National Liberty Alliance

Monday Night Conference Call

June 19, 2017

Opening Song: no opening song

Topic: no topic

Call-In Number: 605-475-3250 Participant Code: 449389

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.

Please support NLA

Scripture Reading: later

In the absence of John, Gerard hosted the call

We received paperwork back from the third district court

The judge jumped up and dismissed the case made a decision in order to throw us out because he said that we are an association and we cannot come in without an attorney.

They always want to give you a name and make you a corporate entity. He doesn’t recognize us as the People. Now we are going to give a Writ of Error because he wasn’t even the judge that was on this case. This judge that came in, and we actually had a magistrate, and this judge came in and made this decision. If you read his decision he said we were asked to look it over and make a ruling. First of all he wasn’t the judge assigned to the case. And if they asked him to do something they should have filed a motion in the case They shouldn’t be sending ex parte letters to the chief judge when the magistrate that is running the case , that’s seeing the paperwork come in and out, hasn’t said anything.

They already accepted our case based on the parameters that we put in that this is common law that the judge is not to make any decisions this was all put out in a memorandum and so they can’t say that they didn’t know it. So now he’s going to come in and say Oh no, you’re not an attorney you can’t come in. Well that’s a mistake.

Because right away they do the knee jerk thing that is going to discredit them in the long run.

NLA has a paper that John wrote in response to that.

Most of the time in these things you do a lot of counterpunching.

Every time they punch us it lets us know exactly where they are coming from not that we don’t know It is always easier to counter punch

Gerard read the Writ of Error that John wrote

(3:12)

Writ of Error

The court comes now to review the facts , record , and process. The record shows that on June 14, 2017 without any constitutional authority self appointed U S District Judge Lawrence E Kahn ignoring the random selection process of Magistrate Daniel J Stewart to this case He conducted his own court without notice or concurrence of the parties. Without notice to the administrator Magistrate Daniel J Stewart without jurisdiction without due process and under color of law. And acted in an attempt to seize control of this court an act of a tyrant by manufacturing an unlawful order to dismiss this action without prejudice thereby aiding and abetting the covering up of murder, torture, manipulation of evidence, witnesses and juries in order to incarcerate innocent people who are threatening to expose judicial law and law enforcement corruption and RICO on a national level conspiracy to supplant the law of the land with statutes thereby placing our republic in corporatism political incarceration covering up murder of inventors who are a threat to corporate profits denying due process robbing people’s homes and estates taking people’s children, for running debtors’ prison covering up and protecting pedophile rings

The genius of a court of record is not to be undermined It is the unalienable right of every American to settle a criminal case in a court of record

Federal district courts are creatures of congress inferior to the one supreme court which is vested by We the People ourselves through the Constitution for the United States of America. Federal district court judges hold their office during good behavior.

That is to say obedience to the one supreme court under Article 3 Section 1 in the law of the land. Under Article 6 Clause 2 the unalienable right of free access to people’s courts is a settled law that all judges are bound by oath to obey. If self appointed U S District Judge Lawrence E Kahn read our papers he would understand that like the other unjust courts that he presides over this is an Article 3 court in which indictments will be filed and criminal cases will be tried We the People are acting as grand juries to indict people that the corrupt judiciary will not. Whereby untainted trial juries will preside over. The U S Attorney General will be providing U S prosecutors or approve a special common law prosecutor. Nevertheless the Sixth Amendment provides for assistance of counsel for defense not BAR or attorney counsel. Judge Lawrence E Kahn will also understand that we are not a corporation a partnership we are an association. We are the People under the authority of the grand jury because all federal juries have been seized by the judiciary.

The Writ ends as follows:

Therefore the Sovereigns of this court of record reminding all officers of the court record that any statute or rule repugnant to the Constitution is null and void in a court of record and thereby issue this Writ of Error Coram Nobis to wit reversing the order by Judge Lawrence E Kahn of the inferior court not of record from jurisdictions unknown thereby returning the court back to the Tribunal.

That’s the response It’s got lots of footnotes

(12:53)

We got to get ready to step up to the plate because this battle is heating up

We have to be in solidarity with each other We have to be a force of one

You have to make time to fight this battle

They’re squeezing us so that we don’t have the time and energy to fight them.

We got this far We’re going to take it to the end

It’s better to go down fighting

This is the way we fight with the pen

In American Patriot the documentary on the Malheur thing the attorneys were in there talking and the one attorney said You don’t ever get out of the federal court with an acquittal ever because they don’t allow it to happen They were amazed that it actually happened It was recommended to watch this documentary.

It was good It was accurate It was a documentary done by a network media company.

Very professionally done. It was very powerful

We need to get the word out

We are going to work hard to get the NLA News and social media cooking.

Eventually there will be some trouble and they’ll try to take our stuff down but we got some people who know how to deal with that.

We got some really good people on NLA who understand these systems

These are our tools

Even if you don’t like facebook it is still a tool

Use what’s in your toolbox until its worn out.

Brent Winters author of Excellence of the Common Law

Brent’s website commonlawyer.com

(20:42)

Regarding the Declaration of ’76 Brent is careful not to call it the Declaration of Independence because that is not what it calls itself. Those words are not found in the document. It is not a declaration of independence it’s a declaration of shifting dependence

Our country shifted dependence for protection from the Crown of England to the Supreme Judge of all the world and Creator of all things.

We were in Paragraph 2

“-That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, --That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness.”

Just powers are those powers of government to which the governed had consented

Unjust powers are those powers of government to which the governed have never consented.

Just powers are those that the governed had a right before giving them to government

If you didn’t have the right to do what government’s doing right now if you never could have had that right then government doesn’t have it either because every right that government has if it is a true right is derived from you

Our common law lodges such consent most powerfully in the grand and petit juries

Grand jury the jury of indictment snatching someone by the foot and holding him impeachment holding him for trial

Petit jury is the one that says yes to the government you may take this man’s life, liberty, or property or combination thereof or no you may not.

The grand jury says yes or no to trial

Yes you may try this person or no you may not

That is the expression and consent of the governed and the jury are not representatives of the people. The jury are representative samples of the people

Very much different than the legislature

The legislature are representative of the people

But a jury isn’t

Just powers are those powers the governed could have rightly held and exercised before giving them to government

Unjust powers are those powers the governed could have never rightly held and exercised before giving them to government

Continuing paragraph 2

“ Prudence, indeed, will dictate that Governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes; and accordingly all experience hath shewn, that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed.”

We are a people of custom

Some people are accustomed to eat at McDonalds

No matter where they are they will stop at McDonalds because they are accustomed to it

Even though it has come out in the news that McDonalds was mixing horse meat with their hamburger

People won’t abolish McDonalds They’re accustomed to it It’s part of Americana

The same thing is true with the abuses of government

People are more supposed to suffer we are very patient We’ve put up with a lot

In the last election some people snapped and said we don’t want to put up with this any more. They went to the ballot box and they made a statement.

The people that voted Trump into office didn’t pick up pitch forks and knives and go after the other side We suffer as long as evils are sufferable

Assassination is not part of our common law Never has been In common law countries assassination hasn’t been the rule But it’s crept into our country because of our foolishness of allowing the law of the city to be part of our government

You cannot be separated from your rights

Rights is from the Old Germanic word rights are your duty your responsibility

God gave it to you direct It is nondelegable

You can’t pass it off to somebody else.

We call these rights that are nondelegable we call these in our common law tradition fundamental rights.

These are the rights that are not seperatable from you

God gave them to you You can’t get rid of them No man can take them from you

The Founders said that you can’t get rid of them yourself.

You can’t divest yourself of your fundamental rights because they are duties given by God.

Having such rights to alter or abolish a government that tries to get in between you and your Maker and tries to be the mediator that says that it gave you the rights and you have them at their pleasure that’s what governments try to do they always try to do that they get powerful enough they may say that you may have those rights but you can’t exercise them without our permission. That’s the same thing as saying we have power over them and we can take them away. But they can’t

They are rights they are duties and you will answer for them some day

And any government that says that you exercise them at their pleasure is a liar.

That’s why we call them fundamental

When governments do that then the people have the right to alter or abolish that government.

Such a right to alter or abolish government does not necessarily demand violent overthrow

Our declaration is no revolutionary manifesto

Revolution doesn’t appear anywhere in the document

Language hinting at a call to arms is not found in our Declaration of ‘76

The British forced war

The Evil Empire now today they’re trying to force war

People who hate true government they’re the ones committing violence

It’s orchestrated with the intent to force war

The only way that the Evil Empire can advance is by murder unlawful taking of property and unlawful jailing of men

By replacing our common law courts with admiralty tribunals all for the ease of England’s control mercantilism and trading monopolies Britain removed any requirement for a search warrant and denied trial by jury.

They extended admiralty law from the high seas to the coastal waters to the harbors to the piers to the warehouses on the piers and then by using the excuse of looking for contraband they extended the admiralty law into the homes of English speaking people in the American colonies

And they said because admiralty law now applied to ships the piers the warehouses and now the homes because sea delivered contraband was in the homes they removed the requirement for a search warrant to search homes. And also denied trial by jury because admiralty law being a species of the law of the city the civil law the civil law of Babylon the law of the city there is no trial by jury There is no trial by jury in the rest of the world.

Only in common law countries do we enjoy true trial by jury. If there is a jury it’s window dressing. And if they don’t like what the jury said then they just overturn it.

No right of revolution is part of the Bible and no right of revolution is part of the common law tradition. We call our war of separation from Britain a revolution but it wasn’t

The English and American revolutions were not rebellions against authority

They were rebellions against usurpation of power

They were war against power without authority.

Revolution is rebellion against authority.

Authority if it is true authority is always right and to war against it it is a war against God.

If someone has true authority then you don’t fight them

The Wizard of Oz came on once a year.

The gal that was the neighbor lady to Dorothy out there on the Kansas plains she was a mean old spinster of a woman and she said that Dorothy’s dog Toto bit her. And she came over on her bicycle and she took the dog She said that she had a warrant from the court.

Dorothy’s uncle looked at it and he said to Dorothy the warrant is good and he gathered up Toto and handed Toto over.

Warrant is another word for authority.

If a warrant is good then it’s good.

And that is why when law enforcement officers come to search a house our tradition our custom has always required them to knock and to show the warrant And you can examine it to see if it is good. I don’t see that happening like it used to.

They take battering rams and bust down the door.

They don’t show anybody a warrant

No right of revolution is part of the Bible neither is it part of our Declaration of ‘76

People have the right to alter or abolish the government

That’s not the first option

The first option is to use the courts

But it got so in the American colonies that the courts were dominated by admiralty law

The law of the city has slipped in under the label of administrative law

Right now a lot of the times the courts are accepting petitions

And if courts aren’t accepting petitions and ignoring them then it may be time to appeal the matter and seek other avenues

Try to avoid violence

Don’t be the starter of the fight

Brent’s views may or may not be the views of NLA

(54:30)

QUESTIONS

Question 1: In Pennsylvania the consolidated statutes say that all courts are courts of record would it be more proper to go into a traffic court as a defendant and carry on as a court of record since jurisdiction isn’t determined yet or would it be more strategic to file a counterclaim to challenge jurisdiction as a plaintiff?

If you’re going to challenge them the only way to challenge them is under fundamental principles because they don’t have the jurisdiction to begin with and why do you want to get into all of the minutia of their statutes and their UCC codes or whatever else they’re using. Most of the time, especially when there is no injured party, they’re violating your due process your fundamental right and you can defend that Those are easy to defend

You can always challenge them

If worse comes to worse then you pay the fine

Most of it should be done on paper Some don’t have time to do that

Don’t be afraid to bail rather than go to jail

Doing a one man war doesn’t really work

Question 2: If it is preferred to file a counterclaim to a traffic citation would you have to inform the traffic court that you’ve opened a counter claim in a superior court and are waiting for the decision on jurisdiction?

It is always better to go in as a plaintiff rather than the defendant but that’s not always possible.

Depends on what the charge is

When there’s no harm done and you want to fight you want to fight on constitutional principles You’re going to end up in the federal court if you do it.

You can win as a defendant but it’s harder

There is a guy out there Eddie He prepares you before you get stopped

He gives you a skit

You answer certain things certain ways and you don’t say anything else

By doing what he says to do he has this whole scenario of what to say first and what to say second

Am I free to go?

At some point if you end up in court and you followed his skit and you didn’t contract with them now this is where the prosecutor is going to hang himself

If you followed my skit the way you were supposed to then we’re going to get to this point and he’s not going to be able to answer it

It is worth listening to if you feel like fighting in traffic court

His methodology is very fundamental Everything he does goes back to fundamental principles I’m into common law and I don’t want to memorize a bunch of statutes.

Question 3: Is NLA in agreement with   "A Treatise on the Law of Sheriffs"    by Walter Anderson   that   "most of the functions of the sheriff to act in a judicial capacity were removed by the Magna Carta”?

(1:00:31)

Gerard would like to brush up on the Magna Carta

Whoever wrote this question maybe they could school us on that.

Brent never read “A Treatise on the Law of Sheriffs”

Sheriff were involved for centuries long before the Magna Carta Magna Carta didn’t remove anything All the Magna Carta attempted to do was re-establish what had been lost

What they’re establishing there is the way it was before the Norman invasion. 300 year or 400 years earlier. That’s what Magna Carta is trying to establish. It’s not removing things. It’s trying to establish what was lost. Our Constitution of the United States does the same thing.

Our Constitution is an attempt to establish common law as it stood before Magna Carta. Our Constitution is an attempt to do the same thing Magna Carta did in the same time.

That stuff that they had way back centuries ago was good.

There are some things that never change

True law never changes

The duties of the sheriff traditionally common law England a way long time ago before the Norman’s invaded England in the year 1066 before that the sheriff was very much a part of the court process The common law brought the court to every cottage Every little place had a court Every little hundredths Hundredths was equivalent to a township

Our counties are the shires There was a courthouse close to every house so you didn’t have to travel to the federal courthouse. You didn’t have to travel to the county seat.

There were courts everywhere and that’s what we need in America

We need them at the township level And that will bring justice to the door of every house and then men can resolve their differences And we won’t be looking to bureaucrats for fixing it for us. To get our neighbor because he’s having a weenie roast in his back yard and we hate him and so we’re going to call the county commissioner boys out to shut him down. That’s the evil of administrative law

Whoever submitted the question must have read “A Treatise on the Law of Sheriffs”

It may be very good. Maybe I should read it I never heard of it

Possibly tell people where to find it. If it is worthwhile to read I’ll try to find it

Question 4: Are there any state constitutions that bar an attorney from being elected to, or occupying the office of sheriff  ?

(1:08:50)

That’s a good question And there may be

It sounds like a conflict of interest

A state trooper can’t be part of anything else

Brent has known men that have run lawyers licensed in the jurisdiction that have run for sheriff. It’s a separation of powers doctrine That’s why the interests are conflicting Because the lawyer the attorney if he’s got a license he’s an officer of the highest court of the jurisdiction where he is licensed. If you’re an officer of the judicial branch and that is what a lawyer is how could he be without a conflict without violating the separation of powers doctrine how could he also be an executive officer chief executive officer of a county where he’s sheriff? That would be an impossibility

How do you get somebody indicted into your own court?

I’ve never seen a case challenging that problem

I’ve seen cases challenging whether or not a member of Congress could be a member of the reserves. Because if he is a member of Congress he’s part of the legislative branch. And under our separation of powers doctrine how could he then be under the command of the President of the United States as a Naval Reserve officer? Our courts have made an exception there. They say that it’s not like it’s a full time job on either end. There have been other challenges like that. I’ve never heard one challenging a lawyer I suppose a lawyer if he wanted to he could have his law license suspended while he was serving as sheriff .

This is a valid question. It’s something that we need to be thinking about. As far as the Laws of Nature’s God which we call the Bible the separation of powers doctrine is there but in the Bible no man no mere mortal was ever allowed to gather all three powers of government into a single will his will Legislative, Executive, Judicial But men were allowed under the government of God to gather two of the powers of government into their hand And so we see Saul as king executive officer also served as prophet but when then he tried to conduct the office of priest which is analogous to the judicial office that was all three powers God ripped the kingdom from him and then he had a hellish life after that. We see other examples of that too.

In our tradition sometime we allow two powers to be combined.

Logic is not the life of our common law

The life of our common law is true law

True law doesn’t always make sense to men

It never has and never will

It is as mysterious to men as the doctrine of the Trinity.

The logic doesn’t make sense with the smallness of the human mind.

We don’t have to understand it It is what it is There is no explaining it

Separation of power is what we are talking about here

Separation of power is one of the chief fundamentals of our common law of government

Without separation of power the executive will control the courts

The pervasive feature of our common law government is the disbursement and then the separation of power.

That’s an important question to raise. I’m glad somebody raised it.

(1:19:17)

Question 5: The Seventh Amendment states   "...  and no fact tried by a jury, shall be otherwise reexamined in any court of the United States, than according to the rules of the common law."    What rules of common law would allow the re-examination of facts tried by a jury?

Only those fundamental rules that we rest in to begin with. In other words , you’re not allowed to try a fact that is established by a jury. Unless the facts weren’t the facts. If somebody lied and there was fraud and that would be under the common law. You can go back if you’re basing your decision on a falsehood because then that law was no law at all. That jury makes the law. The sovereign makes the law. If it was based on false principles and false practice then it falls under that thing that says it was no law at all. You can go back in that sense. You can go back but under strict guidelines.

Question 6: Please explain how when police officers make arrests because they’re private corporations and without authority from We the People such as sheriffs have how the arrests police make are nothing more than a citizen’s arrest?

(1:21:21)

They’re all operating under color of law. Even a citizen’s arrest is valid if the affidavit he is swearing to is laying out the facts of the law So now you got to go and get an official who has the authority given to him by We the People to enforce that law.

When you fight them for violating your due process and your rights that’s exactly what you’re fighting. You’re fighting that they didn’t have the jurisdiction to do what they did.

Did they violate our due process? Is that what they’re doing? It’s not even a citizen’s arrest. I wouldn’t raise it that high if it was done unjustly. If you’re breaking the law, and he’s arresting you, and even if it is a citizen’s arrest and there’s an injured party you’re not going to get off because all he has to do , of course they don’t like to do this, this is the problem, because they violate due process, if he witnessed it he should be signing an affidavit swearing that he witnessed it. You don’t usually see signed affidavits by police officers or any officer for that matter . They never swear to what they’re saying as the truth. That’s a problem.

If you want to challenge the jurisdiction, you’re free to but you can’t challenge it in every case when you’re wrong. You’re not going to be right any way. Even if it is a citizen’s arrest. Then it becomes a valid citizen’s arrest if there’s an injured party. That’s what We the People gave them that authority for to protect the weak from the strong

(1:26:00)

There are two more questions but they’re totally in the fiction One is on the IRS and one is on UCC stuff.

It’s the same answer all of the time though.

Most people are their own worst enemies because they go in and they contract with them

You got to understand what they are saying

CALLERS

Caller 1 California Fred

(1:27:15)

Fred has a question for Brent Winters

Did you hear the response from the self appointed judge to what NLA had filed?

Brent did not

Gerard said that it would be posted

Brent spoke earlier about licensed attorney

That’s one thing that NLA hits head on There is no such thing as a license issued by any state. So these guys are just paying BAR card membership bull shit If they don’t have no license The state doesn’t issue a license for an attorney.

National Liberty Alliance is having a lot of trouble getting their paperwork through

Somehow this judge wanted to throw the case out because there was no attorney to press the charges

What is the actual proper procedure for a redress of grievance with our government?

You don’t have to have an attorney to press the charges

The People can do it through the grand jury

What is that process?

And what about the violation of the public trust?

It’s all over the place These guys are not living up to their oath of office

And as far as prosecution What about a private prosecutor?

Something we’ve gone south on we’ve done wrong on We’ve developed the idea of the professional prosecutor. And that’s no part of our tradition

It seems like only yesterday that the prosecutor in rural counties was a part time job.

All the prosecutors practiced law privately.

They got to have time paid to do it.

I think it really happened in a big way about 15 years ago.

All of a sudden the state legislature said we want all the prosecutors to be full time And they jacked their salary to $100,000/year even in the smallest counties where there were 10,000 people and made it more professional. It’s a civil service job.

(1:30:35)

In the Bible there are no paid employees in God’s plan for government.

The state doesn’t have to license attorneys the state recognizes the license of the attorney

In most states it’s criminal to practice law without a license.

If you’re in front of the bar , the bar that’s in the courtroom, you get up in front where the lawyers are and cross the bar BAR members are supposed to be up there unless the judge gives permission for other people to be up there

In states like California where the BAR association licenses the lawyers

The BAR association is also in charge of disciplining lawyers

In Illinois the highest court in the state licenses lawyers

The highest court in the state is the Supreme Court of the State.

In states where the BAR association licenses lawyers BAR membership for lawyers is mandatory You can’t practice law without being a member of the BAR

In states where the highest court of the state licenses lawyers then lawyers don’t have to belong to the state BAR

Fred said Maybe this is unfair for me to ask because you didn’t hear the judge’s response

Maybe this would be a good question for next time.

Brent will listen to what the judge said.

The redress of grievances is there a standard court case or some way to file a redress of grievance with our government for the violation of the public trust because quite frankly they’re so far askew of the Constitution we can’t even recognize it any more?

Gerard thinks that Bob Schultz already did that.

When he came up with the Articles of Freedom

And he filed those redress of grievances.

They said you can file a redress of grievance but we don’t have to answer it

That was filed in every state, and with the President, and with the Congress

The government didn’t listen to it They didn’t care

You have to come in with a certain force with a certain authority

If they don’t think that you have most of the People on your side they’re never going to yield.

You have to have critical mass to move these guys.

They’re never going to move because you put certain words in or you do a process a certain way.

We’re frustrated that they don’t listen to us

We have a case in the court that they haven’t answered and they just usurp all of our due process and slap us in the face

Ultimately this judge will be indicted into this case.

We gave him knowledge of things going on and he is an officer of the court. He had a duty to give it to a prosecutor He needs to do his job

How could you state it more clear than what we did in our paperwork

And so for him to ignore that that in itself is an act of defiance and treason

There will be consequences and if they think there will not then they are under serious delusion.

They are under serious delusion You would think that some of these guys would have backed off because they have so much evidence against them. When you violate the law of God to such a degree and blatantly laugh at it God hardens your heart Then you don’t have the ability to repent

And you just dig your hole deeper and deeper and deeper just like the Pharaoh did in Egypt when Moses said “Let my people go”

That’s what we’re dealing with We are dealing with that same type of mentality.

It’s not going to be easy

When you read that paper What is in there that you don’t understand?

It paints a pretty clear picture.

They got a duty And they need to step up to the plate

Caller 2: Crystal

(2:02:00)

No response

Caller 3: Ollie

We’ve got an excellent interview for uploading segments He is up to part 3 These are excellent interviews that Lauren Pearce from Redoubt News interviewed Gerard and John Darash

Ollie encourages everyone to watch those videos

(2:06:00)

Caller 4: Cynthia

Are administrative court and administrative law the same?

She has a case number

She has an appeal to send back to the office of the inspector general

She is a social worker by trade she had her own company

We did billing through Medicare and Medicaid

Her clients were her customers

Her employees messed up

She billed and that’s considered fraud

Now her name is on a list and she can’t get a job anywhere

It doesn’t say she did anything wrong it says program conviction

She asked if she could appeal this

They asked if she got a letter

She said she never got a letter

They sent it to the wrong address

She never got judicial due process

She put an appeal together

There’s no transparency

The laws that they come up with the people are not aware of them or even know where to find them

She didn’t agree with it because she didn’t get a fair judicial procedure

They sent it to the wrong place

They decided to target all health care people

There is a federal registry

If the information was available to me and 6,000 medical professionals you wouldn’t have this problem

I’m going to defend myself if I have to

The lawyer I had He robbed me I paid all the money back

Administrative law has no teeth They use it If you’re contracted in that’s a different thing

If you have a contract with them then that’s administrative law and a lot of times it’s arbitration.

If they’re coming after you with administrative law they have no authority

It sounds like you’re doing the right thing the way you are challenging them under U S C

They cannot give you relief and they will not give your relief

When you challenged them under 18 USC that puts you in the federal court

You can go there directly because it’s a constitutional violation You don’t have to go through their stupid appeals process

It’s not easy You got to keep on plugging You got to do the right thing It’s a lot of work.

Cynthia was on a headset and it was hard to understand

Inaudible

(2:24:08)

 Caller 5 Felicia in Florida

Felicia told her mother what NLA told her to do and her mother said “God bless all of you”.

If it wasn’t for Mr. Jan instructing Felicia what to do her house would have been sold on the fourteenth.

The sheriff told Felicia that in order for him to protect her she had to file a report that a crime has been committed.

He should protect you whenever your unalienable rights are being violated.

If you make a complaint to him and you’re willing to go on record and swear out the affidavit

your complaint

In law an affidavit unrebutted is the truth

The sheriff wants you to make a complaint to him in an affidavit that this is what they did to you.

If you come down with a sworn complaint then he has no choice but to serve it on them

She went down to the court house and had it stamped and submitted and added to the first foreclosure case that she had.

The sheriff said that in order for them to protect her from them trying to evict her she needs to come down and fill out a complaint that a crime has been committed before we can protect you.

NLA should work with Felicia on this.

You need to be clear in your head so that when you go there you can talk intelligently about it

We can give you a couple of pointers and brush you up on the finer stuff

Gerard said that April was on the other line and could help with this question

Gerard unmuted April

April was listening to the call and noticed a letter of instruction that Felicia should have received.

The letter comes from the Unified United States Common Law Grand Jury

It says: “Your petition with the Unified United States Common Law Grand Jury for assistance in reporting a crime

your response and information reporting a crime of nonjudicial foreclosure has been sent to your sheriff which explains the ruse that attempts to rob you of your property as opposed to a seizure of property under due process which foreclosure by due process was not done in this case simply because it could not be done

This letter of instruction details how you are to proceed. We are copying the sheriff. Once you receive the information you will know your sheriff received it

Please allow the sheriff one week from the day of receipt to receive the information and conduct his investigation

If however you have a notice of eviction or sale before then you may proceed immediately

Call your sheriff to inquire ‘Did you received the document for which I petitioned the grand jury? Do you understand the crime committed? Do you intend to protect me and rights if the foreclosing agents want my property let them go through due process in the court? ‘

When you call the sheriff’s office be sure not to talk to the deputy or anyone else in the sheriff’s office .

If you are unable to speak directly with the sheriff leave a message.

If you are asked if the matter is personal respond thusly:

“This is not a personal matter The sheriff is an elected individual The sheriff is a constitutional law enforcement officer in the county I have an unalienable right to speak with my sheriff “

NLA will greatly appreciate your recording any success that you receive

We are interested in knowing of the sheriff’s willingness to defend the unalienable rights of their constituents. “

You are apparently doing something right if you succeeded and that’s what we want to hear.

She was the one that sent in the question about the UCC and the IRS

You don’t learn this stuff in high school, college , or business school.

Caller started the civics course

It might benefit you to finish it now

To watch the internet she has to go to the library

She asked those questions because she was never taught it

It will benefit you to finish the civics course and take notes.

The course is very informational

There are some very good videos that the caller can watch

Caller has to go to the sheriff office and fill out something to report a crime

Her neighbor was foreclosed on and her house was sold . Can she get her house back? Should she get in contact with NLA? Her house was also a nonjudicial foreclosure.

You can go after them after the fact because it was fraud.

She can fill out the paperwork and start the case.

In order for her to get it back she will have to fight and this is a big fight.

It is not easy.

To get one back is even more work

There is a lot going on that people don’t know

Her mentor is a former astronaut

Everyday I discover something else in spite of the fact that I don’t want to know.

It is way deeper than anybody can believe

Keep up the fight