

[Your Name]

[Street Address]

[Town/Suburb State Postcode]

To: [Recipients name] doing business as;

[Name followed by Job title]

[gov dept/business name]

[Street address]

[Town/Suburb State Postcode]

Date: [mailing date]

Recorded post:

Dear [Recipients name],

You are now personally liable for the use of coercion to extract my property by force, which is now High Treason considering you have been made aware of the Treason committed by parliament, with evidence, supplied to you in my previous lawful notices which stand as truth in law after your failure to rebut the treason evidence, contained within, point for point.

The threat of loss of my property and ability to travel freely if I do not comply with your unlawful demands has been the source of alarm and distress which caused great harm to my emotional wellbeing. As my first duty under the law is to protect myself from loss or harm, I have complied with your demands to break the law, under duress, which means that you [Recipients name] are now solely responsible for making me break the law. I am collecting evidence of your criminality for your trial before a jury of the people. I would like to remind you that you will be standing alone, without the protection of the legal or legislative system, in your private and unlimited capacity, for forcing me to break the law. Do you understand?

Under the English Commonwealth law, a peace treaty that brought men and women acting as agents and officeholders of government under the law in order for government to retain legitimate authority and consent of the people to govern along with preventing any future attempts by dictatorial regimes to deny the terms of the adhesion contract (constitution) that binds government, codified back in 1215, it is the duty of every sovereign man and woman in the entire English Commonwealth realm to protect the laws that protect the sovereignty of the people, this includes you [Recipients name], and to ignore or deny your duty under the law is to be an outlaw, making you guilty of the crime of sedition and high treason. Do you [Recipients name] deny this as a fact in law?

I would like to remind you that the Penalty for Sedition at Common Law is Full Asset Stripping and Life in Prison and the penalty for High Treason is full asset stripping and the gallows. Do you understand?

You were informed in the Notice of Default and Opportunity to Cure of your opportunity to, and I quote, “remedy this matter by law, amicably so as to save any future breach of the peace or torts being committed.” Your insistence to make default judgements then increasing the severity of the demand are not only acts of dishonour and outlawry, but make you personally liable for the tort of assault.

Assault includes the harm of mental and emotional distress caused by threats of loss of property by way of property seizure without right. Property is defined as that which is proper and exclusive to man including the product of his/her labour. The unlawful demands equating to theft of the property of I [Your Name] by [gov dept/business name] that has been escalating is being collected and placed in a case file as evidence of the severity of tort of assault outlining the harm caused to I [Your Name] by threatening my inalienable and indefeasible right to my property. Your attempts at seizing the product of my labour exclusive to me and only me, are severe transgressions against the underlying intelligence inherent in creation upon which you rely, not only for your survival but for the quality of your life. Do you [Recipients name] claim to be above the force of creation?

I would also like to remind you that under the law we are all liable for our actions and omissions, therefore “I was just doing my job” is no defence as evidenced at Nuremberg.

My Notices are meant to Inform and Educate and compel those sworn to protect the people’s sovereignty to uphold their Oaths of Office. I realize that you will not recognize my LAWFUL Notices as you are operating as a Foreign Corporation and have no Lawful Standing or Authority since the Invocation of Article 61 according to Constitutional Royal Protocol on March 23rd, 2001. My LAWFUL Notices CLEARLY State WITHOUT Malice, Vexation, or Ill Will.

Magna Carta 1215 is the adhesion contract on government that predates Parliament that grants authority to all government across the entire English Commonwealth of which Australia is a part. Without Magna Carta 1215, all nations within the commonwealth would be in a state of outlawry run by warlords as was the case in the events the lead up to the sealing of the 1215 Great Charter that binds government in perpetuity. As the adhesion contract that binds government can only be unsealed by we the people, which has never happened, all claims that it was repealed by parliament are acts of high treason against the peoples sovereignty for which you are personally culpable in your private and unlimited capacity. I refer you to the 1559 Act of Supremacy as the Commonwealth Declaration of Rights, which is in effect today.

The point you appear to be missing, [Recipients name] is that while agents and officers under your control keep quoting Acts and Statutes which fraudulently claim give you power and authority to violate my inalienable rights inherent in the laws of creation. All government and legislation across the commonwealth is null and void since the invocation of Article 61 of 1215 Magna Carta on 23rd March 2001 which deposed the head of state and all her governments across the commonwealth. I would urge you for your own sake to go back into the Notices, particularly the Notice of ConditionalAcceptance, [See Exhibit "A"] (Attached below), and read very carefully the fully translated text of Article 61. Pay particular attention to the very last sentence thereof because this is where the whole matter hangs. It states:

“And we shall procure nothing from anyone, directly or indirectly, whereby any part of these concessions and liberties might be revoked or diminished; and if any such things has been procured, let it be void and null, and we shall never use it personally or by another."

That is the monarch speaking, on behalf of all future governments, making a promise to be observed in perpetuity that neither they nor any of their agents shall ever procure any thing which might revoke or diminish the rights of anyone in the realm to follow the instructions contained in Article 61, which is to engage in full lawful dissent if the monarch breaches the promises made elsewhere in the Magna Carta. There was no Parliament at that time, which is why Parliament has no power to make any laws which amend or breach the Constitution, which is a treaty between the monarch, his peers the Barons, and the rest of the people. If Parliament does this, it is automatic treason.

Clearly, an Act or Statute of Parliament qualifies under the definition of “such things”, or as a “thing”, so any such which attempt to prevent people from honouring their Royal Command (also described in Article 61) to “distress and distrain the Crown in any way they can”, are in direct disobedience to the Head of State’s express command and are therefore treasonous as well.

Your problem [Recipients name], is that Article 61 WAS invoked on the aforementioned date, and that the process is a matter of public record. You were invited to correct me if I was mistaken, upon which I would comply with your demands. But you have not rebutted that claim at all, despite having been given several opportunities to do so. That failure means that as my Notices, unlike those emanating from your office or agents, are LAWFUL INSTRUMENTS, the statements concerning Article 61 now stand as facts in law. Do you [Recipients name] deny this is fact in law?

As each living wo/man has the inalienable right to take action to minimise harm to themselves I [Your Name] am complying under duress meaning that you [Recipients name] along with agents and officers under your control are personally liable for committing the tort of extortion. Be advised that for every one of these offences at law there are lawful claims for damages at law.

Further to that [Recipients name] your official title, badge, or uniform offer you no protection what so ever when the evidence I am collecting is presented to a jury of the people which is imminent. Until that time you are liable in your PERSONAL and UNLIMITED CAPACITY for the harm caused from the distress and alarm caused me by being forced to break the law along with the loss of private property I have suffered which I may pursue at a time of my choosing. Pleading ignorance will not absolve you; you have been given ample opportunity to behave honorably and have chosen, for whatever reason, not to do so. Do you [Recipients name] deny that you are morally couplable for forcing me to break the law and are now liable for damages for your criminal behaviour?

By your insistence to force me to break the law after being made aware of that you are acting in outlawry as there is no lawful government since the invocation of Article 61 you [Recipients name] have escalated the list of torts you are liable for to assault, extortion, trespass, conversion and detinue. Each of these makes the breach of office more onerous and increases the likelihood of removal from your titled position.

Attached is a document explaining how people who have been wronged by others are the victims of torts, and that there is a lawful process for remedy. I strongly urge you to study this document and very thoughtfully consider what disastrous effects the application of this process would likely have upon your life. One effect would be that the publication of your crimes in the manner prescribed, all perfectly lawful, would be prima facie evidence of your malfeasance in public office, an offence which under the English Commonwealth Constitution carries prison terms of up to twenty-five years. You might want to ponder how long those in authority over you in your position would consider that position tenable. Bear in mind that if they decided to turn a blind eye, as the saying goes, that they might be considered complicit in your actions, and placed at hazard themselves.

It may well come as a shock when you complete your due diligence and discover for yourself that my statements are true and that you have been misled by your overseers. However, we are each responsible at law for our own actions or omissions, which makes it a dangerous practice to merely believe whatever we are told without checking. Your actions have caused me stress, costs, and trouble and all without lawful basis or authority, so you will have to accept that justice requires you to make some amends.

Signed:

**The Commercial Lien Process**

Common Law Commercial Lien is a process that any Living wo/man can employ to obtain lawful remedy from the actions of another human being who have – or have attempted to – or have conspired to - damage said Human in some way. Such wrongs are known as “torts” and are the subject of Tort Law. This includes ‘harassment’, such as ‘threats with menaces’, which is ‘psychological damage’, and ‘defamation of character’, which is also considered to ‘damage a reputation’. The reason for this is very simple: Since all are equal under the LAW, then each Human Being has a Duty of Care to each other Human Being, such as to make sure that whatever action we take towards each other have the Common Law behind those actions, and thus we can live together in peace. Abrogating said Duty of Care is a CRIMINAL ACT and constitutes a tort. I believe that you have created a tort, or torts, against My Living "Alive" Self. The Commercial Lien process is a construct of the Common Law (The Law-of-the-Land), and the British Commonwealth is a Common Law jurisdiction (being, as it is, on Land). Thus, any Human Being residing in this country is subject to the Common Law above all else. And that includes the individual(s), to whom this Notice is addressed.

Under the Common Law, everyone is individually responsible for their own actions. The 'office' they may hold, the 'authority' they may consider they have, and/or the uniform they may wear, does ***not*** protect them in any way, shape, or form. Simply because they (like everyone else) are responsible for every action they take. This was set into tablets of stone following World War II, at the Nuremberg Trials. German Officers claimed "I was only obeying orders", yet they were still found guilty, and hanged accordingly. This also forms a part of the Geneva Convention to which most Countries are signatories, especially the United Kingdom. Thus "I was only obeying orders" is ***not*** a defence.

The reasoning is simple: BEFORE taking any actions against anyone else, make sure that what you are doing is ***lawful and moral***. If you suspect that the action you have been ordered to take is either unlawful or immoral, then you ***must*** refuse to obey. You can report the order, and your reasons for believing it to be unlawful and/or immoral to a higher authority. You can go as high as you like in the chain of authority, pointing out that anyone who conspires to support the unlawful/immoral order are making themselves ***accomplices, in Law***. And that, consequently, they (themselves) will be held fully accountable, in Law.

The process comprises:

1. The subject of the harassment (myself in this case), will write a Statement of Truth (Affidavit), under penalty of perjury. This being the case, what I will write will be “the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth”, and will thus be based on first-hand knowledge.

2. You will be sent a copy of this Affidavit, comprising my allegations. You will have to REBUT EACH POINT to ward off the possibility of a Lien. You will be given 30 (thirty) days to do so, but I can assure you that you will not be able to rebut EVEN ONE SINGLE POINT. You will need to rebut by means of a sworn Affidavit of your own, written under the same criteria, namely: From first-hand knowledge, and under penalty of perjury.

3. Any points you manage to rebut will be removed from my allegations, and the remainder kept as my final Affidavit. The result will be Notarized (by a Notary Public) to become My Statement of Truth, which will not only become THE TRUTH, IN LAW – but will also become A JUDGMENT, IN LAW.

4. That being the case, no Hearing will be required. Because the judgement has already been made by the truth. (That’s Common Law!)

5. **I will then place a Public Advertisement, warning whomsoever may be concerned, that your creditworthiness is henceforth highly suspect. I will inform Credit Reference Agencies to this effect.** It might become difficult for you to obtain credit, or insurance (particularly the type of Bond insurance needed to safeguard you in actions undertaken in your job). It could severely curtail you attempts to sell or dispose of valuable property such as cars, real estate, shares etc., without having the proceeds garnished to settle the lien. I would then be LAWFULLY ENTITLED TO SIEZE ANY OF YOUR PROPERTY, up to (and including) the value of the Lien.

6. This process will occur in a LAWFUL manner – because you are given the chance to REBUT IN SUBSTANCE - and I will thus retain entirely ‘clean hands’ (unlike yourselves, which is why your mechanism is UNLAWFUL, and why I am able to counter it by this LAWFUL means).

7. As footnotes, I should add that:

a. Even if I make an honest mistake, WHICH YOU FAILED TO REBUT, my mistake BECOMES THE TRUTH, IN LAW. You will not be able to claim ‘libel’, ‘slander’, etc, because you were given thirty days to rebut the allegations, before public announcement.

b. By a failure to REBUT IN SUBSTANCE you would have tacitly acquiesced to my Statements as Truths, in Law.

c. REBUT IN SUBSTANCE does not comprise simply dismissing my allegations. That is mere gainsaying. “IN SUBSTANCE” means “accompanying with HARD proofs” (in this case, “to the contrary”).

8. As a part of the Lien, I will demand a substantial sum in recompense/settlement of the damages.

9. Being Common Law construct, the only way this Lien can be removed is:

a. By Full Payment … in which case I will remove it

b. The passage of 99 years

c. The verdict of a Jury of 12, deciding that the Lien should not have been imposed. But this will require YOU to take ME to a Court de Jure (Common Law Court) … whereupon I will be able to explain (to said Jury) exactly how you took actions which comprised the tort(s) against me WITHOUT ANY LAWFUL EXCUSE WHATSOEVER. DO NOT, UNDER ANY CIRCUMSTANCES, ASSUME THAT ANY JUDGE CAN REMOVE A LIEN. A JUDGE CONNOT DO THAT, AND JUDGES KNOW THAT (because it is a Common Law, NOT A STATUTORY process).

That being the case, I suggest that you take full Notice of this Notice, and immediately cease & desist from your UNLAWFUL actions in respect of My Self. You will find, in the future, that you will need to contend with this Commercial Lien process more frequently as time goes on, and more people discover it.