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P.I.G.s

- P.I.G. – Persons In Government who intend to breach the trust, and perjure their oaths
United Nations Judicial Whores
• United Nations Judicial whores are so-called judges who are actually NOT judges but are clerks operating for their agency, and are bought and paid for under their UNIDROIT treaty as described in the UNIDROIT video.
• United Nations Judicial whores have a kangaroo court that is pre-judged, under Roman Law, and it doesn’t matter what you say or do.
• If you are before United Nations Judicial whore then you have no rights except those granted by their handlers in some legislature somewhere (Statutes, codes, rules, etc.)
United Nations Judicial Whores

• "...judges who become involved in enforcement of mere statutes (civil or criminal in nature and otherwise), act as mere "clerks" of the involved agency..." K.C. Davis, ADMIN. LAW, Ch. 1 (CTP. West's 1965 Ed.)

• "It is the accepted rule, not only in state courts, but, of the federal courts as well, that when a judge is enforcing administrative law they are described as mere 'extensions of the administrative agency for superior reviewing purposes' as a ministerial clerk for an agency..." 30 Cal 596; 167 Cal 762.
United Nations Judicial Whores

• These United Nations Judicial whores are not competent to do justice, which is they themselves call it “the appearance of justice”, which is a fraud, as found in Corruption in the Court 4

• These United Nations Judicial Whores are NOT neutral or unbiased, but are bought and paid for

• “It is a fundamental right of a party to have a neutral and detached judge preside over the judicial proceedings.” Ward v Village of Monroeville, 409 U.S. 57, 61-62, 93 S.Ct 80, 83, 34 L.Ed. 2d 267 (1972); Tumey v Ohio, 273 U.S. 510, 5209, 47 S. Ct. 437, 440, 71 L.Ed. 749 (1927).
Roman Law

• “summary proceeding. A nonjury proceeding that settles a controversy or disposes of a case in a relatively prompt and simple manner. — Also termed summary trial. Cf. plenary action under ACTION(4). “Summary proceedings were such as were directed by Act of Parliament, there was no jury, and the person accused was acquitted or sentenced only by such person as statute had appointed for his judge. The common law was wholly a stranger to summary proceedings.” A.H. Manchester. Modern Legal History of England and Wales, 1750–1950 160 (1980).” Black’s Law Dictionary 8th Edition, page 3809 [emphasis added]
United Nations Judicial Whores

• United Nations Judicial Whores are selling their justus in violation of the Magna Carta

• “To no one will we sell, to no one will we refuse or delay right or justice” Chapter 40 Magna Carta (1215)

• United Nations Judicial Whores refuse justice if you don’t pay their extortion

• United Nations Judicial Whores deny and delay their justus, so they can collect more royalties
Judicial Whores have a Show-Trial

- United Nations Judicial Whores pre-judgment
- Judicial Whores have a kangaroo court
  
  “kangaroo court. 1. A self-appointed tribunal or mock court in which the principles of law and justice are disre-garded, perverted, or parodied. …2. A court or tribunal characterized by unauthorized or irregular procedures, esp. so as to render a fair proceeding impossible. 3. A sham legal proceeding.

The term's origin is uncertain, but it appears to be an Americanism. It has been traced to 1853 in the American West. “Kangaroo” might refer to the illogical leaps between “facts” and conclusions, or to the hapless defendant's quick bounce from court to gallows.” Black’s Law Dict., 8th Ed, pgs 1076-1076
Taxes

“2. The requirement of payment for such licenses is only a mode of imposing taxes on the licensed business, and the prohibition, under penalties, against carrying on the business without license is only a mode of enforcing the payment of such taxes.

5. The recognition by the acts of Congress of the power and right of the states to tax, control, or regulate any business carried on within its limits is entirely consistent with an intention on the part of Congress to tax such business for national purposes.” License Tax Cases 72 U.S. (5 Wall.) 462 (1866)
Filing Fees are Licenses

“License, contracts, is a right given by some competent authority to do an act, which without such authority would be illegal. The instrument or writing which secures this right is also called a license. Vide Ayl.Parerg. 353; 15 Vin.Ab 92; Ang. Wat. Co. 61, 85. A license is express or implied. An express license is one in which in direct terms authorizes the performance of a certain act; as a license to keep a tavern by public authority. An implied license is one which though not expressly given, may be presumed from the acts of the party having the right to give it.” Bouvier’s Law Dictionary 1843 Edition, Volume 2, page 53 [emphasis added]
“If it were true that, according to the spirit of our Constitution, the power of taxation must be limited by the right of representation, whence is derived the right to lay and collect duties, imposts, and excises, within this District? If the principles of liberty and of our Constitution forbid the raising of revenue from those who are not represented, do not these principles forbid the raising it by duties, imposts, and excises, as well as by a direct tax?” Longborough v Blake 18 U.S. 317 (1820), [emphasis added],
Excise Taxes

• “The individual, unlike the corporation, cannot be taxed for the mere privilege of existing. The corporation is an artificial entity which owes its existence and charter powers to the state; but the individuals' rights to live and own property are natural rights for the enjoyment of which an excise cannot be imposed.“ Redfield v. Fisher, 292 P. 813, 135 Or. 180, 294 P.461 , 73 A.L.R. 721 (1931),
Excise Taxes

• “All subjects over which the sovereign power of the state extends are objects of taxation, but those over which it does not extend are exempt from taxation. This proposition may also be pronounced as self-evident. The sovereignty of the state extends to everything which exists by its authority or its permission.” McCullough v Maryland, 17 U.S. [4 Wheat] 316 (1819). [emphasis added]
Excise Tax

• “The taxing power, being in its nature unlimited over the subjects within its control, would enable the state governments to destroy the above-mentioned rights…” Crandall v Nevada 73 U. S. 35 (1867)
Excise Tax

• "A party paying money into Court, admits the jurisdiction of such Court, and can not plead in abatement to it." J. Chitty pg. 444 (1851)
Judicial Code of 1911 is Territorial

• "CHAP. 231 . - An Act To codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary."

• which was Approved on March 3, 1911 at 36 Stat. 1087, and it goes on to say;

• "Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the laws relating to the judiciary be, and they hereby are, codified, revised, and amended, with title, chapters, headnotes, and sections, entitled, numbered, and to read as follows:"

  – and at SEC 9. at 36 Stat. 1088 it says;

• "SEC. 9. The district courts, as courts of admiralty and as courts of equity, shall be deemed always open for the purpose of filing any pleading..."
Judicial Code of 1911 is Territorial

• Oldest Statute repealed is 1875
• When 28 USC was enacted as positive law, the oldest Statute repealed was 1863
• Title 28 USC is for the District of Columbia and the Territories
Title 28 USC is Territorial

- "AN ACT To revise, codify, and enact into law title 28 of the United States Code entitled "Judicial Code and Judiciary"."
- which was Approved on June 25, 1948 at 62 Stat. 869, and
- the Schedule of Acts Repealed at 62 Stat. 994 shows the oldest repealed Statute is
- "Chap. XCL - An Act to reorganize the Courts as the District of Columbia, and for other Purposes." at 12 Stat. 762, Approved March 3, 1863
The thirteen judicial circuits of the United States are constituted as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Circuits</th>
<th>Composition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>District of Columbia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>Connecticut, New York, Vermont.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td>Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth</td>
<td>District of the Canal Zone, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth</td>
<td>Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seventh</td>
<td>Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eighth</td>
<td>Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ninth</td>
<td>Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guam, Hawaii.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenth</td>
<td>Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleventh</td>
<td>Alabama, Florida, Georgia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>All Federal judicial districts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Historical and Revision Notes


Form of section was simplified.

The District of Columbia was added as a separate circuit. This is in accord with the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States which held the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia to be a circuit court of appeals within the Transfer Act of Sept. 14, 1922, ch. 305, 42 Stat. 837, incorporated in the Judicial Code as §238(a), but repealed by act Feb. 13, 1925, ch. 229, §13, 43 Stat. 942. (See

Swift and Co. v. U.S
., 1928, 48 S.Ct. 311, 276 U.S. 311, 72 L.Ed. 587.)

In recognizing the District of Columbia as a separate circuit, the Supreme Court recently used this language: “* * * the eleven circuits forming the single federal judicature * * *”.

Comm’r. v. Bedford’s Estate
, 65 S.Ct. 1157, at page 1160, 325 U.S. 283, 89 L.Ed. 611.

See section 17 of title 28, U.S.C., 1940 ed., providing, “For the purposes of sections 17–23 of this title, the District of Columbia shall be deemed to be a judicial circuit * * *”, and act Dec. 23, 1944, ch. 724, 58 Stat. 925, which amended section 215 of title 28, U.S.C., 1940 ed., incorporated in section 42 of this title. Such amendment provided that for the purposes of said section 215 “the District of Columbia shall be deemed to be a judicial circuit.”
28 USC 41 References

- 31 Stat 85
- 36 Stat. 1131
- 38 Stat 803
- 39 Stat 966
- 43 Stat 936
- 45 Stat 54
- 45 Stat 1346
- 47 Stat 158
28 USC § 41 Courts of Appeals is Territorial

- Originating document is an Appropriations Bill at 31 Stat. 85, which is;
- "CHAP. 191. - An Act Temporarily to provide revenues and a civic government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes."
- which was Approved on April 12, 1900 at 31 Stat. 77, which goes on to say;
- "Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the provisions of this Act shall apply to the island of Porto Rico and to the adjacent islands and waters of the islands lying east of the seventy-fourth meridian of longitude west of Greenwich, which were ceded to the United States by the Government of Spain by treaty entered into on the tenth day of December, eighteen hundred and ninety-eight; and the name Porto Rico, as used in this Act, shall be held to include not only the island of that name, but all the adjacent islands as aforesaid." [emphasis added]
28 USC § 41 Courts of Appeals is Territorial

- Originating document is an Appropriations Bill at 31 Stat. 77, and under the heading "THE JUDICIARY" at SEC. 33 at 31 Stat. 84;
- "SEC. 33. That the judicial power shall be vested in the courts and tribunals of Porto Rico as already established and now in operation, including municipal courts, under and by virtue of General Orders, Numbered One hundred and eighteen, as promulgated by Brigadier-General Davis, United States Volunteers, August sixteenth, eighteen hundred and ninety-nine, and including also the police courts established by General Orders, Numbered One hundred and ninety-five, promulgated November twenty-ninth, eighteen hundred and ninety-nine, by Brigadier-General Davis, United States Volunteers, and the laws and ordinances of Porto Rico and the municipalities thereof in force, so far as the same are not in conflict herewith, all which courts and tribunals are hereby continued." [emphasis added]
28 USC § 41  Courts of Appeals is Territorial

- Originating document is an Appropriations Bill at 31 Stat. 77, and goes on to say at SEC. 34. at 31 Stat. 85
- "The United States district court hereby established shall be the successor to the United States provisional court established by General Orders, Numbered Eighty-eight, promulgated by Brigadier-General Davis, United States Volunteers, and shall take possession of all records of that court, and take jurisdiction of all cases and proceedings pending therein, and said United States provisional court is hereby discontinued." [emphasis added]
Courts as established by Congress

- All Courts of Appeals are territorial
- The District Courts are both territorial, and de jure
- The Appropriations Bill at 31 Stat. 85 is where “United States District Court” is mentioned for the first time
Courts as established by Congress

• "The United States District Court . . . . is not a true United States court established under Const, art. 3, to administer the judicial power of the United States, but was created by virtue of the sovereign congressional faculty, granted under Article 4, § 3, of making all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory belonging to the United States." Balzac v People of Puerto Rico, 258 U.S. 298
28 U.S. Code Chapter 123 - FEES AND COSTS

Current through Pub. L. 114-38. (See Public Laws for the current Congress.)

- § 1911 - Supreme Court
- § 1912 - Damages and costs on affirmance
- § 1913 - Courts of appeals
- § 1914 - District court; filing and miscellaneous fees; rules of court
- § 1915 - Proceedings in forma pauperis
28 U.S. Code § 1914 - District court; filing and miscellaneous fees; rules of court

Current through Pub. L. 114-38. (See Public Laws for the current Congress.)

(a) The clerk of each district court shall require the parties instituting any civil action, suit or proceeding in such court, whether by original process, removal or otherwise, to pay a filing fee of $350, except that on application for a writ of habeas corpus the filing fee shall be $5.

(b) The clerk shall collect from the parties such additional fees only as are prescribed by the Judicial Conference of the United States.

(c) Each district court by rule or standing order may require advance payment of fees.

28 U.S. Code § 1914 - District court; filing and miscellaneous fees; rules of court

Current through Pub. L. 114-38. (See Public Laws for the current Congress.)

**HISTORICAL AND REVISION NOTES**


Section consolidates sections 549, 553, and 555 of title 28, U.S.C., 1940 ed., as amended with necessary changes of phraseology.

The phrase “filing fee” was substituted for the inconsistent and misleading words of sections 549 and 553 of title 28, U.S.C., 1940 ed., “as full payment for all services to be rendered by the clerk” etc. thus removing the necessity for including exceptions and referring to other sections containing provisions for additional fees.
28 USC § 1914 – Filing Fees

• Originated from 32 Stat. 476, which is an Appropriations Bill

• "CHAP. 1301 .- An Act Making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the June 28, 1902. Government for the fiscal year ending June thirtieth, nineteen hundred and three, and for other purposes." [emphasis added]

• which was Approved on June 28, 1902,
28 USC § 1914 – Filing Fees

• Originated at 32 Stat. 419, which goes on to say at 32 Stat. 475

• "EXPENSES OF THE UNITED STATES COURTS - For defraying the expenses of the Supreme Court; -of the circuit and district courts of the United States, including the district court in the Territory of Hawaii; of the supreme court and court of appeals of the District of Columbia; of the district court of Alaska; of the courts in the Indian Territory; of the circuit courts of appeals; of the Court of Private Land Claims; of suits and preparations for or in defense of suits in which the United States is interested; of the prosecution of offenses committed against the United States; and in the enforcement of the laws of the United States, specifically the expenses stated under the following appropriations, namely..." [emphasis added]
28 USC § 1914 – Filing Fees

• Originated from 32 Stat. 476, which is an Appropriations Bill

• "For fees of clerks, two hundred and forty thousand dollars: Provided, …; and the word "emoluments" shall be understood as including all amounts received in connection with the admission of attorneys to practice in the court, all amounts received for services in naturalization proceedings, whether rendered as clerk, as commissioner, or in any other capacity, and all other amounts received for services in any way connected with the clerk's office: Provided further, That no amount in excess of one dollar shall be received from any attorney in connection with his admission to practice in a circuit or district court..." [emphasis added] at 32 Stat. 475 - 476
Emolument

• “emolument, n. (usu. pl.) Any advantage, profit, or gain received as a result of one's employment or one's holding of office.” Black’s Law Dictionary, 8th Edition, page 1586
28 USC § 1914 – Filing Fees

• Filing Fees are for Attorneys who are using the Courts to make money, and Naturalization Proceedings, which is a privilege
District of Columbia

- 16 Stat. 419, which was Approved on Feb 21, 1871, at Sec. 12;

- “And be it further enacted, that every bill shall be read at large on three different days in each house. No act shall embrace more than one subject, and that shall be expressed in its title; but if any subject shall be embraced in an act which shall not be expressed in the title, such act shall be void only to so much thereof as shall not be expressed in the title...” at 16 Stat. 422
"...the traditional distinction which Congress has drawn between "legislation" and "appropriation," the rules of both Houses prohibiting "legislation" from being added to an appropriation bill." Andrus v Sierra Club 442 U.S. 347 (1979)
District of Columbia

“Eliminating, then, from the opinions of this court all expressions unnecessary to the disposition of the particular case, and gleaning therefrom the exact point decided in each, the following propositions may be considered as established:

1. That the District of Columbia and the territories are not states within the judicial clause of the Constitution giving jurisdiction in cases between citizens of different states;

2. That territories are not states within the meaning of Rev. Stat. 709, permitting writs of error from this court in cases where the validity of a state statute is drawn in question;

3. That the District of Columbia and the territories are states as that word is used in treaties with foreign powers, with respect to the ownership, disposition, and inheritance of property;

4. That the territories are not within the clause of the Constitution providing for the creation of a supreme court and such inferior courts as Congress may see fit to establish;

6. That where the Constitution has been once formally extended by Congress to territories, neither Congress nor the territorial legislature can enact laws inconsistent therewith.” Downes v Bidwell 182 US 244
Downes v Bidwell 182 US 244

- Federal Courts in the 50 States are NOT territorial
- Under federal Statutes, the ONLY Article III Court is the Supreme Court
- No federal statute prior to 1861, involving the courts, has been repealed
District of Columbia Courts

- Courts in the District of Columbia are owned and operated by the Vatican, under the bankruptcy
- staffed by US citizens (Vatican cestui que trusts),
- with BAR member (foreign agents of the Vatican) officers of the court
- The ONLY Article III Court is the Supreme Court, (NOT operating under their Rules) because it was set up by the constitution
- Title 28 USC is for the District of Columbia and the Territories ONLY
- Congress has NOT set up any Article III Courts in the States – they could, but haven’t
Maritime Law is Roman Law

“BARRATRY, or BARRETRY (fr. barratrare, Ital., to cheat, or baret, Ang.-N or., a quarrel), a quarrel or contention; the act of a barrator. It used to be applied to the obtaining benefits at Rome. In marine insurance, it is the commission of any fraud upon the owners or insurers of a ship by the captain or crew, as deserting her, sinking her, or doing any act which may subject her to arrest. detention, loss, or forfeiture, &c. . It is the practice in most countries to insure against barratry.” Wharton Law Lexicon, 1860 Edition, Page 88
BAR member Satanists

• The National BAR Association was set up in 1878.
• BAR Card Union Members have infiltrated the government and every major corporation in the country.
• BAR Card Union Members have infiltrated every governmental entity at every level. Every City, Every County, Every State, Every court, every where in America.
• 2/3 of the lawyers in the world are in America.
“honorable” Satanists

- “Honorable – This was the title formerly given to the degree of fellow craft.” An Encyclopedia of Freemasonry, 1916 Edition, Volume I, page 348

- “TITLE, persons. Titles are distinctions by which a person is known. 3. The constitution of the United States forbids the tyrant by the United States, or any state of any title of nobility. (q. v.)…judges and members of congress that of honorable; and members of the bar and justices of the peace are called esquires. Cooper's, Justinian, 416'; Brackenridge's Law Miscell. Index.” Bouvier’s Law Dictionary 1856 Edition, [emphasis added]
“Whenever you see any of our signs made by a brother Mason, and especially the grand hailing sign of distress, you must always be sure to obey them, even at the risk of your life. If you're on a jury, and the defendant is a Mason and makes the grand hailing sign, you must obey it; you must disagree with your brother jurors, if necessary, but you must be sure not to bring the Mason guilty, for that would bring disgrace upon our order. You must conceal all crimes of your brother Masons except murder and treason, and these at your own option, and should you be summoned as a witness against a brother Mason, be always sure to shield him. Prevaricate, don't tell the truth in this case, keep his secrets, forget the important points. It may be perjury to do this true, but you are keeping your obligations." Masonic Handbook, page 183
Masonic Satanists

“Perjury – In municipal law perjury is defined by be willful false swearing to a material matter, when an oath has been administered by lawful authority. The violation of vows or promissory oaths taken before one who is not legally authorized to administer then, that is to say, one who is not a magistrate, does not involve the crime of perjury. Such is the technical definition of the law; but the moral sense of mankind does not assent to such a doctrine, and considers perjury, as the root of the word indicates, the doing of that which one has sworn not to do, or the omitting to do that which he has sworn to do. The old Romans seem to have taken a sensible view of the crime of perjury. Among them oaths were not often administered, and, in general, a promise made under oath had no more binding power in a court of justice than it would have had without the oath. False swearing was with them a matter of conscience, and the person who was guilty of it was responsible to the Diety alone…” An Encyclopedia of Freemasonry, 1916 Edition, Volume II, page 555-556 [emphasis added]
Albert Pike

- Prominent Luciferian & Masonic leader
- Confederate General
- Wrote Morals and Dogma - Predicted 3 world wars
- Talked about consolidating the entire planet, People, places and things, into the hands of one entity which is sometimes referred to as the “anti-Christ” or the god of freemasonry and the illuminati, Lucifer and Satan, (Morals and Dogma by Albert Pike @ page 321)
- We are now building up to WWIII as predicted by Albert Pike
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From a BAR Member

• "The once honorable profession of law now fully functions as a bottom-line business, driven by greed and the pursuit of power and wealth, even shaping the laws of the United States outside the elected Congress and state legislatures." Justice John F. Molloy, Arizona Court of Appeals in his book; The Fraternity: Lawyers and Judges in Collusion, published by Paragon House.
• “This case law system is a constitutional nightmare because it continuously modifies constitutional intent. For lawyers, however, it creates endless business opportunities. That’s because case law is technically complicated and requires a lawyer’s expertise to guide and move you through the system. The judicial system may begin with enacted laws, but the variations that result from a judge’s application of case law all too often change the ultimate meaning.” Justice John F. Molloy, Arizona Court of Appeals in his book; The Fraternity: Lawyers and Judges in Collusion
From a BAR Member

“"When a lawyer puts on a robe and takes the bench, he or she is called a judge. But in reality, when judges look down from the bench they are lawyers looking upon fellow members of their fraternity. In any other area of the free enterprise system, this would be seen as a conflict of interest. When a lawyer takes an oath as a judge, it merely enhances the ruling class of lawyers and judges. First of all, in Maricopa and Pima counties, judges are not elected but nominated by committees of lawyers, along with concerned citizens. How can they be expected not to be beholden to those who elevated them to the bench?"” Justice John F. Molloy, Arizona Court of Appeals in his book; The Fraternity: Lawyers and Judges in Collusion
From a BAR Member

“Today the skill and gamesmanship of lawyers, not the truth, often determine the outcome of a case. And we lawyers love it. All the tools are there to obscure and confound. The system’s process of discovery and the exclusionary rule often work to keep vital information off limits to jurors and make cases so convoluted and complex that only lawyers and judges understand them. The net effect has been to increase our need for lawyers, create more work for them, clog the courts and ensure that most cases never go to trial and are, instead, plea bargained and compromised. All the while the clock is ticking, and the monster is being fed. The sullying of American law has resulted in a fountain of money for law professionals while the common people, who are increasingly affected by lawyer driven changes and an expensive, self serving bureaucracy, are left confused and ill served. Today, it is estimated that 70 percent of low to middle income citizens can no longer afford the cost of justice in America. What would our Founding Fathers think?” Justice John F. Molloy, Arizona Court of Appeals in his book; The Fraternity: Lawyers and Judges in Collusion

©Common Law Copyright 2012
“This devolution of lawmaking by the judiciary has been subtle, taking place incrementally over decades. But today, it’s engrained in our legal system, and few even question it. But the result is clear. Individuals can no longer participate in the legal system. It has become too complex and too expensive, all the while feeding our dependency on lawyers. By complicating the law, lawyers have achieved the ultimate job security. Gone are the days when American courts functioned to serve justice simply and swiftly. It is estimated that 95 million legal actions now pass through the courts annually, and the time and expense for a plaintiff or defendant in our legal system can be absolutely overwhelming. Surely it’s time to question what has happened to our justice system and to wonder if it is possible to return to a system that truly does protect us from wrongs.”

Justice John F. Molloy, Arizona Court of Appeals in his book; The Fraternity: Lawyers and Judges in Collusion ©Common Law Copyright 2012
From a Legislator

• I had somebody who is a legislator contact me about writing a right to travel law in a State (not Texas) and they told me that they have to do a “Legislative Service Request” to get a bunch of BAR members to write a Bill for him to present to the legislature.
Satanists Lying in Wait

• “CONFESSION AND AVOIDANCE. In pleading. The admission of the truth of a statement of fact contained in the pleading of the opposite party, coupled with the allegation of a new fact, which obviates or repels its legal effect, and thus avoids it.” Page 343, Alexander Burrill Law Dictionary 1871, Volume 1

• It is all in what you tell them, and they are lying in wait for you to say the wrong thing so they can assault you with their satanic so-called contract
Satanists Lying in Wait

• “COLOUR, color.] Signifies a probable plea, but which is in fact false;…” Tomlin’s Law Dictionary 1835 Edition, Volume 1

• Everything they do is a fraud. If there is no fraud, then they will dismiss the case because “the pleadings are NOT colorable enough” – there is not enough fraud
These Whores Intend to Assault Me with their Equity and their Roman Law


• They assault you with their “equity” by treating you like one of their DC slaves
Judicial Satanists

• They don’t care about their oath of office
• Their oath of office trumps everything else
• They intend to assault you with their equity
• They intend to sell you some of their *justus*
• They intend to assault you with their DC Codes
Judicial Satanists

- These Satanists set up for themselves a set of presumptions that are almost impossible (if not impossible) to defeat so they can justify their satanic order taker PIGs with their assaults, kidnappings, false imprisonments, thefts, and murders
- These Satanists are revenue officers working for the IRS thieves, so they can collect their extortion
- These Satanists routinely violate your rights under the color of their so-called laws
- These Satanists put you on their Round Robin (get a different whore) so they can always maintain their presumptions, and their plausible deniability
Judicial Satanists

• These Satanists have the capability of being an Article 3 Judge, but deliberately convert it over to their Admiralty Maritime Law, so they can collect their royalty.

• There are Harvard Law Review Articles how most judges retire millionaires because of the Admiralty Maritime Law court cases they preside over.

• These Satanists intend that their corporate thugs assault you, and kidnap you, and falsely imprison you, and steal your property, and even murder you, because it makes so much business for their so-called court.
Whores

• United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas
Jorge A. Solis, the Whore
Sidney Fitzwater, the Whore
Sidney Fitzwater, PIG

• Before God, angels and all of the witnesses to this video, I shake the dust of the earth from off my feet against Sidney Fitzwater (Matthew 10:14, Mark 6:11, Luke 9:5) and we are going to be talking about this on judgment day!
Joe Fish the Whore
Joe Fish, PIG

• Before God, angels and all of the witnesses to this video, I shake the dust of the earth from off my feet against Joe Fish (Matthew 10:14, Mark 6:11, Luke 9:5) and we are going to be talking about this on judgment day!
Terry Means the Whore
Terry Means, PIG

• Before God, angels and all of the witnesses to this video, I shake the dust of the earth from off my feet against Terry Means (Matthew 10:14, Mark 6:11, Luke 9:5) and we are going to be talking about this on judgment day!
Reed O’Connor, the Whore
Reed O’Connor, PIG

• Before God, angels and all of the witnesses to this video, I shake the dust of the earth from off my feet against Reed O’Connor (Matthew 10:14, Mark 6:11, Luke 9:5) and we are going to be talking about this on judgment day!
Sam R. Cummings, the Whore
Sam R. Cummings, PIG

• Before God, angels and all of the witnesses to this video, I shake the dust of the earth from off my feet against Sam R. Cummings (Matthew 10:14, Mark 6:11, Luke 9:5) and we are going to be talking about this on judgment day!
John H. McBryde, the Whore
John McBryde, PIG

• Before God, angels and all of the witnesses to this video, I shake the dust of the earth from off my feet against John McBryde (Matthew 10:14, Mark 6:11, Luke 9:5) and we are going to be talking about this on judgment day!
Jane Boyle, the Whore
David C. Godbey, the Whore
Barbara Lynn, the Whore
Sam A Lindsay, the Whore
Mary Lou Robinson, the Whore

Judge Mary Lou Robinson
Jeffrey Cureton the Whore
Jeffrey Cureton, PIG

• Before God, angels and all of the witnesses to this video, I shake the dust of the earth from off my feet against Jeffrey Cureton (Matthew 10:14, Mark 6:11, Luke 9:5) and we are going to be talking about this on judgment day!
Paul Stickney, the Whore
Paul Stickney, PIG

• Before God, angels and all of the witnesses to this video, I shake the dust of the earth from off my feet against Paul Stickney (Matthew 10:14, Mark 6:11, Luke 9:5) and we are going to be talking about this on judgment day!
Clinton E. Averitte, the Whore
Nancy M Koenig, the Whore
Irma C Ramirez, the Whore
Renee H Toliver, the Whore
E. Scott Frost, the Whore
David L. Horan, the Whore
Robert K Roach, the Whore
Whores

• United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit
Carl E. Stewart, the Whore
Edith Jones, the Whore
Edith Jones, PIG

• Before God, angels and all of the witnesses to this video, I shake the dust of the earth from off my feet against Edith Jones (Matthew 10:14, Mark 6:11, Luke 9:5) and we are going to be talking about this on judgment day!
Carolyn Dineen King, the Whore
Catherine Dineen King, PIG

• Before God, angels and all of the witnesses to this video, I shake the dust of the earth from off my feet against Catherine Dineen King (Matthew 10:14, Mark 6:11, Luke 9:5) and we are going to be talking about this on judgment day!
Patrick Higginbotham, the Whore
Patrick Higginbotham, PIG

• Before God, angels and all of the witnesses to this video, I shake the dust of the earth from off my feet against Patrick Higginbotham (Matthew 10:14, Mark 6:11, Luke 9:5) and we are going to be talking about this on judgment day!
Edith Clement, the Whore
Edith Clement, PIG

• Before God, angels and all of the witnesses to this video, I shake the dust of the earth from off my feet against Edith Clement (Matthew 10:14, Mark 6:11, Luke 9:5) and we are going to be talking about this on judgment day!
Leslie Southwick, the Whore
Leslie Southwick, PIG

• Before God, angels and all of the witnesses to this video, I shake the dust of the earth from off my feet against Leslie Southwick (Matthew 10:14, Mark 6:11, Luke 9:5) and we are going to be talking about this on judgment day!
Lyle W. Cayce, the Whore
Lyle W. Cayce, PIG

• Before God, angels and all of the witnesses to this video, I shake the dust of the earth from off my feet against Cayce (Matthew 10:14, Mark 6:11, Luke 9:5) and we are going to be talking about this on judgment day!
Notice is hereby given that I, Me, My, or Myself, also known as Glenn Winningham; house of Fearn, hereinafter the Petitioner, hereby APPEAL the fraudulent fictitious so-called ORDER of Reed O'Connor, the (bought and paid for), Clerk masquerading as a Judge, dated October 27, 2015, in conspiracy with another (bought and paid for), Clerk masquerading as a Judge, JEFFREY L. CURETON, and his fraudulent fictitious so-called ORDER dated October 16, 2015, to the (bought and paid for) Clerks masquerading as Judges who insist on selling their so-called justice with the extortion under color of office that they call filing fees, (for the District of Columbia ONLY, which are actually taxes for BAR Members ONLY or those who are involved in naturalization proceedings), in the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, which is a corporation masquerading as a court. Is there a recommended number of times that the Petitioner has to demand an Article III Judge acting in his lawful Article III capacity, before the Petitioner gets a lawful Article III Judge operating in his lawful Article III capacity? Is there a recommended number of times that the Petitioner has to state that He is NOT one of your US citizen slaves, or other fictitious entity of any kind, before the Clerks masquerading as Judges quit assaulting the Petitioner with their US citizen cestui que trust or fictitious entity status under...
Notice is hereby given that I, Me, My, or Myself, also known as Glenn Winningham; house of Fearn, hereinafter the Petitioner, hereby APPEAL the fraudulent fictitious so-called ORDER of Reed O'Connorr, the (bought and paid for), Clerk masquerading as a Judge, dated October 27, 2015, in conspiracy with another (bought and paid for), Clerk masquerading as a Judge, JEFFREY L. CURETON, and his fraudulent fictitious so-called ORDER dated October 16, 2015, to the (bought and paid for) Clerks masquerading as Judges who insist on selling their so-called justice with the extortion under color of office that they call filing fees, (for the District of Columbia ONLY, which are actually taxes for BAR Members ONLY or those who are involved in naturalization proceedings), in the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, which is a corporation masquerading as a court. Is there a recommended number of times that the Petitioner has to demand an Article III Judge acting in his lawful Article III capacity, before the Petitioner gets a lawful Article III Judge operating in his lawful Article III capacity? Is there a recommended number of times that the Petitioner has to state that He is NOT one of your US citizen slaves, or other fictitious entity of any kind, before the Clerks masquerading as Judges quit assaulting the Petitioner with their US citizen cestui que trust or fictitious entity status under
their Satanic Roman law? Maybe the Petitioner should hire an airplane and have them drop
leaflets. The Petitioner doubts anything will make any difference.

All of the above is submitted "UNDER PENALTIES with PERJURY" [28 USC § 1746(1)], without
the UNITED STATES, and under the laws of the United States of America.

Signed and sealed in red ink on the land of Texas, and dated, this twenty-fourth
day of November, in the year two thousand and fifteen.
They have gone silent, why?

- I exposed their violation of my rights under the color of their own codes
- I exposed their fraud
- I exposed their conspiracy
- I exposed their racketeering
US Supreme Court

• You think the Supreme Court is any different?
No Separation of Powers

• “All process of this Court issues in the name of the President of the United States.” Rule 45(1), Rules of the Supreme Court of the United States

• The Rules are for the District of Columbia and the territories
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No Separation of Powers

- "CERTIORARI. This is an Original Writ, issuing out of the court of Chancery or K. B. directed in the king's name to the judges or officers of the inferior courts, commanding them to certify, or to return the records of a cause depending before them; to the end the party may have the more sure and speedy justice before the king, or such justices as he shall assign to determine the cause. See F. N. B. 145.242" Tomlin's Law Dictionary, Fourth Edition 1835, Volume 1
28 U.S. Code § 1254 - Courts of appeals; certiorari; certified questions

Current through Pub. L. 114-38. (See Public Laws for the current Congress.)

HISTORICAL AND REVISION NOTES


Section consolidates sections 346 and 347 of title 28, U.S.C., 1940 ed.

Words "or in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia" and "or of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia" in sections 346 and 347 of title 28, U.S.C., 1940 ed., were omitted. (See section 41 of this title.)

The prefatory words of this section preceding paragraph (1) were substituted for subsection (c) of said section 347.

The revised section omits the words of section 347 of title 28, U.S.C., 1940 ed., "and with like effect as if the case had been brought there with unrestricted appeal", and the words of section 346 of such title "in the same manner as if it had been brought there by appeal". The effect of subsections (1) and (3) of the revised section is to preserve existing law and retain the power of unrestricted review of cases certified or brought up on certiorari. Only in subsection (2) is review restricted.

Changes were made in phraseology and arrangement.

AMENDMENTS

1988—Pub. L. 100-352, §2(b), struck out "appeal;" after "certiorari;" in section catchline.

Pars. (2), (3). Pub. L. 100-352, §2(a), redesignated par. (3) as (2) and struck out former par. (2) which read as follows: "By appeal by a party relying on a State statute held by a court of appeals to be invalid as repugnant to the Constitution, treaties or laws of the United States, but such appeal shall preclude review by writ of certiorari at the instance of such appellant, and the review on appeal shall be restricted to the Federal questions presented;".
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modify, or affirm the judgment or decree of such State court, and may, at their discretion, award execution or remand the same to the court from which it was removed by the writ.

Sec. 238. Appeals and writs of error may be taken from the district courts, including the United States district court for Hawaii, direct to the Supreme Court in the following cases: In any case in which the jurisdiction of the court is in issue, in which case the question of jurisdiction alone shall be certified to the Supreme Court from the court below for decision; from the final sentences and decrees in prize causes; in any case that involves the construction or application of the Constitution of the United States; in any case in which the constitutionality of any law of the United States, or the validity or construction of any treaty made under its authority is drawn in question; and in any case in which the constitution or law of a State is claimed to be in contravention of the Constitution of the United States.
case where such a right is conferred by the preceding paragraph; nor shall the fact that a review on a writ of error might be obtained under the preceding paragraph be an obstacle to granting a review on certiorari under this paragraph.

“(c) If a writ of error be improvidently sought and allowed under this section in a case where the proper mode of invoking a review is by a petition for certiorari, this alone shall not be a ground for dismissal; but the papers whereon the writ of error was allowed shall be regarded and acted on as a petition for certiorari and as if duly presented to the Supreme Court at the time they were presented to the court or judge by whom the writ of error was allowed: Provided, That where in such a case there appears to be no reasonable ground for granting a petition for certiorari it shall be competent for the Supreme Court to adjudge to the respondent reasonable damages for his delay, and single or double costs, as provided in section 1010 of the Revised Statutes.”

“Sec. 238. A direct review by the Supreme Court of an interlocutory or final judgment or decree of a district court may be had where it is so provided in the following Acts or parts of Acts, and not otherwise:
54


January 31, 1928.
[S. 1801.]

[Public, No. 10.]

United States courts.

Chap. 14.—An Act in reference to writs of error.

Writs of error abolished, and appeals substituted therefor.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the writ of error in cases, civil and criminal, is abolished. All relief which heretofore could be obtained by writ of error shall hereafter be obtainable by appeal.

Sec. 2. That in all cases where an appeal may be taken as of right it shall be taken by serving upon the adverse party or his attorney of record, and by filing in the office of the clerk with whom the order appealed from is entered, a written notice to the effect that the appellant appeals from the judgment or order or from a specified part thereof. No petition of appeal or allowance of an appeal shall be required: Provided, however, That the review of judgments of State courts of last resort shall be petitioned for and allowed in the same form as now provided by law for writs of error to such courts.

Approved, January 31, 1928.
AN ACT

To amend an Act of Congress approved February 9, 1893, entitled "An Act to establish a court of appeals for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes."

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the court established by the Act of February 9, 1893 (27 Stat. 434), entitled "An Act to establish a court of appeals for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes", shall hereafter be known as the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia.

Approved, June 7, 1934.
An Act

To improve the administration of justice by providing greater discretion to the Supreme Court in selecting the cases it will review, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

Section 1. Section 1252 of title 28, United States Code, and the item relating to that section in the section analysis of chapter 81 of such title, are repealed.

REVIEW OF DECISIONS INVALIDATING STATE STATUTES

Sec. 2. (a) Section 1254 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking out paragraph (2) and redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2).

(b) The section heading for section 1254 of such title is amended by striking out "appeal;".

(c) The item relating to section 1254 in the section analysis of chapter 81 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking out "appeal;".

REVIEW OF STATE COURT DECISIONS INVOLVING VALIDITY OF STATUTES

Sec. 3. Section 1257 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 1257. State courts; certiorari

(a) Final judgments or decrees rendered by the highest court of a State in which a decision could be had, may be reviewed by the Supreme Court by writ of certiorari where the validity of a treaty or statute of the United States is drawn in question or where the validity of a statute of any State is drawn in question on the ground of its being repugnant to the Constitution, treaties, or laws of the United States, or where any title, right, privilege, or immunity is specially set up or claimed under the Constitution or the treaties or statutes of, or any commission held or authority exercised under, the United States.

(b) For the purposes of this section, the term 'highest court of a State' includes the District of Columbia Court of Appeals."

REVIEW OF DECISIONS FROM SUPREME COURT OF PUERTO RICO

Sec. 4. Section 1258 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 1258. Supreme Court of Puerto Rico; certiorari

"Final judgments or decrees rendered by the Supreme Court of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico may be reviewed by the Supreme Court by writ of certiorari where the validity of a treaty or statute of the United States is drawn in question or where the validity of a statute of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico is drawn in question on
Public Law 100-352

• “An Act To improve the administration of justice by providing greater discretion to the Supreme Court in selecting the cases it will review, and for other purposes.”

• which was Approved on 27 June 1988, at 102 Stat. 662

• SEC. 3. Section 1257 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows: “, 1257. State courts; certiorari

• "(a) Final judgments or decrees rendered by the highest court of a State in which a decision could be had, may be reviewed by the Supreme Court by writ of certiorari where the validity of a treaty or statute of the United States is drawn in question or where the validity of a statute of any State is drawn in question on the ground of its being repugnant to the Constitution, treaties, or laws of the United States, or where any title, right, privilege, or immunity is specially set up or claimed under the Constitution or the treaties or statutes of, or any commission held or authority exercised under, the United States.
Certiorari

• “An Act To improve the administration of justice by providing greater discretion to the Supreme Court in selecting the cases it will review, and for other purposes.”

• which was Approved on 27 June 1988, at 102 Stat. 662

• "(b) For the purposes of this section, the term `highest court of a State' includes the District of Columbia Court of Appeals.".

• REVIEW OF DECISIONS FROM SUPREME COURT OF PUERTO RICO

• SEC. 4. Section 1258 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:““, 1258. Supreme Court of Puerto Rico; certiorari

• "Final judgments or decrees rendered by the Supreme Court of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico may be reviewed by the Supreme Court by writ of certiorari where the validity of a treaty or statute of the United States is drawn in question or where the validity of a statute of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico is drawn in question.”
Certiorari

• “It is a well established principle of law that all federal regulation applies only within the territorial jurisdiction of the United States....” Foley Brothers, Inc. v. Filardo, 336 U.S. 281 (1949)

• “There is a canon of legislative construction which teaches Congress that, unless a contrary intent appears legislation is meant to apply only within the territorial jurisdiction of the United States [District of Columbia].” U.S. v. Spelar, 338 U.S. 217 at 222
US Supreme Court Whores

• See more in my upcoming video about the Supreme Court PIGs
This is the same thing that precipitated the War of Independence

• “He has combined with others to subject us to a jurisdiction foreign to our constitution, and unacknowledged by our laws, giving his Assent to their Acts of pretended legislation.” [color of law – martial law]

• “For imposing taxes on us without our consent.” [martial law]

• “For depriving us in many cases of the benefits of trial by jury.” [martial law]

• Declaration of Independence (1776) [emphasis added]
“Whereas taxation by the parliament of Great Britain, for the purpose of raising a revenue in his Majesty’s colonies, provinces, and plantations, in North America, has been found by experience to occasion great uneasiness and disorders... That from and after the passing of this act the King and Parliament of Great Britain will not impose any duty, tax, or assessment whatever, payable in any of the colonies, provinces, or plantations, in North America or the West Indies; except only such duties as it may be expedient to impose for the regulation of commerce...” George III, CAP XII 1778 [emphasis added]
Martial Law

• Causes and Necessity of Taking Up Arms (1775)
  – “…statutes have been passed extending the courts of admiralty and vice-admiralty far beyond their ancient limits for depriving us the accustomed and inestimable privilege of trial by jury, in cases affecting both life and property……to supersede the course of common law and instead thereof to publish and order the use and exercise of the law martial….;
  – ….. and for altering fundamentally the form of government established by charter.
  – We saw the misery to which such despotism would reduce us.”
Martial Law

• “Give me liberty or give me death” Patrick Henry,
• after he witnessed a man flogged to death for refusing to take a license
Oaths

• “All oaths must be lawful, allowed by the common law, or some statute; if they are administered by persons in a private capacity, or not duly authorized, they are coram non judice, and void; and those administering them are guilty of a high contempt, for doing it without warrant of law, and punishable by fine and imprisonment. 3 Inst. 165; 4 Inst. 278; 2 Roll. Abr. 277.” Tomlin’s Law Dictionary 1835 Edition, Volume 2
PIGs

• An ORDER TAKER is a willing slave, as described by Mark Passio, in his Youtube videos on Natural Law,

• Mark Passio rightly says that all of the atrocities in history were committed by ORDER TAKERS in his Youtube profile;
https://www.youtube.com/user/WhatOnEarth93
Police killed over 1,100 people in US in 2015 – report

Relying on grassroots rather than federal data, the Mapping Police Violence project said over 1,100 people were killed by US police in 2015. It also found that 321 African Americans were killed in police-related incidents, or about 30% of the total number of police killings. The number of black people killed by police represents a disproportionate share of the population.
Relying on grassroots rather than federal data, the Mapping Police Violence project said over 1,100 people were killed by US police in 2015. It also found that 321 African-American people were killed by police officers, a number disproportionate to their population.
Murders by ORDER Takers

• These Satanist Order Taker Clerks masquerading as Judges intend that
  – lots of people get assaulted, kidnapped, falsely imprisoned, and even MURDERED by their hired Satanic ORDER Taker PIGs
  – their bankster handlers steal as much property as possible through their fraudulent fictitious so-called loans
  – Their corporate thugs steal as much of your property as possible, and compel disclosure of Social Security Numbers and violate as many rights as possible
  – because it makes so much business for their so-called court

• These Satanist ORDER Taker Clerks masquerading as Judges have no intention of acting in their lawful Article 3 capacity
PIGs

"Not every action by any judge is in exercise of his judicial function. It is not a judicial function for a Judge to commit an intentional tort even though the tort occurs in the Courthouse, when a judge acts as a Trespasser of the Law, when a judge does not follow the law, the judge loses subject matter jurisdiction and The Judge's orders are void, of no legal force or effect"! Yates Vs. Village of Hoffman Estates, Illinois, 209 F.Supp. 757 (N.D. Ill. 1962)
• “brutum fulmen”: “An empty noise; an empty threat. A judgment void upon its face which is in legal effect no judgment at all, and by which no rights are divested, and from which none can be obtained; and neither binds nor bars anyone. Dollert v. Pratt-Hewitt Oil Corporation, Tex.Civ.Appl, 179 S.W.2d 346, 348. Also, see Corpus Juris Secundum, “Judgments” §§ 499, 512 546, 549. Black’s Law Dictionary, 4th Edition
Satanist Whores

• “Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar, and the father of it.” John 8:44

• There is no truth in these Satanist Whores

• Everything they do is a fraud

• They are full of fraud (lies)
Satanist Whores

• “But the fearful, and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers [pharmaceutical drug pushers], and idolaters, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone: which is the second death.” Revelation 21:8
Fire the Whores Campaign

• The ONLY way we will EVER get any real justice is to DEMAND our Common Law Jury of our Peers, and we need to know what that is.

  – A true common law jury does not take instructions from the judge
  – A true common law jury calls the witnesses and questions the witnesses
  – A true common law jury determines the law and the facts
  – A true common law jury can ignore any statute or law (jury nullification)
  – A true common law jury will pronounce sentence (if any)
  – A true common law jury is not subject to appeal
Fire the Whores Campaign

• Do you want to place your future in the hands of a United Nations whore who wants to sit on the bench and play stupid?

• Do you want to put the future of your wife and children in the hands of one of these judicial whores, that have complete immunity no matter what, because if you sue one of them you have to get one of their whore buddies to do it?

• Sure some (very few) of them want to really do justice, but are you going to take the chance that you got a good one?

• These Whores’ handlers in the Legislature pass literally millions of their codes, rules, and regulations, so they can do literally anything they want
Fire the Whores Campaign

• Do you want to place your future in the hands of a whore that is bought and paid for by these Satanist PIGs?

• Do you want to place yourself in the hands of a judicial whore who is intent on converting you into a ward of the court (an imbecile)?

• Do you consider yourself Christian?

• Do you try to follow the golden rule?

• Do you treat others the way you want to be treated?
Judgment Day

• Do you think you will get any sympathy from God, on judgment day, when you have not done everything you can to put a stop to these satanic judicial whores, selling their justus
Karma – what goes around comes around

• Karma is the universal principle of “what goes around comes around”

• If we knowingly allow these judicial whores to victimize tens of thousands of people, in the name of their satanic religious ceremonies, don’t you think that we will be held accountable

• Don’t you think it will come back around at us?
Karma – what goes around comes around

• Don’t you think it is already coming back around at us everyday
  – When they sell their justus in their de facto so-called courts
  – When their revenue officers masquerading as police officers unlawfully arrest us for commercial crimes, like speeding
  – When they deny us due process based on one of their fictitious quazi-contracts
  – When they populate their prisons with victimless crimes
Separation of Church and State

• All Clerks masquerading as judges are foreign agents of the Vatican (see Presentation on Attorneys)

• This idea of separation of church and state was really about taking Christianity out of government and displacing it with the Satanic Roman Civil Law from the Vatican

• All so-called court cases are actually a satanic religious ceremony by Priests of BAAL.
Separation of Church and State

• Under the guise of the separation of church and state they have
  – Taken the Lord’s prayer out of the schools
  – Taken the Christian symbols out of the courts
  – Taken Christian symbols out of the schools

• They have converted our Christian government into satanic government

• It has all been done by court rulings from these priests of BAAL masquerading as judges
Prisons

• At common law there are no prisons
  – That is why common law is so severe

• All prisons are commercial

• Most of the people in prison are in there for victimless crimes

• We need to FIRE the Whores and end the tyranny of these de facto United Nations courts and their Vatican judicial whores selling their justus

• Our court is ONLY a jury of our peers, and we are all being denied it, so these judicial whores can populate their prisons and collect royalties
Fire the Whores Campaign

- We all need to work together to bring these whores (tyrants) to justice
- I would like to see some of these whores (tyrants) do that little dance they do at the end of a common law rope
- I am glad that it is up a jury of my peers, and not me
- We can NEVER take the law into our own hands because that makes us worse than the whores
What can we do?

• Lay a proper foundation so they cannot claim ignorance.

• Demand a common law court

• Know what a true common law court is, so you can tell if they really give you a common law court

• Complain to the judicial council, (council of whores) and make sure you bring up the right issues

• Complain to politicians (liars), etc.
What can we do?

• Make Youtube videos and circulate them far and wide!
• Realize that it is NEVER over, until you say it is over!
• Never, ever, ever, ever, ever, give up!!!
What can I do?

• Always remember, “We the people” are the ones who are really in control
  – NOT a gang of Vatican judicial whores selling their justus
  – NOT their hired thugs
  – NOT the Canada Border PIGs
What Can We Do?

• We can Refuse to participate in their de facto system
• We can educate ourselves about what a common law jury is, and what the law of the land is
• We can educate ourselves so we know when our rights are being violated
• We can educate our public servants, because many of them do not know, any more than we do
• We can educate other people by circulating this video, and any other way possible
• We can DEMAND a common law Jury of Our peers
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What can We do?

• We can work with our friends and neighbors to re-establish our common law juries and our common law de jure courts.

• We can work with our friends and neighbors to get the United Nations out of America, and Canada, and anywhere that wants to be free.

• The United Nations is owned and operated by the bankster thieves and their Vatican handlers.
Conclusion

• Judgment day is coming for these judicial whores, and I am looking forward to it!
• I am looking forward to seeing some of them do that little dance they do at the end of a common law rope!
• There are common law courts springing up all over, and these judicial whores are going to be brought to some real justice!!!!
• I am glad it is NOT up to me!
Upcoming Videos

• State Whores In Texas
• Kerr County PIGs
• Federal vs National
• Alberta Sheriff PIGs
• Fort Worth PIGs
• US Supreme Court PIGs
• Federal Whores in Arizona
• Federal Whores in New York
Summary

• Copies of these documents can be found at My private group at Yahoo called Administrating-Your-Public-Servants

• I have Youtube videos that are videos of Private Information Shares that show these and other court citations

• I have Vimeo videos of Private Information Shares that show these and other court citations

• Donations to support this work is appreciated. I prefer gold or silver coin, but as an extremely less desirable alternative I can accept IOUs (Federal Reserve Notes – Checks, Money Orders, Paypal gifts, etc.)

• Send me an email for other copies of documents to: engineerwin@gmail.com or engineerwin@yahoo.com