonised by the State Company Scumbags.

"Sovereign State".

A Monarch is a Sovereign SERVANT.

Its now a meaningless Mantra. This has actually been seeded to be so.

The same as all the Common Law and FMOTL Jibba Jabba.

The Word Sovereign instantly labels people an Idiot. The village fool. You are not a Sovereign. You are a Baron.

The scumbag Cabal hate this as well.

Only a Baron who Knows who they are would ever Use the word Baron.

Baron is a Word. Not Title.

And is the Highest Authority over any Monarch or Government.

It is why in 1215 the Barons did NOT lose their heads for High Treason.

Subverted to Title which is a company employee. No Different to Janitor.

Nothing has any authority over a Baron.

I have given you all the very tool to prove you are free.

Now it is up to you.



## Does this Work?

Im reading comment here that I just cant believe after 5 years.

Lets just say at this point I am very Pissed and I just might pull the fucking plug and say Fuck you all. Have a nice day and Kiss my arse.

Does this work? Wow what the fuck?? if this didnt work I would be in Jail and this group would not be here. Some people just cant get their head round that simple fact. Well if that you then fuck off and leave the group right now.

There is a files repository. The files repository is the gold mine now if people here just cant be bothered to read then why bother being here at all??

You can addup the thousands of people with their webcams on Youtube talkin Crap and the 10's of thousands of Freeman on the Land Common Law and Magna Carter idiots that have ZERO results. ZERO Nard FUCK all. Nothing. Not one other person on this planet has any results.

SO if the people here cant be arsed to read the FACTS which are all REAL LIFE. Whats the point?? Not Only whats the point? Only the people here Know this. The other 7 Billion people on the Planet wont know anything will they??

If the people here just cant be fucking arsed when this is the only place on the planet that has the difinitive FACTS that do work. Then this is beyond unforgivable. Beyond comprehension. Worse than pondlife. If people are really this stupid or just bone idel lazy then this planet WILL go to hell in a hambasket and it will be the people here doing nothing and to dam lazy and cant be botherd to read that are to blame.

So I am Pissed. Really pissed and given good reason to be pissed off right here. This is so way beyond the Red line I need the hubble telescope to find the red line.

This is NOT hard. Its NOT Complicated. A 65 year old Mike Watson got stuck in Having chosen the hard way which took longer and he is flying in 6 months. He will tell you himself he shoud have read the files first.

So whats it going to be?? let the world go to hell in a Ham basket?? Is that how it is?? Only the people here know. The other 7 Billion still dont have the first clue. How will they know. No one else on the planet has a plan.



## FAQ

**Q:** *What's the process of sending the Affidavit?*

**Peter:** Sending the affidavit with YOUR crest and seal gives them 28 days.

Sending David's or mine means you can start a lien in 48 hours and that is because they are already on the public record.

The affidavit with YOUR OWN crest and seal can be used the same way but only once it has become a public document by waiting the 28 days and then sending the public announcement and decree.

**Q:** *If the affidavit and liens work why are the people they're sent to still employed and working still?*

**Peter:** The reason is because the whole system is corrupt and the departments who are supposed to investigate these crimes are a part of the crime.

**Q:** *Do I post the Affidavit or email it?*

- You may do either. Emailing is a valid form of sending the affidavit and will be much kinder to your finances as sending registered mail can become expensive.

**Q:** *What if I send the Affidavit and the recipient doesn't read the email?*

- We have no control over what others do. As long as the email doesn't bounce back, then it can be considered delivered. We can't make them read an email anymore than we can make them open and read mail sent via post.

**Q:** *How does the Affidavit apply to me when it's David Ward's words?*

- David created the Affidavit through a legal process whereby he sought the agreement of the facts in the Affidavit from those he sent the Affidavit to (MPs) and then published it with a decree so that it is on the public record for all to view and use. The facts are on and for the record and therefore agreed to and as such, apply to all.
- We keep getting asked the same question again and again over and over again. This Affidavit is the 657 formal and legal agreement FOUNDATION in agreed fact.. THAT. .. The government are all, without exception, ALL Criminals. Outright criminal scumbags and terrorists. There is no escape. This Affidavit, as David told us, makes Judges shit their knickers. Remember this: NO, You don't have to change a damn thing. Use it exactly as it is. That's why it is made public with the Public cover declaration. 7 Billion people can use this. That's the advanced thinking 5 years ago when **Baron David Ward** made it Public.

– Adrian James

**Q:** *Can I get in trouble for sending the Affidavit?*

- As long as you haven't changed anything and have made no claims, then you can't get in trouble. The facts are already agreed to and on and for the record.

**Q:** *Do I need to write a covering letter?*

- You can write a covering letter and it can be as short or as long as you like. There are examples in the groups and [links](#) to them in this document.

**Q: How do I become a Baron/Baroness?**

- You can read a great explanation [here](#).

**Q: If all the acts and Statutes are in the bin, why are we using the Bills of Exchange Act, the Companies Act/Corporation Act and the Fraud Act?**

- Right lets clear up the reason why those 3 Acts and Statutes managed to survive when the 8 million went in the bin on the 29th May 2013. The Acts and Statutes are there, but it was always a question of obligation under those Acts and Statutes. David proved the blatant obvious but it was overlooked by everyone, past and present.

Without the consent of the governed then the rules have no enforceability. There is no contract with the governed. Not a single one.

To identify the fraud and the method in which they have been committing this fraud then David looked at the company policy itself.

Although it is agreed that the people are not members of the public, not on the public pay roll and therefore not obligated, the people acting in their capacity as (think of a profession...Mp Judge CEO of HMRC for example) they ARE obligated.

The Companies Act 2006 s44 Execution of documents (UK) and the Corporations Act 2001 (Australia).

This Act which is company policy explains how a document should be legally signed to be valid and compliant. 99.9% of documents are not signed. They mostly have fraudulent signatories. "The legal department" "Customer Services Team which is not a man or woman taking liability for what is said in the documents. A computer graphic is not a valid or acceptable signature either.

The Bills of Exchange Act gives further clarity on what rules of their own policy are being broken in order to commit the fraud.

Sometimes the answer seems long winded but the more you read the statement of facts the more you see what I mean.

Lastly the Fraud Act. Where a person may be guilty of an offence even if his or her conduct consisted of an omission rather an act.

They fail to tell you a lot. This much is obvious now your eyes are wide open. – Adrian James

**Q: Why didn't the Baron sign the Affidavit in wet ink?**

- You can read a great explanation on how to sign [here](#).



**Q: Why do we write 'We' instead of 'I'?**

- 'We' is used as it represents who we are writing on behalf of and is stated in the 'signature' -

For and on behalf of the Principal legal embodiment by the title of MR DAVID WARD

For and on behalf of the Attorney General of the House of WARD

For and on behalf of Baron David of the House of Ward

We have three strikes here for and on behalf of: For and on behalf of... means for something or someone.

The PRINCIPAL legal embodiment by the title of MR DAVID WARD means the highest it can be (principal), MR DAVID WARD.

This means any other MR DAVID, Mr David is within this category and is a servant in title.

The Attorney General of the House of WARD (note the capitals) is the highest of the high in State & Law & Ministerial terms of that House and (categories) as above is a servant in title.

The Baron David of the House of Ward is a natural born title as a natural born Baron from Adam has no master, he is the highest he can be in title.

Each three of these are for and on behalf of each other (three strikes) and yet it is from the House of Ward.

**Q: Do I need to send the whole Affidavit or just some of it?**

- The whole Affidavit! If you are sending an already published Affidavit, you send the whole document with the decree attached in front of the Affidavit – you don't change a thing.

**Q: I've sent the Affidavit to all the relevant people and I'm still getting letters. Why hasn't it worked?**

- This is what criminals do. Yes they are terrorists and they have a massive infrastructure to follow up with. This does get very ugly and brutal. This is what will happen when you don't pay the criminals. It's relentless because if they don't get your cash they will starve. It is their job to steal from you.

**BACK**

## The Lien

There is a Need to justify the amount in Millions, but it is still merely confidence and belief which is what all fiat currency is.

Confidence and Belief is a bucket full of nothing.

This is what David would say, as the following is a copied and pasted comment from this group...

Everything I have done predates me.

I have created nothing.

Affidavits. Liens, Maxims. Securitisation.

All of this predates me. I have created nothing New.

But I still have to Validate the Millions.

These scumbags will never be worth the Millions.

The Context of the Sins of the Father to the 7th Generation is Biblical. I never created that either.

But I can use it to justify my objective, because I didn't create it and it already exists in Biblical Law.

This is then a Securitised commercial Lien.

Because it is securitised it is Monitised Legal tender in your terms.

So it won't cost them a penny.

Or their Grand childrens Grand Children.

No harm caused. That's the Point and what it means.

This is a Mesh of legal concepts.

No one had securitised a Lien before. That dosen't mean you can't securitise a Lien, which is a commercial asset.

No one had used the Maxim. "He who makes a claim carries the Obligation to provide the Material substance of the Claim",,, Before to create a Debt and an agreed Debt so there can be a Lien From that Maxim.

No one has done that before.

But it can be done. No one thought of it.

I have meshed all this together. All the pre-existing Content and context. and that Meshing has never been done before. No one won this case before. No one has Served Affidavit on a government before.

It all predates me in Content. But it has never been meshed together like this before.

If I did this in Law University it would be an instant PHD with Honours.

Now this has been under the Microscope by the Best of the Best Judges and Barristers on the Planet.

If I screwed up I would have been in Jail 5 Years ago for a very long Time. They would have thrown away the Key.

But No one on the Planet has done this before like this



## **The Lien – Adrian James**

Of course there are figures involved, but ultimately a securitised lien is to establish what the facts of that matter at hand are.

When you read the securitised liens, you will notice the process.

Their claims are received by the victim.

There is a response given, carefully constructed so that there are no claims coming from the victim, but the victim identifies the claims, the obligations carried by the claimant, the affidavit is attached as the supporting evidence to the facts they shy away from.

7 days is given for clarity and candour in this legal and honourable procedure.

Then you will see a second correspondence sent by the victim after the seven days. This has a new paragraph added to the beginning but its basically the same correspondence sent again. Remaining honourable and again for clarity and candour another 7days is granted by the victim to the claimant to prove the claim.

And a third time with another 7 days. We can surely assume it's a busy task committing fraud all day so they get another 7days before an opportunity to resolve.

You are a victim. Victims get to decide the redress. This isn't a law or a statute but a fact. The victim chooses the redress.

None of these monsters have £15m to settle with each of us. Hence the lien is securitised on the named claimant in their position as...for whichever company it is.

This is why there is no objection. This is fully sanctioned by the state with now 1905 published and perfected cases on the record.

Forget the claims that banks create money out of thin air. We have heard this our whole lives through. There is no money. Never has been in our lifetimes. Money as we know it is commercial instruments.

A securitised lien is a commercial asset my friend.

The psychos will not have control of the asylum forever. A legal agreement is a legal agreement.

So the response is sent, 3 times over 21 days.

Opportunity to resolve on week 4 is where the formal charges are laid.

Remember they have had ample opportunity to bring forth any evidence whatsoever to counter the facts. It's impossible.

A fact would not be a fact if it were refutable. Thats why we never make claims which then make us obligated. The published affdavit with decree does all the talking. A collection of Exhibits and evidence that destroys all corporations claiming to be governments and every statute worldwide.

The charge of 5 million per fraudulent claim is a reflection of the seriousness of the fraud itself. And to be a deterrent, of sorts but this is the solution for them too, as it creates brand new legal tender.. commercial instruments.... that they can tax. And we just keep rolling with the redress.

Its just figures of no significance. There is no money. We are literally inside a game of monopoly.

Who says crime doesn't pay? Lol. This is OUR payday for THEIR wrongdoing. This was the destruction of the 807year lie by Baron David Ward and the way out for everyone on Earth.

As he said, he created nothing new. Liens. Securitisation. Affidavits. Courts of record. All pre-dated him. Its just nobody had done this before. Nobody was taught and nobody has been afforded the truth for obvious reasons.

If they default on your charges and fail to forward a commercial instrument to settle the DEBT at they have at this point legally agreed to, then week 5 a notice of default is issued. The case is final at this point but we allow seven further days to elapse before wrapping up all previous correspondence into one document wrapped up in an affidavit of truth (your declaration that all within is true and accurate and factual). You will see this is the first pages of a lien but is written at the conclusion of the process.

Everything is dated anyway so I'm sure you're keen to go read some and see for yourself. I would normally attach files here for you for ease but I'm on an ancient mobile phone and cannot do that.

There's a file in the files section with bit.ly links to the majority of cases. Not all cases published have had a bit ly link created yet, I'm months behind with that.

In addition to the process itself, the complete document should also contain notifications. Any media of your choice. County Records Office.

You never receive any resoinsse or acknowledgement because, hey ho, all in this together comes to mind.

Licensed by the state... slightly under the thumb despite the power of 67.5million people in this country alone.

Back to the notification list - for a lien to be perfected, it has to be published...put out there...

Well this is evidence of that action being fulfilled. Naturally keep records. A simple receipt for a stamp is enough. A screenshot of email sent if sending by email.





### **Peter-joseph talks about the Affidavit and Lien:**

Its about time people realize that only a living breathing man can make a claim of injury or loss on another wo/man.

It is NOT possible for a fictional entity (corporation) to make a claim, sign a letter or take you to court.

Indoctrination in a fraudulent system has hidden the truth and facts from us all but the truth and the facts are available in these groups for everyone to use. What are you all waiting for?

An affidavit is YOUR statement of truth and if/when unrebutted it stands as fact of the case against another man.

An affidavit CAN NOT be served on a corporation as a corporation is not a living entity that can answer for itself. A corporation has no mouth to communicate with you, it has no hands to sign a document with and it has no mind to consider matters.

It is a nothing, a figment of your imagination, a belief in authority, a massive presumption that the corporation exists.

You have to understand that when the council sends a rate notice it is NOT the council that has sent a rate notice, it is a man or woman working for the council that is responsible for the rate notice. If there is no name (there never will be) on the rate notice then you will write to the CEO of the council and notify them that a man or woman in the council has sent a notice with fraudulent claims and that it is the CEO's responsibility to rectify the record.

You must rebut every claim on the rate notice and let the CEO know that you require presentable material evidence of those claims.

This is the start of the commercial lien process.

A commercial lien is a non judicial, pre judicial judgement on a man making claims on you and an agreement to the facts in your affidavit.

It is non judicial and pre judicial as you do not need a court to have a judgement on another wo/man and that a wo/man can not then proceed to take you to court as he has already agreed to your affidavit and lien.

How can a wo/man that has already agreed to a non judicial judgement take you to court and claim that he has been injured?

It is not possible, it cannot happen.

So how can a solicitor that does not have first hand knowledge of a matter then make claims that a fictional entity has been injured?

Any solicitor making claims that a corporation has been injured must be sent a rebuttal of their claims and made aware that they have an obligation to provide evidence of their claims. This again will be the start of a commercial lien.

No magistrate, solicitor, lawyer or clerk of the courts have first hand knowledge of any matters that comes into their court and as such they CAN NOT testify to any facts in the matter at all and as you will already have commercial liens on the men and women in the council then there is no one left to take you to court.

There is no fear in prosecution when you know that you have won a case even before solicitors become involved.

By Peter Joseph



## **TAX TIME!**

So apparently its tax return time here in Australia and we need to know what income tax actually is.

The first question the tax office ask is what is your assessable taxable income.

Your answer will be nil, nada, zilch, nothing.

I know, I know, this can't be true.

Lets look at what assessable income is according to the Income Tax Assessment Act 1997.

An important thing to remember here is that ONLY those things after the word "includes" is what is included in the statement and to the exclusion of everything else.

The Income Tax Assessment Act 1997 sect 4.1 states who must pay income tax and provides the following statement:

Income Tax is payable by each individual and company, and by some other entities.

Note: The actual amount of income tax payable may be nil.

In an attempt to fully appreciate who indeed is liable for income tax we need to comprehend the definitions of the words used in the legislation.

The legislation itself provides the definitions to all words and the meaning to the underlined words above in sect 4.1 as provided by the legislation is as follows:

1 - "Income Tax" means income tax imposed by any of these:

(a) the Income Tax Act 1986

(b) the Income Tax (Diverted Income) Act 1981

(c) the Income Tax (Former Complying Superannuation Funds) Act 1994

(d) the Income Tax (Former Non-resident Superannuation Funds) Act 1994

(e) the Income Tax (Fund Contributions) Act 1989

2 - "Individual" means a natural person

3 - "Company" means:

(a) a body corporate or

(b) any other unincorporated association or body of persons

So with the definition of the words as provided by the legislation we are then able to determine that the word "person" has the same meaning as the word "individual" and the same meaning as the word "personal"

As stated in the legislation the word "person" and the word "personal" have the following meanings:

(a) "person" includes a partnership, a company and a person in the capacity of trustee of a trust estate.



(b) "person" includes a company

The final definition required for Sect 4.1 is for the word "entity"

We found the definition for the word entity in the Income Tax Assessment Act 1997 Sect 9.1.

Sect 9.1 of the act provides a table for the type of entity that is liable to pay income tax and the table provided the following two examples:

1 – An "individual"

2 – A company, that is

(a) a body corporate

(b) an unincorporated body (except a partnership)

So with full comprehension of the meaning of the words in the Income Tax Assessment Act 1997 Sect 4.1 we are able to determine that the following statements can be the only true facts.

The Income Tax Assessment Act 1997 Sect 4.1 is stating that income tax is payable by an "Individual" where the meaning of the word "Individual" is a "person".

A "person" includes a partnership, a company and a person in the capacity of trustee of a trust estate.

Income tax is also payable by other "entities" which are known as "individuals" and as we have already clearly pointed out, an "individual" is a "person" and a "person" is a "company"

Income Tax Assessment Act 1997 Sect 6.15 states what is not assessable income.

What is not assessable income.

(1) If an amount is not ordinary income and is not statutory income it is not assessable income (so you do not have to pay income tax on it).

(2) If an amount is exempt income it is not assessable income.

It is very clear and it cannot be mistaken by the statements in Sect 6.15 that if an assessable income amount is not ordinary income and is not statutory income and if an amount is exempt income then it is NOT an assessable income.

Income Tax Assessment Act 1997 Sect 6.5 states the following facts:

(1) Your assessable income includes income according to ordinary concepts, which is called ordinary income.

(2) If you are an Australian resident, your assessable income includes the ordinary income you derived directly or indirectly from all sources, whether in or out of Australia, during the income year.

Once again the definition of the words in the above statements, as provided by the legislation definitions is where we get the true facts about the two previous statements.

We find that there are two very important words in Sect 6.5 of the Income Tax Assessment Act 1997 and those are the words "Australian resident" and "Australia".

Once again the legislation itself provides the following definition for the words "Australian resident".

"Australian resident" means a "person" who is a resident of "Australia" for the purposes of the Income Tax Assessment Act 1936.

The definition of the word "Australia" can be found in the Income Tax Assessment Act Sect 960.505 and states the following:

Meaning of Australia

Territories

(1) "Australia", when used in a geographical sense, includes each of the following:

- (a) Norfolk Island;
- (b) the Coral Sea Territories;
- (c) the Territory of Ashmore and Cartier Islands;
- (d) the Territory of Christmas Island;
- (e) the Territory of Cocos (Keeling) Islands;
- (f) the Territory of Heard Island and the McDonald Islands.

So in summary of Sections 6.5 the only true factual statement that can be given using the definitions as provided by the legislation is the following;

An Australian resident is a person and as the definition as provided by the legislation states, a person is a company.

Section 960.505 states that when Australia is used in a geographical sense it includes only the islands and territories listed in a, b, c, d, e and f in the list above.

As Australia is indeed a land mass and cannot be known as anything other than a land mass we can determine that Australia can only be used in a geographical sense as per the definition provided in Sect 960.505 of the Income Tax Assessment Act 1936 and thus Australia can only be known as the following;

- (a) Norfolk Island;
- (b) the Coral Sea Territories;
- (c) the Territory of Ashmore and Cartier Islands;
- (d) the Territory of Christmas Island;
- (e) the Territory of Cocos (Keeling) Islands;
- (f) the Territory of Heard Island and the McDonald Islands.

When one fully comprehends the definitions of the words used in the legislation provided in the Income Tax Assessment Act 1997 it is very clear and can be of no doubt as to the facts to who is liable for income tax in Australia.

The ONLY entities or persons liable for income tax under the Income Tax Assessment Act 1997 would be a company with an assessable income derived from the list of islands and territories as listed in the Income Tax Assessment Act 1997 Sect 960.505.

So there you have it straight from the tax office, no man or woman in Australia has an assessable taxable income so the answer to the first question from the tax office is, I do not have an assessable income. To state anything else would be fraud as no one I know derives their primary income from Norfolk Island.

So why are you paying income tax in Australia?

[http://classic.austlii.edu.au/.../consol\\_act/itaa1997240/](http://classic.austlii.edu.au/.../consol_act/itaa1997240/)

Just follow the rules as set out by the tax office



## TAX

They claim....  
Think about it.  
They claim

We can also claim, but you don't know how, AND if you don't know HOW or what for you will never make a Claim. Now we have this first Hand from the HMR&C Office.

It is the HMR&C (That's the Tax man to you) Policy.... (Look 🤪🤪🤪 read the words when it says "Policy" - it is HMR&C LAW)

It is HMR&C Policy to return your Tax. ....

Have you got that? Let me type it again so you can read it TWICE .....

It is HMR&C Policy to return your Tax ....  
I never said PAYE Tax..... Read it again.

It is HMR&C Policy to return your Tax.....

That would be ALL the Tax you pay. With all the hidden and stealth tax you pay. Which the Accountants of the NOT Government have told us is minimum 85% and as high as 92% of our £Gross income in Tax, Duty, VAT.... Council Tax.

One more Time .... Just for the Shits and Giggles.

.... It is HMR&C Policy to return your Tax. ....  
Its called end of year SELF assessment. It's Self Assessment...  
SO you asses yourself for Tax.

DO you have any obligation OR formal agreement to pay Tax?  
No...funny that, nobody seems to be able to recall this agreement?  
We must all be experiencing severe memory loss, or is it more the FACT that.....  
You can self assess that you DO NOT have any Taxable income.

Taxable income = Zero.

How much Tax have you paid?? That would be 85% of your £Gross Income and  
.....it is HMR&C Policy to return your Tax.  
Now you can ask them and they will tell you that. It is HMR&C Policy to return your Tax.  
This is the very important bit. Write this down 20 times.  
DO NOT... Under ANY circumstance tell them your Bank details. They will close your Bank  
account so they cannot return the cash. You want a cheque.  
How do I know? Easy. They closed David Ward's Bank account. But then, He did make a Tax  
claim back to the day he was Born.. You can too.

ONE MORE TIME..

.....It is HMR&C Policy to return your Tax. .... Have you got that, folks?

One last time, because this FACT really turns me on....

.... It is HMR&C Policy to return your Tax. Ooooooh!

Have a lovely day, everyone 😊



## COURT by Adrian James

The man doesn't go to court. You send the paper. They cannot see or hear the man.

So you have a summons? This is the material evidence of claim you need to start a lien. There will never be a liability order. They are applying for an application for a liability order. The application will be granted but that's not a liability order. Never ever will there be a signed and legal liability order, for nobody in the judiciary of the private corporation has the legal authority to issue, award or sign such an order.

Adrian James "Certificate of live birth"

Yes this is the next revision of the Freeman on the Land Jibba Jabba. 12 months ago no one was using the words Certificate of live birth. The very words are an Oxymoron.

A Ship given a Birth in a Dock. You was BORN. The Ship can never be alive it is a "Thing".

The legal embodiment by an Act of registration with the company is not only a dead entity, It has NO Material substance to it at all. It is a Figment of the Mind. A Figment of the Mind Certified by a dead piece of Paper Certificate.

SO it is Like this: The dead company cannot see or hear the Living Man/Woman, only the dead make believe fiction. The dead make believe fiction can never be or have a Certificate of Live Birth.

Now here is the good Bit. What function would this have? A Certificate of LIVE Birth cannot be seen as it is a certificate for something which is dead claiming to be alive when the dead fiction Company cannot see it any way. Give us strength!

SO WHO or WHAT would you give the certificate of live birth to, and for what function would it have? This is how moronic people are. Well it sounds good lets do it. Bring out the Party poppers! It is complete bollocks so lets make ourselves look like complete idiots talking crap because it sounds good???

Now here is the REAL Big One..

Get ready.

It was the Dead Fiction MR DAVID WARD that won the case... OMFG. What? What the feck? 🤔🤔🤔

ALL the FMOTL Idiots saying that the Strawman is owned by the Crown/Government/State/Company have been talking complete Crap for two decades. MR DAVID WARD (Strawman/Fiction) has NO Liability under the 8 Million Acts and Statutes and the Company/State/Crown /Government do not own or have authority over MR DAVID WARD.

Replace MR DAVID WARD with your name. The Servants of the State/Company are LESS because they are servants of the Company. SO my MR ADRIAN JAMES (Strawman /Fiction) Is God Almighty in the world of Strawman/Fiction. ....

Certificate of Live Birth?

You are killing me Laughing at you.

The scum are pissing themselves laughing as well at the complete moronic stupidity.

Fiction/Strawman, FMOTL and Now Certificate of Live Birth. Moronic Crap comes from? Any

guesses? It is seeded directly FROM the NOT government for the village idiots to suck up and Parrot.

They just can't get enough distraction. Remember JUST one thing.. It was MR DAVID WARD that won the case. WHY OH WHY do you think that all of a sudden you need a certificate of Live Birth?

Here is the Answer.. MR DAVID WARD (Strawman/Fiction) Won the case 8 years ago and they need some new shit to throw in to make more smoke and Mirrors so that the (Strawman /Fiction) is now Alive... OMFG.

You first of all need to accept the facts. The court houses are not your courts.

It is theirs.

Walking in there is an action.

Whether through fear or defeat, or even not knowing what the agreed facts are. There are maxims and they are called maxims because they are maxims in fact.

That maxim is Actions, words and deeds. What you do can and will be held against you.

Walking in there will have consequences.

Not responding, the greed in which they operate will result in an unsigned and therefore illegal fail to identify driver charge.

They can only go so far, i have explained this a thousand times.... and the art of this process is **not making any claims whatsoever**. You always go after THEIR claims.

Where is the signed contract, arrangement or agreement, where Rights were granted and accepted?

WHO has any authority over another and in a position to grant those rights?

Stop making claims based on beliefs.

There is no evidence of any rights. We are all born free and equal and law is but a belief system. You carry no obligation to respond to the CHIEF CONSTABLE of whatever force it is. The speeding cases I've done for myself alone do go but my knowledge was tested repeatedly by the same court clerk at cardiff. Two cases and one withdrawn when he correctly withdrew a case. That is the honourable action to take. You don't have a right to remain silent. There is a fraudulent claim being made.

Every instance of fraud must be dealt with. To comply wilfully is complicity in that fraud, how is it not? Yes they proceed. Well thats the material evidence in your hand. UNSIGNED. No consent of the governed to give any validity or legality to acts and Statutes. The strawman won the case. OMG I know.

All the FMOTL village idiots stating that the registered all caps name is owned by the CROWN/CORP /Government have been parroting this crap for decades. The claim is govern/police by consent.

There is no evidence of that consent, therefore you are in the private and not liable.

This is from page 29 of the AGREED and PUBLISHED Affidavit of Truth and Statement of Fact. The ALL CAPS NAME is nothing to be afraid of. Nothing at all. It was created by an Act of Registration. That is all. I cannot agree that the cases they bring will just go away by not responding. AND more importantly, NOT responding is allowing the fraud to continue.

WHENEVER there is a fraudulent claim made, that fraud must be redressed. There is no consent of the governed. That's the most important factor for each and every one of us.

Their company policy, the Acts and Statutes (Which will never be referred to as Law from me) are only given FORCE of LAW by the consent of the governed. On the record, agreed FACT. Over the years, as I ignored their fraudulent claims, they proceeded. They dealt with it in my absence and money was taken from my wages. Of course none of that happens now.

Now I know what the last two years has taught me.

WE, all of us, have the power. We always did. And we always will, but it's not going to affirmed by inaction.

Which is still an Action.

Choosing to allow fraud to continue, and all the enslavement it clearly entails is not an option.

These fraudsters are not above you or have any authority over you.

Well now you need to express the FACT that you carry no obligations to fill in their paperwork. You are gambling by ignoring it. Don't get me wrong, they will proceed sometimes even with all the paperwork from you sorted. That's why it is important to go after the claimant straight away. You will then have an agreement. The court of record (The paperwork) is published and is the witness and the true court of your house. There can be no further action even in their offices come courts. The MPs are the weakest link, but every claimant of fraudulent claims that enters your life (CT, Gas/Elec/Water/Courts or whatever it is) needs the same action. By everyone. Right now in this moment in time. The towel was thrown in in 2008. Exhibit C the two company doctrine speeches prove this.



## A Reading of the Affidavit with Baron David Ward's words of Wisdom.

\* Click on the buttons to link to the audios.

A huge thank you to Mandy for her time and energy in reading the Affidavit. It is amazing to have Baron David Ward explaining sections of the Affidavit and also giving background to the information.

**David Summarises the Affidavit** - David talks about how the Affidavit originated.

**The Complete Reading of all the Sections**

### The Reading of the Affidavit in sections.

**The Decree** - The Decree makes the public declaration that the Affidavit has been agreed to for and on the record.

**The Affidavit** - The 'actual' Affidavit. 😊

**Exhibit A** - Formal Challenge to the Twelve Presumptions of Law.

**Exhibit B (1)** (1 of 2) - Case Authority (Exhibit B has two recordings, this being the first.)

**Exhibit B (2)** (2 of 2) - Case Authority (Exhibit B has two recordings, this being the second.)

**Exhibit C (1)** (1 of 3) - The Material Evidence of the FACTS

**Exhibit C (2)** (2 of 3) - The Material Evidence of the FACTS

**Exhibit C (3)** (3 of 3) - The Material Evidence of the FACTS

**Exhibit D and E** - Exhibit D - The Companies Act 2006 (Corporations Act 2001 for Australia)

Exhibit E - The Insanity of Tax

**Exhibit F** - No Body Gets Paid.


**Exhibit G and H** - Exhibit G - An Englishman's Home is his Castle.

Exhibit H - The Hypocrisy of the Secret Ballot Elective Process.

**BACK**

## The Affidavit





Ladies and Gentlemen it is our Duty and obligation and very great honour to make the following announcement and Decree

On this Day the 20<sup>th</sup> Day of August 2020

It is now confirmed Formally, on and for the Record as of this Day the 20<sup>th</sup> Day of August 2020 Agreed by the State and the Crown By way of un-rebutted Affidavit and statement of Fact and that there is a lasting tacit and binding agreement through Acquiescence and Royal Assent by Default.

That there has never been any such thing as LAW, but only the presumption of law, where a presumption is nothing of material substance and any presumption can be dismissed by a formal challenge.

It is now confirmed Formally, on and for the Record as of this Day the 20<sup>th</sup> Day of August 2020 Agreed by the State and the Crown By way of un-rebutted Affidavit and statement of Fact and that there is a lasting tacit and binding agreement through Acquiescence and Royal Assent by Default.

That Parliament does not reign supreme and that any notion of government has no legitimacy without the material evidence that the governed have given their consent and that there cannot be any Government for the one cannot exist in isolation without the other.

Also that any action taken by way of an Act or statute of Parliament is and always has been a criminal offence of FRAUD and Malfeasance in the office, at the very least.

It is now confirmed Formally, on and for the Record as of this Day the 20<sup>th</sup> Day of August 2020 Agreed by the State and the Crown By way of un-rebutted Affidavit and statement of Fact and that there is a lasting tacit and binding agreement through Acquiescence and Royal Assent by Default.

That the office of the Judiciary is nothing more than a sub office of a commercial body and the status and standing of any Judge or Magistrate currently on this land has no greater status or standing or authority than the Manager of McDonalds.

Also it is formally recognised on and for the record that the state is a legal embodiment by an act of registration which is of no material substance and therefore fraud by default and that the interests of the State are the interests of the State alone to the detriment of anybody and anything else including its own officers of the state.

That the actions of the State are now recognised as an unconscionable and criminal fraternity capable of heinous crimes, without measure.

It is now confirmed Formally, on and for the Record as of this Day the 20<sup>th</sup> Day of August 2020 Agreed by the State and the Crown By way of un-rebutted Affidavit and statement of Fact and that there is a lasting tacit and binding agreement through Acquiescence and Royal Assent by Default.


That any and all executable Orders and Documents must carry an affixed common seal which denotes point of origin and that any and all excitable Orders and Documents must be signed by human hand and in wet ink by a named authoritative living being who takes full responsibility for the content of that formal excitable Order or document.

Any deviation from this standing process where there is no affixed common seal or signature in wet ink by a living hand with the authority to do so will be recognised in perpetuity as a criminal offence.

It is now confirmed Formally, on and for the Record as of this Day the 20<sup>th</sup> Day of August 2020 Agreed by the State and the Crown By way of un-rebutted Affidavit and statement of Fact and that there is a lasting tacit and binding agreement through Acquiescence and Royal Assent by Default. That all imposed Taxation and Duty is and always has been not only a criminal offence but is also detrimental to all the people of this planet.







That from this day forward and as of the 20th Day of August 2020 and in perpetuity the enforcement of all Taxation and duty is a recognised Act of Terrorism.

It is now confirmed Formally, on and for the Record as of this Day the 20<sup>th</sup> Day of August 2020 Agreed by the State and the Crown By way of un-rebutted Affidavit and statement of Fact and that there is a lasting tacit and binding agreement through Acquiescence and Royal Assent by Default.

That there is no such thing as money or commerce.

Nobody gets paid or has been paid.

No Body has the capability to Pay anybody or for anything or Item without Money.

All commercial instruments are nothing more than pieces of paper with marks on them.

That there value is only confidence and belief where confidence and Belief is recognised as being of no material substance.

The continued use of these commercial instruments is for the feeble of mind who insist on living in a make believe world of their own making.

Capitalism will forever be recognised and in perpetuity as the exploitation of another for personal gain.

This has always been an unconscionable and detrimental activity to the human race since Babylonian times.

It is now confirmed Formally, on and for the Record as of this Day the 20th Day of August 2020 Agreed by the State and the Crown By way of un-rebutted Affidavit and statement of Fact and that there is a lasting tacit and binding agreement through Acquiescence and Royal Assent by Default.

There is no greater Sanctuary than the human home, be this home a castle or a wood hut or a blanket on the ground.

From this day forward as of the 20th Day of August 2020 let it be known that any transgression of this sanctuary other than by invitation, that any transgression of this Sanctuary is a recognised Act of War and aggression.

We have the right by the very fact that we live to protect our life and the life of our loved ones.

Any transgression of this Sanctuary can be met with equal or great force with impunity.

This is the long standing law and traditions of this land. So say we all.

It is now confirmed Formally, on and for the Record as of this Day the 20th Day of August 2020 Agreed by the State and the Crown By way of un-rebutted Affidavit and statement of Fact and that there is a lasting tacit and binding agreement through Acquiescence and Royal Assent by Default.

That the practice of election by way of a secret ballot is, and always has been, an abomination and deception with no credibility, or redeeming qualities.

By the very fact that this is a SECRET Ballot by any means of notarisation or recording renders the outcome obsolete by definition that is a secret Ballot.

By the very fact that there is not a recognised un-elective or reverse process of election and by the very fact that there is no such word to this effect in the recognised dictionaries.

Then this elective process by way of secret ballot is and always has been void ab initio.

Have a nice day.

On and for the record.

Bring out the town crier and let the Bell ring.

Let it be known across this planet, that from this day the 20th Day of August 2020 that the satanic Roman Empire is no more.

Let it be by Decreed that this is the day and will always be the day in perpetuity when the days of austerity and tyranny end for all time to come.

Let this day go down in history across this planet as a day of celebration for all time.

So say we all.

**Let the celebrations begin.  
So say we all.**

No Assured Value. No Liability. No Errors and Omissions Accepted. All Rights Reserved.






## Affidavit of Truth and Statement of Fact.

1. I, Peter-joseph of the House of Humm (being the undersigned) do solemnly swear, declare and depose....
2. That I am competent to state the matters herein, and do take oath and swear that the matters herein are true, certain and correct as contained within this Peter-joseph of the House of Humm Affidavit of Truth and Fact.
3. I am herein stating the truth, the whole truth & nothing but the truth; and these truths stand as fact until another can provide the material and physical evidence to the contrary.
4. That I fully and completely understand, before any charges can be brought, it must be firstly proved, by presenting the material evidence to support the facts that the charges are valid and have substance that can be shown to have material physical substance as a foundation in fact.
5. From: Exhibit (A). —Formal challenge to the twelve presumptions of law: A presumption is something that is presumed to be true and as a presumption then there is only a need for a formal challenge to that presumption to dismiss that presumption until the physical and material evidence can be presented to support that presumption.
6. From: Exhibit (B). — Case Authority WI-05257F|| David Ward V Warrington Borough Council, 30thDay of May 2013. Which is a case at court tribunal undertaken by recognised due process, it is clear in the case that David Ward did not challenge the PCN or the traffic Management Act 2004 section 82. But what was challenged was the presumption of the consent of the governed. What is a mandatory requirement before the Acts and statutes can be legally acted upon is that the consent of the governed has some validity and that it can be presented as material fact before any charges can be brought. It is clear from this case authority undertaken by due process that: -(1) It is illegal to act upon any of the Acts or statutes without the consent of the governed where the governed have actually given their consent and that consent is presentable as material physical evidence of the fact that the governed have given their consent. (2) Where the Acts and statutes are acted upon then this is illegal and a criminal action by the State. (3) The criminal action is Malfeasance in a public office and fraud. (4) Were there is no consent of the governed on and for the public record then there is not governed and where there is no governed then there is no government. The one cannot exist without the other. (5) As this criminal activity is observed to be standard practice and has been for nearly 800 years, then this is clear observable evidence to the fact that LAW is a presumption and there is no such thing as LAW. See Exhibit (A) the twelve presumptions of law.

From: Exhibit (C). —The Material evidence of the FACTS|| It has been confirmed by the Rt. Hon. Lord Chief Justice Sir Jack Beatson FBA, on and for the record that:-(1) Whilst there is no material and physical evidence to the fact that the governed have given their consent. Then the office of the Judiciary has no greater authority than the local manager of McDonalds. As the office of the Judiciary is a sub office of a legal embodiment by an act of registration. Where this act of registration creates nothing of physical material substance and is also fraud by default. Any objection to this observation of fact should be taken up with the Rt. Hon. Lord |Chief Justice Sir Jack Beatson FBA, Where the Rt. Hon. Lord Chief Justice Sir Jack Beatson FBA would then have to present the material and physical evidence that the governed have given their consent. As the office of the Judiciary is nothing more than a private commercial and fraudulent enterprise built upon fraud and criminal intent. This is by no stretch of the imagination a valid government by the people for the people as it is by default a private company providing a judicial service for profit and gain but where there is also and always a conflict of interests where there is a conflict of interests between the needs of the people and the state (Company) Policy which has no obligation to the people or even the needs and wellbeing company staff. This has been confirmed by Chandran Kukathas of the London School of Economics and state office titled the Department of Government. See Exhibit (C) The Material evidence of the FACTS.





7. From: Exhibit (D). It is quite clear that there is due process for the execution of legal and commercial documents. Where these processes are not followed then the very presence of a document which does not comply with these processes then the document it's self is physical and material evidence of Malfeasance in a public office and fraud.
8. From: Exhibit (E). It is very clear that all instances of Taxation and Duty, VAT is not only not necessary but only serves to deplete and subtract from the populations prosperity. Not only this but as we have shown it is also illegal and criminal to do so without the agreement or the consent of the governed. It is unconscionable and a recognised act of terrorism. The Exhibit speaks for its self.
9. From: Exhibit (F). The Facts are the Facts. There is no money. The facts are the Facts. A great number of people live their lives in a world of make believe. Let us consider this. Two barristers or lawyers will and do enter into a court room and one of them will lose. For some reason which is beyond our comprehension it is a professionally accepted practice to have a 50% failure rate. In a world of reality there are some people who service the planes at the local airport between flights. If these people had a 50% failure rate then 50% of the planes would fall out of the sky. THAT IS A FACT. There is no money, just the illusion of money. There is legal tender and fiscal currency and commercial instruments and promissory Bank notes, but there is no money. It is quite clear that a lot of people live in a world of make believe and Alice in wonderland and La La Land. There is no money. It is not possible to pay for anything without money. You never paid for anything and you never got paid. That is a fact.
10. There is no valid, legal or lawful government on this land. See Exhibit (H) The Hypocrisy of the Secret Ballet Elective Process.
11. From: Exhibit (G). My rights end where your rights begin. Your rights end where my rights begin. Rights are not granted by government or the crown and they cannot be taken away or violated by government or the crown. A Judge does not have the right to trespass on my property so the judge cannot give a Bailiff or a civil enforcement officer or a policeman the right by means of a warrant or an order because the Judge, who is a company servant by default, does not have that authority unless I agree. A public servant is a servant by default with the status of servant and a servant has no authority above the one who grants that authority. Until the Judge can present the agreement or the consent of the governed then the Judge has no authority to grant a warrant or a court order. Exhibit Case Authority WI-05257F. (David Ward V Warrington Borough Council. 30thday of May 2013). Also Exhibit (C) The Material evidence of the FACTS. These are the facts. The material evidence of these facts has been provided.
12. This Affidavit of Truth and statement of Fact stands on and for the record as FACT until some other can present the material physical evidence to the contrary which is valid.

Without ill will, or vexation.

For and on behalf of the Principal legal embodiment by the title of Mr. Peter Humm.  
For and on behalf of the Attorney General of the House of Humm.  
For and on behalf of Peter-joseph of the House of Humm.

No Assured Value. No liability. No errors and omissions accepted.  
All Rights Reserved.






## **Exhibit (A)**

# **Formal challenge to the twelve presumptions of law**

**19th Day of January 2015**





## Formal challenge to the twelve presumptions of law

Definition of presumption: <http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/presumption>

1. An idea that is taken to be true on the basis of probability:

As a presumption, is a presumption on which must be agreed by the parties, to be true.

THEN and EQUALLY

If one party challenges the presumption to be true on the basis of probability. Then this is all that is recognised to be required to remove the presumption is a formal challenge to that presumption. The presumption then has no standing or merit in FACT.

A probability: [http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/american\\_english/probability](http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/american_english/probability)

1. The extent to which something is probable; the likelihood of something happening or being the case:

By definition then this is not substantive as it is only a probability of what may be and therefore has no substance in material FACT.

A **State 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. 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, Agent and Agency, Incompetence, and Guilt:*

- (i) *The Presumption of **Public Record*** is that any matter brought before a state Court 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;

We, the undersigned formally challenge the *Presumption of Public Record* as it is by definition a presumption by definition and has no standing or merit in presentable or material fact

- (ii) *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;

We, the undersigned formally challenge the *Presumption of Public Service* as it is by definition a presumption, by definition and has no standing or merit in presentable or material fact.





- (iii) 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 recues themselves as having a conflict of interest and cannot possibly stand under a public oath;

We, the undersigned formally challenge the *Presumption of Public Oath* as it is by definition a presumption, by definition and has no standing or merit in presentable or material fact.

- (iv) 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;

We, the undersigned formally challenge the *Presumption of Immunity* as it is by definition a presumption, by definition and has no standing or merit in presentable or material fact.

- (v) The *Presumption of Summons* is that by custom a summons un-rebutted 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;

We, the undersigned formally challenge the *Presumption of Summons* as it is by definition a Presumption, by definition and has no standing or merit in presentable or material fact.


- (vi) The *Presumption of Custody* is that by custom a summons or warrant for arrest un-rebutted stands and therefore one who attends Court is presumed to be a thing and therefore liable to be detained in custody by "Custodians". 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;

We, the undersigned formally challenge the *Presumption of Custody* as it is by definition a Presumption, by definition and has no standing or merit in presentable or material fact.

- (vii) 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);

We, , the undersigned formally challenge the *Presumption of Guardians* as it is by definition a presumption, by definition and has no standing or merit in presentable or material fact.





- (viii) 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";

We, the undersigned formally challenge the *Presumption of Trustees* as it is by definition a Presumption, by definition, and has no standing or merit in presentable or material fact.

- (ix) The *Presumption of Government acting in two roles as Executor and Beneficiary* is that for the matter at hand, the Private Bar Guild appoints the judge/magistrate in the capacity of Executor while the Prosecutor acts in the capacity of Beneficiary of the trust for the current matter. If the accused 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 to demonstrate you are both the true general guardian and general executor of the matter (trust) before the court, questioning and challenging whether the judge or magistrate is seeking to act as Executor De Son Tort, the presumption stands and you are by default the trustee, therefore must obey the rules of the executor (judge/magistrate) or you are an Executor De Son Tort and a judge or magistrate of the private Bar guild may seek to assistance of bailiffs or sheriffs to assert their false claim against you;

We, the undersigned formally challenge the *Presumption of Government acting in two roles as Executor and Beneficiary* as it is by definition a presumption, by definition and has no standing or merit in presentable or material fact.

- (x) The *Presumption of Agent and Agency* is the presumption that under contract law you have expressed and granted authority to the Judge and Magistrate through the statement of such words as "recognize, understand" or "comprehend" and therefore agree to be bound to a contract. Therefore, unless all presumptions of agent appointment are rebutted through the use of such formal rejections as "I do not recognize you", to remove all implied or expressed appointment of the judge, prosecutor or clerk as agents, the presumption stands and you agree to be contractually bound to perform at the direction of the judge or magistrate;

We, the undersigned formally challenge the *Presumption of Agent and Agency* as it is by definition a presumption and has no standing or merit in presentable or material fact.

- (xi) 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;

We, the undersigned formally challenge the *Presumption of Incompetence* as it is by definition a presumption and has no standing or merit in presentable or material fact.





(xii) 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.

We, the undersigned formally challenge the *Presumption of **Guilt*** as it is by definition a presumption and has no standing or merit in presentable or material fact.

We formally challenge all presumptions of law and as we have formally challenged all the twelve presumptions of law then the presumption of law formally has no substance in material FACT. We will recognise the rule of law, when and only when there is the material evidence of that assumed rule of law has some material evidence of substance in presentable material fact.

Until then, the search for the rule of law that has some credibility in material fact: continues.

It is done.


Without ill will or vexation.

For and on behalf of the principal legal embodiment by the title of Mr Peter Humm  
For and on behalf of the attorney general of the House of Humm  
For and on behalf of Peter-joseph of the House of Humm

No Assured Value. No liability. No errors and omissions accepted.  
All Rights Reserved.







# **Exhibit (B)**

## **Case Authority**

**Case No WI 05257F**

**David Ward  
And  
Warrington Borough Council  
Date: 30<sup>th</sup> Day of May 2013**



## Case Overview

What the Government would like people to believe is that a procedural impropriety is an acceptable mistake which can be overlooked. But what this is a deliberate act of fraud and also malfeasance in a public office.

These are very serious crimes with criminal intent.

Fraud is a deliberate action to defraud where the victim of the crime is unaware having no knowledge of a situation or fact. This crime carries a penalty of 7 to 10 years incarceration and there latter, where there is multiple instances of. 63.5 million People are subject to this crime everyday as it is now commonplace and is carried out by the largest and most ruthless criminal company in this country.

This same company is also a public office with the enforcement to execute this crime which is inclusive of but not limited to:- The office of the police, The office of the Judiciary, Local government and central government; Independent Bailiff Companies which are licensed by the same company.

Malfeasance, Misfeasance and Nonfeasance is also a very severe crime with a period of incarceration of life in prison. Malfeasance is a deliberate act, with criminal intent to defraud. Ignorance is no defence. Malfeasance has been defined by appellate courts in other jurisdictions as a wrongful act which the actor has no legal right to do; as an act for which there is no authority or warrant of law; as an act which a person ought not to do; as an act which is wholly wrongful and unlawful; as that which an officer has no authority to do and is positively wrong or unlawful; and as the unjust performance of some act which the party performing it has no legal right.

Crimes of this nature cannot go unpunished. If crime goes unpunished then the criminal will undertake the action again and again. When the criminal is rewarded for the crime by their peers and superiors it then becomes difficult to know that a crime has been committed in the first place. However, it is everyone's obligation to be fully conversant with their actions, and the consequences of their actions in every situation.

"I was just following orders" Or "I was just doing my Job" Is no excuse.

When the full extent of these crimes is realised, it then becomes blatantly obvious that these crimes are deliberate and in full knowledge if not by the lower subordinates but defiantly by the executive officers of the company. The cost of these crimes has been estimated to be in the region of £4,037.25 Trillion over the past 35 years. This is the cost to the people of this small country which is far in excess by many times the global GDP.

The simplicity of this case is very often overlooked as it involves a simple PCN. (Penalty Charge Notice)

It is important to note here that the appellant at tribunal did not challenge the PCN, or the Traffic Management Act. But the appellant took out the very foundation to any claim made under any Act or statute of Parliament. All of which have the same legal dependency which has never been fulfilled in 800 years.

There are in excess of 8 million Act's and statutes. None of which can be acted upon without the legal authority to do so.

To act upon these same Act's/Statutes without the legal authority to do so is Malfeasance in a public office and fraud at the very least. This case which was undertaken at tribunal and therefore recognized due process confirms this to be the facts of the matter.

## Case details.

This may be a simple PCN (Penalty Charge Notice) but close observation of the details will conclusively show otherwise.

This is the PCN (Penalty Charge Notice) issued by Warrington Borough Council which clearly shows that a claim is being made under the traffic management Act 2004. There is clearly no disclosure to the fact that there is no liability to pay as the outcome will show.

IT IS AN OFFENCE FOR AN UNAUTHORISED PERSON TO REMOVE OR INTERFERE WITH THIS NOTICE

**PENALTY CHARGE NOTICE**


**Warrington**  
Borough Council

The Traffic Management Act 2004 s.78; Civil Enforcement of Parking Contraventions (England) General Regulations 2007; Civil Enforcement of Parking Contraventions (England) Representations and Appeals Regulations 2007.

Penalty Charge Notice Number: W101185088  
Served On: 05/03/2013  
Date of Contravention: 05/03/2013  
Time: 10:57

The Vehicle with the Registration Number: WM51GJZ  
Make: Fiat Colour: Purple  
Road Fund Licence Number: 17524329  
Road Fund Licence Expiry Date: 0213

Was observed between 10:56 and 10:57  
In: Cairn Street (NW 30min)

By Civil Enforcement Officer: D64  
Signature/Initials: 

Who had reasonable cause to believe that the following parking contravention had occurred:

40 Parked in a designated disabled persons parking place without displaying a valid disabled persons badge in the prescribed manner

A penalty charge of £70 is now payable and must be paid not later than the last day of the period of 28 days beginning with the date on which this Penalty Charge Notice was served.  
The penalty charge will be reduced by a discount of 50% to £35.00 if it is paid not later than the last day of the period of 14 days beginning with the date on which this Penalty Charge Notice was served.


PLEASE BE AWARE THAT PAYMENT CLOSES THE CASE  
Payment instructions are printed on the reverse of this notice.  
A photograph may have been taken of this parking contravention. For payment instructions see overleaf.

**DO NOT PAY THE CIVIL ENFORCEMENT OFFICER**

Notice Number: W101185088  
Date: 05/03/2013  
Time: 10:57

40 Parked in a designated disabled persons parking place without displaying a valid disabled persons badge in the prescribed manner

The Penalty Charge of £70 or £35.00 if paid not later than the last day of the 14 day period beginning with the date on which this PCN was served.



Please detach this slip and return with postal payments to the address shown overleaf.

**INSTRUCTIONS FOR PAYMENT**

- **By Telephone** Credit / Debit card payments only. Automated payment line 0845 452 4545 (24 hours a day / 7 days a week) Have your vehicle details and PCN Number ready.
- **Online** at [www.warrington.gov.uk](http://www.warrington.gov.uk) follow links from internet payments, then car parking fine.
- **By Post** using the payment slip below to: Warrington Borough Council, Enquiries and Payment Office, Level 6, Market Multi Storey Car Park, Academy Way, Warrington WA1 2HN. Payment may be made by crossed cheque or postal order. Please write the **PCN Number** and your address on the reverse of the cheque/postal order.
- **In Person** at The Enquiries and Payments Office, Warrington Borough Council, Enquiries and Payment Office, Level 6, Market Multi Storey Car Park, Academy Way, Warrington WA1 2HN. Mon to Fri 10am - 4pm (excluding Bank Holidays).

PLEASE BE AWARE THAT PAYMENT CLOSES THE CASE

**If you believe that the Penalty should not be paid and wish to challenge this PCN**

- Write to Warrington Borough Council, Enquiries and Payment Office, Level 6, Market Multi Storey Car Park, Academy Way, Warrington WA1 2HN or
- E-mail at [np.warrington@apcoa.com](mailto:np.warrington@apcoa.com)  
If you are unable to write or e-mail, or have any other enquiry, please telephone **0844 800 8540** Mon to Fri 10am - 4pm

Please quote the PCN Number, the vehicle registration and your address in all contacts.

Details of the Council's policy and approach to challenges can be found at [www.warrington.gov.uk](http://www.warrington.gov.uk) or seen at the Council's offices - all cases will be considered on their individual circumstances.

If you challenge this PCN within 14 days of the PCN's service date and the challenge is rejected the council will re-offer the 14 day discount period.

**If the Penalty Charge is not paid or challenged**  
If the Penalty Charge is not paid on or before the end of the 28 day period as specified on the front of this notice or successfully challenged the Council may serve a Notice to Owner (NtO) on the owner of the vehicle requiring payment of the Penalty Charge. The owner can then make representations to the Council and may appeal to an independent adjudicator if those representations are rejected. The NtO will contain instructions for doing this. If you challenge this PCN but the Council issues a NtO anyway, the owner must follow the instructions on the NtO.

Further information about Civil Parking Enforcement (including PCNs and NtOs) is available online at [www.parcet-wk.info](http://www.parcet-wk.info).

Detach here

please complete your details before returning this slip with your payment.

**PAYMENT SLIP**

TICK BOX FOR RECEIPT   
Please enclose a stamped addressed envelope if you need a receipt.

Name (Mr/Mrs/Miss/Ms): .....

Address: .....

Postcode: ..... Date: .....

Make cheques and postal orders payable to Warrington Borough Council and write the PCN Number on the reverse.

LN 00000012

The next document and physical evidence is the notice to owner from the same Warrington Borough Council which also quite clearly makes the claim that there has been a violation of the Traffic Management Act 2004 section 82, on the 08 April 2013.

# Notice to Owner

**WARRINGTON**  
Borough Council



Traffic Management Act 2004, s82; Civil Enforcement of Parking Contraventions (England) General Regulations 2007; Civil Enforcement of Parking Contraventions (England) Representations and Appeals Regulations 2007

Mr David Ward  
145 Slater Street  
Warrington  
WA4 1DW

**WI01185069**

This Notice to Owner has been issued to you by Warrington Borough Council because the Penalty Charge Notice has not been paid in full and you are the registered owner/keeper/hirer on the date on which the Penalty Charge Notice was served to the vehicle.

Date of this Notice to Owner and date of posting	08/04/2013		
To:	Mr David Ward		
This Notice to Owner has been served on you because it appears to Warrington Borough Council that you are the owner of			
Vehicle Registration Number	WM51GJZ	Make	FIAT
Tax Disc	17524329	Expiry	0213
In respect of Penalty Charge Notice (PCN) Number	WI01185069	Served on	05/03/2013
By Civil Enforcement Officer (CEO)	WI084		
who had reason to believe that the following contravention had occurred and that a penalty charge was payable.	40 Parked in a designated disabled persons parking place without displaying a valid disabled persons badge in the prescribed manner		
Location of contravention	Cairo Street (MW 30min)		
Date of Contravention	05/03/2013	Time	10:57:04

Penalty Charge Amount:	<b>£70</b>		
Amount Paid to Date:	<b>£0</b>	Payment Due Now	<b>£70</b>

Note: The person appearing to be in charge of the vehicle was served with a Penalty Charge Notice (PCN) which allowed 14 days for payment of a 50% discounted penalty charge; otherwise the full penalty charge became due. Either no payment has been received or any payment received has been insufficient to clear the penalty charge.

A penalty charge of **£70** is now payable by you as the owner and must be paid no later than the last day of the period of 28 days beginning with the date on which this Notice is served. This Notice will be taken to have been served on the second working day after the day of posting (as shown above) unless you can show that it was not.

**YOU THE OWNER/KEEPER/HIRER ARE LIABLE FOR THE PENALTY CHARGE NOTICE – DO NOT IGNORE THIS NOTICE OR PASS IT TO THE DRIVER**

You may make representations to Warrington Borough Council as to why this penalty charge should not be paid. These Representations should be made not later than the last day of the period of 28 days beginning on the date on which this Notice is served and any representations made outside that period may be disregarded.

Note: If you do not pay the penalty charge or make Representations before the period specified above, the penalty charge will increase by 50% to **£105** and a Charge Certificate will be served on you. **If you do not pay the full amount shown on the Charge Certificate, Warrington Borough Council may register it as a debt at the County Court and then put the case in the hands of the bailiffs who will add their own costs to the penalty charge.**

## Payment Slip

**WI01185069**

Penalty Charge Notice: WI01185069  
Vehicle Registration Number: WM51GJZ  
Date of Contravention: 05/03/2013  
Payment Amount Due: £70

For payment options please see overleaf

You must complete this slip in BLOCK CAPITALS and return it to the address below:

Warrington Borough Council, Enquiries & Payments Office, Level 6, Market Multi Storey Car Park, Academy Way, Warrington, WA1 2HN

Along with the opportunity to make representation as to why there is no liability.

<h1>Representations</h1>	<b>WARRINGTON</b> Borough Council 
Traffic Management Act 2004, s82: Civil Enforcement of Parking Contraventions (England) General Regulations 2007; Civil Enforcement of Parking Contraventions (England) Representations and Appeals Regulations 2007	
<b>WI01 185069</b>	Penalty Charge Notice: WI01185069 Vehicle Registration Number: WM51GJZ Date Of Contravention: 05/03/2013
If you believe that the penalty charge should not be paid you may make Representations to Warrington Borough Council. Representations must be made in writing and you may use this form.	
<b>How to Make Representations</b> The Traffic Management Act 2004 sets out grounds (see below) on which you may make Representations. Representations must be made in writing within the period of 28 days beginning with the date of service of this Notice, the date of service will be taken to have been 2 working days after the day of posting. Any Representations made after this date may be disregarded. If your Representation is successful a Notice of Acceptance will be issued and the penalty charge cancelled. If your Representation is unsuccessful a Notice of Rejection will be issued to you and you must either pay the penalty charge in full or appeal to an Adjudicator, who will independently consider your Appeal. An Appeal form will be included with the Notice of Rejection, which you should complete and send to the adjudicator at the address shown on the form. Details of the appeals procedure will be sent with the Notice of Rejection.	
<b>Section One: Grounds for Representations.</b> Please tick the grounds on which you are making representations. <b>I am not liable to pay the penalty charge because:</b>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>The alleged contravention did not occur.</b> In Section 3, explain why you believe no contravention took place.	
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>I was never the owner of the vehicle in question/or</b> Please complete section 2.	
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>I had ceased to be its owner before the date on which the alleged contravention occurred/or</b> Please complete section 2.	
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>I became its owner after the date on which the alleged contravention occurred.</b> Please complete section 2.	
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>The vehicle had been permitted to remain at rest in the place in question by a person who was in control of the vehicle without the consent of the owner.</b> Supply proof such as a police crime report number, police station address or insurance claim in Section 3.	
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>We are a vehicle hire firm and the vehicle was on hire under a hiring agreement and the hirer had signed a statement acknowledging liability for any PCN issued during the hiring period.</b> Please supply a copy of the signed hire agreement including the name and address of hirer. Please complete Section 4.	
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>The penalty charge exceeded the amount applicable in the circumstances of the case.</b> That is, you have been asked to pay more than you are legally liable to pay. Please complete Section 3.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>There has been a procedural impropriety by the enforcement authority.</b> Please complete Section 3 stating why you believe the authority has acted improperly or in breach of regulations.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>The Order which is alleged to have been contravened in relation to the vehicle concerned is invalid.</b> You believe the parking restriction in question was invalid or illegal. Please complete Section 3.	
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>This Notice should not have been served because the penalty charge had already been paid.</b>	
If none of the grounds above apply but you believe there are mitigating circumstances please complete Section 3.	

We would also point out at this point that this is an unsigned NOTICE and not a legal document. The mitigating circumstances are that there has been a procedural impropriety, which is clearly an option as this is clearly stated on the notice to owner. So it is apparent that there is a procedural impropriety in place and this is known by Warrington Borough Council otherwise this option would not be a part of the Notice to owner. We also took the opportunity to utilise a second option which confirms there is a procedural impropriety and that the order which is alleged to have been contravened in relation to the vehicle is invalid. Why else would these possibilities be on this notice to owner if there was not a procedural impropriety. We also took the opportunity to complete section 3 of the notice to owner to clarify the procedural impropriety on a separate piece of paper as advocated by Warrington Borough Council as there was not enough space on the notice to owner provided. These presentations were as follows:-

# Notice to Warrington Borough Council

145 Slater Street  
Latchford  
Warrington  
WA4 1DW  
16th of April 2013

Warrington Borough Council,  
Enquiries & Payments Office  
Level 6  
Market Multi Story Car Park  
Academy Way  
Warrington  
WA1 2H

## Notice of opportunity to withdraw

**NOTICE TO AGENT IS NOTICE TO PRINCIPAL AND NOTICE TO PRINCIPAL IS NOTICE TO AGENT  
DO NOT IGNORE THIS LETTER. IGNORING THIS LETTER WILL HAVE LEGAL CONSEQUENCES**

Your Reference: WI01185069

Dear Sirs

We do not know who to name as the recipient of this communication as the sender failed in his/her duty of care and did not sign the document sent to Mr David Ward at his address. The action of not signing the document sent to Mr David Ward legally means that no living person has taken legal responsibility for the content of the document on behalf of Warrington Borough Council and the document cannot be legally responded to. That very act of not signing the document renders the document void and therefore none legal and unusable in law under current legislation. **Strike one.** Deliberate Deception.

This Document will now be kept on file as physical presentable evidence, as it represent the criminal activities of the representatives of Warrington Borough Council whether they are aware of this transgression or not. Ignorance of the law is no defence and all of the representatives of Warrington Borough Council are now culpable under the current legislation because one individual failed to sign the document. This is a fact which must be understood. **Strike two.** Ignorance of current legislation.

The second big mistake on the document is that the document is a notice to owner. Under current legislation the owner of any motorised vehicle is the DVLA Swansea SA99 1BA, this means that some imbecile at Warrington Borough Council has sent a notice to owner to the registered keeper and not the official owner. **Strike three.** Document sent to the wrong address. We have not progressed beyond the first line yet and we are falling around on the floor in a state of hysteria at the competence levels demonstrated by the representatives of Warrington Borough Council. Mr David Ward is the official registered keeper not the owner.

The very next line refers to the Traffic Management Act 2004. Now this is where things get really interesting because the Act referred to is an act of HM Parliament and governments PLC, a recognised corporation or an all for profit business. An Act which is not law in the UK, it is not even referred to as law as it is an Act of a corporation or an all for profit business, or policy, but it is not a law. **Strike four.** Displays lack of understanding and competence regarding what is the difference between law and legislation.

Act's and statutes of HM Parliament and governments **PLC** can only be given force of law by the consent of the governed which have agreed to those Act's and statutes of HM Parliament and governments PLC. There for there is a mandatory legal requirement under current legislation that the governed must have given their consent legally which can be physically presented as fact before the Act's and statutes of HM Parliament and governments PLC can be given force of law.

Not Law, Not enforceable. Sixty three and a half million people in the UK have not legally entered into those agreements in full knowledge and understanding and of their own free will, which must be kept on the public record for the Act's and statutes of HM Parliament and governments PLC to be given an action which involves force. Or force of law. The answers to the questions are in the understanding of the words used to implement acts of force. Or Law.

The next item we come to is a demand for payment. A demand for payment without a signed Bill is a direct contravention of the Bills of Exchange Act 1882. **Strike Five**. The Bills of exchange act of 1882 is based upon a pre existing commercial contract or agreement. See Bills of exchange act of 1882.

<http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/Vict/45-46/61>.

Profiteering through deception is an act of fraud. **Strike six**. See Fraud Act 2006.

<http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2006/35/contents>. Insisting or demanding payment without a pre-existing commercial arrangement which is based on presentable fact in the form of a commercial agreement is an act of deception. Payment is a commercial activity.

## You have been served LEGAL NOTICE

Mr David ward has no recognisable legal means to respond to a demand for payment without a signed bill which is based upon a pre existing commercial contract or arrangement or agreement, because there is no standing commercial contract or arrangement or agreement between Mr David Ward and Warrington Borough Council. If Mr David Ward was to willingly comply with the demand for payment without a commercially recognised bill, then Mr David Ward would have knowingly given consent and conspired to a commercially fraudulent action. This in turn would make Mr David Ward culpable under current regulation for that action. Mr David Ward will not knowingly create that liability against himself or create that culpability.

The very presentation of the document that we are responding to from Warrington Borough Council, which is also a document that will be kept on file for future presentation as physical evidence, which is presentable physical evidence and a list of transgressions against the currently held legislation.

This same document supplied by Warrington Borough Council recognises that there may be, or has been a procedural impropriety by the enforcement authority. This is the only saving grace on this document which allows for an honourable withdrawal, of the proceedings implemented illegally by the enforcement authority.

This document is representation as to the procedural impropriety by the enforcement authority and as stated at the outset of the document, gives an [opportunity to withdraw](#) due to the procedural impropriety by the enforcement authority. This process is also a matter of complying with current legislation, without which Mr David Ward would be unsuccessful if he were to pursue legal proceeding against the enforcement authority and or the members of Warrington Borough Council.

As the opportunity to withdraw has now been presented to the enforcement authority and the members of Warrington Borough Council under a procedural impropriety by the enforcement authority. Should the above mentioned not take the opportunity to make an honourable withdrawal and confirm such in writing to Mr David Ward, then Mr David Ward will be left with no other option in the future but to start legal proceedings against the enforcement authority and the members of Warrington Borough Council.

The content of this document will be in the public domain in the next few days as there is no agreement in place which is legally binding with which to prevent this. We don't expect to be hearing from the enforcement authority and or the members of Warrington Borough Council again unless it is in the form of a written confirmation of withdrawal of proceedings. No further correspondence will be entered into regarding this matter.

WITHOUT PREJUDICE, i.e. all natural and Unalienable Rights Reserved

For and on behalf of David Ward

Mr David Ward reserves the right to use force to defend himself, his family and his family home, which he has an unalienable right to do so. Response to this notice should be forwarded within 10 days of receipt of this notice to the postal address known as,

145 Slater Street, Latchford, Warrington WA4 1DW

**No assured value, No liability. No Errors & Omissions Accepted. All Rights Reserved.**

**WITHOUT RECOURSE – NON-ASSUMPSIT**

## **You have been served LEGAL NOTICE**

Warrington Borough council decided at this point not to recognise the representation given or the requirement for Warrington Borough council to present the legal and presentable "Consent of the governed" Which is mandatory for Warrington Borough council to have the correct legal authority before acting under the Act's and statutes of parliament.

It is also important to note that Warrington Borough council did not at this point contest the presentations made.





Mr David Ward  
145 Slater Street  
Warrington  
WA4 1DW

David Boyer  
Assistant Director  
Transportation, Engineering and Operations

Parking Services Unit  
Enquiries & Payment Office  
Level 6, Market Multi-Storey Car Park  
Academy Way  
Warrington  
WA1 2HN

Interim Chief Executive  
Professor Steven Broomhead  
[www.warrington.gov.uk](http://www.warrington.gov.uk)  
If you have difficulty making contact  
please dial 0844 800 8540  
Apcoa, working in partnership with  
Warrington Borough Council

23/04/2013



Dear Mr Ward,

**Re : Notice of Rejection of Representations**

Traffic Management Act 2004 - s78; Civil Enforcement of Parking Contraventions  
(England) General Regulations 2007; Civil Enforcement of Parking Contraventions  
(England) Representations and Appeals Regulations 2007.

**PCN No** : W101185069  
**Date Issued** : 05/03/2013 10:57:04  
**Location of Contravention** : Cairo Street (MW 30min)

Your representations against the above Penalty Charge Notice have been carefully considered in the light of the circumstances at the time and in accordance with the Traffic Management Act 2004. Grounds for cancellation of the charge have not been established and this letter is the formal Notice of 'Rejection of Representations'.

The reasons for rejection are:

*of what?*

Your vehicle was parked in a designated disabled persons parking place without displaying a valid disabled persons badge in the prescribed manner.

Unfortunately, you cannot park in a Disabled Bay unless you are clearly displaying a valid Disabled Blue Badge. The Traffic Information Sign on Cairo Street (adjacent to your vehicle) clearly states:-

"Disabled badge holders only,

Mon – Sat,

8am – 6.30pm",

and, on the road (adjacent to your vehicle) there is a white 'bay' marking with the word "DISABLED".

There is no effective contest to the presentations made. So the presentations made stand as fact.

Also at this point Warrington Borough council invited Mr D Ward to take Warrington Borough council to tribunal and the outcome would be legal and binding on both parties. So we took advantage of this generous offer and we also included Page 9 of 14 copies of all documents up to this point as physical evidence. This was the same process as before. Along with same presentations sent to Warrington Borough council. Along with a letter to the adjudicator as follows:

---

Dear Adjudicator

Please forgive the informality as we have not been made aware of the name of the adjudicator.

This is in response to Warrington Borough Council's decision to reject our challenge against the PCN. Clearly the PCN has been challenged by Mr David Ward, but that challenge has not been rebutted by Warrington Borough Council, as Warrington Borough Council have only repeated the grounds under which the PCN was raised. Copy under same cover, which is highlighted. Also a PCN is a penalty charge Notice and as such a notice of a penalty charge. A recognisable Bill has not been raised and presented to Mr David Ward complete with a wet ink signature.

As the presentations made by Mr David Ward were not addressed, then the challenge made by Mr David Ward still stands and the PCN is not valid or enforceable.

Warrington Borough Council has made a demand for payment, but has not presented Mr David Ward with a Bill which is recognised under the Bills of exchange act of 1882. (*Which also must have a signature in wet ink?*) Warrington Borough Council cannot raise a Bill because there is no commercial arrangement in place between Warrington Borough Council and Mr David Ward under which to raise a Bill.

For Mr David Ward to respond by paying without a bill signed in wet ink, then that would be a direct violation of the Bills of Exchange Act of 1882. In addition to this, as there is no commercial arrangement and Bill presented, this would also be a contravention of the fraud act of 2006. Mr David Ward is not in the habit of knowingly conspiring to fraud. This action would also create a liability against Mr David Ward.

Warrington Borough has also listed in their "Rejection of Representations" the Traffic Management Act 2004 – s78 in support of their claim. The Acts and Statutes of HM Parliaments and Governments PLC can only be given force of law by the consent of the governed. What is mandatory in the first instance is the consent of the governed which is also presentable as fact. As the consent of the governed is not presentable as fact, then the Acts and Statutes of HM Parliaments and Governments PLC cannot be acted upon in any way which would cause loss to the governed. What is mandatory in this instance is the presentable agreements of sixty three and a half million governed to be in place before an Act or Statute can be acted upon. We fail to see how this is in support of the PCN presented to Mr David Ward.

We fail to see how listing the Traffic Management Act 2004 – s78 supports the claims made by Warrington Borough Council in any way other than to create obfuscation in an attempt to confuse the mind.

There are no agreements in place between the 22000 residents of the Warrington Borough and Warrington Borough Council, which can be presented as fact complete with signatures in wet ink, which can be presented to support the claim of Warrington Borough Council in support of a demand for payment. Without violating the Bill's of exchange Act of 1882 and the fraud act of 2006 section 2 Fraud by false representation see:

<http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2006/35/section/2>. And section 4 part 2

A person may be regarded as having abused his position even though his conduct consisted of an omission rather than an act. See:

<http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2006/35/section/4>. An omission in the form of an omitted signature would constitute an act of fraud under section 4 section 2 of the fraud act of 2006.

So let us summarise regarding the grounds for appeal with reference to the form provided for appeal.

- **(A) The alleged contravention did not occur.** No contravention has occurred, because there are no agreements between the 220,000 members of the Warrington Borough and Warrington Borough Council, which can be legally presented as fact in support of the alleged contravention.
- **(C) There has been a procedural impropriety by the council.** The council did not respond to the challenge made by Mr David Ward in a manner which would make any sense or would constitute a rebuttal to the challenge. Warrington Borough Council are advocating to Mr David Ward in their demand for payment without a bill presented, a direct contravention of the Bill's of exchange Act 1882 and the Fraud Act 2006.

- **(D) The traffic Order which is alleged to have been contravened in relation to the vehicle concerned is invalid.** The traffic order (*that's a new approach, can't find a listing for that.*) is illegal because there is no agreement between the parties which is legally presentable as fact and signed in wet ink. You have got to love that word legal, legally blind, legal consent.

All presentable as fact complete with a signature in wet ink, and without the signature in wet ink on a legal document in the form of an agreement, then it is not legal or is illegal and therefore not lawful. You have to love the word legal.

Need we continue? It is obvious at this point that there is no body at Warrington Borough Council that is capable of understanding the challenge made by Mr David Ward, or capable of responding therefore an Adjudicator becomes necessary.

There is only one outcome to this tribunal, where the adjudicator is a recognised lawyer and is independent of the council.

- A challenge has been made and has not been effectively rebutted by Warrington Borough Council.
- The action of demanding payment without the presentation of a lawful legal Bill which is subject to The Bills of Exchange Act of 1882 and signed in wet ink cannot be responded to in the manner expected by Warrington Borough Council, without a second transgression against the fraud act of 2006.
- Regardless of the policies or legislation of Warrington Borough Council or HM Parliaments and Governments PLC, any commercial activity would constitute an act of fraud without the commercial agreements in place beforehand.
- The continued activates where demands for payment are made without observing the bills of exchange act 1882 and a recognised bill is presented complete with wet ink signature is a continued procedural impropriety by the council and the members of Warrington Borough Council are culpable in law for their actions.

There can only be one outcome to this tribunal which is acceptable under current legislation and that outcome will be found in favour of the appellant Mr David Ward and not in favour of continued transgressions against current legislation by Warrington Borough Council.

In the document provided outlining procedure to make presentations in this tribunal process, there is a section concerning Costs in favour of the appellant, where a party has behaved wholly unreasonable.

We have taken a considerable amount of time and energy responding to Warrington Borough Council when making representation and in preparation for this tribunal. It is not without reason that a consideration could be expected. This would also serve to enforce the decision made by the adjudicator in this tribunal. If the adjudicator is truly an independent and an honourable individual then a consideration is in order.

**Mr David Ward also notes that as this Tribunal is informal then it is also recognised as not legally binding regardless of the findings of the Adjudicator.**

We would also like a response in writing from the adjudicator to relay the outcome of this tribunal conveying the reasons for the adjudicator's decisions.

For and on behalf of Mr David Ward

WITHOUT PREJUDICE, i.e. all natural and Unalienable Rights Reserved

Mr David Ward reserves the right to use force to defend himself, his family and his family home, which is his unalienable right to do so.

**No assured value, No liability. Errors & Omissions Accepted. All Rights Reserved.  
WITHOUT RECOURSE – NON-ASSUMPSIT**

There are addition changes in international law that the adjudicator may not be aware of at this time. Please consider the following which also has some bearing on this tribunal.

The results from the tribunal are as follows. Decision Cover Letter (Appellant) 1249270-1.pdf



**Mr David Ward**  
**145 Slater Street**  
**Latchford**  
**Warrington**  
**Cheshire WA4 1DW**

Case Number: **WI 05257F**

Vehicle Registration: **WM51GJZ**

Direct Dial: **01625 44 55 84**

**30 May 2013**

Dear Mr Ward,

**David Ward v Warrington Borough Council**  
**WI01185069**

Enclosed you will find the Adjudicator's Decision. A copy has been sent to the Council.

The Adjudicator's Decision is final and binding on both you and the Council.

The attached notes explain the consequences of the Decision, but must be read subject to any specific directions given by the Adjudicator.

If payment is required, please send payment to the Council, not to the Traffic Penalty Tribunal.

Yours sincerely

*Kerry Conway*

Clearly this is a tribunal and as such recognised due process which is legal and binding on both Parties. In addition to this there was the adjudicator's decision.



Case Number **WI 05257F**

## **Adjudicator's Decision**

David Ward  
and  
Warrington Borough Council

**Penalty Charge Notice      WI01185069      £70.00**

**Appeal allowed on the ground that the Council does not contest the appeal.**

### **Reasons**

The PCN was issued on 5 March 2013 at 10:57 to vehicle WM51GJZ in Cairo Street for being parked in a designated disabled person's parking place without clearly displaying a valid disabled person's badge.

The council has decided not to contest this appeal. The adjudicator has therefore directed that the appeal is allowed without consideration of any evidence or the merits of the case.

The appellant is not liable to pay the outstanding penalty charge.

**The Proper Officer on behalf of the Adjudicator**

**30 May 2013**

*“Appeal allowed on the ground that the council does not contest the appeal” “The council has decided not to contest this appeal”*

Warrington Borough Council cannot contest the appeal. There is a mandatory requirement for Warrington Borough council to present as physical evidence and factual foundation for the claim, which is the legally signed on and for the public record “Consent of the Governed” This is the legal authority that Warrington Borough council would have to present as physical evidence and foundation for their claim, for the claim to have any legal substance in presentable fact.

He who makes the claim must also provide the foundation and the physical proof of that claim otherwise the moon could be made from cream cheese just because Warrington Borough council claim this is so.


Without this physical evidence then the claim is fraudulent. Hence a crime is committed by Warrington Borough council and that crime is fraud not a procedural impropriety or a mistake. Also, there is a second crime. This second crime is Malfeasance in a public office. A clear and intended action to extort funds where there is no legal authority to do so.

*“The adjudicator has therefore directed that the appeal is allowed without consideration of any evidence or the merits of the case”*

Clearly there are merits of the case which have been presented here.

The appellant is not liable to pay. Case No WI 05257F Dated 30th day of May 2013.

There is also confirmation of this fact from Warrington Borough council and signed in wet ink by an officer of the state  
Scott Clarke Dated 29th of May 2013.

Notice that Appeal Not Contested by the Enforcement Authority		No Contest
<b>Appeal Details</b>		
Name of Enforcement Authority	Warrington Borough Council	
Traffic Penalty Tribunal reference	W105257F	
Appellant's name	Mr David Ward	
Appellant's address	145 Slater Street Latchford Warrington WA4 1DW	
<b>PCN Details</b>		
Penalty Charge Notice number	W101185069	
VRM	WMS1G1Z	
Contravention date	05/03/2013	
Contravention time	10:57:04	
Location	Caire Street (MW 30min)	
PCN Issue Date	05/03/2013	
Full Penalty Charge	£70.00	
Amount Paid	£0.00	
Contravention Code	40	
<b>PCN Type: Parking</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Parking with Removal</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Bus Lane</b> <input type="checkbox"/>		
Postal PCN	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Reason for Postal PCN	Camera (Bus Lane)	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Camera (Parking)	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Drive away	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Issue prevention	<input type="checkbox"/>
Release and Storage Charge (if vehicle removed)	*****	
<b>The Enforcement Authority does not intend to contest this case further because:</b>		
Due to an unanticipated shortage of Parking Services Staff, Warrington Borough Council has no alternative except to exercise our discretion and cancel the above Penalty Charge Notice.		
Authorising Signature		Date 29/3/13
Print Name	SCOTT CLARK	
2012 version		

*“Due to the unanticipated shortage of parking services staff, Warrington Borough Council has no alternative except to exercise our discretion and cancel the above Penalty Charge Notice”*

This is a very interesting choice of words which are obfuscatory in nature. Warrington Borough Council will never be able to provide staff which can provide the legal consent of the governed because for the past 800 years the governed have never once been so much as asked to provide the legal consent of the governed on and for the public record. Warrington Borough council or it’s parking services staff cannot provide something that does not exist and is of no physical substance for the foundation to the claim.

*“Warrington Borough Council has no alternative except to exercise our discretion”*

As there is no legal consent of the governed then Warrington Borough Council does not have any authority or discretion to exercise. This also applies to HM Parliaments and Government PLC, the parent company.

The ramifications to this case authority are huge and not all apparent at first glance. Consider the following. A licence is a permission to undertake an action that would otherwise be illegal. HP Parliaments and Governments PLC clearly do not have the legal Authority to issue any form of licence without the legal and physically presentable signed in wet ink consent of the governed. Also, HM. Parliaments and Governments PLC do not have the legal authority to determine that an action is illegal without the legal and signed consent of the governed physically on and for the public record. There is no physical record of the fact. 63.5 million People have not signed the consent of the governed.

63.5 million People have never once been asked and have never once signed the consent of the governed and as the office of Parliament is only a four year office then there must be this signed legal document every four years on and for the public record.

All forms of Tax, VAT, Duty, Council tax etc is illegal and constitutes fraud and malfeasance in a public office without this legal dependency being fulfilled.

The enforcement of these Acts/Statutes, by the Police, the local authority, the Judiciary, and government licensed Bailiffs are also illegal and constitute Malfeasance without this legal authority to do so.


It is a known fact and this has been documented by Chartered accountants that the populace pays all manner of tax to the tune of 85% in the £. Sometimes where fuel is concerned this is as much as 92% in the pound. The argument has been made that it is necessary to pay tax to pay for the services that we need such as police, ambulance and so on. Then it can also be argued that these people who provide these services should not pay any form of Tax. They should live a tax free life.

This is not in evidence. In fact the contrary is true.

It would also be accurate to argue that the 15% that the populace gets to keep actually pays for all the services inclusive. People provide services not government. This would be an accurate assessment of the available facts. There is no valid reason to pay tax at all and the cost of living would drop by 85% at a minimum. Do the math.

All the public officials are also victims of this crime including the Police, Ambulance Paramedic, Teachers and so on. In fact there is not an instance where there is not a victim of this crime. The ramifications span well beyond the content of this case authority undertaken by recognised due process at tribunal.





## **Exhibit (C)**

# **The Material evidence of the FACTS**

**19th Day of January 2015**





It is on and for the public record by way of published records at <http://www.judiciary.gov.uk/wpcontent/uploads/JCO/Documents/Speeches/beatsonj040608.pdf>

That at the NOTTINGHAM TRENT UNIVERSITY 16 APRIL 2008 the HON. SIR JACK BEATSON FBA spoke the following words. (Supplement 1 Provided)

“The 2003 changes and the new responsibilities given to the Lord Chief Justice necessitated a certain amount of re-examination of the relationship between the judiciary and the **two stronger branches of the state** --- the executive and the legislature.”

It is clear from the HON. SIR JACK BEATSON FBA spoke words that the office of the Judiciary is a sub office of the state. Therefore there will always be a conflict of interests between any private individual who is not a state company employee, AND there is and will always be a conflict of interests Where a Judge or a magistrate is acting in the office of the judiciary, where the office of the judiciary is a sub office of the state.

What is a State?

See (Supplement 2) from the London School of Economics

*“1) The state should not be viewed as a form of association that subsumes or subordinates all others. 2) The state is not an entity whose interests map closely onto the interests of the groups and individuals that fall under its authority, but has interests of its own. 3) The state is, to some extent at least, an alien power; though it is of human construction, it is not within human control. 4) The state is not there to secure peoples deepest interests, and it does not serve to unify them, reconcile them with one another, bring their competing interests into harmony, or realize any important good such as justice, freedom, or peace. While its power might be harnessed from time to time, that will serve the interests of some not the interests of all. 5) The state is thus an institution through which individuals and groups seek to exercise power (though it is not the only such institution); but it is also an institution that exercises power over individuals and groups. 6) The state is, ultimately, an abstraction, for it has no existence as a material object, is not confined to a particular space, and is not embodied in any person or collection of persons.”*

Also:-

*“The question now is: what does it mean to say that a state is a corporate entity? The state is a corporation in the way that a people or a public cannot be. ”*



A number of things are clear from this definition of state from the London School of Economics.

1. A state is a corporate entity by an act of registration: A Legal embodiment by an Act of registration.
2. A state has no obligations to anything other than the state and to the exclusion of anything or anybody else.
3. A state is nothing of material substance but only a construct of the mind.

All that is created by the same process is equal in status and standing to anything else that is created by the same process. There is a peer relationship of equals that are separate legal embodiments.

Consider the graphic representation for those that are feeble of mind.





If there is any disagreement to the above stated FACT, then they should take this up with the Rt. Hon Lord Chief Justice Sir Jack Beatson FBA.

The Facts Are the Facts. This is the material evidence of the FACTS.


From the Supplement 2, Definition of State from the London School of economics.

*"The question now is: what does it mean to say that a state is a corporate entity? The state is a corporation in the Way that a people or a public cannot be."*

A Corporation is a legal embodiment by an act of registration.....

To be legal then there has to be a meeting of the minds and an agreement between two parties. Legal is by agreement.





So by agreement:-

1. *The state should not be viewed as a form of association that subsumes or subordinates all others.*
2. *The state is not an entity whose interests map closely onto the interests of the groups and individuals that fall under its authority, but has interests of its own.*
3. *The state is, to some extent at least, an alien power; though it is of human construction, it is not within human control.*
4. *The state is not there to secure peoples deepest interests, and it does not serve to unify them, reconcile them with one another, bring their competing interests into harmony, or realize any important good such as justice, freedom, or peace. While its power might be harnessed from time to time, that will serve the interests of some not the interests of all.*
5. *The state is thus an institution through which individuals and groups seek to exercise power (though it is not the only such institution); but it is also an institution that exercises power over individuals and groups.*
6. *The state is, ultimately, an abstraction, for it has no existence as a material object, is not confined to a particular space, and is not embodied in any person or collection of persons.*

If a carpenter were to register a chair he had made. There is the act of registration, then the certificate of registration where two parties have agreed that there is a chair...

The point being that there is a chair and this chair is of material substance.

A legal embodiment by an act of registration where there is nothing of material substance created, is nothing more than a figment of the mind that has agreed to create nothing of material substance.

This very legal agreement is an act of fraud by deception.

*The state is, ultimately, an abstraction, for it has no existence as a material object, is not confined to a Particular space, and is not embodied in any person or collection of persons.*

The State which is a legal embodiment is of no material substance.

How is it possible that:-

- A legal embodiment by an act of registration which is of no material substance by default, or
- A State, which is of no material substance by default, or
- A Corporation, which is of no material substance by default

How is it possible that something of no material substance in fact or which is a fiction of the mind can:-

- Have a life of its own, or
- Claimed to have Authority over another, or
- Can be held responsible, or
- Have a liability, or
- holds property, or
- Have any form of powers or
- Be in any way or have any form of legitimacy in existence, or
- Undertake an act of force.

It is quite clear that, Chandran Kukathas, Department of Government and the London School of Economics, have had great difficulty defining what a state is. Why are we not surprised at this? It is not possible to define or give definition to or to legitimise something which is of no material substance and is a figment of the imagination.

Fraud however has been clearly defined as a criminal act with full knowledge and intent to engage in criminal behaviour for the personal gain of oneself or another, to the expense of another party.





To bring about by an act of force, support of this same fraud and criminal intent is also clearly recognised as act of terrorism. So it is quite clear and has been confirmed by the Rt. Hon Lord Chief Justice Sir Jack Beatson FBA, who has achieved the highest status within the office of the Judiciary as Lord Chief Justice that.


This Land by the name of England and the (United Kingdom (Private corporation)) which extends to the common wealth is run definitively by terrorists who maintain their status by fraud and deception to the expense of others by acts of force where there is no legitimacy and can be no legitimacy to the fact that a state is a legal embodiment by an act of registration of which there is no material substance to support that fact and by maintaining that parliament reigns supreme, where the legal definition of Statute which is a "legislative rule given force of law by the consent of the governed" Where there has been no consent of the governed and there is no material evidence that the governed have given their consent to legitimise this claim to supremacy and authority

See Case authority and exhibit (B) Case Authority No WI 05257F . David Ward. V. Warrington Borough Council,

Which by all accounts holds executive status within the STATE. Above that of the legislation and cannot be held accountable to that legislation as the status of the officers is superior to the legislation.

The Facts Are the Facts. This is the material evidence of the FACTS.





Supplement 1.

Supplement 1.



**SPEECH BY THE HON. SIR JACK BEATSON FBA**

**JUDICIAL INDEPENDENCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY: PRESSURES AND OPPORTUNITIES**

**NOTTINGHAM TRENT UNIVERSITY**


**16 APRIL 2008**

A quiet constitutional upheaval has been occurring in this country since 1998. That year saw the enactment of the Human Rights Act and the devolution legislation for Scotland, Northern Ireland and to a lesser degree, Wales. These developments have led to new interest in the judiciary. Today, however, I am primarily concerned with events since June 2003 when the government announced the abolition of the office of Lord Chancellor, bringing to an end a position in which a senior member of the Cabinet was also a judge, Head of the Judiciary, and Speaker of the House of Lords. The government also announced the replacement of the Judicial Committee of the House of Lords by a United Kingdom Supreme Court. These events led to the Constitutional Reform Act 2005 (hereafter "CRA") and to the Lord Chief Justice becoming Head of the Judiciary of England and Wales.

The 2003 changes and the new responsibilities given to the Lord Chief Justice necessitated a certain amount of re-examination of the relationship between the judiciary and the two stronger branches of the state --- the executive and the legislature. Moreover, in the atmosphere of reform and change, branded as "modernisation", not all have always remembered the long accepted rules and understandings about what judges can appropriately say and do outside their courts. Others have asked whether the rules and understandings remain justified in modern conditions. The "pressures" to which my title refers arise because of the view of some that judges should be more engaged with the public, the government, and the legislature than they have been in the past. The "Opportunities" arise from

<http://www.judiciary.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/JCO/Documents/Speeches/beatsonj040608.pdf>





<http://philosophy.wisc.edu/hunt/A%20Definition%20of%20the%20State.htm>

## Supplement 2

### A Definition of the State

Chandran Kukathas

Department of Government

London School of Economics

[c.kukathas@lse.ac.uk](mailto:c.kukathas@lse.ac.uk)

Presented at a conference on **Dominations and Powers: The Nature of the State**, University of Wisconsin, Madison, March 29, 2008

#### 1. The problem of defining the state

A state is a form of political association, and political association is itself only one form of human association. Other associations range from clubs to business enterprises to churches. Human beings relate to one another, however, not only in associations but also in other collective arrangements, such as families, neighbourhoods, cities, religions, cultures, societies, and nations. The state is not the only form of political association. Other examples of political associations include townships, counties, provinces, condominiums, territories, confederations, international organizations (such as the UN) and supranational organizations (such as the EU). To define the state is to account for the kind of political association it is, and to describe its relation to other forms of human association, and other kinds of human collectively more generally. This is no easy matter for a number of reasons. First, the state is a form of association with a history, so the entity that is to be described is one that has evolved or developed and, thus, cannot readily be captured in a snapshot. Second, the concept of the state itself has a history, so any invocation of the term will have to deal with the fact that it has been used in subtly different ways. Third, not all the entities that claim to be, or are recognized as, states are the same kinds of entity, since they vary in size, longevity, power, political organization and legitimacy. Fourth, because the state is a political entity, any account of it must deploy normative concepts such as legitimacy that are themselves as contentious as the notion of the state. Although the state is not uniquely difficult to define, these problems need to be acknowledged.

The aim of this paper is to try to offer a definition of the state that is sensitive to these difficulties. More particularly, it seeks to develop an account of the state that is not subject to the problems that beset alternative explanations that have been prominent in political theory. The main points it defends are these. 1) The state should not be viewed as a form of association that subsumes or subordinates all others. 2) The state is not an entity whose interests map loosely onto the interests of the groups and individuals that fall under its authority, but has interests of its own. 3) The state is, to some extent at least, an alien power; though it is of human construction, it is not within human control. 4) The state is not there to secure peoples deepest interests, and it does not serve to unify them, reconcile them with one another, bring their competing interests into harmony, or realize any important good such as justice, freedom, or peace. While its power might be harnessed from time to time, that will serve the interests of some not the interests of all. 5) The state is thus an institution through which individuals and groups seek to exercise power (though it is not the only such institution); but it is also an institution that exercises power over individuals and groups. 6) The state is, ultimately, an abstraction, for it has no existence as a material object, is not confined to a particular space, and is not embodied in any person or collection of persons.





The state exists because certain relations obtain between people; but the outcome of these relations is an entity that has a life of its own though it would be a mistake to think of it as entirely autonomous and to define the state is to try to account for the entity that exists through these relations.

### The concept of the state

A *state* is a form of *political association* or *polity* that is distinguished by the fact that it is not itself incorporated into any other political associations, though it may incorporate other such associations. The state is thus a supreme *corporate* entity because it is not incorporated into any other entity, even though it might be subordinate to other powers (such as another state or an empire). One state is distinguished from another by its having its own independent structure of political authority, and an attachment to separate physical territories. The state is itself a *political community*, though not all political communities are states. A state is not a *nation*, or a *people*, though it may contain a single nation, parts of different nations, or a number of entire nations. A state arises out of *society*, but it does not contain or subsume society. A state will have a *government*, but the state is not simply a government, for there exists many more governments than there are states. The state is a modern political construction that emerged in early modern Europe, but has been replicated in all other parts of the world. The most important aspect of the state that makes it a distinctive and new form of political association is its most abstract quality: it is a *corporate* entity.


To understand this formulation of the idea of a state we need to understand the meaning of the other terms that have been used to identify it, and to distinguish it from other entities. The state is a *political association*. An association is a collectivity of persons joined for the purpose for carrying out some action or actions. An association thus has the capacity for action or agency, and because it is a collectivity it must therefore also have some structure of *authority* through which one course of action or another can be determined. Since authority is a relation that exists only among agents, an association is a collectivity of agents. Other collectivities of persons, such as classes or crowds or neighbourhoods or categories (like bachelors or smokers or amputees) are not associations, for they do not have the capacity for agency and have no structures of authority to make decisions. A mob is not an association: even though it appears to act, it is no more an agent than is a herd.

On this understanding, *society* is not itself an association, for it is not an agent. It may be made up of or contain a multiplicity of associations and individual agents, but it is not an association or agent. Unless, that is, it is constituted as one by an act or process of incorporation. So, for example, Californian society is not an association, but the state of California is: for while a society is not, a *polity* is an association a *political* association. In pre-civil war America, the southern states were a society, since they amounted to a union of groups and communities living under common laws some of which sharply distinguished it from the North but they did not form a single (political) association until they constituted themselves as the Confederacy. A society is a collectivity of people who belong to different communities or associations that are geographically contiguous. The boundaries of a society are not easy to specify,

Since the contiguity of societies makes it hard to say why one society has been left and another entered. One way of drawing the distinction would be to say that, since all societies are governed by law, a move from one legal jurisdiction to another is a move from one society to another. But this has to be qualified because law is not always confined by geography, and people moving from one region to another may still be bound by laws from their places of origin or membership. Furthermore, some law deals with relations between people from different jurisdictions. That being true, however, a society could be said to exist when there is some established set of customs or conventions or legal arrangements specifying how laws apply to persons whether they stay put or move from one jurisdiction to another. (Thus there was not much of a society among the different highland peoples of New Guinea when they lived in isolation from one another, though there was a society in Medieval Spain when Jews, Muslims and Christians coexisted under elaborate legal arrangements specifying rights and duties individuals had within their own communities and as outsiders when in others.)







A society is different, however, from a community, which is in turn different from an association. A community is a collection of people who share some common interest and who therefore are united by bonds of commitment to that interest. Those bonds may be relatively weak, but they are enough to distinguish communities from mere aggregates or classes of person. However, communities are not agents and thus are not associations: they are marked by shared understandings but not by shared structures of authority. At the core of that shared understanding is an understanding of what issues or matters are of *public* concern to the collectivity and what matters are *private*. Though other theories of community have held that a community depends for its existence on a common locality (Robert Mclver) or ties of blood kinship (Ferdinand Tonnies), this account of community allows for the possibility of communities that cross geographical boundaries. Thus, while it makes perfect sense to talk of a village or a neighbourhood as a community, it makes no less sense to talk about, say, the university community, or the scholarly community, or the religious community. One of the important features of a community is the fact that its members draw from it elements that make up their identities though the fact that individuals usually belong to a number of communities means that it is highly unlikely (if not impossible) that an identity would be constituted entirely by membership of one community. For this reason, almost all communities are partial communities rather than all-encompassing or constitutive communities.

An important question, then, is whether there can be such a thing as a political community, and whether the state is such a community. On this account of community, there can be a political community, which is defined as a collection of individuals who share an understanding of what is public and what is private within that polity. Whether or not a state is a political community will depend, however, on the nature of the state in question. States that are divided societies are not political communities. Iraq after the second Gulf War, and Sri Lanka since the civil war (and arguably earlier), are not political communities because there is serious disagreement over what comprises the public. Arguably, Belgium is no longer a political community, though it remains a state.

Now, there is one philosopher who has denied that a political society or a state or at least, a well-ordered democratic society can be a community. According to John Rawls, such a society is neither an association nor a community. A community, he argues, is a society governed by a shared comprehensive, religious, philosophical, or moral doctrine.

[1] Once we recognize the fact of pluralism, Rawls maintains, we must abandon hope of political community unless

[1] Rawls, *Political Liberalism* (New York: Columbia University Press, second ed.1996), 42.

We are prepared to countenance the oppressive use of state power to secure it.<sup>2</sup> [2] However, this view rests on a very narrow understanding of community as a Collectivity united in affirming the same comprehensive doctrine. It would make it impossible to recognize as communities a range of collectivities commonly regarded as communities, including neighbourhoods and townships. While some common understanding is undoubtedly necessary, it is too much to ask that communities share as much as a comprehensive doctrine. On a broader understanding of community, a state can be a political community. However, it should be noted that on this account political community is a much less substantial thing than many might argue. It is no more than a partial community, being only one of many possible communities to which individuals might belong.

Though a state may be a political community, it need not be. Yet it must always be an association: a collectivity with a structure of authority and a capacity for agency. What usually gives expression to that capacity is the states *government*. Government and the state are not however, the same thing. States can exist without governments and frequently exist with many governments. Not all governments have states. Australia, for example, has one federal government, six state governments, two territorial governments, and numerous local governments. The United States, Canada, Germany, Malaysia and India are just a few of the many countries with many governments. States that have, for at least a time, operated without governments (or at least a central government) include Somalia from 1991 to 2000 (de facto, 2002), Iraq from 2003 to 2004, and Japan from 1945 to 1952 (when the post war Allied occupation came to an end). Many governments are clearly governments of units within federal states. But there can also be governments where there are no states: the Palestinian Authority is one example.





Government is an institution whose existence precedes that of the state. A government is a person or group of persons who rule or administer (or govern) a political community or a state. For government to come into being there must exist a public. Ruling within a household is not government. Government exists when people accept (willingly or not) the authority of some person or persons to address matters of public concern: the provision of non-excludable good, the administration of justice, and defence against external enemies being typical examples of such matters. Until the emergence of the state, however, government did not attend to the interests of a corporate entity but administered the affairs of less clearly defined or demarcated publics. With the advent of the state, however, government became the established administrative element of a corporate entity.

The question now is: what does it mean to say that a state is a corporate entity? The state is a corporation in the way that a people or a public cannot be. It is a corporation because it is, in effect and in fact, a legal person. As a legal person a corporation not only has the capacity to act but also a liability to be held responsible. Furthermore, a

corporation is able to hold property. This is true for incorporated commercial enterprises, for institutions like universities and churches, and for the state. A corporation cannot exist without the natural persons who comprise it and there must be more than one, for a single individual cannot be a corporation. But the corporation is also a person separate from the persons who comprise it. Thus a public company has an existence because of its shareholders, its agents and their employees, but its rights and duties, powers and liabilities, are not reducible to, or definable in terms of, those of such natural persons. A church or a university has an existence because of the officers who run them and the members who give them their point, but the property of such an entity does not belong to any of these


individuals. The state is a corporation in the same way that these other entities are: it is a legal person with rights and duties, powers and liabilities, and holds property that accrues to no other agents than itself. The question in political theory has always been not whether such an entity can come into existence (since it plainly has) but how it does so.

This is, in a part, a question of whether its existence is legitimate.

The state is not, however, the only possible political corporation. Provinces, counties, townships, and districts, as well as condominiums (such as Andorra), some international organizations, and supranational organizations are also political corporations but not states. A state is a supreme form of political corporation because it is able to incorporate within its structure of authority other political corporations (such as provinces and townships) but is not subject to incorporation by others (such as supranational organizations). Political corporations the state is unable to incorporate are themselves therefore states. Any state incorporated by any other political corporation thereby ceases to be a state. By this account, prior to the American Civil War, the various states of the Union were not provinces of the United States but fully independent states. After the war, to the extent that the war established that no state could properly secede or cease to be incorporated into the one national state, the United States became a fully independent state and not a supranational organization.

The significance of the capacity for political corporations to hold property ought to be noted. Of critical importance is the fact that this property does not accrue to individual persons. Revenues raised by such corporations by the levying of taxes, or the imposition of tariffs or licensing fees, or by any other means, become the property of the corporation not of particular governments, or officials, or monarchs, or any other natural person who is able to exercise authority in the name of the corporation. The political corporation, being an abstract entity, cannot enjoy the use of its property only redistribute it among the agents through whom it exercises power and among others whom those agents are able, or obliged, to favour. The state is not the only political corporation capable of raising revenue and acquiring property, though it will generally be the most voracious in its appetite.





One question that arises is whether the best way to describe the state is as a *sovereign* power. The answer depends on how one understands sovereignty. If sovereignty means supreme authority within a territory (Philpott SEP 2003), it is not clear that sovereignty captures the nature of all states. In the United States, the American state incorporates the 50 states of the union, so those states are not at liberty to withdraw from the union. However, authority of the various states and state governments does limit the authority of the American state, which is unable to act unilaterally on a range of issues. To take just one example, it cannot amend the Constitution without the agreement of two-thirds of the states. Indeed many national states find themselves constrained not just because they exist as federated polities but because their membership of other organizations and associations, as well as their treaty commitments, limit what they can legally do within their own territorial boundaries. Sovereignty could, on the other hand, be taken to be a matter of degree; but this would suggest that it is of limited use in capturing the nature of states and distinguishing them from other political corporations.

One aspect of being a state that is sometimes considered best identified by the concept of sovereignty is its *territoriality*. People belong to a state by virtue of their residence within borders, and states, it is argued, exercise authority over those within its geographical bounds. While it is important to recognize that states must possess territory in order to exist, they are not unique in having geographical extension. Provinces, townships, and supranational entities such as the EU, are also defined by their territories. Moreover, residence within certain borders does not make people members of that state any more than it removes them from the authority of another under whose passport they might travel. Nor is the states capacity to control the movement of people within or across its territory essential to its being a state, for many states have relinquished that right to some degree by membership of other associations. Citizens of the EU have the right to travel to and reside in other member states. To exist, states must have territory; but not entire control over such territory. Weber's well-known definition of the state as a body having a monopoly on the legitimate use of physical force in a given territory is also inadequate. The extent of a states control, including its control of the means of using violence, varies considerably with the state, not only legally but also in fact.

Though they are supreme corporate entities, states do not always exist in isolation, and usually stand in some relation to other forms of political association beyond their territorial borders. States may belong to *international organizations* such as the United Nations or alliances such as NATO. They may be a part of *supranational associations* that are loosely integrated defence and trading blocs (such as ASEAN) or more substantially integrated governmental associations (such as the EU). They might be members of *international regimes*, such as the International Refugee Convention, as a result of agreements they have entered into. States might also be parts of *empires*, or operate under the *sphere of influence* of another more powerful state. States might exist as *associated states* as was the case with the Philippines, which was from 1935-46 the first associated state of the United States. The Filipino state was responsible for domestic affairs, but the US handled foreign and military matters. Even today, though in different circumstances, the foreign relations of a number of states are handled by other states Spain and France are responsible for Andorra, the Switzerland for Liechtenstein, France for Monaco, and India for Bhutan. States can also bear responsibility for territories with the right to become states but which have not yet (and may never) become states. Puerto Rico, for example, is an *unincorporated territory* of the United States, whose residents are un-enfranchised American citizens, enjoying limited social security benefits, but not subject to Federal income tax; it is unlikely to become an independent state.

The state is, in the end, only one form of political association. Indeed, the range of different forms of political association and government even in recent history is astonishing. The reason for paying the state as much attention as it is given is that it is, in spite of the variety of other political forms, the most significant type of human collectively at work in the world today.





## A theory of the state

According to Martin Van Creveld, the state emerged because of the limitations of the innumerable forms of political organization that existed before it.<sup>3[3]</sup> The crucial innovation that made for development of the state was the idea of the corporation as a legal person, and thus of the state as a legal person. It enabled the emergence of a political entity whose existence was not tied to the existence of particular persons such as chiefs, lords and kings or particular groups such as clans, tribes, and dynasties. The state was an entity that was more durable. Whether or not this advantage was what caused the state to emerge, it seems clear enough that such an entity did come into being. The modern state represents a different form of governance than was found under European feudalism, or in the Roman Empire, or in the Greek city-states.

.....<sup>3[3]</sup> Van Creveld, *The Rise and Decline of the State* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 52-8.

Having accounted for the concept of the state, however, we now need to consider what kind of theory of the state might best account for the nature of this entity. Ever since the state came into existence, political philosophers have been preoccupied with the problem of giving an account of its moral standing. To be sure, philosophers had always asked why individuals should obey the law, or what, if anything, could justify rebellion against a king or prince.


But the emergence of the state gave rise to a host of new theories that have tried to explain what relationship people could have, not to particular persons or groups of persons with power or authority over them, but to a different kind of entity.

To explain the emergence of the state in Europe from the 13th to the 19th centuries would require an account of many things, from the decline of the power of the church against kingdoms and principalities to the development of new political power structures with the transformation and eventual disappearance of the Holy Roman Empire; from the disappearance of towns and city-states, and extended associations like the Hanseatic League, to the rise of members of national unification. Attempts by theorists to describe the state that was emerging are as much a part of the history of the state as are the political changes and legal innovations. Bodin, Hobbes, Spinoza, Locke, Montequieu, Hume, Rousseau, Madison, Kant, Bentham, Mill, Hegel, Tocqueville, and Marx were among the most insightful thinkers to offer theories of the state during the course of its emergence, though theorizing went on well into the 20th century in the thought of Max Weber, the English pluralists, various American democratic theorists, and Michael Oakeshott. They offered theories of the state in the sense that they tried to explain what it was that gave the state its point: how it was that the existence of the state made sense. To some, this meant also justifying the state, though for the most part this was not the central philosophical concern. (Normative theory, so called, is probably a relatively recent invention.)

The question, however, remains: what theory best accounts for the state? Since there is time and space only for some suggestions rather than for a full-scale defence of a new theory of the state, I shall come to the point. The theorist who gives us the best theory of the state we have so far is Hume, and any advance we might make should build on Hume's insights. To appreciate what Hume has to offer, we should consider briefly what the main alternatives are, before turning again to Hume.

We might usefully do this by posing the question in a way that Hume would have appreciated: what interest does the state serve? Among the first answers to be offered was that presented, with different reasoning, by Bodin and Hobbes: the interest of everyone in peace or stability or *order*. Each developed this answer in politically similar circumstances: religious wars that reflected the declining power of a church trying to hold on to political influence. Both thinkers defended conceptions of the state as absolutist (or at least highly authoritarian) to make clear that the point of the state was to preserve order in the face of challenges to the peace posed by the Church or by proponents of group rights such as the Monarchomachs.





The state was best understood as the realm of order, to be contrasted with the state of war signified by its absence and threatened by its dereliction. Crucially, for both thinkers, the state had to be conceived as a single sovereign entity, whose powers were not divided or to be shared either by different branches of government or by different elements in a mixed constitution. Among the problems with this view is that it is not clear that the state is needed to secure order, nor plausible to think that divided government is impossible. The conception of the state as condition in which order is possible looks unlikely not only because the state may sometimes act in ways that are destructive of order (and even self-destructive) but also because order has existed without states. Indeed, one of the problems for Hobbs's social theory in particular is explaining how the state could come into being if it really is the result of agreement voluntarily to transfer power to a corporate agent since the state of war is not conducive to making or keeping agreements. It does not look as if the point of the state is to serve our interest in order even if that were our sole or primary interest.

Another view of the point of the state is that it serves our interest in freedom. Two theories of this kind were offered


by Rousseau and Kant. In Rousseau's account, the emergence of society brings with it the loss of a kind of freedom as natural man is transformed into a social being ruled directly and indirectly by others. The recovery of this freedom is not entirely possible, but freedom of a kind is possible in the state, which is the embodiment of the general will. Living in such a state we can be free as beings, who are, ultimately, subject not to others but to laws we give ourselves. Drawing inspiration from Rousseau's conception of freedom, Kant presents a slightly different contractarian story, but one with a similarly happy ending. The antithesis of the state is the state of nature, which is a state of lawless freedom. In that condition, all are morally obliged to contract with one another to leave that state to enter a juridical realm in which freedom is regulated by justice so that the freedom each can be compatible with the freedom of all. The state serves our interest in freedom by first serving our interest in justice. If Hobbes thought that whatever the state decreed was, so ipso, just; Kant held that justice presupposed the existence of the state. What's difficult to see in Kant's account is why there is any obligation for everyone in the state of nature to enter a single juridical realm, rather than simply to agree to abide by the requirements of morality or form different ethical communities. Why should freedom require the creation of a single juridical order? It is no less difficult to see why the state might solve the problem of freedom in Rousseau's account. If, in reality, there is a conflict between

different interests, and some can prevail only at the expense of others, it seems no better than a cover-up to suggest that all interests are served equally well since all are free when governed by laws that reflect the general will. If this is the case, the state serves our interest in freedom only by feeding us the illusion that we are free when in fact we are subordinated to others.

Hegel also thinks that our deepest interest is in freedom, but for him it can only be fully enjoyed when we live in a community in which the exercise of that freedom reflects not simply the capacity of particular wills to secure their particular interest but the existence of an ethical life in which conflicts of interest are properly mediated and reconciled. The institution that achieves this is the state, which takes us out of the realm of particularity into the realm of concrete universality: a realm in which freedom is given full expression because, for the first time, people are able to relate to one another as individuals. This is possible because the state brings into existence something that eluded people in society before the state came into being: a form of ethical life in which, at last, people can feel at home in the world.

The most serious challenge to Hegel's view is that offered by Marx. The state might appear to be the structure within which conflicts of interest were overcome as government by the universal class Hegel's state bureaucracy acted to serve only the universal interest, but in reality the state did no more than masquerade as the defender of the universal interest. The very existence of the state, Marx argued, was evidence that particularity had not been eliminated, and discrete interests remained in destructive competition with one another. More specifically, this conflict remained manifest in the class divisions in society, and the state could never amount to more than a vehicle for the interests of the ruling class. Freedom would be achieved not when the state was fulfilled but when it was superseded.





What is present in Marx but missing in the previously criticized theories is a keen sense that the state might not so much serve human interests in general as serve particular interests that have managed to capture it for their own purposes. This is why, for Marx, social transformation requires, first, the capture by the working class of the apparatus of the state. The cause of human freedom would be served, however, only when the conditions that made the state inevitable were overcome: scarcity and the division of labour, which brought with them alienation, competition and class conflict.

What is most persuasive in Marx's analysis is his account of the state as an institution that embodies the conflict of interest found in the world rather than as one that reconciles competing interests. What is less convincing, however, is the expectation that particular interests will one day be eradicated. What is missing is any sense that the state itself has its own interests, as well as being the site through which a diverse range of interests compete to secure their own advantage. To gain an appreciation of these dimensions of the state, we need to turn, at least initially, to Hume.

Hume's theory of the state does not appear conveniently in any one part of his political writings, which address a variety of issues but not this one directly. His analysis is to be found in part in his *Treatise*, in an even smaller part of his second *Enquiry*, in his *Essays*, and in his multi-volume *History of England*. What can be gleaned from these writings is Hume's view of the state as an entity that emerged in history, in part because the logic of the human condition demanded it, in part because the nature of strategic interactions between individuals made it probable, and finally because accidents of history pushed the process in one way or another.

The first step in Hume's analysis is to explain how society is possible, given that the facts of human moral psychology suggest cooperation is unprofitable. The answer is that repeated interactions reveal to individuals the advantage of cooperating with potential future co-operators and out of this understanding, conventions are born.

The emergence of society means the simultaneous emergence therefore of two other institutions without which the idea of society is meaningless: justice and property. Society, justice and property co-exist, for no one of them can have any meaning without the other two. What these institutions serve are human interests' in prospering in a world of moderate scarcity. Interest accounts for the emergence of other institutions, such as law, and government, though in these cases there is an element of contingency. Government arises because war as eminent soldiers come to command authority among their men and then extend that authority to their groups more broadly. Law develops in part as custom becomes entrenched and is then further established when authorities in power formalize it, and judges and magistrates regularize it by setting the power of precedent. In the course of time, people become attached to the laws, and even more attached to particular authorities, both of which come to acquire lives of their own. A sense of allegiance is born.

Of crucial importance in Hume's social theory is his understanding of human institutions as capable of having lives of their own. They come into the world without human design, and they develop not at the whim of any individual or by the wish of any collective. Law, once in place, is a hardy plant that will survive even if abused or neglected. Government, once in place, will evolve as it responds to the interests than shape and try to control it. The entire edifice of society will reflect not any collective purpose or intention but the interplay of interests that contend for pre-eminence. The state, in this analysis, is not the construction of human reason rooted in individual consent to a political settlement; nor a product of the decrees of divine providence, even if the construction appears ever so perfect. It is simply the residue of what might (anachronistically) be called a Darwinian struggle. What survives is what is most fit to do so

The state in this story is the product of chance: it is nothing more than the way political interests have settled for now the question of how power should be allocated and exercised. It would be a mistake to think that they could do this simply as they pleased, as if on a whim. The facts of human psychology and the logic of strategic relations will constrain action, just as will the prevailing balance of power. But chance events can bring about dramatic and unexpected changes.






The important thing, however, is that for Hume the state cannot be accounted for by referring to any deeper moral interest that humans have be that in justice, or freedom, or reconciliation with their fellows. The state, like all institutions, is an evolutionary product. Evolution has no purpose, no end, and no prospect of being controlled.

Hume's theory of the state is, in the end, born of a deeply pluralistic outlook. Hume was very much alive to the fact of human diversity of customs, laws, and political systems. He was also very much aware of the extent to which human society was marked by conflicts among contending interests. The human condition was always going to be one of interest conflict, and this condition was capable of palliation but resistant to cure. All human institutions had to be understood as the outcome of conflict and efforts at palliation, but not as resolutions of anything. If there are two general tendencies we might observe, Hume suggests, they are the tendency to authority and the tendency to liberty. Both elements are there at the heart of the human predicament: authority is needed to make society possible, and liberty to make it perfect. But there is no particular balance to be struck, for every point on the scale is a possible equilibrium point, each with its own advantages and disadvantages. To understand the state is to recognize that we are in this predicament and that there is no final resolution.

Hume's theory of the state, as I have presented, in some ways recalls the theory offered by Michael Oakeshott, which presents the modern European state as shifting uneasily between two competing tendencies. One tendency is towards what he called society as an enterprise association: a conception of the role of the state as having a purposive character, its purpose being to achieve some particular goal or goals such as producing more economic growth and raising levels of happiness. The other tendency is towards the idea of society as a civil association: a conception of the state as having not particular purpose beyond making possible its member's pursuit of their own separate ends. The states historical character is of an institution that has oscillated between these two tendencies, never at any time being of either one kind or the other. Hume's theory of the state shares with Oakeshott's account this unwillingness to set down in definitive or snapshot form a picture or description of something that embodies important contradictions. Even if it seems not particularly satisfying, I suspect it is about as satisfying a portrait of the state as we can hope to get.

<http://philosophy.wisc.edu/hunt/A%20Definition%20of%20the%20State.htm>





## **Exhibit (D)**


### **The Companies Act 2006**

#### **“44 Execution of documents”**

**26th Day of January 2015**







The Companies Act 2006

“44 Execution of documents.

(1) Under the law of England and Wales or Northern Ireland a document is executed by a company—(a) by the affixing of its common seal, or (b) by signature in accordance with the following provisions. (2) A document is validly executed by a company if it is signed on behalf of the company— (a) by two authorised signatories, or (b) by a director of the company in the presence of a witness who attests the signature. (4) A document signed in accordance with subsection (2) and expressed in whatever words, to be executed by the company, has the same effect as if executed under the common seal of the company.”

The legal effect of the statute is that documents and deeds must be signed on behalf of the company by a director in the presence of a witness, or by two authorised signatories. Without adherence to these provisions no mortgage contracts can be considered duly executed by a company and their terms are therefore legally unenforceable, as was clearly implied when the Court of Appeal endorsed the view of Lewison J in the case of Williams v Redcard Ltd [2011]:

“For a document to be executed by a company, it must either bear the company’s seal, or it must comply with s.44 (4) in order to take effect as if it had been executed under seal. Subsection (4) requires that the document must not only be made on behalf of the company by complying with one of the two alternative requirements for signature in s.44 (2): it must also be “expressed, in whatever words, to be executed by the company. That means that the document must purport to have been signed by persons held out as authorised signatories and held out to be signing on the company’s behalf. It must be apparent from the face of the document that the people signing it are doing something more than signing it on the company’s behalf. It must be apparent that they are signing it on the company’s behalf in such a way that the document is to be treated as having been executed “by” the company for the purposes of subsection (4), and not merely by an agent “for” the company.”


In addition, a company which is by default of no material substance cannot commit a crime. However the Directors and the secretary of a company are liable for any fraudulent or criminal activities of that company.

Without ill will or vexation.

For and on behalf of the Principal legal embodiment by the title of Mr Peter Humm  
For and on behalf of the attorney General of the House of Humm  
For and on behalf of Peter-joseph of the House of Humm

No Assured Value. No Liability. No Errors and Omissions accepted.  
All Rights Reserved






## **Exhibit (E)**

# **The Insanity of Tax**

**On and for the record**





## There is a loaf of bread on Morrison's Shelf.

There is a loaf of bread on Morrison's shelf. But it didn't just appear there by magic, the loaf of bread started its journey on John the farmers' farm.

Whoops, hang on a minute,

John the farmer pays council tax on his hard standing and that council tax is added to the cost of the loaf of bread.

So John the farmer rises early in the morning to plough the field and plant some grain.

Just hold it right there.

In the tractor there is red diesel fuel and that fuel carries a fuel duty of 36% plus the vat on the duty, plus the vat on the diesel and all that tax goes to the cost of the loaf of bread.

So now John has ploughed the field to plant the grain but the grain is not in the ground yet, the grain has to be sowed.

So John the farmer fires up the tractor again to sow the grain.

Just hang on.

In the tractor there is red diesel fuel and that fuel carries a fuel duty of 36% plus the vat on the duty plus the vat on the diesel and all that tax goes to the cost of the loaf of bread.

Now the grain is sowed and is in the ground and John the farmer has to wait three or six months whilst the grain grows and is ready for harvesting.

Wait a minute,

John the farmer pays council tax on his hard standing and that council tax is added to the cost of the loaf of bread.

So now it is time for harvesting, John the farmer fires up the big, monster combine harvester and harvests the field.

Woo stop.

In the combine harvester there is red diesel fuel and that fuel carries a fuel duty of 36% plus the vat on the duty plus the vat on the diesel and all that tax goes to the cost of the loaf of bread.

Now John the farmer has a big pile of hay and a whole pile of grain, so John the farmer calls up Bob the haulage truck driver to carry the grain to the grain storage silo.

Stop the bus right there.

Bob haulage truck driver drives a truck on the road, now this has white diesel fuel in the tank and white diesel fuel carries a duty of 80% plus the vat on the duty plus the vat on the diesel and all that tax goes to the cost of the loaf of bread. Also Bob haulage truck driver pays road tax to drive on the road, also Bob haulage truck driver lives in a house and pays council tax and all that tax goes to the cost of the loaf of bread.

It gets better the grain has now been delivered to the grain storage silo.

Stop. The grain storage silo company pays commercial council tax and all the employees of that company live in houses and they all pay domestic council tax and all that tax is added to the cost of the loaf of bread.

Are we beginning to see a trend here? So the grain sits in the storage silo until it is called upon by the flour mill.

Just hang on.

That's even more commercial council tax and all that tax is added to the cost of the loaf of bread

That's absolutely correct the tax man just loves the tax.

So the flour mill calls up Bob the haulage truck driver to carry the grain to the flour mill.

Stop, my ears are bleeding and my brain hurts.





No pain no gain knowing the truth is a painful experience and if you can't stand the pain go back to sleep and keep paying the tax.

Are you insane?

Aren't we all, we have been doing this insanity for donkey's years, now shut up and take it.

Nooooo.

Bob the haulage truck driver drives a truck on the road, now this has white diesel fuel in the tank and white diesel fuel carries a duty of 80% plus the vat on the duty plus the vat on the diesel and all that tax goes to the cost of the loaf of bread. Also Bob haulage truck driver pays road tax to drive on the road, also Bob haulage truck driver lives in a house and pays council tax and all that tax goes to the cost of the loaf of bread. Why, why, Why.

Shut up and take it.

OMG No.

Now the grain is at the flower mill.

Stop please no, I can't take any more.

Shut up and take it, take it, take it, take the pain what doesn't kill you will only make you stronger.

The flower mill company pays commercial council tax and all the employees of that company live in houses and they all pay domestic council tax and all that tax is added to the cost of the loaf of bread. Whimper!

Somebody has to pay the tax man now take it.

Having made the grain into flower now the flower is ready to go to another storage depot. St-- Suck it up!! The flower mill calls

Bob the haulage truck driver to carry the flower to the storage depot.

Bob the haulage truck driver drives a truck on the road, now this has white diesel fuel in the tank and white diesel fuel carries a duty of 80% plus the vat on the duty plus the vat on the diesel and all that tax goes to the cost of the loaf of bread. Also Bob haulage truck driver pays road tax to drive on the road, also Bob haulage truck driver lives in a house and pays council tax and all that tax goes to the cost of the loaf of bread.

The storage depot company pays commercial council tax and all the employees of that company live in houses and they all pay domestic council tax and all that tax is added to the cost of the loaf of bread. Do you have a gun?

Somewhere:

Now the bakery has an order for some bread so they call Bob to collect the flower from the storage depot and take it to the bakery.

Not saying anything anymore.

Bob the haulage truck driver drives a truck on the road, now this has white diesel fuel in the tank and white diesel fuel carries a duty of 80% plus the vat on the duty plus the vat on the diesel and all that tax goes to the cost of the loaf of bread. Also Bob haulage truck driver pays road tax to drive on the road, also Bob haulage truck driver lives in a house and pays council tax and all that tax goes to the cost of the loaf of bread.

The bakery company pays commercial council tax and all the employees of that company live in houses and they all pay domestic council tax and all that tax is added to the cost of the loaf of bread.

Can I find that gun? No, you're not allowed a gun it's against legislation, besides you might just use it to shoot the tax man, and we can't have that now: can we?

Silence:-

So the bakery calls up Bob to take the bread to Morrison's.

Silence:


Bob the haulage truck driver drives a truck on the road, now this has white diesel fuel in the tank and white diesel fuel carries a duty of 80% plus the vat on the duty plus the vat on the diesel and all that tax goes to the cost of the loaf of bread. Also Bob haulage truck driver pays road tax to drive on the road, also Bob haulage truck driver lives in a house and pays council tax and all that tax goes to the cost of the loaf of bread.

Morrison's is a that company pays commercial council tax and all the employees of that company live in houses and they all pay domestic council tax and all that tax is added to the cost of the loaf of bread.

What you looking for in that draw?

Nothing:-





Where you going?

There's a peaceful occupy Downing Street on today I thought I would keep them company:

What's that in your pocket?

Nothing:

Well don't be too long, you have work to do so you can keep paying the tax man: And when you get old you're going to need plenty of money to spend on the grandkids, things like mobile phones and Xbox's and computer games:

The door closes.

Now the first question is how much is the tax on a loaf of bread when it is still on the shelf? The tax man has already had more than he should. He does not care if it is sold or it goes stale. It does not matter who pays for the bread whether the purchaser is employed or unemployed it's all the same to the tax man. So how much is the tax value on a loaf of bread on Morison's shelf?

If all the tax was removed from the loaf of bread just leaving the cost of each loaf inclusive of all the growing, manufacture and transport costs, even allowing for some profit for all the processes involved how much would it cost? The answer to that question will astonish you. These calculations have been made by two chartered accountants burning the midnight oil and plenty of coffee. Coffee, cool:

Here's the answer.

85% of the cost of the loaf of bread is nothing but TAX: This means that if a loaf of bread costs £1 then the price on the shelf should be 15p. Ouch! Isn't that amazing? Now take this example and apply it across the board. From a lollipop to a colour TV, to the tarmac on the road, to the cost of a house or a car.


A £20K car would now be say £3K. Doesn't that sound good, a £100K house would cost £15K. This is an economically valid example. Let it sink in for a while. -----

There's more. We pay 24% of our income out of our gross earning to the NHS. I know if you are employed you only pay 8% but you boss pays 16% and who do you think earns that 16%? You do, you pay your part of your bosses 24% as well. Now the NHS pays for a lot of things such as Hospitals and staff and medication and ambulances and unemployment from the department of works and pensions. And I hear the words "so what" well all that money is spent and the taxman rakes back in 85% of it: That's 85% that will never return to the NHS. Now you can also say that our tax is necessary because it pays for the police and the schools and the bin men and the park keeper and fire brigade: Well this is also true but as that money is spent the taxman rakes back in 85%. Now the question is when do you get the value of that money? And the answer is never: Never, ever, ever and if you can find it then let me know.

There's more. This means that the only money you get to keep is the 15%. Oh s---t yes. That 15% pays for everything ells, your home and furnishings, the car, the holiday, the food, on and on. Yes you live your life on 15% and that is a fact, oh yes and some credit cards. Now that is a very sobering thought. This is exactly the reason why we are all broke. So what is it that the tax man does that makes him worth so much of your life energy???? Anybody please let me know.

There's more. The opposite side of the coin! The cost of a £100K house is £15K you could save up for that in say 5 years on minimum wage and buy the house cash with no mortgage. Having a mortgage means you pay for three houses and only get to keep one. So you would save the cost of two houses, that's money back in your pocket that the bank will never see. Minimum wage would be equal to current day without paying tax say £50 per hour. You could buy your car cash, no loan. We would be a cash rich nation in no time at all and the banks would just be a service to move our cash around as usual. There would be no national debt. We would have roads that do not wreck our cars. Let the mind wonder. And don't forget that all tax is illegal, it contravenes the bills of exchange act and is an act of fraud without the consent of the governed, and the consent of the governed is not a presentable fact.





So the last observation is this. We pay all this tax for the Fireman and the policeman and everybody else who gets paid from the public purse. But all those paid from the public purse also pay tax to the tune of 85%.

**How insane is that?**

It is no wonder that this country is commercially ruined and cannot compete in the world market place. That is just bad business management. I blame Parliament. This country is not economically viable.

## What's wrong with the world?

What is wrong with the world and what can we do about it?

# Lots and lots

Without ill will or vexation.

For and on behalf of the Principal legal embodiment by the title of Mr Peter Humm


For and on behalf of the attorney General of the House of Humm

For and on behalf of Peter-joseph of the House of Humm

No Assured Value. No liability. No errors and omissions accepted.

All Rights Reserved.






**No Body Gets Paid**

**On and for the record**





## No Body gets paid and nobody pays for anything ever. The Facts

What does this mean? What happened and when did this happen and what is the outcome?

This is becoming more and more difficult to validate from reputable source as much of that which was available has been removed from the public record. It is however a well known fact that the victors rewrite the public record to suit their needs. It has also been noted that where there is something to hide then hidden it will be. There is however still a great deal of information still available. One such resource is this. <http://mises.org/library/gold-standard-and-its-future> Published by, E. P. DUTTON & CO., INC. By All accounts this is the work of a young London University economist.

A commentary on the book made by [T.E. Gregory](#)

*“Between 1919 and 1925 a co-operative and successful effort was made to replace the monetary systems of the world upon a firm foundation and the international gold standard was thereby restored. In the last few years a variety of circumstances have combined to imperil this work of restoration. The collapse of the gold standard in a number of raw material producing countries in the course of 1930 was followed by the suspension of the gold standard in a number of European countries in 1931.*

*The most important country to be driven off was Great Britain, which had reverted to gold after the War by the Gold Standard*

*Act of April 1925. The Gold Standard (Amendment) Act, passed on September 25th 1931, by suspending the gold standard in this country, led not only to suspension by the Scandinavian countries and by Finland, but also to suspension in Ireland and India. Other countries followed, including Japan and the U.S.A”*

Followed by the usual disclaimer:-

*“Note: The views expressed on Mises.org are not necessarily those of the Mises Institute.”*

We find it very strange how these days that there is always a disclaimer and nobody stands by their words.

It is very strange that there is no record of this The Gold Standard Amendment Act 1931 at the .legislation.gov.uk website. I wonder why?

Google brings up 36,600 results but nothing on the .legislation.gov.uk web..... Very strange that?

So was the gold standard Act abolished and is there other evidence to support this?


Well for the older ones of us there is the living memory. People used to get paid with gold sovereigns and silver coins. Imagine that!!! People used to get paid with real money!!! How absurd. Back in the day and for thousands of years merchants used to use real gold and silver coins to trade. Back in the day the Merchants would make use of the gold smith's safe to keep their money safe in exchange for a cashier note to the value of what was deposited in the gold smiths safe.

So what happened?

Fractional lending happened where it was legalised by the government by agreement that the Banks could lend more money in the form of Bank notes than the Bank had sufficient gold or money to support. A bank note is not money. A Bank note has never been money but a note supported by the money on deposit in the Bank (The gold and the silver) This is also licence fraud legalised by agreement. Fraud is still fraud legalised or not. Fraud by agreement is still fraud. The Banks do not have enough money on deposit to support the notes in circulation.







At some point in the 1800's the Banks claimed the gold/silver as there would never be enough money to pay back all the debt that the Banks had created by licensed agreement with the government.

The facts are this. A Bank note is not money and never has been but only a note or a record of something of value. As long as there was a gold standard Act then the Bank note would be something of perceived value as it would have a relationship with something of value on deposit in the form of gold or silver.

What if there was no gold or silver to give the Bank note some value? What then? What then is the value of a Bank note? If there is no Gold standard Act and there is no money that the Bank note represents then what is the value of the Bank note?

If there is no money to support the Bank note then the Bank note is nothing more than a piece of paper with marks on it of no value. It would be Monopoly Money. How can we show this to be factual? Simple...

Take some Bank notes to the Bank of England, walk up to the cashier and demand the money that the Bank of England promises to pay on demand. How easy is that?? Don't be too surprised when the cashier looks at you strange and if you become insistent then the Bank security will be summoned to remove you from the premises for disturbing the peace. How much proof do you need?

What else do we have as evidence? Well there is the Bills of Exchange Act of 1882. Why was there no Bills of exchange Act before 1882? Did we not need any Bills of exchange Act before 1882?? Why is this date significant??

Could this be because the government went into the 11th chapter of insolvency prior to 1882 due to the fractional lending fraud?

How about you take out a loan and then ask the Bank to provide the source of the funds dating back by three accounts and be compliant with The Money Laundering Regulations 2007. Don't hold your breath waiting for a response. The Bank cannot provide the historic record of the source of the funds.

What really happens when you enter a retail outlet and purchase some goods with Bank of England Promissory notes? You then approach the **cashier** and make an **offer** of payment, which is a piece of paper from the bank of England where there is a promise to pay but no actual payment takes place. It is not possible to pay for anything without money. A Bank Note is not money.

The cashier then gives you a receipt for the offer of payment. So in effect pieces of paper have changed hands both with words and numbers on them. This complies with the Bills of Exchange act 1882 as two pieces of paper to the same perceived value has changed hands. But when did you ever return to the retail outlet and PAY for the Goods with money??

When did you ever pay for anything with real money?? A Bank Note has never been money. There is no monetary system. The economics is based upon confidence and belief in a monetary system where there is no money. Can somebody let me know where I can buy 20 pounds of confidence or 20 pounds of belief? Confidence and belief is of no material substance. Confidence and belief is a figment of the imagination.

We continue to use these words Money and Pay, without ever thinking of the actual meaning of the words. How can there be economics without money? Commerce is a scam. How is it possible for there to be Debt when there is no money? Every contractual obligation you have ever entered into is void by default because there has never been full disclosure by the parties.





You work for pay but you never get paid. There is no money to pay you with, just Bank notes that make promises that can never be kept. Even when there was real money in the form of gold and silver coins the weight of the silver coins adding up to 1 pound never ever weighed 1 pound (lb) Back in the day when there was 10s coins, two of them never weighed 1lb (1 pound) it never happened. Stop living in dream land and face the facts.

What is £100.00 BPS? British sterling silver weighed in troy ounces? Well 100 pounds is 100lb is 45kg. This is more than 25kg it is greater than the deemed safe carrying weight under the Health and Safety at Work etc Act 1974 where more than 25kg is a two man lift. It never happened. Ever. When are people going to wake up and smell the coffee Beans? Face the Facts!! To be in a capitalistic society is to exploit another for personal gain. But there has never been any gain because you never get paid. The Bankers and the politicians are going to be really pissed when they find out they got conned as well!! £100,000,000 is still nothing of value because there is no money. 100,000,000 times 0 = 0. Zero. These are the facts.

It could be said that I am making this all up as I go along. That may be true, but only maybe? It's a two way street. The politicians and the Bankers and the governments have been making it up as they go along for years and nobody ever noticed. Somebody made it all up. So the real question is this!!!

It is also true that where there is no physical material evidence to the contrary then the obvious stands as fact. Were the statement or the document containing the details of the obvious is then the documented fact that cannot be challenged as there is no material physical evidence to the contrary of the obvious.

**Sherlock Holmes** is a fictional character created by Scottish author and physician Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, a graduate of the University of Edinburgh Medical School. It is clear that Sir Arthur Conan Doyle was a learned man who was very skilled in analytical and deductive reasoning. From these writings by Sir Arthur Conan Doyle there is the following.

A Study in Scarlet (1886) Part 2, chap. 7, p. 83


***"In solving a problem of this sort, the grand thing is to be able to reason backward. That is a very useful accomplishment, and a very easy one, but people do not practise it much. In the everyday affairs of life it is more useful to reason forward, and so the other comes to be neglected. There are fifty who can reason synthetically for one who can reason analytically."***

**The Sign of the Four** (1890), Is the second novel featuring Sherlock Holmes written by Sir Arthur Conan Doyle.

***"When you have eliminated the impossible, whatever remains, however improbable, must be the truth?"***

Where there is the lack of material evidence to support the claim then is the claim being made not an act of fraud by the very fact that there is no material evidence to support the claim. The very lack of material physical evidence to support the claim is the evidence that is the material evidence that proves that the claim is fraud.





Consider the following:-

There are some fundamentals to be give consideration before an agreement or a contract is valid and enforceable.

- **Full disclosure by the parties.** If there is no full disclosure by the parties then the agreement is void from the outset. There would not be any material physical evidence to any missing disclosure but the absence of this material physical evidence is the evidence of the fraud.
- **Agreed Consideration by both parties.** There must be a consideration by both parties! There must be material evidence of this consideration. Where Banks are concerned then this would be the record as to the source of the funds lent to the Borrower. If the Bank has not provided this material evidence of the source of the funds then the bank have not given any consideration and cannot suffer any loss.
- **There should be a signed agreement by both parties.** Without the signature from both parties then there is no material evidence to the agreement or contract.
- To be compliant with The Companies Act 2006 (1) Under the law of England and Wales or Northern Ireland a document is executed by a company— (a) by the affixing of its common seal, or (b) by signature in accordance with the following provisions. (2) A document is validly executed by a company if it is signed on behalf of the company—
  - (a) by two authorised signatories, or
  - (b) by a director of the company in the presence of a witness who attests the signature.

The very absence of the company (Bank) seal or signatures from the company is the material evidence of the fact that their activities are fraudulent from the start.

(Account Holder) Signs the Bank's Loan Contract or Mortgage or credit card agreement (The Bank officer does not so there is no agreement or contract).

(Account Holder) Signature transforms the Loan Contract into a Financial Instrument worth the Value of the agreed amount.

**Bank Fails to Disclose** to (Account Holder) that the (Account Holder) Created an Asset.

(Financial Instrument) Asset Deposited with the Bank by the (Account Holder).

Financial Instrument remains property of (Account Holder) since the (Account Holder) created Financial Instrument with the signature.

**Bank Fails to Disclose** the Bank's Liability to the (Account Holder) for the Value of the Asset of the commercial instrument.

**Bank Fails to Give** (Account Holder) a Receipt for Deposit of the (Account Holders) Asset or commercial instrument.

New Credit is created on the Bank Books credited against the (Account Holder) Financial Instrument

**Bank Fails to Disclose** to the (Account Holder) that the (Account Holder) Signature Created New credit that is claimed by the

Bank as a Loan to the Borrower

Loan Amount Credited to an Account for Borrower's Use as a credit.

**Bank Deceives Borrower** by Calling Credit a "Loan" when it is a Deposited Asset created by the (Account Holder)

**Bank Deceives Public** at large by calling this process Mortgage Lending, Loan and similar.

**Bank Deceives Borrower** by Charging Interest and Fees when there is no consideration provided to the (Account Holder) by the Bank

Bank Provides None of own Money or commercial instruments so the Bank has No Consideration in the transaction and so **no True Contract exists.**


**Bank Deceives** (Account Holder) that the (Account Holder's) self-created Credit is a "Loan" from the Bank, thus there is No Full Disclosure so no True Contract exists.

(Account Holder) is the True Creditor in the Transaction. (Account Holder) Created the new credit as a commercial instrument.

**Bank provided no value or consideration.**

**Bank Deceives** (Account Holder) that (Account Holder) is Debtor not Creditor





**Bank Hides its Liability** by off balance-sheet accounting and only shows its Debtor ledger in order to Deceive the Borrower and the Court. The Bank is licensed by the government to commit actions that would otherwise be illegal (Banking Fraud) The court is a sub office of the same company. See Exhibit (C) The material evidence of the fact. The Court has an obligation to support actions licensed by the state. **There is a clear conflict of interests here.**

**Bank Demands** (Account Holder) payments without Just Cause, which is **Deception, Theft and Fraud**

**Bank Sells** (Account Holder) **Financial Instrument** to a third party for profit

Sale of the Financial Instrument confirms it has intrinsic value as an Asset yet that value is not credited to the (Account Holder) as Creator and Depositor of the Instrument.

**Bank Hides truth** from the (Account Holder), not admitting Theft, nor sharing proceeds of the sale of the (Account Holder's) Financial Instrument with the (Account Holder) and creator of the financial instrument.

The (Account Holder's) Financial Instrument is converted into a Security through a Trust or similar arrangement in order to defeat restrictions on transactions of Loan Contracts.

The Security including the Loan Contract is sold to investors, despite the fact that such **Securitization is Illegal**

Bank is not the Holder in Due Course of the Loan Contract.

Only the Holder in Due Course can claim on the Loan Contract.

**Bank Deceives the** (Account Holder) that the Bank is Holder in Due Course of the Loan Contract

**Bank makes Fraudulent Charges** to (Account Holder) for Loan payments which the Bank has no lawful right to since it is not the Holder in Due Course of the Loan Contract.

Bank advanced none of own money to (Account Holder) but only monetized (Account Holder) signature.

**Bank Interest is Usurious** based on there being No Money Provided to the (Account Holder) by the Bank so that any interest charged at all would be Usurious

Thus **BANK "LOAN" TRANSACTIONS ARE UNCONSCIONABLE!**

Bank Has No True Need for a Mortgage over the Borrower's Property, since the Bank has No Consideration, No Risk and No Need for Security.

**Bank Exploits** (Account Holder) by demanding a Redundant and Unjust Mortgage.

**Bank Deceives** (Account Holder) that the Mortgage is needed as Security

Mortgage Contract is a second Financial Instrument Created by the (Account Holder)

Deposit of the Mortgage Contract is not credited to the (Account Holder)

Bank sells the (Account Holder) Mortgage Contract for profit without disclosure or share of proceeds to (Account Holder)

Sale of the Mortgage Contract confirms it has intrinsic value as an Asset yet that value is not credited to the (Account Holder) as Creator and Depositor of the Mortgage Contract

**Bank Deceives** (Account Holder) that Bank is the Holder in Due Course of the Mortgage

**Bank Extorts Unjust Payments** from the (Account Holder) under Duress with threat of Foreclosure

**Bank Steals** (Account Holder) **Wealth** by intimidating (Account Holder) to make Unjust and fraudulent Loan Payments

**Bank Harasses** (Account Holder) if (Account Holder) fails to make payments, threatening Legal Recourse


Bank Enlists Lawyers willing to **Deceive** (Account Holder) and Court and **Exploit** (Account Holder)

**Bank Deceives Court** that Bank is Holder in Due Course of Loan Contract and Mortgage.

Bank's Lawyers Deceive and Exploit Court to **Defraud** (Account Holder)

The government license the Bank were a license is permission to partake in an activity which would otherwise be illegal. The Court (Judiciary) is a sub office of the company which grants the license and has an obligation to find in favour of the holder of that license as the Judiciary is a sub office of the company (STATE) that grants the license. See Exhibit (C) The material evidence of the Fact.





The Judiciary is a sub office of the (STATE) Company and this is confirmed by the Rt. Hon. Lord chief Justice Sir Jack Beatson FBA. This is a fact on and for the record.

The State (Company) has no legal authority to grant the license.

See Exhibit (B) Case authority No WI-05257F as definitive material evidence of this fact that the governed have not given their consent or the legal authority for the (STATE) (Government) company to create legislation or grant license. This is a fact on and for the record.

**Bank Steals** (Account Holder) **Mortgaged Property** with Legal Impunity.

**Bank Holds** (Account Holder) **Liable** for any outstanding balance of original Loan plus costs

Bank Profits from Loan Contract and Mortgage by Sale of the Loan Contract, Sale of the Mortgage, Principal and Interest Charges, Fees Charged, Increase of its Lending Capacity due to (Account Holder) Mortgaged Asset and by Acquisition of (Account Holder) Mortgaged Property in Foreclosure. Bank retains the amount of increase to the Money Supply Created by the (Account Holder) Signature once the Loan Account has been closed.

(Account Holder) is damaged by the Bank's Loan Contract and Mortgage by Theft of his Financial Instrument Asset, Theft of his Mortgage Asset, Being Deceived into the unjust Status of a Debt Slave, Paying Lifetime Wealth to the Bank, Paying Unjust Fees and Charges, Living in Fear of Foreclosure, and ultimately having his Family Home Stolen by the Bank.

Thus the BANK MORTGAGE LOAN BUSINESS IS UNCONSCIONABLE.

### **So what is the material evidence that is missing?**

- First there is the contract or agreement which bears no signature from the bank or the company seal.
- The true accounting from the Bank (Company) that shows the source of the funds that the Bank lent to the borrower.
- Full disclosure from the Bank (Company) to the fact that it is the (Account Holder's) signature that created the commercial instrument and the asset which is the true source of the funds.
- The consent of the governed (Exhibit (B))
- The recorded legal authority on and for the record. (Exhibit (B))

Facts are facts because they are the facts. Facts have material substance. The material evidence of the facts is something of material substance. When there is no material substance to the facts then there is Bill and Ben making things up as they go along.


These are the FACTS. This is the documented evidence of the facts. It is the very lack of the material evidence to the contrary to these documented facts, which is the very evidence itself.

Where there can be no physical evidence presented as material evidence that the opposite is true, is by default the fact. And Fraud.

We are all victims of this same criminal and intentional and UNCONSCIONABLE crime. This is inclusive but not limited to:-

- The lawyers,
- The Barristers,
- The Judges,
- The Members of Parliament (MP's)
- The Banking Staff,
- The Police,
- The people of this land.





Who is not a victim of this UNCONSCIONABLE crime?

These are the Facts and the documented Facts on and for the record. These facts stand as facts until somebody presents the material evidence which stands as fact to the contrary to these stated, documented on and for the record facts.


## **Who is the Fool? The Fool, or the Fool that follows the Fool?**

Without ill will or vexation.

For and on behalf of the Principal legal embodiment of Mr. Peter Humm  
For and on behalf of the Attorney General of the House of Humm  
For and on behalf of Peter-joseph of the House of Humm

No Assured Value. No liability. No errors and omissions accepted.  
All Rights Reserved.






## Exhibit (G)

**An Englishman's Home is his castle**





## An Englishman's Home is his castle

Queen Elizabeth the second took a verbal oath when she entered into service (Status Servant) of her own free will. This oath was to uphold the Laws and —TRADITIONS|| of this land.

An Englishman's home is his Castle and an assault on the Castle is a recognised Act of WAR. In a time of War then the casualties of War, are just that, the casualties of war. He that knowingly enters into an act of war knowingly or unknowingly has still entered into an act of war of his own volition. The occupants defending the Castle cannot be held culpable for any casualties of war even though these casualties of war should end up dead. This is recognised from the historic —traditions|| of this land.

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Castle\\_doctrine](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Castle_doctrine)

A **castle doctrine** (also known as a **castle law** or a **defence of habitation law**) is a legal doctrine that designates a person's abode (or any legally-occupied place [e.g., a vehicle or workplace]) as a place in which that person has certain protections and immunities permitting him or her, in certain circumstances, to use force (up to and including deadly force) to defend themselves against an intruder, free from legal responsibility/prosecution for the consequences of the force used.[1] Typically deadly force is considered justified, and a defence of justifiable homicide applicable, in cases "when the actor reasonably fears imminent peril of death or serious bodily harm to him or herself or another".[1]

The doctrine is not a defined law that can be invoked, but a set of principles which is incorporated in some form in the law of many states.

The legal concept of the inviolability of the home has been known in Western Civilization since the age of the Roman Republic. [2] The term derives from the historic English common law dictum that "an Englishman's home is his castle".

This concept was established as English law by 17th century jurist Sir Edward Coke, in his *The Institutes of the Laws of England*, 1628.[3] The dictum was carried by colonists to the New World, who later removed "English" from the phrase, making it "a man's home is his castle", which thereby became simply the castle doctrine.[3] The term has been used in England to imply a person's absolute right to exclude anyone from his home, although this has always had restrictions, and since the late twentieth century bailiffs have also had increasing powers of entry.[4] There is a claim here that since the late twentieth century bailiffs have also had increasing powers of entry. This is incorrect because a Bailiff in the twentieth century is a crown corporation servant and the crown authority has no authority without a legal agreement that the crown has an authority. There is no material evidence to the fact that there is any legal agreement. This fact has now been confirmed.

Case Authority No WI 05257F David Ward and Warrington Borough Council 30th Day of May 2013 at court tribunal.

The crown has no power of entry. The crown Bailiffs do not have power of entry. It is done.

Any Crown Authority stops at the boundary of the property. To proceed beyond this point is a recognised Act of War.


Where no such legal agreement exists then the Bailiff who is only a Bailiff by title has no powers of entry, unless that authority can be presented in the form of a legal agreement: which must contain upon it two wet ink signatures, one of which must be yours.

So a Bailiff has no power of entry without your consent to do so and an assault upon the castle is a recognised Act of war.

We have case law to support this fact where for example, the Bailiff was smashed over the head with a milk Bottle.







**A debtor is where there is proof of Debt. Where there is no proof of debt then you are not a debtor.**

Case Law in the UK Queens Bench. <http://www.dealingwithbailiffs.co.uk>

Vaughan v McKenzie [1969] 1 QB 557 if the debtor strikes the bailiff over the head with a full milk bottle after making a forced entry, the debtor is not guilty of assault because the bailiff was there illegally, likewise R. v Tucker at Hove Trial Centre Crown Court, December 2012 if the debtor gives the bailiff a good slap.

If a person strikes a trespasser who has refused to leave is not guilty of an offence: Davis v Lisle [1936] 2 KB 434

License to enter must be refused BEFORE the process of levy starts, Kay v Hibbert [1977] Crim LR 226 or Matthews v Dwan [1949] NZLR 1037 ..... *Aha send a denial of implied right of access before the Bailiff comes in advance.*

A bailiff rendered a trespasser is liable for penalties in tort and the entry may be in breach of Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights if entry is not made in accordance with the law, Jokinen v Finland [2009] 37233/07

<http://www.dealingwithbailiffs.co.uk>

A debtor can remove right of implied access by displaying a notice at the entrance. This was endorsed by **Lord Justice Donaldson** in the case of Lambert v Roberts [1981] 72 Cr App R 223 - and placing such a notice is akin to a closed door but it also prevents a bailiff entering the garden or driveway, Knox v Anderton [1983] Crim LR 115 or R. v Leroy Roberts [2003] EWCA Crim 2753

Debtors can also remove implied right of access to property by telling him to leave: Davis v Lisle [1936] 2 KB 434 similarly, McArdle v Wallace [1964] 108 Sol Jo 483

A person having been told to leave is now under a duty to withdraw from the property with all due reasonable speed and failure to do so he is not thereafter acting in the execution of his duty and becomes a trespasser with any subsequent levy made being invalid and attracts a liability under a claim for damages, Morris v Beardmore [1980] 71 Cr App 256.

Bailiffs cannot force their way into a private dwelling, Grove v Eastern Gas [1952] 1 KB 77

Excessive force must be avoided, Gregory v Hall [1799] 8 TR 299 or Oakes v Wood [1837] 2 M&W 791

A debtor can use an equal amount of force to resist a bailiff from gaining entry, Weaver v Bush [1795] 8TR, Simpson v Morris [1813] 4 Taunt 821, Polkinhorne v Wright [1845] 8QB 197. Another occupier of the premises or an employee may also take these steps: Hall v Davis [1825] 2 C&P 33.


Also wrongful would be an attempt at forcible entry despite resistance, Ingle v Bell [1836] 1 M&W 516

Bailiffs cannot apply force to a door to gain entry, and if he does so he is not in the execution of his duty, Broughton v Wilkerson [1880] 44 JP 781

A Bailiff may not encourage a third party to allow the bailiff access to a property (i.e. workmen inside a house), access by this means renders the entry unlawful, Nash v Lucas [1867] 2 QB 590.

The debtor's home and all buildings within the boundary of the premises are protected against forced entry, Munroe & Munroe v Woodspring District Council [1979] Weston-Super-Mare County Court





A Bailiff may not encourage a third party to allow the bailiff access to a property (i.e. workmen inside a house), access by this means renders the entry unlawful, Nash v Lucas [1867] 2 QB 590.

Contrast: A bailiff may climb over a wall or a fence or walk across a garden or yard provided that no damage occurs, Long v Clarke & another [1894] 1 QB 119.

It is not contempt to assault a bailiff trying to climb over a locked gate after being refused entry, Lewis v Owen [1893] The Times November 6 p.36b (QBD)

If a bailiff enters by force he is there unlawfully and you can treat him as a trespasser. Curlewis v Laurie [1848] or Vaughan v McKenzie [1969] 1 QB 557.

A debtor cannot be sued if a person enters a property uninvited and injures himself because he had no legal right to enter, Great Central Railway Co v Bates [1921] 3 KB 578.

If a bailiff jams his boot into a debtors door to stop him closing, any levy that is subsequently made is not valid: Rai & Rai v Birmingham City Council [1993] or Vaughan v McKenzie [1969] 1 QB 557 or Broughton v Wilkerson [1880] 44 JP 781

If a bailiff refuses to leave the property after being requested to do so or starts trying to force entry then he is causing a disturbance, Howell v Jackson [1834] 6 C&P 723 - but it is unreasonable for a police officer to arrest the bailiff unless he makes a threat, Bibby v Constable of Essex [2000] Court of Appeal April 2000.

The very presence of the Bailiff or third Part Company who is engaged in a recognised Act of war is an assault on the castle and it is reasonable for the police officer to arrest the bailiff where there is a recognised Act of War. If the police officer does not arrest the Bailiff on request then the police officer is guilty by default of an offence against legislation which is the offence of Malfeasance in a public office. The police officer is also guilty by default of an act of fraud as he is on duty and being paid for his inaction. The penalty under legislation for these offences are as follows: 25 years' incarceration for the offence of Malfeasance in a public office and 7 to 10 years' incarceration for the offence of fraud under current legislation for which the police officer is culpable.

Without ill will or vexation.

For and on behalf of the principal legal embodiment by the title of Mr Peter Humm  
For and on behalf of the Attorney General of the House of Humm  
For and on behalf of: Peter-joseph of the House of Humm

No Assured Value. No liability. No errors and omissions accepted.  
All Rights Reserved.





**LEGAL NOTICE TO BAILIFF/ or third Party Company.**

**NOTICE TO AGENT IS NOTICE TO PRINCIPAL; NOTICE TO PRINCIPAL IS NOTICE TO AGENT**

DO NOT IGNORE THIS NOTICE IGNORING THIS NOTICE WILL HAVE CONSEQUENCES.

**NOTICE OF REMOVAL OF IMPLIED RIGHT OF ACCESS  
FROM THIS TIME FORWARD AND IN PERPETUITY**

Peter-joseph of the House of Humm hereby gives notice of removal of the implied right of access to the property known as 228 High Street, Belmont Victoria 3216 And surrounding areas: Along with all associated property including, but not limited to, any private conveyance, in respect of the following:

Please also take notice that the land known as England has recognised historic traditions and any transgression of this notice will be dealt with according to the traditions of this land where it is recognised that an Englishman's House is his Castle and any transgressions upon that property is also a recognised Act of War. It is recognised that a state of war has been declared by you, let battle commence.

I, a man who has a recognised status by natural descent according to the traditions of this land being: Peter-joseph of the House of Humm claim indefeasible Right to self-defence, and to protect the House of Humm family Castle and the contents therein but not limited to, 228 High Street, Belmont Victoria 3216 and surrounding areas.

Any transgressions will be dealt with using any force deemed necessary at the discretion of the House of Humm. You have been given legal warning. Your personal safety and the safety of any agents may be compromised if you ignore this legal warning. No quarter given.

Nothing will prevent us from defending our life, our family home (Castle) and all that is held within. All natural and Inalienable Rights Reserved as recognised by the historic traditions of this land.

**You have been served LEGAL NOTICE**

Without ill will or vexation.

For and on behalf of the principal legal embodiment by the title of Mr Peter Humm  
For and on behalf of the Attorney General of the House of Humm  
For and on behalf of: Peter-joseph of the House of Humm

No Assured Value. No liability. No errors and omissions accepted.  
All Rights Reserved.





## **Exhibit (H)**

### **The Hypocrisy of the Secret Ballot Elective Process.**





Do we really have a valid election process? Is Government truly government by the people for the people? Are we all members of the public? What are the known observable Facts?

## **What is an election?**

An election is where the people elect into office the representatives they wish to represent them into local government and then Parliament. Everybody knows that, we have been doing this for decades. The concept is that we elect of ourselves and that is self government by the people for the people, it is obvious any fool can see that. The people elect of themselves and then the people tell the local government what they want and the local government pass this forward to the central government and therefore we have government by the people for the people and all is well.

Is this really what happens?

## **Secret Ballot**

Is this a valid process? Well we do have a choice of all the elected councillors. Is this a real choice? The first question would be as to where be the box to place the —X in that states —None of the above? Strange how this option is not present on the Ballot sheet. Where does this collection of candidates come from in the first place? 95% of the people would not be able to answer this question. Then there is the process itself. The people place an —X in a box to signify a choice. So there is only a Mr or Ms —X who has voted in a secret Ballot.

Where is the accountability? Who was it that voted in this secret Ballot? Well that would be Mr or Mrs —X. What happens to all these Ballot sheets after a secret Ballot? Should they not be kept on and for the public record? But what would be the point?

This is after all a **SECRET** Ballot.

So the first question is this. Where is the material evidence that there has been somebody elected into office? If an elected was asked to present the material evidence of the fact that they have been elected. Then where is this material evidence and accountability? How can the elected prove by presenting physical evidence that they have been elected? Where is the public record on and for the public record? In which public office can this evidence be seen?

Can our current Prime Minister present the material evidence of the fact that he has been elected? No he cannot.

## **The un-election Process.**


What is this? 63.5 million People on this land can tell and know what the elective process is. But not one of the 63.5 Million people can tell or know what the un-election process is! How is this representative of the people's choice? The fact is there is no process to remove some one from office once they have been elected into office. How is this government by the people for the people where there is no known process to un-elect an officer of the state?

## **The Public and the Private.**

It is a general consensus of opinion that the people of this land are the public. Is this correct? No, it is not. Only those in public office and who are paid from the public purse are members of the public. So the general consensus of opinion is incorrect.

An opinion is not fact. A belief is not fact. So is a general consensus of opinion a fact? No, it is an opinion. We have searched all the Ordnance Survey Maps for a public road. We did not find one. So where is the material evidence that there is such a thing as a public road or a public highway? There is however designated public foot paths for pedestrians to pas and re-pas as long as the pedestrians do not obstruct the public foot path.





We have also had great difficulty finding the queens highway. It is a common held belief that we have the right to free travel down the queen's highway but for the life of us we cannot find the queen's highway on any Ordnance Survey Maps. We were hoping to locate this queen's highway; as if it has the right to free travel then we could travel this queen's highway without any speed restrictions. Additionally we could also have charged the queen for travelling expenses as we are travelling on the queen's highway for free as there is always an expense when travelling. But after consulting all of the Ordnance Survey Maps alas, there was no queen's highway to be found. So there is no material evidence to support the people's general consensus of opinion that there is such a thing as the queen's highway. Therefore the general consensus of opinion is incorrect.

So is there such a thing as a public road? This public road would be a public road if it was a designated public road only for the members of the public on the public payroll to drive upon. So which of the roads on this land is a designated public road purely and specifically for the purpose of the public use? The majority of the people are private individuals who are not paid from the public purse. If you are not on the public pay role then you are not a member of the public.

Is there such a thing as —The public? It is quite clear from the Rt. Hon. Sir Jack Beatson speech at the Nottingham and Trent law university and the definition of a state by the London School of Economics that a state is a private company. See Exhibit (C) The Material evidence of the FACTS which is the material evidence that there is no such thing as public and that the general consensus of opinion is once again incorrect and there is no such thing as public. This is once again a belief and not a fact.

### **So do we have a valid election process and does this have any valid credibility.**

Quite simply the answer is No. Let us sum up the facts.

- There is no un-election process.
- Only Mr and Mrs —X have voted (No accountability)
- There is no material evidence to present on and for the public record that there has been an election. (No accountability).
- No elected official in public office can present any material evidence to the fact that they have been elected.
- There is no public office as the office is the office of a private company. See Exhibit (C).
- The private policy of the private government company carries no authority or legal obligation under the private company government legal definition of statute where there is a requirement for the legal consent of the governed. See Exhibit (B).
- There is no legal obligation for the elected to act upon the wishes of the people. (No accountability).
- The office of the Judiciary is a sub office to a private company. See Exhibit (C).

Do we have an elected government by the people for the people where this government has responsibility and accountability to the people?

**The answer is No we do not.**

**These are the facts on and for the record.**

Without ill will or vexation.

For and on behalf of the Principal legal embodiment by the title of Mr Peter Humm  
For and on behalf of the Attorney General of the House of Humm  
For and on behalf of Peter-joseph of the House of Humm

No Assured Value. No Liability. No Errors and Omissions accepted. All Rights Reserved

