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Sent by recorded post.

Dear Recipients name,

I am writing to bring to your attention to 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.

The people are not bound by the constitution, but the King (and his government if he/ the people choose to have one) is. It is a promise by the most senior public servant (King) to preserve the people’s way of life where their inalienable rights are not trampled by anyone, and that nobody may be deprived of their liberty without a trial by a jury of their peers.

The constitutional monarchy system of governance, as expressed in the enduring Magna Carta of 1215, remains binding on our system of governance today, just as it was centuries ago. In this system, the King (wise elder) serves as our highest public servant.

They occupy the highest office in the kingdom, created for the purpose of assisting the people in governing themselves through the jury. The jury represents the country and makes decisions based on the consciences of individual jurors. Through this process, the people create and uphold their own law.

Examination of the oath of office taken by all public servants, whether in the military, constabulary, judiciary, or as a member of parliament, reveals a consistent theme: pledging allegiance to the highest-ranking public servant. The role of the monarch is to assume the paramount responsibility of managing the daily provision of services to meet the needs of the people within the kingdom. This complex role requires the delegation of various responsibilities, leading to the creation of individual offices and the accompanying oaths for each office.

In order to cultivate a peaceful and harmonious coexistence within the kingdom, it is essential that everyone is acknowledged as equal under the law. This principle of equality was reaffirmed in 1215 through the sealing of Magna Carta, a response to King John's numerous atrocities that were no longer tolerable to the people. Magna Carta stands as the constitution for the entire English Commonwealth, and it distinguishes itself by recognising the people as sovereign, elevating them to their rightful position of superiority over the administrative system of service they established.

A document that purports to be a constitution granting sovereignty to parliament is a deliberate act of deception, aimed at undermining the inherent ability of the people to govern themselves. One way to identify such deception is by examining who holds the power to administer punishment. In the case of the 1901 Commonwealth of Australia "Constitution," parliament granted itself the authority to establish and govern the judiciary while enjoying parliamentary immunity from private prosecution. Any attempt to construct an argument that seeks to justify the usurpation of the people’s inherent right to self-governance as a legitimate system of service constitutes an admission of complicity and guilt rather than a statement of fact. Would you not agree?

Our (English Commonwealth) Constitution preserves and protects a voluntaryist way of life as it serves as the agreed set of boundary conditions necessary for people to live as individuals interacting with others on a voluntary basis, whilst ensuring that no person's individual rights are transgressed.

The political party system, along with the accompanying voting process known as Adult Suffrage, was deliberately created to deceive and dilute the more direct Rule of Law. This rule preserves the inherent ability of the people to shape the character of society directly through the Jury. In our proper system, there is no requirement for politics or the imposition of policies to dictate moral behaviour to the people. It is not the role of an administrative system of service to involve itself in the minutiae of our daily lives.

Law is supposed to be defined in the negative (the apophatic) - you can do anything you like except... (doing harm to others). This leaves an empty vast space of possibility and freedom for the people and law is dealt with through intent and not outcome.

The purpose of legislation is to create a procedural process for delivering quality services to the people and at a minimum those procedures must stay in alignment with the people’s collective conscience in order to serve its intended purpose of meeting the people’s day to day needs in alignment with their shared values.

The primary responsibility of the most senior public servant, the monarch, is to deny royal assent to legislation that imposes on the people's individual rights. This is an essential aspect of their sworn duty to protect individual rights.

The people’s right to recourse from intrusive legislation lies with them through the independence of the jury. When a piece of legislation conflicts with the collective conscience, it serves as a signal by bringing a member of the public before the jury, where both the accused and the justice of the legislation are on trial. Only the people can determine if their innate freedoms are being threatened by legislation making jury independence non-negotiable. This process of subjecting legislation to the people's judgment also acts as an indicator of the legislators' awareness and accountability.

The jury's independence in arbitrating the justice of legislation serves as a fail-safe for the people. It not only acts as an indicator of the suitability of certain public servants for the role of legislators but also serves as a constant deterrent against legislation being used to infringe on individual rights. This mechanism ensures that the people themselves are the safeguard of their innate freedoms, leaving no room for exceptions. By upholding the jury's independence, the system protects individual rights and maintains the integrity of the democratic process.

Legislation, in its essence, lacks the power to punish or encroach upon individual rights. The very etymology of "legis", derived from the Latin word "leges" plural derivative of law, underscores its purpose as the expression of what is already lawful, rather than a license to create laws based on the biases and prejudices of legislators, as unfortunately seen in the present context.

Unrestrained power possesses the capacity to corrupt even the most unwavering individuals. Therefore, to ensure that people can freely pursue their own interests while respecting the rights of others, it is imperative that the democratic rule of law remains steadfast without any exceptions. This underscores the significance of the people themselves serving as the ultimate law authority, safeguarding their own freedoms and determining the moral tapestry of their community.

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

For public servants to utilise legislation as a means to impose their personal moral standards upon the people they are sworn to faithfully serve is by definition institutionalised treason and akin to despotism.

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 public servant, be they a member of parliament, bureaucrat, department employee, judicial officer or state prosecutor, party to such violations constitutes a blatant act of malfeasance in public office and commissioning of a miscarriage of justice forbidden by the law that binds government and must be held responsible for their actions.

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 public servants are complicit in high treason when asserting the counterfeit of “Australian Law” as legitimate.

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 English Commonwealth Law. Interestingly, these individuals use terms such as 'crown land' to refer to public lands within the country, acknowledge the existence of royal defence forces and acknowledge the presence of governor generals for each state, along with a national one. Further evidence that all authority within these borders is derived from English Commonwealth law and no other.

The foundational principles of fair and impartial justice set out in Magna Carta 1215\*\* is the set of standards that modern government must abide within any Commonwealth nation 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 III along with previous monarchs at their word and assert their right to a trial by jury and to their rights as free men 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 (judges and magistrates), 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 specify job title to administer a system of natural justice and equity for nations that fall under commonwealth jurisdiction.

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

\* 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’Oudney’s 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.