HOW COURT OPERATES

When entering a *court building,* almost everyone employed at this *place of business* will be trained to deceive you into agreeing with, or entering you into, a *contract* that you will know nothing about.

The "contract" is within the jurisdiction of the court.

<u>Note:</u> a *court* is not the same as a *courtroom*. A *court* is held by a *natural living person* making a claim, a *courtroom* is just a room where it is held.

Plebeian

Plebeians, or lower class "commoners", are controlled by **Roman Common Law** to become the debtors. **Patricians** were the upper class who benefited from the **credit** of the people by making them both the **creditors** and the **debtors**.

<u>Note:</u> the origin of the name "court" is a place to trade debt and bonds; this has been going on for over 2000 years, and has not changed to this day.

Ignorance

The court uses "consent through ignorance".

If you are in the court building, then just your presence could be taken as "acceptance" of a contract, or your "consent" to a jurisdiction.

To combat this, you must state why you are there.

<u>Note:</u> all questions and declarations should be stated to the "clerk of the court" and not the magistrate directly. So on entry to the courtroom, identify who the clerk of the court is.

Remember this: *nothing* can be hidden in a courtroom, otherwise *informed consent* is lost and the court collapses.

Special Appearance

The courts operate under a system of "voluntary submission", and require your consent.

When questioned <u>why</u> you have appeared before the **court**, usually by the simple action of asking your name, they are trying to get you to "**consent**" to a **general appearance**, resulting in the "**acceptance**" of their **jurisdiction** and loss of your sovereign status.

An appearance in *court* may be either *general* or *special*:

- **General:** is a simple and unqualified or unrestricted submission to the jurisdiction of the court.
- **Special:** is a submission to the jurisdiction for some specific purpose only, <u>not</u> for all the purposes of the suit.

Meaning, a *general appearance* is made where the defendant waives defects of service and submits to the *jurisdiction* of the *court*.

Whereas a *special appearance* is for the purpose of testing, or objecting to, the sufficiency of service or the *jurisdiction* of the *court* over the defendant or respondent, *without* submitting to such jurisdiction.

Special Appearance in Chancery

The *Chancery Court* or *Chancery Division of the High Court* operates within *ecclesiastical law* jurisdiction, including *diplomatic*.

The *Chancery Court* is considered a "high court of equity" in England and Wales, with common law functions and jurisdiction over causes in equity.

This *court* applies *principles of equity* or "equity law" to a dispute and has protected orders, which operate above *acts* and *statutes*.

If declared in court that you are "here by special appearance in Chancery", it raises the jurisdiction of the court to a "higher level" above "acts and statutes".

Mr and Mrs

In *court* the title *Mr* and *Mrs* refers to your "foreign military accounts" or "foreign situs trust", and the *court* is a "foreign vessel" in dry dock.

Do not accept these titles, or you have surrendered your sovereign status and agreed for the *court* to access your "foreign military accounts".

Note: it is your right to accept, decline or even refuse any title being applied to you.

Legal titles do not mean the same as described in the *Oxford English Dictionary*, so other *legal titles* to decline would be:

- **Resident**: a person occupying within a jurisdiction, and does not own the property.
- *Occupier*: as in "occupation", referring to a person's profession within a jurisdiction conducting commerce.

<u>Note:</u> *Occupation* also means taking control of a piece of land or property which belongs to someone else.

Postcode in Court:

The use of the **postcode** is acceptance of **"residency"**. Meaning you are the **"corporate legal entity"**, and therefore cannot **"live"** there.

If an employee within the court persists in trying to apply titles to you, inquire that they must *define* said title first.

If they continue further, they are now causing a conflict and contempt of court.

If you are currently auditing the *court*, this should be noted, as should all answers to questions and other issues.

When asked your Name

You will be asked to give your name, however what they are trying to do in court is for you to accept the name of your "legal fiction" or "corporation".

If you *refuse* to give your name, then they will record that you did not turn up to court, and put out a warrant for your arrest.

However, you can proceed by letting the court know that you are there for the matter associated with the name, and they can call you by a name of your choice. Furthermore, you will notice them that you *reserve all your rights*.

<u>Note:</u> Court protocol dictates that a "defendant" or "respondent" can be addressed the way they choose.

These two titles have different meanings, as follows:

- A *defendant* has accepted the *claim* or *obligation* and is now "*defending*" their position.
- A *respondent* is "*responding*" to a *claim* but has <u>not</u> accepted the *claim* or *obligation*.

For example:

Court: "Are you Mr John Henry Doe?"

Respondent: "I am here for that matter, you can call me John and I reserve all my rights."

They may persist, so you can reply as follows:

"I am unable to give you my name, as I would be without name; however you can call me John as I am here for that matter."

Addition: "I am the responsible party in due course for that account."

Meaning, that you are the "creditor" to the "debt" or bond, which is "for sale", and are therefore the "account holder". This plays into the constructed trust which is most likely operating within the court.

If you are pressured to give your full name, or accept a full name, by the following questions:

- "Give me your name?"
- "What is your name?"
- "Are you [John Henry doe)?"

Reply: "Could you define the meaning behind the name as written on your paperwork?"

<u>For example</u>: *Are you referring to either*:

• A private natural person or

• A corporation?

If the court is hesitant to answer, you can follow up with a question as follows:

"Are you asking me that question to entice me into an immoral contract to purport to act in person as a corporation through a crown created fictitious corporate name?"

If the court becomes belligerent and is going to declare a verdict that you have "not attended" court and then put out a "warrant" for your arrest, you may have no choice but to reveal your name, however state the following:

"You can call me John Henry Doe; however this declaration is not acceptance of any obligation, jurisdiction or contract and is not to be applied to the following":

- 1. A Corporation.
- 2. An implied company.
- 3. A constructed trust.
- 4. A Dead Entity.
- 5. Legal Title.
- 6. Legal Entity.
- 7. The last name is not a surname but a family name.

You should then question the court for the source of the name.

Source of the Name

If the court is trying to apply a name to you, which is usually done by asking you "Are you [John Henry doe]?", inquire on the source of the name.

<u>For example:</u> many names are written and sound the same, but are <u>not</u> the same name. Anyone with the last name "ford" is **not** necessarily the owner of the "ford" motor company.

There are many names that share the following;

- Style (font).
- Spelling.
- Diction.
- Language.
- Pronunciation.

However they are **NOT** the same name.

To define the true name, the *original source* must be determined, therefore ask for the *source* of the name and *who* sourced said name.

Birth certificate:

If it is a "traffic matter" and "the court" gave the source for your name as your "driver's licence", then that name <u>cannot</u> be used as a form of identification as it is based on "your" birth certificate.

<u>Note:</u> it is clearly written on "your" birth certificate that it cannot be used as a form of identity, and therefore any document based on it can also <u>not</u> be used as a source of identity.

Third Party Representative

Once you have established what you wish to be called within the courtroom, usually just your first name, you can now claim you are the *Third Party Representative* for your *legal fiction*.

For example: "You can call me John, I am the third party representative for Mr John Henry Doe."

<u>Note:</u> it may be prudent to establish who is the *rightful legal owner* of *"Mr John Henry Doe"* before offering to be the representative.

<u>Also note:</u> if you have brought proof of your own *limited corporation*, then you can claim you represent that.

The *legal fiction* that is used within these courts is <u>NOT</u> owned by you, but is *crown copyrighted*, so you could be committing fraud for speaking on behalf of said *legal fiction*.

<u>Note:</u> you can use this as the reason why you cannot accept the *legal fiction* or "corporate name" being used within court, as "Mr John Henry Doe" is not owned by you.

If you find yourself in court and the "claimant" happens to be a corporation, such as "The Police" or "The Council" or "The Inland Revenue", then you, in turn, will require the name of the Representative for that "legal fiction".

Because the claim is being made against you, you have the right to have the full name of the *claimant* in court on that day.

If there is no one within the courtroom who wishes to represent the *corporation* making the claim and therefore be accountable, liable and responsible for said *corporation*, then the court collapses.

For the court to move forward it will require the following:

- John a "Private living person" representing "Mr John Henry Doe" a Corporation.
- Tom Dick Smith a "Private living person" representing "The Government" a Corporation.

Jurisdiction of the Court

Most people are tricked into accepting the jurisdiction of the court by some very deceptive methods.

The judge will try and gain *jurisdiction* and *control* over you through the follow ways:

- 1. Oath of Office.
- 2. Statutes.
- 3. Parens Patriae.

Oath of Office:

Ask to see proof of the oath taken and the up-to-date copy of the oath.

Statutes:

Statutes, **acts**, **codes**, **regulations** are all quoted within **court** and the judge is hoping that your silence is acceptance of these jurisdictions, so it is assumed you have accepted them.

Remedy: when *acts* and *statutes* are used, ask who is *administrating* them and if the court has evidence that you are an *employee* of the government.

<u>Note:</u> within the *legal system* the people are *"governed"* by *consent*, and therefore *acts*, *statutes* and *regulations* cannot be forced onto a *natural living person*.

The *court* is operating as a *"foreign vessel"* at *dry dock*, and is <u>not</u> currently under any other jurisdiction, this is why so many people fall foul of this deception by quoting from other *jurisdictions of law* which are *not* applicable.

So before quoting *acts*, *statutes*, *rules* and *regulations* you should ensure that the court is operating with the correct jurisdiction, so ask the following questions:

- 1. Is the court operating within the Bill of Rights act 1688-1689?
- 2. Is the Coronation Oath act 1688 current statute law?
- 3. Do you accept the jurisdiction of the bench book?

Once these *jurisdictions* have been confirmed, you can now quote *legislation* from them.

Bench Book:

Once the jurisdiction of the Bench Book has been accepted, the clerk of the court is obligated to introduce you to everyone within the courtroom:

Bench Book Page 28: Section 63 of the Equal Treatment Bench Book, requires the court
introduce everyone, and must explain each person's role. This means not only their title but
also their rights and obligations.

If the answer regarding the previous jurisdictions should be "no", which is unlikely or the deception would be obvious to see, then ask the following:

To the Court: "What jurisdiction is being offered?"

You then have the right to accept or decline.

Parens Patriae:

Parens patriae is Latin for "parent of the nation". In "colour of law" it refers to the "public policy power" of the "state" to intervene against an abusive or negligent "parent", legal guardian, or informal caretaker, and to act as the "parent" of any child, individual or animal who is in need of protection.

Note: notice the wording here; "parent of the nation" or "parent of one's country" or "father of the people" means "common law authority".

Therefore *Parens Patriae* means the "common law authority" of the Attorney General to represent the interests of those who are unable to represent themselves.

Because you are unable to "represent" yourself, you have now lost your authority and are under the authority of someone else.

<u>Jury</u>

If the court has agreed that they are operating under the jurisdiction of the *Bill of Rights act 1688-1689*, you may wish to inquire to the absence of a jury.

Not only is it your right to be tried in front of a *jury*, but within the *Bill of Rights act 1688-1689* jurisdiction it also stipulates this.

Also with the Bill of Rights act 1688-1689 it is stated:

"No fine or forfeiture without conviction with a jury of my peers."

The minimum number of people it takes to form a jury is 12, although a *Common law* court has 25 jury members.

This is why modern day "courts" often only "allow" 7 people into the courtroom, so you are unable to form your own jury.

Note: limiting the number of people to enter the *courtroom* is a violation of your rights.

To combat this fraud you have the right to bring a *jury* of 12 or more people with you; this gives control of the *court* to the *jury*. The judge cannot stop this, or he would be in contempt of court.

A true *court of law* is an *open court* and a *court of record*, meaning you can bring your own jury, witnesses, recording devices and audit team with you.

The jury for any court should be made up of "his peers" and NOT citizens.

<u>Note:</u> *peer* means people your age, or close to it, who have experiences and interests similar to yours, preferably who are living within the same local economy and location.

Citizen means "slave to the city", or employee of a corporation, namely the "crown corporation".

Memorandum of Consent

Once you have established who is in court and they have each identified themselves and confirmed their individual oaths, it would be advisable to confirm the *case number*.

The case number allows easy and unique reference to specific civil and criminal cases. Such as:

- 1. Identifying the year the case was filed.
- 2. The office in which it was filed.
- 3. The judicial officer whom it was assigned to.

<u>Note:</u> everything that occurs within these courts is all commerce, including *criminal* cases. Meaning a "*criminal charge*" is still brought forward for financial gain, resulting in the creation of a *prison certificate*, which is securitised and sold on the debt market.

Once a case number has been created, it is applied to a *Memorandum of Consent* and *Case management files*.

<u>Note:</u> it is important to note that the one being accused <u>must</u> sign these documents for the court to move forward. Without a signature, the court is committing fraud if the court continues.

On the *Case management files* there will be a *declaration box* that must be signed by you.

One of the deceptions, or frauds, to get around the signing of this document, if you decline, is to get it signed by someone else on your behalf.

Meaning it can either be signed by you or *your solicitor*; however the solicitor will not tell you this otherwise he will lose his commission.

Furthermore, you must sign this document to *excuse* the *jury*, or the court has no *jurisdiction* and cannot proceed.

The jury must be **excused** before judgment can be made, so they cannot be held liable for their decision, unless intent to defraud is discovered.

Court as a Trust

The court is being set up as a trust, so these questions can be asked regarding the construction of a trust that resembles your full name:

"I must confirm the following regarding this name:

Is there an illegal trust before this court that was set up using a nom de guerre, which resembles this name?"

If the clerk answers "no", give them forewarning that they will be personally liable if this is to be found untrue.

If the clerk answers "yes", which is unlikely, respond as follows:

"I require the bond to be brought forward. Is there a reference number or bond number attached to your paperwork?"

"I do not consent to being surety for this case and these proceedings."

"I demand the bond be immediately brought forward so I can see who will indemnify me if I am damaged."

Alleged Claim

When a claim is made upon you, there are three points you should remember:

- 1. The burden of proof is placed on the one making the claim.
- 2. You have the right to know the full name and contact details, namely their address, of the one making the claim against you.
- 3. You are under no obligation to answer any questions.

So, before you proceed any further you will require "the court" to provide the full name and details of the person making the claim.

If these details are not provided, then ask the following:

"Who is refusing to give me these details?"

It is unlikely anyone will accept this liability, as you can then make a claim against them. However, without the details of the person making the claim, the *court* collapses as there is no one making a claim. And, without a *claim*, there is no *cause* and therefore no *case*.

Claimant a Corporation

There can only be two types of claimant offered by the court, and they are as follows:

- 1. A private natural person.
- 2. A corporation.

It is the latter, a "corporation" or "legal fiction", which you must address if given in court as the claimant.

<u>Note:</u> a *corporation* can only make a claim against another *corporation*. A *corporation* can <u>never</u> make a claim against a *private natural person*. These are two separate jurisdictions, and can <u>never</u> cross.

If a name of *corporation* is given, then you will need to know the name of the *corporation* the claim is being made against.

<u>For example:</u> the following would be *legal entities*, *legal fictions* and *corporations*:

- 1. The state.
- 2. The government.
- 3. The police.
- 4. The council.

<u>Note:</u> in fact, you should question any name given if not applied to a *natural living person*, and even then you should get confirmation and <u>never</u> assume.

If a name of a *corporation* is given, then you will need to ask the following:

"Can you give me the name of the corporation that [insert corporation] is making the claim against?"

Now the court has a problem: they cannot proceed without divulging the name of the *corporation*, which will resemble your name, at which point the gig is up.

Furthermore, you will need to see the contract between these two *corporations* that allows the claim to be made, so you can ascertain if you are even obligated.

Note: it is your right to be provided with a lawful contract on demand.

Verified Claim

There must be a *verified claim* in court, meaning a claim must be backed by a *private natural person* or *"living breathing man or woman"* and, if an affidavit is present, that *private natural person* can be cross-examined in court, on the day.

If a name of a *corporation* is given, then a *private natural person* representing the *corporation* or "*legal fiction*" will have to accept liability for the claim.

If no one is willing to take responsibility, liability and the consequences of making the claim, then there is no claim. And, without a claim, you must question why you are even in court at all.

There can be no *cause of action* if there is *no claim*, meaning there is *no case*.

Body Corporate

When a "legal fiction" or "corporation" is making a claim against you, although in reality it will not be you but against your own corporation, challenge the corporation that they are not a "for-profit" organisation.

All corporations are registered with *Dun and Bradstreet*, *Companies House* or *the U.S. Securities* and *Exchange Commission*.

- Companies House: the Department for Business registration within the UK Corporation.
- **Dun and Bradstreet**: Credit reporting agency for corporations.
- *The U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission*: regulates companies within the USA Corporation.

Both the "council" and "police", and indeed even the "government", give the false, assumed illusion they are "not-for-profit", when in fact they are.

For example: The UK Parliament is a for-profit company; company number: #UC2279443

This would prove *conflict of interest* within the court, as employees working for the "body corporate" would be making a claim for financial gain, and not "law".

<u>Note:</u> when using an approach like this, word your question so your opponent is forced to *deny* something, rather than *admit*, because if they remain silent, they admit guilt automatically.

No one has to admit anything within court as everyone has the right to remain silent so not to self-incriminate.

Press Gang

The name **Press Gang** referred to a body of men from the 1700's who would **"force"** others into service or **civil** conscription. This was done by tricking the unsuspecting man to accept the **King's money**.

A silver coin with the face of the king would be "pressed", hence the name, into the hands of the victim, and once "coin" had been "accepted" the contract was concluded and the man had enlisted.

Note: today, the modern fiat currency has hidden "contracts", such as taxation.

However, the use of the *British pound* within these courts is grounds for treason as the *British pound* is now backed by the *US dollar*, which is printed by a *non-governmental*, *independent US corporation* called the *Federal Reserve*, with shareholders.

Furthermore, as these "notes" are nothing but promissory notes, you have the right to submit your own promissory note to discharge any fine.

Economic Gain

The word "fine" is a legal term used in regards to a breached policy within a contract, and for a "fine" to be issued you must first consent to the contract and accept the policy.

Therefore, if you are issued with a "fine" in court, you must question "the court" as follows:

- 1. "Who is going to financially benefit regarding any fine that maybe imposed?"
- 2. "I require the contract to be brought forth to prove obligation to pay."

<u>Note:</u> although difficult, it is possible to track payments and bonds that the court processes, so if done correctly you can prove fraud.

<u>For example:</u> if it is found that *"the court"* is working alongside *"the police"*, both having DUNS numbers or are registered businesses, like all are, then they are *"for-profit"*, so there is a clear and provable conflict of interest.

<u>Note:</u> when a court pronounces "debt to society" it is referring to the BAR association or "Law society". There is no such thing as "debt to society", assuming that means "to the people", as "the people" do not receive the payment made.

BAR is an acronym for **British Accreditation Registry** and is a privately owned corporation.

Meaning, this is a fraudulent "court for profit" and no law is being conducted. Therefore, any employee of the court is committing barratry by using the phrase "pay your debt to society".

Barratry

The word barratry was first used within Admiralty law and means "misconduct by crew of a ship resulting in its damage". However, within Common Law it means "litigation for the purpose of harassment or profit".

If an employee working for a corporation should initiate litigation against you, **without** a contract, then they have committed **barratry**, and if said corporation is **"for-profit"** then the employee has done so for financial gain.

Until the year 1888 *barratry* was a capital offence, and, although it is still punishable by imprisonment today, fines are usually paid.

Contract law

The "court" requires your consent to enter into contract with you, so the proceeding can go forth, as this is a "court of commerce" or "business".

However, within *contract law* everything must be disclosed, including any *payments* or *commissions* from the court to any 3rd party within the court, or vice versa.

Any hidden 3rd party payments or "secret commissions" would be an "illegal contract", and as this was conducted within a courtroom with witnesses, the people involved would be committing a crime, as the act would be unlawful.

Injured Party

When in court, you have every right to know who the injured party is that is *cause* for you to be in the courtroom.

Therefore you must ask the following:

"Can I have the name of the victim or injured party?"

<u>Note:</u> if a name of a *corporation* is given, you will need to see the contract where the policy is written to have caused the *corporation* to be an "*injured party*".

The definition of the word "victim" is a person harmed, injured, or killed as a result of a crime, accident, or other event or action. And in this case the word "person" refers to a private living person, not a corporation.

A *corporation* is a *"dead entity"* and does not exist, hence it cannot be physically injured in this way, and ultimately a *corporation* has no rights to violate.

Therefore, a legal fiction or corporation cannot be a victim.

If there is a claim that a "legal fiction" or corporation is an injured party, then "injured party" would refer to being financially injured due to a breach of contract.

At which point you would demand to see the contract to verify if you were obligated by it.

No Name Given

If you are not given the name of the *injured party* then there would be one of two reasons for this:

1. The name of the injured party is being deliberately withheld.

2. There is no name of the injured party, as there is no injured party.

If the name of the injured party is being deliberately withheld, ask the following:

"Why are you refusing to give me the name of the injured party?"

If the court continues to refuse, then *conflict* has been created and the court cannot proceed, without your consent.

If no name is given, then ask the following:

"Can it be confirmed that there is no injured party or victim?"

Once confirmed ask the following:

"If there is no victim, then will there be a claim for damages made against me?"

Note: There cannot be a claim for damages without an injured party.

Pleading

If you are asked to "make a plea", the court is trying to strip you of your rights.

By being given only two choices, either *guilty* or *not guilty*, you will have inadvertently "*accepted*" the claim *whichever* choice you make.

Note: The word *plea* is short for *plead*, meaning to make an "emotional appeal", such as begging.

However, as a *private natural person* or "*living breathing man or woman*" you have a third option, which is to question the *validity* of the claim made against you. In other words, if a *claim* or *charge* has been made against you, you request they *prove it*.

If a plea is made *without* your authority, you must question the source of this pleading, as it is <u>not</u> yours.

No one within that courtroom can make a plea for you without your consent; this includes the *judge* or *magistrate*.

If anyone should attempt this, ask them the following:

"Have I authorised you to speak for me?"

If they say "no", then request they retract their statement. If they say "yes" then the burden of proof is on them, so now ask them to prove it.

Prosecutor

Prosecutors are *government officials* charged with investigating and prosecuting crimes.

<u>Note:</u> within the **UK Corporation**, the prosecution is carried out in the name of the **"crown"**, meaning the **prosecutor** works for the **"crown corporation"** which is a **legal fiction**.

<u>Also note:</u> representing a *legal fiction* without disclosing the *full name* of the owner of said *legal fiction* within *court*, is *unlawful* and *illegal*.

The official narrative for the function of the *prosecutor* is to decide which cases should be prosecuted, determine the appropriate charge and control the plea bargaining process.

This clearly has nothing to do with law, as a single person can <u>never</u> have so much power or control over the proceedings.

Note: the title "prosecutor" denotes that the decision of your innocence is already decided.

However, if you have no *claimant* or *jury*, just a *prosecutor*, then question the following:

"Does the prosecutor have subject matter or personal knowledge regarding the claim?"

Without either *subject matter* or *personal knowledge* then the prosecutor cannot move forward, due to there being nothing to substantiate the claim.

The *prosecutor* may try and gloss over this question and move forward, which he cannot do unless there is a witness present who does have either *subject matter* or *personal knowledge*, therefore ask the following:

"Has the prosecutor brought forward a witness to verify the claim?"

Without a witness then there *cannot* be any hearing, you are *not* in a "court of law".

Officer in Court

If there is a police officer in court who is going to give evidence against you, then get them under oath. However, they cannot swear an oath as a *police officer*, as they are allowed to lie in court, so you must get the *private living person*, who is acting as a *police officer*, under oath.

Ask the Clerk of the Court:

"I require [Name of officer] to be sworn in under oath, but not as a police officer but within their own standing."

<u>Note:</u> do <u>NOT</u> refer to the person as a police officer or mention their PC number, just refer to their full name.

For example: it is not PC John Doe, it is just John Doe.

<u>Note:</u> the word *status* within this court takes on a "*legal meaning*" and refers to the "*status*" of your "*legal fiction*" or "*corporation*", so you must use the word *standing*, which refers to "*standing* on the land" or "*law of the land*", meaning they are personally liable and cannot hide behind a title or office.

If the police officer refuses, then ask:

"Why are you, [PC name] refusing to be sworn in under oath?"

<u>Note:</u> if someone fails or refuses to swear under oath, then their testimony cannot be heard in court.

Res Judicata

The Latin term *Res Judicata* means "a matter judged" or "a matter decided" and is a lawful doctrine from "common law" and is also found in civil law within the legal system.

Res Judicata refers to a case in which there has been a final judgment and that is no longer subject to appeal.

Note: "appeal" only exists within the legal system and not a "court of law".

This legal and lawful doctrine is meant to bar, or preclude, re-litigation of a claim between the same parties.

Proof of a *Res Judicata* case is required with debt collections and liens.

Returning Summons

If you prefer not to attend the courthouse, you can make the decision to return the summons unopened. However, it should be noted that the *court* may unlawfully rule in your absence.

When returning unopened mail, usually a stamp is applied saying *return to sender*, however instead of "return to sender" you can use "Refused as addressed" because it is addressed incorrectly.

Note: "refused" could be seen as controversy so use "declined as addressed", however a "decline" could be seen as "acceptance" of the addressed, when you have in fact "declined".

If you choose to return the court summons, you may wish to complete and file an *affidavit of third party mailings*.

<u>Acquiescence</u>

Mail, including "court summons", that are sent to you, if not replied to or returned, can be taken as your "acceptance" as you "acquiesced".

<u>Note:</u> the time period for this is 30 days. Anything shorter than 30 days can be considered entrapment or frowned upon in court, unless an ongoing dispute is currently under way.

<u>Acquiescence meaning:</u> "the reluctant acceptance of something without protest". Time to protest should be done within 30 days.

<u>Note:</u> the word *protest* is derived from the Latin word "*protestārī*" meaning "to declare publicly" and the root word "testārī" meaning "to testify", ergo pro-test means to "testify publicly".

However, as "the public" has now become a controlled jurisdiction, to "protest" is no longer a right, but a "privilege" that can be revoked at any time by those who control the "general public" or "community".

Three letter approach:

You can use this acquiescence to your advantage as long as you use the **three letter approach**, meaning you have sent three or more letters or notices to the person you are making the claim against.

If they ignore you, they have "acquiesced" and accepted through tacit agreement.

<u>Note:</u> the shortest honourable amount of time for this three letter process is 10 days between correspondence, although it is still honourable to give 30 days with your first notice.

Also note: you must have proof of this in court.