

NOTICE TO PRINCIPAL IS NOTICE TO AGENT

NOTICE TO AGENT IS NOTICE TO PRINCIPAL

Today: 17.1.2017

mike: v philip-mark:pelling / james:munby / peter-arthur-brian:jackson / barbara-janet:fontaine
2MA90015 case Date: 14.1.2013 & CoP 10370284

NOTICE: 'void orders'

(Maxim of Law)Cf. setting aside a 'void order'.

[THE VOID COURT ORDER]

This notice pertains to case number [2MA90015] heard on 14.1.2013 Manchester It is my belief that the order granted to the claimant is void on its face and should be set aside for the following reasons: & that in relation to CoP case 10370284 all orders after the 20.8.2012 are void see ann's will:

Judicial disqualification, also referred to as recusal, refers to the act of abstaining from 28 (543): 543–61. Barnes, Robert (June 9, 2009). "Campaign Contributions Can Lead to Judicial Bias, Supreme Court Rules". Eg i bite a mcDonalds burger which is contaminated so i take them to court but the judge is on the payroll of mcDonalds.... **philip-mark:pelling** was on the payroll as a **NOMINATED court of 'protection' judge!!** Who was he protecting?? In 2013

Nominated court of Protection Judges

North West Region

Name	Resident Court
1. District Judge Michael Anson	Preston
2. District Judge John Coffey	Liverpool
3. District Judge Helen Conway	St Helens
4. District Judge Claire Evans	Bolton
5. District Judge Charles Fairclough	Manchester
6. District Judge Anthony Harrison	Manchester
7. District Judge Charles Khan	Manchester
8. District Judge Ranj Matharu	Manchester
9. District Judge John Park	Carlisle
10. District Judge Louise Relph	Manchester
11. District Judge Stephen E Rogers	Crewe
12. His Honour Judge John Appleby	Manchester
13. His Honour Judge Martin Allweis	Manchester
14. His Honour Judge Kevin Barnett	Warrington
15. His Honour Judge Nigel Bird	Manchester
16. Her Honour Judge Margaret De HaaS QC	Liverpool
17. His Honour Judge Stephen Dodds	Liverpool
18. Her Honour Judge Barbara Forrester	Carlisle
19. His Honour Judge Allan Gore QC	Liverpool
20. His Honour Judge Iain Hamilton	Manchester
21. His Honour Judge David R Hodge, QC	Manchester
22. His Honour Judge Peter Hughes QC	Carlisle
23. Her Honour Judge Lindsey Kushner QC	Manchester
24. His Honour Judge Tony Lancaster	Lancaster
25. Her Honour Judge Lesley Newton	Manchester
26. His Honour Judge Mark Pelling, QC	Manchester
27. His Honour Judge Jeremy Rawkins	Lancaster
28. His Honour Judge Phillip Raynor	Manchester (Admin court cases)
29. Her Honour Judge Maureen Roddy	Manchester
30. Her Honour Judge Barbara Watson	Preston

[A void order does not have to be obeyed because, for example, in *Crane v Director of Public Prosecutions* [1921], it was stated that if an order is void ab initio (from the beginning) then there is no real order of the court. Therefore, the defendant does not commit an offense if he ignores the void convictions and their related orders for enforcement in the present cases];

[A void order results from a 'fundamental defect' in proceedings (Upjohn LJ in *Re Pritchard (deceased)* [1963] 1 Ch 502 and Lord Denning in *Firman v Ellis* [1978] 3 WLR 1). A 'fundamental defect' includes a failure to serve process where service of process is required (Lord Greene in *Craig v Kanssen* [1943] 1 KB 256); or where proceedings appear to be duly issued but fail to comply with a statutory requirement (Upjohn LJ in *Re Pritchard* [1963]). Failure to comply with a statutory requirement includes rules made pursuant to a statute (*Smurthwaite v Hannay* [1894] A.C. 494).

Therefore, by its failure to serve due process and by acting outside of its limited jurisdiction the court has effected a fundamental defect in these proceedings];

[In *Peacock v Bell and Kendal* [1667] 85 E.R. 81 it was held that nothing shall be intended to be out of the jurisdiction of a Superior Court, but that which specially appears to be so; and nothing shall be intended to be within the jurisdiction of an Inferior Court but that which is so expressly stated];

[Similarly, if a higher court's order is founded on a lower court's void act or invalid claim, then the higher court's decision will also be void [Lord Denning in *MacFoy v United Africa Co. Ltd.* [1961] 3 All ER];

[Furthermore, a person affected by both a void or voidable order has the right – *ex debito justitiae* – to have the order set aside (which means that the court does not have discretion to refuse to set aside the order or to go into the merits of the case) (Lord Greene in *Craig v Kanssen*, 1943). The procedure for setting aside a void order is by application to the court which made the void order, although it can also be set aside by appeal, even though an appeal is not necessary [Lord Greene in *Craig v Kanssen*, 1943], or it can be quashed or declared invalid by Judicial Review (where available) and where damages may also be claimed];

[Although an appeal is not necessary to set aside a void order, if permission to appeal is requested, even if out of time, the court should grant permission because time does not run because the order is void and the person affected by it has the right to have it set aside [Lord Greene in *Craig v Kanssen*, 1943]. A void order is also incurably void and all proceedings based on the invalid claim or void act are also void. Even a decision of the higher courts (High Court, Court of Appeal and Supreme Court) will be void if the decision is founded on an invalid claim or void act, because something cannot be founded on nothing [Lord Denning in *MacFoy v United Africa Co. Ltd.*, 1961];

[A void order is void even if it results in a failure of natural justice or injustice to an innocent third party (Lord Denning in *Wiseman v Wiseman* [1953] 1 All ER 601). It is also never too late to raise the issue of nullity and a person can ignore the void order or claim and raise it as a defence when necessary (*Wandsworth London Borough Council v. Winder* [1985] A.C. 461; *Smurthwaite v Hannay* [1894] A.C. 494; Upjohn LJ in *Re Pritchard (deceased)* [1963]; Lord Denning in *MacFoy v United Africa Co. Ltd.* [1961]). Furthermore, in *Firman v Ellis* [1978] Lord Denning affirmed that: (i) a void act is void ab initio];

[In *Re Pritchard (deceased)* [1963] Upjohn LJ confirmed that: (i) a fundamental defect in proceedings will make the whole proceedings a nullity; (ii) a nullity cannot be waived; (iii) it is never too late to raise the issue of nullity; and (iv) a person affected by a void order has the right – *ex debito justitiae* – to have it set aside. For the avoidance of doubt in the present cases, this means that the court does

not have the right to refuse this application or to convene a hearing of its merits, as per Lord Greene in *Craig v Kanssen* [1943] and other authorities cited herein, by which the court is bound];

[In *Wiseman v Wiseman* [1953] 1 All ER 601, Lord Denning confirmed that: (i) the issue of natural justice does not arise in a void order because it is void whether it causes a failure of natural justice or not; (ii) a claimant or defendant should not be allowed to abuse the process of court by failing to comply with a statutory procedure and yet keep the benefit of it and for that reason also a void act is void even if it affects the rights of an innocent third party];

[Therefore, in summary of the foregoing authorities: (i) an application to have a void order set aside can be made to the court which made the void order; (ii) the setting aside must be done under the court's inherent power to set aside its own void order;

(iii) the court does not have discretion to refuse the application because the person affected by the void order has a right to have it set aside; (iv) an appeal is not necessary because the order is already void; (v) if permission to appeal is sought even if out of time permission should be given because as the order is void time does not run; it is never too late to raise the issue of nullity and the person affected by the void order has a right to have it set aside; (vi) a void order can be quashed or declared unlawful by Judicial Review where available and where damages may also be claimed; (vii) the whole proceedings is void if it was based on a void act; (viii) a void

order does not have to be obeyed because it has no legal effect from the beginning];

(xi) [As it is never too late to raise the issue of nullity, a person can ignore the void order and rely on nullity as a defense when necessary; (x) a void order is void even if the nullity is unjust or injustice occurs to an innocent third party; (xi) an order of a court of limited jurisdiction is void if it cannot be expressly shown, whether by relying upon statutes or procedures subject to statutes, that the court has the jurisdiction to act, or if the order is founded on an invalid claim or void act; (xii) no court (not even the Supreme Court) has jurisdiction to give effect to a void act and the

duty of the court is only to interpret and apply the law not to reform or create it as such power rests only with Parliament];

SOVERIGNTY

Elizabeth Alexandra Mary Saxe-Coburg-Gotha-Battenberg [Mountbatten] a.k.a. Elizabeth Alexandra Mary Windsor a.k.a. Her Majesty the Queen, etcetera is not the true reigning monarch and lawful heir to the throne of England and Wales since she is not a direct descendant of the Royal House of Plantagenet's bloodline. Simon Abney-Hastings 15th Earl of Loudoun (born 1974) is the true heir to the throne [See Tony Robinson's documentary: "Britain's Real Monarch" - a Channel 4 Television Corporation Spire-Films Production]. The true Royal bloodline was broken with the birth and subsequent crowning of Edward IV on March 4 1461. This subsequently invalidated all claims to the throne throughout history (for over 500 years) right the way down to the current House of Windsor. And because the monarchy rests entirely upon (1) the legitimacy of bloodline and (2) inheritance, with an absolutely rigid system for passing on the throne, it is therefore true that Elizabeth Alexandra Mary Saxe-Coburg-Gotha-Battenberg [Mountbatten] cannot lawfully be vested with having any authority over [we] the people;

Significantly, no judge(s) and or other members of the judiciary can lawfully claim to derive their authority from the 'Queen' or lawfully hold any court in her name since they have no authority or jurisdiction over [we] the people;

If it could be proven that Elizabeth Alexandra Mary Saxe-Coburg-Gotha-Battenberg [Mountbatten] was true heir and legitimate reigning monarch which is not the case the fact is she did knowingly and with malice aforethought permit her coronation to take place on a fake coronation stone on Tuesday, June 2, 1953. This means she has never been rightfully or lawfully crowned as 'Sovereign' see R vs. John Anthony Hill (JAH) at Southwark Crown Court on Thursday May 12, 2011 Case Reference/Docket number T20107746. This landmark case successfully challenged the Sovereignty and jurisdiction of the Queen by unanimous decision of the quorum of twelve jurors which is binding upon all courts;

The faked Coronation ceremony of Elizabeth Alexandra Mary Saxe-Coburg-Gotha-Battenberg [Mountbatten] is of enormous importance because of the obligations imposed upon her through her solemn promise to govern the peoples of the United Kingdom according to Statutes in Parliament agreed on and according to their laws and customs. Elizabeth Alexandra Mary Saxe-Coburg-Gotha-Battenberg [Mountbatten] swore to preserve all rights and privileges as by law do or shall appertain to any of them. From a secular point of view the Coronation Oath is a signed contract before God which [inter alia] binds her to do her utmost to maintain The Laws of God first and foremost. However in repeated violation of her binding oath Elizabeth Alexandra Mary Saxe-Coburg-Gotha-Battenberg [Mountbatten] has continued giving her 'royal assent' to man-made 'laws' [legislation] which are in clear violation of God's Law prohibiting them thus characterizing her divorce from her sworn duty;

"No enactment of man can be considered law unless it conforms to the law of God." ~ Sir William Blackstone stated in his "Commentaries on the Laws of England (1765 - 1769)": .

God's Law expressly forbids all [wo]men from making any laws:

'Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish ought from it, that ye may keep the commandments of the Lord your God which I command you' ~

Deuteronomy 4:2- King James Version ('KJV').

'Whatever I command you, you shall be careful to do; you shall not add to nor take away from it'~ Deuteronomy 12:32

'Ye shall observe to do therefore as the Lord your God hath commanded you: ye shall not turn aside to the right hand or to the left' ~ Deuteronomy 5:32

The twelfth COMMANDMENT, given later by Jesus says: "YOU shall NOT judge."

"Judge not, that ye be not judged"~The Gospel according to St. Matthew 7:1

The Holy Bible: King James Version ('KJV');

"For with what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged: and with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again."

The Gospel according to St. Matthew 7:2

"Judge not, and ye shall not be judged. Condemn not, and ye shall not be condemned..."

~ The Gospel according to St. Luke 6:37- The Holy Bible: King James Version ('KJV');

Further the British monarchy was officially dissolved vesting all authority in we the people by covenant. i; a man [of the people] has sovereignty over the Crown monarchy and the right and the

authority to dismiss any case(s) instigated by the Crown [see High Court Proclamation of January 22 1649] and because it is the people who created the Crown and all privileges associated with it;

[Blackstone's Commentaries (volume 1, page 239) states "of the Royal Prerogative":

"The splendour, rights, and powers of the Crown were attached to it for the benefit of the people. They form part of, and are, generally speaking, as ancient as the law itself, De prerogative regis is merely declaratory of the common law..."];

Two Maxims of Law state: (1) "No one is obliged to accept a benefit against his consent", and (2) "He who receives the benefit should also bear the disadvantage"

Never having knowingly or voluntarily accepted any benefit(s) arising from this matter i; a woman, am not bound and disadvantaged by such;

All so called 'laws' devised by [wo]man violate God's Law. The so called 'Law(s)' devised by [wo]man are in fact legislated rules given by legislators for those who voluntarily consent to be governed and bound by them. Such 'law(s)' are therefore subject to contract, since "the law is contract" (Maxim of Law) and 'consent makes the law' ['Consensus facit legem'] (Maxim of Law).

i; have never knowingly consented to be bound or governed by any [wo]man's 'law(s)' and have refused to consent to any arbitrary decisions being made by anyone concerning my property. The administration of my property without right and [my] consent is a clear violation of my sovereignty and a wrongful trespass against me and my property whether done in error or otherwise;

"All public authority emanates from the people"[cf. Article 17, Declaration of Fundamental Rights and Freedoms]. i; woa man [of the people] have rights and superior authority over all public offices titles and those acting in their capacity as public office holder's public servant's agent(s) or representatives. All are subordinate to [wo]men. In my capacity and standing as a man i; have required the office of 'judge' to dismiss this case for the reasons stated but which was ignored;

All people have the right of self-determination [cf. Article 1, International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights]. Nobody has the right to interfere with such rights. And because there was no verifiable evidence of any wrongdoing by me a man, i; in my capacity as a sovereign man, have the requisite right and the authority to dismiss the case on grounds of there being no case to answer to, since it was my wish not to be bound by statutory rules, which are not laws, of an another society which i; am not a part of, and which are entirely fictitious;

The Universal Declaration states in Article 8 that 'everyone has the right to an effective remedy by the competent national tribunals for acts violating the fundamental rights granted by the constitution or by law'.

Notwithstanding the right to an effective remedy is enshrined in several ICCPR articles. Article 2(3) provides the most highly elaborated general provision in human rights law. Moreover, one finds specific remedies in the ICCPR such as Article 6(4) on the right to apply for pardon, amnesty and commutation of the death sentence. Article 9(3) and (4) defines the right to habeas corpus and judicial review, Article 13 provides a remedy against expulsion, Article 14 guarantees fair trial and Article 14(5) defines the right to review of conviction and sentence. Both general and specific provisions on effective remedy can be found under other UN Conventions, such as Articles 2, 2(c) and 3 CEDAW; Article 6 CERD; Articles 2 and 3 ICESCR; Articles 12 and 13 CAT; Articles 2(2), 3, 4, 19, 20, 32 and 37(d) CRC; and Articles 18, 19, 22 and 23 CMW.

[“The absolute rights of man, considered as a free agent, endowed with discernment to know good from evil, and with power of choosing those measures which appear to him to be most desirable, are usually summed up in one general appellation, and denominated the natural liberty of mankind. This natural liberty consists properly in a power of acting as one thinks fit, without any restraint or control, unless by the Law of nature: being a right inherent in us by birth, and one of the gifts of God to man at his creation, when he endued him with the faculty of free will...”~ William Blackstone, Commentaries on the Laws of England]. i; a woman and free agent have had my property interfered with by false allegations promulgated by <philip-mark:pelling, peter-arthur-brian:jackson, james:munby, barbara-janet:fontaine>

“All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience ...” [cf. Article 1, Universal Declaration of Human Rights (“UDHR”), December 10 1948]. The person acting in the role of ‘judge’ blunderingly overlooked this fact;

“The people are the ultimate sovereign”[see Coughlan v. Broadcasting Complaints Commission [2000] IESC 44, 26th January, 2000];

Sovereignty itself is, of course, not subject to law, for it is the author and source of law; but, in our system, while sovereign powers are delegated to the agencies of government, sovereignty itself remains with the people, by whom and for whom all government exists and acts[see Yick Wo v. Hopkins - 118 U.S. 356 (1886)];

AUTHORITY [cf. JURISDICTION] OF THE COURT

All ministers, officer’s and agents and officials receive their authority by swearing under oath or affirmation their allegiance to the (fictional) Crown or their ‘Sovereign Lady Queen Elizabeth the Second’. Such authority is in fact false null and void from the outset [ab initio] since none can have authority transferred to them by a fiction and cannot be binding upon any other [wo]man without their respective consent;

Members of the judiciary especially judges who have sworn their ‘oath of allegiance’ and their ‘judicial oath’ to serve ‘the Queen’ are acting unquestionably without lawful authority and jurisdiction for the reasons as stated and cannot lawfully arbitrate in any matters in her name [see R vs. John Anthony Hill (JAH) at Southwark Crown Court on Thursday May 12, 2011 Case Reference/Docket number T20107746];

Further on Monday February 25 2013 Elizabeth Alexandra Mary Saxe-Coburg-Gotha-Battenberg [Mountbatten] a.k.a. Elizabeth Windsor and the Crown of England was publicly found guilty as charged on the two (2) indictments of committing or aiding and abetting Crimes against Humanity including Genocide and human trafficking violating the Law of Nations inciting their members to aid and abet these crimes and of being part of an ongoing [international] Criminal Conspiracy by unanimous verdict of a quorum of twelve Citizen Jurors of the International Common Law Court of Justice (hereinafter “ICLCJ”) in the City of Brussels and the Protocols of the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime (2000), See The People v. Elizabeth Windsor and the Crown of England see ICLCJ Case Number 022513-001 in the Docket of the Court. By public notice and legal instrument issued by the ICLCJ on Sunday, September 1 2013

“the jurisdictional authority of these governments and churches and their courts is now and forever null and void ab initio. Their orders and statutes have no binding force on any person or corporate body, and are to be ignored”;

"All codes, rules and regulations are applicable to the government authorities only, not human/Creators in accordance with God's laws. All codes, rules and regulations are unconstitutional and lacking in due process. We, the People, created the governments and we did not give them the power to rule over us." [See *Rodrigues v Ray Donavan*, 1985];

No [wo]man or other person(s) has superior authority or rights over me and my property without my consent;

No verified evidence to the contrary exists;

The person acting as 'judge' never swore in under their own oath or affirmation during my entire session in court and thus had no privilege right and authority to make any arbitrary decisions depriving me of my property;

Legal means " the undoing of God's law." See 1893 Dictionary of Arts and Sciences, Encyclopedia Britannica, a dictionary of arts, sciences and general literature / The R. S. Peale 9th 1893;

The person acting as "judge" clearly violated their sworn oath made to Elizabeth Alexandra Mary Saxe-Coburg-Gotha-Battenberg [Mountbatten] who herself swore and oath at her alleged Coronation to "maintain the Laws of God" and promised to "perform and keep" them [See the Coronation Oath]. The promises made are thus a contract which have repeatedly been broken rendering all subsequent actions or conduct null and void [ab initio];

"A Judge without jurisdiction is to be disobeyed with impunity" (Maxim of Law);

The Universal Declaration states in Article 8 that 'everyone has the right to an effective remedy by the competent national tribunals for acts violating the fundamental rights granted by the constitution or by law'.

THE LAW & UNITED KINGDOM CONSTITUTION

"Be ye King or Commoner the law is above you". Sir Edward Coke (1552- 1634).

The person acting as 'judge' failed to abide by her sworn [statutory] judicial oath duty and obligation to "...do right to all manner of people after the laws and usages of this realm, without fear or favour, affection or ill will [cf. s.76(1)(a) of the Courts and Legal Services Act 1990].

There was never any witness testimony pressed upon the record in open court under oath or affirmation;

No witnesses appeared in open court whatsoever;

There was never any claim pressed upon the record in open court under oath or affirmation;

The 'Plaintiff' or 'Claimant' "R" did not appear;

The 'Plaintiff' or 'Claimant' must always appear [cf. Habeas Corpus Act 1679] to verify the claim upon the record in open court under own oath or affirmation and to facilitate cross-examination by the alleged wrongdoer; If the 'Plaintiff' or 'Claimant' does not appear then there is no case to answer and must therefore be dismissed in the interests of justice and with prejudice;

I.

There was no verifiable evidence of any injury pressed upon the record in open court under oath or affirmation;

li.

There must be an actual injury or there is no case to answer and must therefore be dismissed in the interests of justice and with prejudice;

lii.

There was no independent third-party evidence pressed upon the record in open court under oath or affirmation to corroborate any evidence tendered to court;

liii.

No independent third-party witnesses appeared in open court whatsoever;

liv.

No verifiable complaint has ever been pressed upon the record in open court under oath or affirmation by anyone including the prosecutor;

lv.

“In future no official shall place a man on trial upon his own un-supported statement, without producing credible witnesses to the truth of it” ~Magna Carta 1215, (38);

lvi.

This so called court was a purely administrative court without an independent jury to render a verdict. It was not a court of Law for the reasons stated;

“The law is absolutely clear on this subject. There is no authority for administrative courts in this country and no act can be passed to legitimise them.” ~ Halsbury’s on Administrative Law 20-11:

The person acting as ‘judge’ showed distinct [judicial] bias and favor toward the Complainant by allowing the complainant to make statements assuming facts clearly not in evidence;

“No one is believed in court but upon his oath ” (Maxim of Law);

The measure of [judicial] bias and favor shown by the person acting as ‘judge’ to the complainant was unprecedented;

The prosecutor court officials/officers and ‘judge’ all failed in their duties obligations and responsibilities as owed to the (fictional) Crown and in accordance with law;

The prosecutor court officials/officers and ‘judge’ failed to provide full disclosure [cf. discovery] by not declaring and presenting to me the contents of the complainant’s ‘case management folder’ especially the “PREPARATION FOR TRIAL FORM” and **all within a timely fashion**;

Full knowledge and presentation of the “Preparation for Trial” **was strictly withheld from me** at all material times in violation of the courts own criminal procedure rules [see Criminal Procedure Rules 3.2 and 3.3 and 3.5 respectively];

Failure of the court to abide by its own governing Criminal Procedure Rules was and is contempt of the court;

No piece of paper with or without the word 'Order' or 'Warrant' written thereon and bearing the wet-ink signature of any [wo]man acting in the role of 'judge' was ever presented to and or

received by me. This issue was raised and was **disregarded**;

No 'judge' was therefore willing to accept responsibility and accountability for anything said or done in the court. No power of official wet-ink signature means no responsibility and no privilege to operate legal statutes as the corporate vehicle in court;

All men and women know that the foundation of law and commerce exists in the telling of the truth, and nothing but the truth (Maxim of Law);

This entire case was actuated by an attempt **to defraud me a man**;

"Fraud vitiates all contracts" (Maxim of Law);

[S]HE WHO ACTS ON FRAUD, PARTICIPATES IN FRAUD IS LAIBLE FOR THE FRAUD;

I No officers of any court has authority rights and privileges to act outside of [cf.ultra vires] or above the Law and the quoted Maxims of Law without lawful remedy recourse and full accountability;

Pope Francis has issued his First Apostolic Letter, the Motu Proprio of July 11, 2013, rewriting the international criminal code as part of his continuing effort to address this situation, and has more recently addressed the United Nations and collapsed the worldwide derivatives market. t is about the Church's responsibility to support the Pope in his role as the Ultimate Trustee of the Global Estate, to uphold the Rule of Law, and to make correction for a grave Breach of Trust that continued for 165 years and which has cost millions of innocent lives.

<https://mainerepublicemailalert.com/2016/05/26/letter-of-response-to-archbishop-of-chicago/>

I direct your attention to the Treaty of Verona (1845) in which the then-Pope and the British Monarch, both Trustees of the American national trust, agreed that the representative form of government was incompatible with Divine Right of Kings and with Papal Supremacy, and so both acted in secretive Breach of Trust.

The British Monarch issued Letters of Marque and Reprisal to the members of the Bar Association (British Crown Commercial Company) which issued licenses to privateers to attack American "vessels" in international jurisdictions of the law. That, Sir, is the genesis of Bar Association Licenses.

A "license" as you must know, is permission to engage in an act which would otherwise be illegal. The Americans responded by quickly passing an Amendment to their Constitution effectively barring attorneys from holding public office.

There will be no deceptive "offers" in commerce seeking to exchange gold for land or human capital under conditions of non-disclosure and deceit. There will be an end to this criminality and to the complacency of the Church and of the American Cardinals and Archbishops responsible for the misadministration of the courts.

Or there will be Hell on earth, Cardinal George — literally, and it will not come against the innocent Americans. The Left Hand of God will come for those who are responsible and unrepentant.

The Treaty of Verona is extinguished.

All Bar Association licenses are extinguished.

By order of Pope Francis, all attorneys, all clerks, every member of the judicial system operating these frauds and oppressions became 100% individually and commercially liable as of September 1, 2013.

The banking cartels and governmental services corporations have been given three years to clean up their acts from top to bottom, to come into compliance with the Original Equity contract”, and to stop operating in criminal default.

i: say here and will verify in open court that all herein be true;

i; man, mike:clarke of mike@rake.net published www.opg.me

January 18 2017