From: Your name

Street Address

Town/Suburb

State Postcode

To: Recipient’s name doing business as;

Job title/Bus-govt dept

Street address

Town/suburb

State/postcode

Date served: Mailing date

*Sent by recorded post.*

Dear Recipient’s name,

I am writing to urgently address a matter of great importance following recent public concern regarding the conduct of Name of State Police failing to meet community standards. Given the significance of this situation, and that it affects the entire Name of State population, it is crucial to establish a clear understanding of how ‘community standards of policing’ are defined. Would the moral principles ingrained, and the actions stipulated in the oath taken by a police constable on the day of graduation from the academy, serve as the enduring and binding standards that delineate the thin blue line separating lawful conduct from criminal behaviour? Do you deny that failing or refusing to abide by one’s Oath as a constable when dealing with other members of the community, who are lawfully to be regarded as equals before the law, constitutes criminal behaviour, as a fact in law?

The purpose of this letter is to extend a gesture of goodwill and to provide you with the opportunity to offer a detailed explanation regarding the operations of Name of State Police. It is concerning that the operation standards appear to be exceeding the authority granted to the specific division of public servants responsible for maintaining peace in a just and impartial manner, as intended by the original system of service from which Australia is meant to operate.

Furthermore, building upon the previous point, I aim to highlight what my research has revealed about the correct authority vested in police constables when they take their oath of office, which involves pledging allegiance to the highest-ranking public servant of the entire Commonwealth. This allegiance carries substantial implications for your role as a representative entrusted with the administration of justice in nations under Commonwealth jurisdiction. As the holder of the highest rank within the office of constable in Name of State, it is essential for you to fulfil your duty by providing the public you serve with accurate and concise knowledge, addressing any inaccuracies that may have arisen. By doing so, you can ensure transparency, uphold public trust, and fulfil your responsibilities as a custodian of justice.

Based on my investigations, I have found that none of the police constables I have encountered are willing to affirm their commitment to their constable oath. Additionally, the majority of the constables I have contacted seem to be unaware of their role as a public servant. Moreover, they are unable to provide a definition of impartiality nor are they capable of explaining the fundamental principles of universal morality, which they are required to uphold through their oath. This raises the question of how it is possible for the thousands of constables under your jurisdiction to be completely unaware of the boundaries of their authority, which is no greater than that of any individual community member. After all, the police are part of the community, and the community is part of the police. Is that not correct?

Adherence to the oath of office without deviation is the cornerstone that empowers constables to embody the concept of ‘policing by consent’. It is through unwavering commitment to this oath that true authority is bestowed. However, let it be known that anyone who claims to ‘police by consent’ yet lacks knowledge of their solemn oath, can only resort to policing by force, a flagrant act of terrorism. Given your most senior position within Name of State Police, you would be more than acquainted with the verity that the oath is not a mere formality; it is the foundation upon which the principles of justice, fairness, and trust are upheld, ensuring the safety and harmony of our society. Deviation from this oath undermines the very essence of ‘policing by consent’, leaving only tyranny in its wake.

I extend to you an opportunity to present irrefutable evidence supporting your claim that you and Name of State Police ‘police by consent’. I request a detailed explanation, in writing, highlighting the distinction between legislation and law, and how Name of State Police, who are sworn to uphold the law, not legislation, can justify policing by consent. Additionally, please elucidate how the executive branch, as one of the three branches of government, ensures checks and balances while **following the orders** of the legislative branch.

What is becoming evident is that you, Recipient’s name head up a paramilitary force that demonstrates no allegiance to the people that they are sworn to serve because they are not constables standing under oath, but employees of a foreign-owned corporation that has no authority to engage in matters of law enforcement within Name of State. What is your response to this?

With this in mind, I require you, Recipient’s name, acting as Chief Commissioner of Name of State Police, to provide me with a comprehensive written explanation regarding the presence of an ABN (91 724 684 688) associated with Name of State Police. It is imperative that you fulfil your duty to the public by explaining how a public service entity was incorporated in 1999 and registered for GST on July 1, 2000, without the public’s knowledge or consent. Transparency and accountability are paramount in maintaining public trust. Additionally, I seek clarification on the reason behind Name of State Police being listed as “NAME OF STATE POLICE” with Dun and Bradstreet, a credit reporting agency primarily serving corporations. Your detailed response is necessary to remove the suspicion that comes with secrecy in order to foster the culture of openness and transparency which you claim to seek.

With each passing day that the aforementioned matters remain hidden from the public, the problems inappropriately associated with Name of State Police will persist unchecked, serving as mere symptoms of a broader systemic issue. The lack of awareness among the public regarding Name of State Police being a paramilitary force, devoid of allegiance to the people it should serve, coupled with their non-existent understanding that your employees are not constables upholding their oath of public service, but rather individuals employed by a foreign-owned corporation with no moral or lawful authority to enforce laws in Name of State, grants you unrestricted power to exploit and take advantage of the trust vested in you by the people of Name of State. Do you agree that it is crucial that these concealed truths are brought to light, fostering transparency, and holding accountable those responsible for upholding justice and public welfare?

The concerns I am addressing today highlight the distressing evidence that points towards a significant absence of genuine individuals holding lawful positions as constables, responsible for upholding the laws and preserving the safety of all Name of State. Instead, what seems to exist is a collective entity comprising of individuals who impersonate constables and employ terrorist tactics of intimidation and violent force to impose a form of slavery upon the people of Name of State. As the Chief Commissioner of Name of State Police, operating under the name of Recipient’s name, is it not you that is ultimately responsible for these reprehensible violations of the law?

Furthermore, do you deny that the usurpation of Crown authority, which was suspended by the invocation of Article 61 of Magna Carta (1215) on 23rd March 2001, according to correct Constitutional protocols, constitutes High Treason (a capital crime), as a fact in law?

The alarming concerns I am raising with you today are to do with the overwhelming evidence that supports there being a vacuum of individual lawful office holders of constable enforcing the laws of morality that keep the community safe within the landmass known as Name of State. In its place, the people of Name of State are subject to a monolith made up of individual domestic terrorists impersonating constables as a means to impose slavery by intimidation and violent force and being that you, Recipient’s name, are doing business as Chief Commissioner of Name of State Police, would it not mean that responsibility for the above-mentioned unconscionable violations of law ultimately rests with you?

The war crimes committed by every member of your organisation who issued fines, penalty and infringement notices, set up roadblocks, enforced home detention, forcibly dispersed people from public spaces, and engaged in brutal violence against individuals defending their fundamental rights of freedom of travel, association, assembly, choice, and bodily autonomy during the alleged COVID-19 pandemic, stands firmly imprinted in the minds of not only the populace that endured it, but all those who viewed it across the country and the world.

Furthermore, any constable who, despite not being directly involved in the violence, fails to arrest individuals wearing Name of State Police uniforms committing crimes, is neglecting their sworn duty and is considered complicit in these crimes by their refusal to apprehend the guilty parties. What is your response to this?

Over the past three years, I have not seen either you or your predecessor denying commissioning the use of violent force, endangering lives by smashing car windows and destroying private property of individuals who challenge your claim of right to violate their inviolable individual rights. Indeed, I have personally been threatened with assault (itself an assault) by police officers (they can’t be legitimately called constables, since these threats were made without any preliminary criminal activity by me). Furthermore, many of your officers refer to those who defend their individual rights, a duty you are sworn to uphold as a public servant, as ‘sovereign citizens’, using an oxymoron as a slanderous label.

This brings to light a concerning list of criminal offences for which you as Commissioner of Police are ultimately liable. These offences include, but are not limited to, defamation of character, reckless endangerment, grievous bodily harm, assault, assault with a deadly weapon, false arrest, wrongful imprisonment, destruction of private property, harassment and intimidation, extortion, obstruction of justice, malfeasance in public office, duplicity, and misprision of treason. What is your response to this and does your indemnity insurance cover you and your fellow constables for the aforementioned crimes?

Included in your explanation, it is crucial to provide a comprehensive assessment of how the integrity of the constabulary has been infiltrated and subverted in secret. Additionally, please clarify how Name of State Police transformed into the armed enforcement division of a for-profit corporation with a charter to use lethal and violent force to extort money with menaces from the very people you are entrusted to protect, and to drive the prison industry. Moreover, it is essential to address the distinction between the actions of Name of State Police and the war crime of human trafficking.

I require you and only you Recipient’s name, to refute each false statement contained within point for point and 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 and penalty of perjury.

Sincerely

Your name