

[Your Name]

[Street Address]

[Town/Suburb State Postcode]

To: [Recipient full name] doing business as;

[Name followed by Job title]

[Business/gov dept]

[Street address]

[Town/Suburb State Postcode]

Date: [mailing date]

Dear [Recipients full name]

Thank you, [Recipient's full name], for your acknowledgement of receipt of my lawful notices. The latest correspondence from your office is riddled with serious irregularities, of which I will mention two, that require your urgent and immediate attention; the first being the absence of a name and wet ink signature, which is the foundational pillar of a lawful instrument. The absence of the above is a strong indicator that your office is engaged in the practice of issuing counterfeits with the intention to deceive, which is a serious crime. Are you willing to refute the above providing evidence in substance of where it is incorrect?

The second irregularity lies in the letter of demand, which insists on justifying your right to extort monies with menaces, even after you were personally notified of the law that compels all people of the commonwealth to protect individual sovereignty. Furthermore, ignoring your duty under the law and maintaining a claim to authority when evidence has been provided that no such authority exists, while failing to rebut the points of law contained within said notices, means that I am lawfully obliged to create a case file of evidence for your trial before a jury of the people. This jury will be conversant in the Democratic Rule of Law, which elevates the people in authority over their public servants and associated agents.

The foundation of English Commonwealth law lies in the principles of legem terræ, which explicitly excludes all statutes, laws, and regulations made by the government, along with judges' precedents (stare decisis), from binding the people without the expressed consent of a jury of my equals. As all public servants within Australia must swear allegiance to the most senior public servant (monarch) to hold office, Australia is a party to this principle. Are you, [Recipients full name], willing to deny this as a statement of fact?

My Notice of Conditional acceptance clearly articulates a willingness to accept your demand upon the condition that you provide evidence of your authority under the law that governs government which stipulates that the legislative branch of public servants only has authority to administer the provision of services to the people, but never to behavioural terms with threat of menaces to force compliance.

For your demand to be legitimate you are required to show where in the original arrangement for the construction of state, it stipulates that the legitimate system of service has been granted authority to use legislation as a means to extort money with menaces from the people it was set up to serve.  
  
What you have provided is proof that the legislative branch has delegitimised itself and become criminal by applying legislation in a manner it is not authorised for, which constitutes abuse of public office and treason.

To carry on insisting on the validity of your demand, requires you, [Recipient's full name], to take that stand under oath and swear upon penalty of perjury that the correct system of service from which all public service oaths are derived grants authority to legislation as an instrument for imposing random arbitrary demands of monies with menaces upon the people it has been created to serve.

Unless you place your name and wet ink signature to substantiate evidence that the democratic rule of law authorises public servants and affiliates to use threats with menaces to extort money from the people, I am under no obligation to comply with your demands. Doing so would mean breaking the law that holds all branches of government accountable for abuses of power. Are you, [Recipient's full name], willing to take full responsibility in your private and unlimited capacity for premeditated criminal intent of using coercive force to bully me into breaking the law?

A principle of the secular common law in Magna Carta 1215 from which all public servants derive legitimacy, is that NO judgement (verdict and sentence) can be valid against a party’s money, goods, or person, including a judgement for contempt or costs, unlessit be a judgement rendered by a unanimous jury following the common law Trial by Jury (viz. Article Thirty-Nine). Do you, [Recipients full name], deny this as a fact in law?   
  
Before issuing any further demands, you, [Recipients full name], would be well advised to conduct thorough due diligence and engage in independent research to understand the correct set up binding to this day, for establishing a system of public servants entrusted with the privilege of enhancing the quality of life for the people within the structure of a nation-state. Additionally, every statement you do not refute point for point stands as fact in law, serving as damning evidence of premeditated intent to deceive and defraud.

I require your 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.

Signed: