From: Your name

Street Address

Town/Suburb State Postcode

To: Recipients name doing business as;  
Recipients name Job Title

Business/gov dept

Street Address

Town/City State Postcode

Date served: Mailing date

Sent by recorded post.

Dear Recipients name,

Upon reading this letter in its entirety I, Your name do instruct you, Recipients name, to pass this letter on to the individual responsible for the issuance of ‘Exhibit 1’ as no name is provided in the documentation.

I am writing to urgently bring your attention to the court orders presented in 'Exhibit 1.' These orders brazenly grant enforceable directives involving violence, forced re-education and labour, dispossession, defamation of character, and confinement. Shockingly, without any evidence of a crime being committed, these orders have subjected me to repeated detention, dispossessed me of property, restricted my freedom of travel and association, and continue to pose an ongoing threat that has forcibly separated me from my children for over number of months. This unjust situation has caused immeasurable distress, alarm, and chronic suffering.

This situation has emerged due to the wilful enforcement of immoral [state the name of specific legislation] a concept known as precrime, that grants authority to punish individuals for crimes they have not committed. Precrime treats mere opinion as indisputable truth, completely disregarding the requirement for evidence or thorough investigation. Moreover, it exempts the accuser from any criminal prosecution, elevating them above the law and allowing them to act with impunity.

Consequently, the distress and alarm inflicted upon myself, and my children has been immeasurable, with far-reaching consequences. The trauma imposed by the state, as my children were forcibly separated from me, their paternal protector as well as extended family members, with whom they share a profound bond, is something that may take years correct or far worse, the damage may never be healed. This is a situation that will never be fully comprehended.

Your enforcement of immoral orders stands as a significant contributor to the prevalence of fatherless/motherless homes. Statistics reveal that the absence of fathers leads to a disturbing rise in teenage suicides, homeless runaways, high school dropouts, drug addictions, and youth incarceration. By obediently following orders that unquestionably accept hearsay as irrefutable truth, you actively contribute to the excruciating torment and anguish endured by innocent children - an alarming precursor to criminal behaviour. History, exemplified by the Nuremberg trials, unequivocally demonstrates that the weight of moral culpability rests upon those who carry out immoral orders.

Such legislation undermines the very essence of justice by denying inherent individual rights and freedoms, creating a climate of anguish and torment where innocent people are unjustly targeted and punished. It tears apart the familial bonds that form the fabric of a cohesive and harmonious society. In this dystopian reality, individuals live in constant fear, stripped of their rights and subjected to unwarranted persecution. The consequences are devastating, eroding trust, and perpetuating an environment of injustice and oppression.

Recipients name, would you be willing to stand in a court of law, under penalty of perjury, and affirm your acceptance of punishment based on an unsubstantiated complaint that lacks evidence or investigation? Would you go on the record to state that it is fair and just for the accuser to be granted immunity from prosecution for making false statements?  
  
At this juncture, it is crucial to differentiate between law and legislation in order to articulate the duties that bestow officers enforcing the law. Law is derived from a fundamental moral principle known as The Golden Rule: "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you."

The statement above draws a glaring distinction between law and legislation and why legislation that isn’t tested for moral principle can never be law and must be constrained by the principles of law derived from moral foundations for society to operate equitably. I will delve deeper into this point shortly when providing a concise definition of the correct function of a legitimate constitution.

First, I wish to draw your attention to an important matter concerning the oath taken by King Charles III and its implications for the exercise of your duties as a representative for the administration of justice in nations falling under Commonwealth jurisdiction.

On Saturday May 6, 2023, King Charles III signed a contractual document that offers extraordinary powers to the people of Britain and the Commonwealth. Although some may consider the oath contained within the document to be of symbolic significance, a recent report by the House of Commons from May 2023 states that the oath is the only part of the ceremony that is required by law. This oath is binding and serves as a one-sided contract with the people of the realms that fall under its jurisdiction.

As you may know, millions of viewers across the Commonwealth served as witnesses to two aspects of the oath. One was the undertaking that Charles made to govern according to the 'laws and customs' of the relevant realms and territories. The second was to do the utmost in his power to 'maintain the Laws of God.' These two aspects of the oath have important implications for your role as judicial officer.

When a monarch swears to uphold 'the Laws of God,' they are pledging to adhere to the injunctions outlined in the foundational books of the Bible. These injunctions encompass the prohibition of man-made legislation to trespass on individual rights, the sole judgment of one individual by another. This fact alone disqualifies the legitimacy of all Magistrates’ Courts as they are set up for the sole judgment of one man over another as prescribed by legislation that violates individual rights. In my specific case, this violation of individual rights is evident. For a more detailed explanation, please refer to the paragraphs below.

The common thread among all nations of the Commonwealth is that all public servants, including lawfully appointed judicial officers, are obligated to take an oath of public office. This oath pledges allegiance to the most senior public servant (monarch) responsible for overseeing the day-to-day affairs of the entire Commonwealth and serves as a binding declaration to hold the people's sovereignty in trust and impartially administer justice based on the principles of natural justice and equity.

The reason behind these imperatives lies in establishing personal liability for actions and omissions that breach the trust vested in public servants to act with honour and integrity.

Given recent developments, you Recipients name would be well advised to carefully consider the implications of the monarch's oath on the sworn duties of people such as you, holding the position of judicial officer under Commonwealth jurisdiction.

This leads me to address the matter of “Australian Law.” People such as yourself that assert their authority as judicial officers are on the record claiming that the courts operate under "Australian Law," which is considered distinct from the constitution. However, for the claim that "Australian Law" holds jurisdiction within publicly owned courthouses to be valid, would require evidence of the people’s approval to create the highest office in the land a living individual is elected to, separate from the current monarch of the entire Commonwealth. This individual would bear contractual obligations to assume full responsibility and personal liability, ensuring the transparent, accountable, and impartial administration of laws. To date, I have not come across any verified evidence supporting the claims made by any judicial officer, be it a judge, magistrate, registrar, or court clerk. This letter presents a unique opportunity for you to stand with honour and demonstrate the validity of the assertions made by your fellow office holders.

It is worth noting that Australian politicians swear allegiance to a fictionally created Queen of Australia, which constitutes treason. If that is the basis of your claim to authority, it indicates that you and your fellow officers are complicit in high treason when asserting “Australian Law” as your jurisdiction.

I would like to draw your attention to the contradiction in the claims made by police, politician’s, judicial officers and other government employees regarding the legitimacy of "Australian Law" as a separate jurisdiction exclusive to Australia, distinct from Commonwealth Law. Interestingly, these individuals use terms such as 'crown land' to refer to public lands within the country and acknowledge the presence of governor generals for each state, along with a national one.

Furthermore, I have presented your colleagues with compelling documented evidence from the Victorian Attorney General’s Legislation and Policy Branch. This evidence unequivocally states that the 1688 Bill of Rights and aspects of 1297 Magna Carta dealing with issues of justice and liberty, continue in force in Victoria.

The above-mentioned factors serve as testament to the fact that Australia operates under English Constitutional Law, which entails a crucial obligation for all public servants to pledge allegiance to the highest-ranking public servant of the English Commonwealth. This individual is bound by the constraints of English Common Law (Legem Terræ), which explicitly excludes statutes, government acts, regulations, and judges' precedents (case law; stare decisis). These circumstances present tangible evidence that the assertion of “Australian Law” as a stand-alone jurisdiction is a fabricated counterfeit version of Commonwealth Law, meticulously crafted to deceive.

Australia's legitimate law system is rooted in the democratic rule of law, which staunchly upholds the principles of justice and equality for all. At its core, this system affirms that every individual is presumed innocent until proven guilty by a jury of their peers, regardless of the nature of the case - be it civil, fiscal, or criminal. This fundamental principle ensures that justice is carried out in a fair and impartial manner, with equal consideration afforded to all individuals. The law requires that all matters be thoroughly examined by a jury of equals who possess the sovereigns right to determine the admissibility of evidence, ascertain facts, and discern motives, with the capacity to annul unjust legislation. This framework guarantees that every person is entitled to a trial that is transparent, accountable, and free from bias.

The following five points are a paraphrased summary of the scholarly work of Kenn d’Oudney from his book The Constitution Treatise\*\* that defines the meaning of democracy:

1.     Only as long as juries of ordinary people have the final say, government remains the servant, not the master of the people.

2.     Suffrage does not define democracy, for electoral voting takes place in totalitarian states. Having been elected, there is nothing to stop government from imposing control of an upper house, reneging on pledges, nor from adopting any tyrannical measures it chooses.

3.     Constitutional adoption and practical implementation of the Juror’s Duty in Trial by Jury, to assess the justice of government-created law enforcement actions as a fundamental and indispensable requirement for upholding democratic principles.

4.     In practice and by definition, government which denies ordinary people the right to judge the justice of the laws and the way they are enforced on their fellow community members during trial, is a despotism.

5.     Constitutions which deny the Common Law Trial by Jury Justice System install constitutional despotism.

The democratic rule of law protections are as follows:

(i)            The right to a Trial by a Jury of peers (i.e. social-equals, not trial by government or its employees)

(ii)           The right and duty of the Juror to judge on the justice of government made law and its enforcement in finding the verdict in Trial by Jury (i.e., Nullification by Jury)

(iii)          Freedom from arbitrary arrest (i.e., unfounded claims)

(iv)          Freedom from arbitrary detention

(v)           Equality before the law

In order to comprehend the gravity of the aforementioned statements, it is essential to establish a clear and concise definition of what a constitution is. A constitution serves as a binding code for guiding and controlling the government, but not the people themselves. Furthermore, it can be altered solely through the active participation of the vast majority of individuals.

The constitution, which governs the government, explicitly declares that 'To no one will we sell, to no one will we deny or delay right or justice.' This means that everyone is entitled to a fair and impartial trial. The relevant article referred to is Article 40 of Magna Carta 1215\*, which has been combined with Article 39\* of the same document and appears as Article 29 in the 1297 statute version displayed in Parliament House Canberra. The presence of this statute version in parliament serves as tangible evidence that Trial by Jury is the established method of administering legitimate law in this country, and for each participating individual attempting to undermine jury independence is considered the personal commission of a premeditated criminal act.

Article 39 of our world-respected permanent 1215 Great Charter Constitution Magna Carta\* transfers all power to punish out of the hands of government, the executive, the legislature, and the judiciary. Our protective Constitution strips the state, the government, and judges of all power to set sentences and prescribe punishments, transferring this responsibility to the Jury. This is the single most significant protective aspect of Trial by Jury defined and prescribed by the virtually immutable 1215 Magna Carta Constitution and Common Law.

It is of utmost importance to recognise that any case heard in a court without a jury, which holds the independence to assess all aspects of the case, amounts to a summary trial. Such trials violate the law that forbids the government to execute any of its legislation by punishing violators in any case whatsoever, without first getting the consent of the people through a jury. Any judicial officer and state prosecutor party to such violations constitutes a blatant act of malfeasance in public office, rendering any resulting orders null and void.

The foundational principles of fair and impartial justice set out in Magna Carta 1215 is the set of standards that modern government within any Commonwealth nation must abide by to remain legitimate.

In contrast to the legislation, you unwaveringly adhere to, Magna Carta 1215 re-established the timeless principle that everyone, including the king, was subject to the law. It recognises that it is the duty of a legitimate system of governance to facilitate the people’s right to a fair trial and protection against arbitrary imprisonment. The three common law articles (39, 40 and 61)\* contained within Magna Carta 1215 is documented evidence of the existence of Constitutional Law and the protection of individual rights as an essential cornerstone of justice, and it is the duty of every individual to uphold this fundamental principle.

The monarch's commitment to observe the 'laws and customs' of the realms goes back to the Saxon Kings, and the spirit of the ancient oath was included in the oath sworn by Queen Elizabeth II. This commitment includes the Magna Carta 1215, which recognises the lawful dissent of 25 Barons and people's rights as 'freemen' alongside their right to a trial by jury, as specified in Article 39\*\* of the Magna Carta 1215. Therefore, the people of Britain and in the Commonwealth realm, can take King Charles along with previous monarchs at their word and assert their right to a Trial by Jury and to their rights as freemen of the land. This means that obligations addressed to the legal fiction are legally rendered null and void.

Any public servant who openly denies the constitution and participates in the betrayal of public trust by prosecuting summary trial is not only in violation of the oath of public office but committing the common law crime of sedition, making them accountable to English Constitutional Common Law as enshrined in Magna Carta 1215 and must be held responsible for their actions.

You are obligated by the law to establish that your claim to authority is rooted in verifiable source of authority mentioned above. Failure to do so, whether through avoidance or silence, constitutes an admission of criminal intent to deceive and perpetuates a fraudulent act.

I wish to emphasise a crucial fact: at the end of the Second World War, blindly following orders was internationally recognised as a war crime, and it continues to hold that status to this day. Countless public servants were held personally accountable for abandoning their moral judgment in favour of implementing immoral policies and procedures dictated by legislation. Today, as more and more individuals endure private suffering at the hands of 'public servants' who merely follow orders, the number of people awakening to this profound injustice grows with each passing day.

The truth is indomitable, unyielding in its pursuit. It is ingrained in human nature that the more the media and government employees attempt to suppress those who unearth the truth and seek lawful justice, the stronger the resolve becomes to stand up for what is right. The recent surge in media stories highlighting the rising number of self-representing individuals branded as 'sovereign citizens' serves as undeniable evidence of an unstoppable wave. More and more people are awakening to the contradictions within the (il)legal system that purports to uphold justice. It is only a matter of time before the overwhelming tide of informed voices prevails, overpowering the very system you contribute to through your actions.

Considering the precedent set at Nuremberg, one must confront a fundamental question: If the right to punish another without evidence of wrongdoing does not exist at the individual level, how can it exist at the collective level merely by virtue of holding a job title? The fact remains that individuals within a collective remain individuals and are liable as such, irrespective of the group they belong to. One cannot absolve oneself of moral culpability by claiming to have been just "doing their job."

Failure to substantively address any of the points raised above and to establish the source of your lawful authority is deemed as an admission of the facts stated in this letter. Consequently, you will be accountable for the grave miscarriage of justice inflicted upon myself and my family. The law demands that you articulate the specific actions you intend to undertake to rectify the injustice caused to me and my children to end our unjust suffering.

Anything short of the immediate dismissal of orders outlined in ‘Exhibit 1’, serves as evidence of your conscious denial of moral responsibility to end unjust suffering. Furthermore, it will serve as compelling evidence of your ‘knowledge of circumstance’ leaving no room for plausible deniability in your betrayal of the sacred trust bestowed upon you as an honourable office holder within a legitimate system of governance. Please be aware that I am fully prepared to exercise my right to have these matters heard before a jury of the people at a later date, as required by law.

Please note that life is inherently uncertain, and the longer you continue to disregard moral principles, the higher the probability of a scenario where you will be compelled to justify how you, in good conscience, accepted a salary to enforce legislation that elevates unsubstantiated complaints to the status of unchallenged factual evidence in a system that enforces immoral legislation as law.

To participate in the betrayal of public trust through the prosecution of summary trials is a flagrant violation of the oath of public office for any servant of the public. Such actions hold all involved fully accountable under the venerable English Constitutional Common Law, as enshrined in the historic Magna Carta of 1215. Therefore, every individual involved in this misconduct bears the weight of personal responsibility, as there exists no statute of limitations for these grave offences. Moreover, should justice elude any public servant involved in the miscarriage of justice, in their lifetime, the ill-gotten assets acquired through these criminal acts are rightfully deemed proceeds of crime, subject to forfeiture from their heirs and successors.

As I have provided you with a detailed and referenced explanation of the law, it is your responsibility to present the lawful source of authority on which you claim to act and to refute each false statement with specific counterarguments. I expect a written response, sent by post, within ten (10) days of receiving this letter. Your response should include your full name and signature, indicating your full commercial liability and acting under penalty of perjury.

Sincerely,

Your name

\* DEMOCRACY DEFINED: The Manifesto - Kenn d'Oudney

\*\* THE CONSTITUTION TREATISE by Kenn d'Oudney - A Treatise on Law, Constitutions and Democracy in Twelve Points

Kenn d’Oudneys’ material is sourced from the historical, legal, constitutional opuses by Gibbon, Palgrave, Millar, Gilbert, Hale, Crabbe, Hallam, Spooner, Coke, Blackstone, Mackintosh, de Thoyras, Stephens, Hume, Jefferson, Madison, Franklin, Wilson (Justice James), Macaulay et al.