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Dear Recipients name

I am writing to bring to your attention an important matter that concerns 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.

Australia's legitimate law system is rooted in the democratic rule of law, which upholds the principles of justice and equality for all. At its core, this system ensures that every person is innocent until proven guilty by a jury of their peers, regardless of the nature of the case - be it civil, fiscal, or criminal. This principle ensures that justice is carried out in a fair and impartial manner, with equal consideration given to all individuals. The law requires that all matters be thoroughly examined by a jury of equals that hold the right as sovereigns to decide on the admissibility of evidence, facts, and 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.

It is crucial to understand that any matter heard in a court without a jury that possesses the independence to judge on all matters of the case is not only null and void but also a gross violation of the law constituting a clear act of malfeasance in public office. Any public servant who participates in the betrayal of public trust by violating their oath of public office is accountable to the law and must be held responsible for their actions.

The law unequivocally states that everyone has the right to a fair and impartial trial. To have knowledge of this fundamental right and yet deny it to the people you have sworn to serve is nothing short of a premeditated and deliberate miscarriage of justice. This act constitutes a blatant violation of the law, which declares that "To no one will we sell, to no one will we deny or delay right or justice." Such a heinous act not only undermines the foundation of justice set up to protect the people from criminal governance but also goes against the moral and ethical principles English and Commonwealth law is built upon.

The foundational principles of fair and impartial justice set out in Magna Carta 1215 is the set of standards that modern government must abide by to remain legitimate. 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 Carta1215 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.

Furthermore, 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, and the practice of usury. Therefore, if a monarch allows the continuation of legislation that enforces immoral mandates on the people, permits one person to pass judgment on another, or tolerates usury within their realms, they are, in fact, violating their oath. In such instances, the people have the right to assert that the monarch has breached their sworn commitment unless the monarch takes decisive action to correct the aforementioned violations.

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 a judicial officer, to administer a system of natural justice and equity for nations that fall under commonwealth jurisdiction.

To claim that you are fulfilling your obligations under Australian law, you must prove the source of authority from which it is derived. However, no judicial officer, whether titled judge, magistrate, registrar, or court clerk, has established this with any substantial evidence. The fact that public property is referred to as crown land and all public servants are required to take an oath of allegiance to the most senior public servant, who is bound by the constraints of English Common Law (Legem Terræ), which explicitly excludes statutes, laws, regulations made by the government, and judges' precedents (case law; stare decisis), serves as verifiable evidence that Australian law is at best a counterfeit of Commonwealth law.

The justice system set up within the commonwealth springs from a source authority otherwise known as a fountain of justice. The source of authority must be able to be traced to the highest public office occupied by a man or woman (monarch) charged with the authority to keep the entire system together in perpetuity. This person assumes the sole responsibility of administering a just system by publicly pledging personal accountability to ensure that the system operates correctly without exception. If any aspect of the system fails to fulfill its obligations, the monarch and all representations thereof immediately undermine their legitimacy and become subject to criminal scrutiny.

In order to fulfill their duty as a lawfully appointed judicial officer under the legitimate rule of law that binds all nations within Commonwealth jurisdiction, including Australia, individuals are bound by an unwavering precept: the non-negotiable requirement to take the oath of public service.

The reason behind these imperatives lies in establishing a legitimate system of service, whereby crown officers are obligated to make a solemn declaration. This declaration signifies their commitment to uphold the people's sovereignty, impartially administer justice, and abide by the principles of natural justice and equity. Crucially, it entails the acknowledgment that personal liability will be borne should actions and decisions breach the trust placed upon them by the people.

Recipient's name, it is of utmost importance to grasp that failing to establish your lawful authority from a verifiable source, be it through avoidance or silence, implies an admission of criminal intent to deceive and perpetuates a fraudulent act. Such actions could potentially lead to severe consequences for you.

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 judge the justice of every act of government created law enforcement, define and compromise the basis of, Democracy, sine qua non.
4. In practice and by definition, government which denies ordinary people the right to judge the justice of the laws and the manner of their enforcement on their fellow community members at trial, is a despotism.
5. Constitutions which deny the Common Law Trial by Jury Justice System install constitutional despotism.

The democratic protections are as follows:

1. The right to a Trial by a Jury of peers (i.e. social-equals, not trial by government or its employees)
2. 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)
3. Freedom from arbitrary arrest (i.e., unfounded claims)
4. Freedom from arbitrary detention
5. Equality before the law

As I have supplied you with an articulated and referenced explanation, it is incumbent on you to provide the lawful source of authority that you claim to act on behalf of and refute each false statement point for point in substance in a dated written reply by post within no more than ten (10) days of receipt of this letter, accompanied by your legibly written full name and wet ink signature on your full commercial liability under penalty of perjury. If you fail to refute any of the points above in substance without establishing the source of lawful authority upon which you rely to make demands on, we the people, the law requires you to articulate the specific action you have committed to taking in order to restore the rule of law you are bound to uphold and preserve in your reply. Failure to do so will be taken as an admission of the facts and assertions contained herein bearing your culpability in betraying the sanctity of trust vested in you as an honourable office holder of a legitimate system of governance.

Sincerely,

Your name

\*[THE\_TRAGEDY\_AND\_TREASON\_OF\_THE\_1689\_BILL\_OF\_RIGHTS.pdf (democracydefined.org)](https://www.democracydefined.org/essays/THE_TRAGEDY_AND_TREASON_OF_THE_1689_BILL_OF_RIGHTS.pdf)

\*\*The Constitution Treatise by Kenn d’Oudney

Also see the constitutional, historical and law texts of Blackstone, Crabbe, Palgrave, Coke, Hume. Stewart, Hallam. Gilbert, Hale, et al.