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March 28, 2016

Topic: Jurisdiction

Questions can be e-mailed to questions@nationallibertyalliance.org

Please support our business partners. You can find their banners on the right hand side of the website. Proceeds support National Liberty Alliance’s effort to save America.

Scripture Reading: Proverbs 15: 1-14

NLA has gotten out all of the letters and papers to the sheriffs and that went out in the mail last week.

All the sheriffs and the governors have our papers

NLA will follow up on that

There are a lot of things going on

As it becomes more solid we will talk about it.

A lot of alliances with different groups of people that is compatible with what NLA is doing.

A lot of activity going on in Oregon

Gary read the QUESTIONS

No victim, no crime is a common phrase that we hear in common law

Although I agree with it

Is there any court cases, especially Supreme Court cases that substantiate this.

Something to use in a court filing rather than what appears to be one’s opinion.

No victim, No crime is a common law precept, it’s a principle

You can find it in Black’s Law

You can find it in quite a few places

There are at least one, and maybe more, there could be quite a few of them, Supreme Court cases.

John cannot think of them at the moment.

Precepts ultimately come from God

For every crime there must be an injured party

Corpus delicti is the phase for that.

It is called a maxim of law

Another one is : With no contract then you have no cause for action.

Maxims are self evident truths. That is the key to common law

NLA has a list of maxims at the website

John will search for the specific court case

Even if you have a court case that quotes that, that doesn’t mean that they are going to listen anyway.

Their end result of every court case is already preplanned.

They already know how it is going to end.

They already know what they are going to take away from you or what type of punishment they are going to apply.

The cases are monetized.

They got a game that they play

They love to make things secret.

They put you in contempt of court.

QUESTION 2:

Please, if someone who knew that a case was dismissed by a judge during jury selection procedure

This question could not be understood

Gerard said that once we get some things cemented we will be able to come back with a very exciting meeting next week that will be filled with a lot of news. Things are moving very quickly. A lot of connections are being made. It is very exciting to see what’s going on with the different groups that are coming together and are supporting National Liberty Alliance. NLA is lending our support also.

It is very exciting. Gerard will have more specific information next week once we cement some of the things down that we are doing.

Gerard referred to the jury selection question where they said that it was dismissed, Gerard said that that happens all of the time. A couple of times Gerard got called for jury selection and you go through this whole thing, and they are selecting the jury, and the next thing you know, everybody leaves the court, the case is off because they settled in the hall. The lawyers got together and they got it right down to jury selection before somebody decided to make a deal. They never want to go to trial if they don’t have to. They never want to put anything on the record.

In a civil case , the parties can settle, it is up to them.

Lawyers charge one price when they are playing with you, and another price when they get into court.

Brent Winters is the speaker and he is speaking on jurisdiction.

Brent Winters is author of Excellence of the Common Law and his website is [www.commonlawyer.com](http://www.commonlawyer.com)

(20 min)

Brent began by announcing that presently on Liberty Works Radio Network they are going through his 40 hours of presentations, clause by clause of Magna Carta which he had done during the 800th anniversary of Magna Carta last year.

If you tune into Liberty Works Radio, Brent is on three times each day for an hour.

You can check Liberty Works Radio website for the schedule.

The subject for this evening is jurisdiction.

Jurisdiction is the holy of holies in our common law country

That’s not to say that it is observed

That’s not to say that courts or lawyers or anyone else take time to understand what jurisdiction is.

This is the definition of jurisdiction:

Jurisdiction is the right to act respecting a given matter.

That means that if you have a right , a right is a responsibility, it is not something that is selfish, popular discussions among legal scholars have made it a selfish thing since the emphasis and stress courts have begun to put upon the Bill of Rights since about 1936 1937 the Carolene Products case . Rights are responsibilities and jurisdiction is the responsibility, the right, to act respecting a given matter.

Now the action that a person may choose to make within their jurisdiction may be forbearing to act. There is power in that too. Jurisdiction is the right, or duty, or responsibility, to act respecting a given matter. For instance, a judge in a court has a scope of jurisdiction. If it is a state court then his scope of jurisdiction is relatively unlimited. If it is a federal court, the scope of his jurisdiction is his jurisdiction is limited to matters arising under the Constitution of the United States. And that is pretty narrow. But in both cases, each of those kinds of courts has a jurisdiction. That means that they have the right, the responsibility, the duty to act respecting a given matter.

That means that the court must say yes or no or this or that.

They must do something.

Even if it is no more than throwing the case out for lack of jurisdiction.

And courts sometimes do that.

Throw the case out because the law does not give me jurisdiction over that matter.

A power, a jurisdiction, a right to act that Congress has , that if they would use it, as they have in the past, use it a little more, it could eliminate a lot of our problems.

And that jurisdiction is this: Congress has the power to remove a whole lot of courts from any jurisdiction at all, in fact, the Congress of the United States has the power to remove the existence of every federal court in our nation, with exception of one, and that is the Supreme Court of the United States. Congress has that jurisdiction. They can reduce the number of federal courts in our country, except the Supreme Court, down to four or five courts, or a dozen courts, or one in each state, or they could increase the number of federal courts . That is in their absolute jurisdiction. Their right, their responsibility to act. Each one of you, and me, every member of Adam’s race has a specific jurisdiction also. Traditionally in common law that jurisdiction is called his peace. And the king had his peace. And every man had his peace. And to violate the peace of another man was to create an action against the violator of that peace. If you violate the peace of the king, you have committed a crime. If you violate the peace of another man you may have committed a crime or you may have just offended him and given him a right, a jurisdiction, to bring a civil action against you. Jurisdiction is the right, the responsibility, to act. To either say yes to action or no. That means to act.

 When I say every person has jurisdiction , it is God-given, every person has a God-given jurisdiction. And we have a list in our Constitution, our Constitution, the Bill of Rights, lists some of those jurisdictions, those God-delegated rights to act or to forebear from acting

And those rights, we call them fundamental, because those are the ones we recognize are given direct from God without any intermediary. You can see them there in the Bill of Rights, for example, the right to speak mentioned Amendment 1 and the right to remain silent, the flip side of the right to speak, the right to remain silent mentioned Amendment 5. Both of those rights are part and parcel of a single jurisdiction you have over your tongue.

When it comes to the police he advices not to talk because everything you say will be held against you.

Don’t waste your time trying to convince them that you are innocent.

All you are doing is giving them more power.

You have authority over your tongue.

There are three words that are substantially the same jurisdiction, right, and authority.

Also bailiwick

The source or the fountain of all jurisdiction is God

If you say it is anything else then you have entered the realm of the evil empire and you are helping them along. And if you stay silent about that the truth and liberty are losing ground. Because if you don’t recognize that all authority, all jurisdiction, and all rights find the ultimate fountain, their ultimate source in God that has created all things, then you leave open a vacuum that allows the entry of men. And in most countries, authority is not recognized to be from God but is said to be from government.

(30 min)

And then there are religions that say that there is a priesthood and all authority flows from it.

That is untrue also

All authority that God gives to His people comes direct to them from God.

And that is one of the fundamentals of Christianity.

Our walking papers as Christian men and women come from the Bible.

Our freedom comes from the Bible.

God has all authority and jurisdiction.

Paul’s letter to the Romans , Chapter 13, Paul says this:

Let every soul be subject to the highest levels of jurisdiction.

Most translations are exceedingly wanting.

They are perverted on purpose.

Brent has good evidence that the King James Bible twists this, and they do it , the King James translators did it to support the power of King James.

This is an important passage that is being used against Christian people in our own country.

Even our own government has taken it and tried to say what they believe it means and training pastors to co operate with FEMA by trying to persuade them what this means.

Romans 13 says this:

Let every soul be subject unto the highest levels of jurisdiction.

That is getting pretty close to God

Let me read the next sentence:

For there is no jurisdiction, that means no authority,

The King James says power and that is not right.

Brent likes the King James Bible but recognizes that there are problems.

Let every soul be subject unto the highest levels of jurisdiction.

For there is no jurisdiction except under God.

(33 min)

And the delegations of the jurisdiction are arranged under God.

So God is the source of all jurisdiction

All that He delegates of jurisdiction and authority , He arranges them under Himself.

And the jurisdiction that you have, direct from God , think of your fundamental rights, among those, many of them, some of them mentioned in the Bill of Rights, but God has arranged those and given those to you.

And then he has given you a specific jurisdiction, for instance if you are a father, a husband, a mother, a wife, each father in the world has a similar jurisdiction but he doesn’t have the same jurisdiction because he has a different family. But that jurisdiction came to him direct from God.

And it cannot be taken away.

He himself cannot get rid of it.

 I don’t have the jurisdiction to get rid of my jurisdiction.

Verse 2: Whoever is the one arraigned battle against Thee jurisdiction matches the arraigned delegation of the lawgiver.

Whoever goes to war against God’s jurisdiction is squaring off with what God has said in His delegation of jurisdiction.

For instance, if you have jurisdiction as a wife and a mother, and it is different than your husbands, and someone tries to rob you of it , take away your motherhood against your will, rob you of your children, as is happening in American today, then Paul the Apostle in Romans says the person that does that may not understand it but they are squaring off with God. A very dangerous and unadvisable thing to do.

He always wins.

I’m reading on: And the ones having so matched shall receive for themselves damnation.

What is respect for the other fellow?

Peter the Apostle says honor all men. Love the brotherhood, fear God, honor the King.

Honor all men. Respect all men. What does that mean?

That means you do not violate, you do not usurp, you do not encroach upon their God-delegated jurisdiction.

When you see police officers, and government lackies, and useful idiots of all shapes and sorts , bureaucrats encroaching, usurping, violating God given rights , busting down doors of houses without warrants , shooting people without authority, arresting people without warrant or authority, those folks are interfering with God’s delegated jurisdiction , that means rights.

When you violate the rights of other people, Paul the Apostle says, you shall receive damnation.

Damnation means the sentence of punishment, the infliction of loss.

Keep in mind the source of jurisdiction, your responsibility, my responsibility is twofold.

Number one : Do not encroach upon the jurisdiction of another.

Number two: Each one of us has an authority , a right, a duty to defend the jurisdiction that God has given to us.

It is most important that we limit the jurisdiction of government

How do we do that?

By squaring off with them? No

Squaring off in a blow by blow contest will get you whooped.

They got more force than you.

They have a monopoly on force and violence right now.

What we are to do right now is limit the jurisdiction of government by exercising, learning first, our own jurisdiction individually, recognizing it and asserting it.

Start with the Bill of Rights, and you can see those supported in the Bible.

The right over your tongue, the right respecting your family, your right as a countryman, an American.

Rights means responsibilities. Certain things that you are suppose to do.

If you are a member of the militia you have a twofold duty.

Armed defense of your land and jury duty.

(42 min)

QUESTIONS FOR BRENT

Caller 1 for Brent: Scott South Carolina

He is in touch with a Native American who is telling him that they are taking away their land and building condos. What would be their jurisdiction?

The Native American is in Oregon.

That is a common problem.

Brent represented some of the tribes in Oregon in a case

What the courts are doing in the Indian rights cases , they are just coming up with ideas right out of their head, they are not following much precedent. They are giving over rights. They are saying the white man took the rights and we are going to find a way to give them back.

It is causing confusion of property rights.

The Hellgate Treaty of Montana which was signed back in the 1850s with the tribes in the Flathead Valley. The Hellgate Treaty had one purpose The purpose of the treaty was to assimilate the Red Man into the White world. The Red Man even back then before the Civil War , the War between the States, out west was willing to sign the treaty and be assimilated into the white world.

(46 min)

 The courts have consistently , even though that treaty is in full force, and by the way as such it has the same authority in federal jurisdiction as the Constitution of the United States, as you know, treaties arising under the Constitution or pursuant to the Constitution have the force of constitutional law. They have abandoned the purpose of that treaty

and the laws being passed now and upheld in our courts have absolutely nothing to do with the purpose of that treaty.

Once we bring justice back into our courts, it will be their courts too.

Caller 2 Eric from Georgia

Eric gave a shout out to Rebecca to have her come on and tell her story about going to the federal court.

You have the right to speak and you have the right to remain silent.

Our public servants don’t have the right to take the Fifth because they have a duty to speak as they are serving us.

In your book you mention that the Christian seeks to learn the rules and then to obey them .

They don’t understand the relationship. The relationship, the independent contract that this stuff is weighed upon. Our public servants don’t have the right to be silent because they have a duty to speak. When you have a duty to speak , silence can only be equated with fraud.

Why our public servants shouldn’t be able to take the Fifth?

Traditionally our courts have said and continue to say that the Fifth Amendment applies when a person is in real accusatory danger. Now, when are you in real accusatory danger?

You are in real accusatory danger more time than ever. Everything that a fellow does today , someone recently wrote a book and titled it Three Felonies a Day and he argued that most Americans commit three felonies a day

Congress and the States have passed so many laws making so many things a crime that aren’t crimes. That God never gave them jurisdiction to make them crimes. That puts all of us in real accusatory danger.

Brent advises his clients Do not talk to the police.

It is one of our last weapons: The right to remain silent.

Do government employees have the right to remain silent?

If they are in real accusatory danger then that right has to be there.

When the court says that someone isn’t in real accusatory danger then they will say you got to talk,

you got to answer the questions, we are going to put you under oath and you got to answer the question.

If you disagree with the court and think that you are in accusatory danger as Susan McDougal did for example, the judge has the power to put you in jail.

It’s not a crime. He says I am going to let you sit in jail and when you are ready to answer the question you can get out any time you want, you just have to tell me that you are ready to answer the question.

That’s the problem that it creates for us.

Every breathing person, no matter if he is a useful idiot for the bureaucracies or not , he is still a creature of God and as such he has power over his tongue and a God delegated duty to exercise that jurisdiction.

What is the difference between a government employee that has committed a crime and a non government employee that has committed a crime?

Let’s say they committed an unjustified killing called murder

Do they have the right to remain silent if they are in danger of being accused of murder, innocent or guilty.

Yes they have that right.

If someone wants to disagree, I will listen.

Hillary Clinton decided not to turn over government property.

Any court in the country would have said, had it been a private citizen, the turning over of documents falls under the Fifth Amendment, any court would have said you got to turn these over.

Why? Because you are an officer of a corporate body called the government of the United States. The government of the United States has always been a corporate body. There has never been a time when any government of the United States, state and federal, have not been corporate entities. They have been viewed as corporations even if they don’t have charters making them such.

The law looks at them that way.

(55)

And as such those e-mails were fair game.

Now I’ve been in court, and I have argued in court, both ways, when people come in and the government wants documents that are corporate documents , even trust documents, I have a little trouble with that, that is a different situation, that is not a corporation, it is not a corporate body. That is corporate papers and you got to give that up. You do not have the right to remain silent. You have to produce them. You don’t have to talk about them but you have to produce them.

Every government employee must turn over the document that pertains to their business as employees of the corporate state. In that case they don’t have the right to remain silent.

But as far as talking, that is a different matter . Both of those fall under the Fifth Amendment but in different ways.

John’s position is that the Supreme Court has ruled numerous times that when an individual, particularly a judge or anybody of authority has a duty to speak then their silence would be a fraud if they didn’t. The key thing when some individuals from the IRS were called before Congress and questioned They were coming to make a report on what Congress wanted to know about. Some of the questions they refused to answer and they pleaded the Fifth. That is the position that John is talking about. They have a duty to speak. They are working for us as one of our representatives They have a duty to speak concerning whatever it is that they have control over and they have to give the truth. They could refuse to speak. But then it would be the duty of someone else Congress should turn to the person next to them and have them answer the question and that may incriminate the person who is refusing to speak.

(59)

Caller 3: Keith in Alabama

Could you touch on oaths?

They did not want to disenfranchise the Quakers because they were well known and a populace group in the middle colonies, Pennsylvania. The Quakers because of their false views of the Bible have caused us a heap of a lot of trouble. They are the fathers of our penitentiary system.

DeTocqueville the French aristocrat who came to America in the early 1800s was quoted for all of the wonderful things that he said about America. He also said things that were not flattering. DeTocqueville was sent here by the aristocracy of France to investigate and report on this newly formed system the Quakers had started in Pennsylvania called the penitentiary system. The Quakers also said that God does not allow us to take oaths. And they quoted the Sermon on the Mount where Jesus said Do not swear at all.

But what Jesus really said was Do not swear olos (the Greek word) and it is closely translated to our word whole What Jesus is saying is Do not swear in a broad way. Do not say, “I swear I will never do this” or “I swear I never did anything like that” His point is that when you take an oath crank it down tight and put boundaries on it. Be careful to what you swear because as the Old Testament law says God will require it of you

Jesus never forbid the swearing of an oath but be careful how you do it and what you swear to. And don’t be too free with it.

Never swear to anything, as the Old Testament law says, never swear to anything but by the God of Heaven. Never say “Heaven forbid” That is evil

Never say, “Swear to God, hope to die, stick a needle in my eye” That is evil.

Caller 4: Crystal Mack Connecticut

lost the caller

Caller 5: Linda from Massachusetts new member

She wants to refer people to the site.

It says 5,000 plus members

Some people prefer to join as groups

Tens of thousands visit the NLA site on a monthly bases and they don’t all join.

The key part of our membership is to take the courses

A lot of people visit the site and learn from our site.

NLA is one of the largest liberty groups out there.

We are more an assembly than a liberty group.

We are working to get people together to get a job done.

To take this nation back and deal with subversion against the United States of America collectively across the nation from every state.

The key thing is to build up administrations inside every county

We have 5,206 members

We have constituted every county in the United States

We have a presence in every state

We have 111 state co ordinators

We have 109 federal district leaders

We have 8 national co ordinators

We have two founding members

Caller 6: a/k/a Israel North Carolina a county co ordinator

Is it wise to establish the jurisdiction of the court at the first proceedings as to challenge the jurisdiction of the courts?

Yes but if it is a criminal prosecution it will probably just irritate the judge more than anything

The way they get criminal jurisdiction is through an indictment a grand jury giving them a true bill.

Or by Information.

If they got that they will presume jurisdiction

You can challenge jurisdiction in a criminal case on the basis of statute of limitations.

If it is an IRS case , the IRS must prosecute within six years to the day after the act that they allege was a crime.

(1hr 14 min)

If it is a civil case, a non criminal case, and somebody’s suing somebody, the person that’s being sued , the court has no jurisdiction over that person until the opposing party serves that piece of paper called process. Let’s say you have not been served and the court drags you into court anyway on a noncriminal matter. At that point you can challenge jurisdiction by saying, “The Constitution of the United States says that I am entitled to due process of law and if there is anything fundamental of due process it is personal service to that piece of paper. And I didn’t get it according to the terms of the law. “ You can challenge it right there.

 Caller 7: Crystal Mack

She sent her affidavits to Linda

She goes to colleges and high schools so that the kids can start learning this.

John hopes to have a meeting soon with all of the people who are putting in affidavits.

Tuesday or Wednesday we are meeting at 3:00 Probably next week

John thanked Brent for his time

Caller 8: Buckley from the Show Me State

One of the most outspoken voices on the power of the county sheriff has been Richard Mack.

What is NLA’s relationship with Richard Mack ? Is NLA working with Richard Mack?

NLA is working with the CSPOA right now on educating the sheriffs and we are talking about getting them to use our materials. Richard needs to look into it a little more. We have a lot of sheriffs coming on board and Gerard is convinced that Sheriff Mack too will see things in a favorable way concerning NLA

CSPOA, the organization that Sheriff Mack has founded, has verbally agreed to come on with NLA.

They are looking into using the NLA civics course and Constitution Course

Do you have any examples of common law court cases that NLA has been involved in?

NLA has cases but not common law cases because we have not been able to get a common law court open. We have won in their courts. We use common law principles. When the judge does something wrong we give him a Writ of Error.

We go into court and we kill the presumption that we are in their corporate world by our heading when we say

In this court of record we accept your oaths and your bonds

You are accepting their oaths to the Constitution and the fact that they are bonded and at that point if the judge doesn’t chime up and say I am not under the Constitution or I don’t have an oath and if he doesn’t he is committing perjury he is committing fraud

We are educating everybody including the judge

Under common law is intent

Under common law you have restitution Can he restitute? Do we really have to go to trial?

They don’t like that stuff because it takes control of the money out of their hands.

When people work their problems out amongst each other in a civil lawful Godly manner, you can’t make money on it.

John personally has never walked into a court that is a common law court

John tried to change it into a common law court by stating I am one of the People of New York and in this court of record we are doing this and we accept the oaths and bonds. At that point we just turned it into a court of record and a court of record is common law. At that point it becomes a conflict We always have to do battle with the judge. We can never get to the case because we are always fighting with the judge.

We came up with a new strategy We are going to state it We are going to give him a Writ of Error and we will move on and we will sue him for violating our unalienable rights take him into the federal court Usually they throw us out of their court and to us that is a win

Caller asked about a DWI case

(1 hr 50 min)

Caller 9: from Virginia

Yale University website

Avalon project Documents in Law, History and Diplomacy

You can look up treaties

Communist Manifesto is at that website

Anyone interested in claiming Social Security

Congress has hidden a bunch of loopholes

The loopholes will be closed on the first of April

You may be able to grandfather some of those loopholes if you can find out what some of the loopholes are

You won’t be able to get after April 1

Caller 10: Maude

They have been trying to serve her to evict her

They have not been able to serve her

She has not opened the door.

They do have a method of serving if they can’t get to you

They will put it in the newspaper and they will consider you being served

If they can prove that they tried X many times through the mail and a process server and they can’t get you

Registered mail is the only way they can prove that you got it or a process server.

If they can’t get ahold of you and they can prove that they tried then there is a method that they use and it may involve putting it in the legal announcements

Just because they can’t serve you is not going to stop them.

They gamble and take bets on the golf course on who gets what case

When you start accusing the judge you have to be careful You might get contempt

Do a simple affidavit for the sheriff to understand that you never had your day in court

These people illegally fraudulently changed the papers

NLA will try to get the Tuesday call opened up again

Hopefully next Tuesday

(2 hr 9 min)

Caller 11: Harley Vermont

He sent in an appeal to the Supreme Court

He sent everything to his sheriff with a note asking if he heard of NLA

Does NLA have a process to check with the sheriffs to make sure that they got all of that stuff that was sent to them?

NLA kind of does that. There are 3,000 plus sheriffs. We try to communicate with them as much as we can.

We are also working with district leadership.

NLA is looking to fill the district leadership in the 90 districts.

Those leaders are checking all the courts to make sure that the papers have been filed.

In most cases they haven’t and nobody knows where they are at.

They are doing affidavits and that is the beginning of preparing for crimes that we are going to go after these chief judges and chief clerks on.

There is possibly 20 years for the judge and possibly three years for the clerk for removing, mutilating, burying, or covering up any kind of paperwork. They have to file it. That is the law.

NLA is looking at talking with all of the sheriffs through faxes particularly. And moving them closer and closer to working with NLA to start to do some arrests on these judges and different individuals that just refuse the common law.

That will take time.

One of the district leaders projects is to start communicating with these sheriffs.

We will be depending on the sheriff and the militia to protect our liberties.

Caller was breaking up

It is better to call in through the phone for a better connection rather than the browser.

Contact with the sheriffs is the next part of the process coming up

Caller recommends to look up on facebook or the web:

Resources: Tom Crawford resisting mortgage fraud and evictions

 Michael O’Bernicia and natural law

Caller 12: Iowa Richard

Richard is with the Common Law Advisory Committee

Made corrections to Information to Sheriff

The writers don’t know how to use quotation marks.

In Cooper v Aaron they put quotation marks around the quote but it is not to be found in the document

When you quote a court opinion do not quote the headnotes which are not the court’s opinion but are just a summary

Most of NLA’s quotes come from Black’s Law

The headnotes are a summary but they are not the court’s opinion

So you do not want to quote the headnotes

In the document NLA just put out, the Information to Sheriffs there was a quote of a headnote

John asked Richard to get ahold of Gary

Ask Gary to connect you with Linda

Caller 13: Jason from Texas

Suspension of a license case

DWI case for refusing the breathalyzer

He challenged jurisdiction

They called his name and when he answered to his name they said that he gave them jurisdiction.

The judge and the state attorney said you almost had us you almost had it that is as close as anybody has come to it until you answered to your name

John said I hope you got a recording of that because that is a fraud

If it happens again you can say Here I am I am here on special appearance to test the jurisdiction

Caller 14: New

Question about a case he is looking into taking into federal court.

Violation of his 6th amendment, violation of 8th amendment, and violation of 19th amendment

In addition to violation of due process

Had punishment inflicted upon him without due process

Also excessive force

He was in the wrong place at the wrong time and spotted by the wrong person

He is looking at potentially being thrown in jail for 90 days

for supposedly being in violation of a court order.

For not staying away from a place that he had every right to be there.

He had every right to stand where he was standing.

Because he is poor that is why he was dealt with the way he was dealt with.

John asked the caller if there was a restraining order against him

Yes

He was panhandling in a public place. Caller understands that panhandling is a constitutionally protected activity.

John got back to the original question

How to get into a federal court

You have to find a violation of your unalienable rights

Article 3 Section 2  The judicial power shall extend to all cases, in law and equity, arising under this Constitution, the laws of the United State

You have to get a constitutional violation

The question is Who is violating your unalienable rights?

Caller has multiple cases

They don’t have authority over you because they are a nisi prius court

Where is the grand jury?

It’s an up hill battle and you need an education to fight in the courts

Go to nationallibertyalliance.org and you will find a lot of information

We wrote a book on court access and motions how to fill out the paper

We have the courses on common law by Bill Thornton

Stay out of jail until we get to the other side of justice

Right now we are on the side with injustice

(2 hr 45)

Caller 15: PA Mary No response