

F.Y.I.:

Wouldn't it work to just say, "*invito beneficium non datur*," every time the cop asked a question, even when he says, "don't you speak English?"

Subject: Rules of the "Game"

The "Appearance" trap...

No "Policy Enforcement" / "Revenue Collection" officer ("Police") has the power to "Arrest" you. They can only "apprehend" and "detain" you for up to two (2) hours, -during which time they must take you before a "Court Officer" for "probable Cause" Hearing. It is the Commissioner/ Judge/ magistrate's job to determine whether the government has sufficient evidence to "charge" or prosecute you. It is at the "Court Officer's Office" that the detainment is converted to an actual "Arrest."

In order to become a "Party" to a Law suit or "Case",- government must "trick" you (within the first 48 hours after "Arrest" at the "court commissioner's"/ Justice of Peace's/ Judge's Office) [See Riverside vs. McLaughlin], into making "Appearance". By making "Appearance" - you become "a party" to the case as "Defendant".

The several "tricks" are:

1. You must give them your Name. Until YOU voluntarily state your Name, - they must write the fictitious name "John Doe" on their papers. Even if they already know you. Even if they have found a "Driver License" with the ALL CAPITAL LETTER fictitious name duplicate to yours, - they can not make the tie-in. They have to trick YOU into stating your name to them, or They must trick you, where:
2. You must agree to post a "Bail-Bond", or
3. You "sign" something (Signature = "Consent to be regulated"), or
4. You must agree to accept an "Attorney" to "Represent" you, or
5. You must enter a Plea of "Not Guilty" or "Guilty", or
6. You discuss, address or mention any facts about the case, or

7. You must say or write something (anything) favorable to your position or un-Favorable to the Plaintiff's position, (traverse).
8. You say or write anything admitting that there is a "case". [The presumption being - if it is not Your "case", Why would you even acknowledge it?] By acknowledging that there even is a "case", - you must be a "Party" to that case - you just made an "Appearance."

According to C.J.S. the only way to defeat being tricked into making "Appearance", is to challenge "In Personam" jurisdiction and NOTHING ELSE. The (geographical) physical location "Venue" jurisdiction, and "subject matter" "In Rem" (contract in commerce) jurisdiction of the Court, arise by "Operation of Law". (Case entry)

Returning All Papers with the "SAMPLE" "Neutral Response #1" letter, removes the "In Personam", which accomplishes - they don't get "Appearance" on You. So, You are Not a "Party" or "Defendant" - if you send All papers back with it. This is for "Defense" Mode only.

If they "Arrest" you and "Take you in" - DON'T EVER give your name. To do so, is to voluntarily enter into a "Contract" with the court - and You have made an "Appearance" in the "Case". Exercise your "Miranda" "Right to remain silent" and DON'T SIGN ANYTHING (No Bond papers, No "Finger Print Card", No "Photograph Card", No "Personal effects" voucher, etc.), where they only have 48 Hours to hold you, and trick you into "Appearance", or Release you (See Riverside vs. McLaughlin- Calif.).

Also, - If they "Arrest" you, - have a Friend (after the 49th Hour) serve the "Riverside vs. McLaughlin Law Suit" on the Plaintiff "STATE OF _____ and District Prosecuting Attorney, and the "Keepers" at the jail (or wherever they are holding you). They will contact their "Lawyer" to ask about it. He will advise them to let you out, immediately, rather than face additional damages from the "Law Suit".

When in the Court, - When they ask you a question, ANY question - Don't say Anything. Don't give, write, or say your Name. When they say, - "What's your name?" Say "I am not 'authorized' to sign anything." When they ask you a question, (such as "What's Your Name?"), say "I don't have enough information or knowledge to form a responsive answer" or "I Object" or "I don't Understand." (To "understand"- is to "stand" "under"; be subordinate; be "subject" to.)

Note. If the "Judge" enters a Plea (for you) of "Not Guilty". You must ask "Is that a "Administrative" decision or a "Judicial" Decision"? When he says "Judicial". - (or "both") - You say, "On the Record" - "Thank you, Your Honor, for the "Acquittal that I am "Not Guilty!" and WALK OUT OF THE COURT. DO NOT SAY ANYTHING ELSE TO ANYONE. SIMPLY WALK OUT.

If he orders the Bailiff or other "Court Officer" to apprehend you or You will be in "Contempt Of Court", - say, "If you are Not going to honor your own 'Decision', - I hereby serve NOTICE of Appeal" (State vs. Adams, K- Mart Corp vs. Salmon, "Malicious Prosecution", and "Abuse of Process")

For copy of "Brad's Kansas Law Suit / Riverside vs. McLaughlin" send \$5.00, or for further information and/or a Seminar for your "Rights Study" Group, contact:

PEOPLES RIGHTS ASSOCIATION

address used without prejudice to rights

c/o 1624 Savannah Road

Lewes, Delaware

(Spell fully out, small letters. no voluntary-military zip zone Venue number used.)

JOHN DOE

John Doe- A fictitious name frequently used to indicate a person for the purpose of argument or illustration. or in the course of enforcing a fiction in the law. The name which was usually given to the fictitious lessee of the plaintiff in the mixed action of ejectment. He was sometimes called "Good title." So the Romans had their fictitious personages In law proceedings as Titus, Seius.

The name "John Doe" Is, and for some centuries has been. Used In legal proceedings as a fictitious name to designate a party until his real name can be ascertained. State v. Rossignol. 22 Wash.2d 19. 153 P.2d 882. 885.

When they demand "payment" of a "debt" in Court. We say "Will you accept a non-redeemable Note drawn on a Private Bank?" They say, "No". We show a \$ Federal Reserve "Note" to the Judge, and We say, "Your Honor, they just refused "Payment" as per U.C.C. 3- 603 1 (b) Tender Offered – Tender Refused - Debt is discharged to the amount of tender'. He says, 'You're right- Case Dismissed."

Statement to make before a "fiction court"

"Under" - 1.) in or to a position below or beneath something. 3.) in or into a condition of subjection, subordination, or unconsciousness.

"Standing" - n. 1b: a position from which one may assert or enforce legal rights and duties.

"Understanding" - n. 3c: a mutual agreement not formally entered into but in some degree binding on each side. "Understanding" - adj. 1: fully apprehended.

"Apprehend" - 1a: to take hold of. 1b: arrest, seize. 3: to grasp with the understanding; be fully aware of vi i understand, grasp.

"Fiction" - 1a: something invented by the imagination or feigned.

"Feign" - 1a: to represent by a false appearance of. Pretense, dissemble.

"Dissemble" 1: to hide under false appearance. 2: to put under the appearance of: simulate - vi: to put on a false appearance, conceal facts, intentions, of feelings under some pretense.

"Statement - before a fictitious court", "I Do Not understand as to feign or dissemble, or to be so understood as to be fully apprehended, for to do so would be under false pretense, therefore, I Do Not have understanding"

SECOND STATEMENT (follow-up) if necessary. "I Do NOT understand, for I may be beneath a position from which YOU may assert your legal rights, and may create an agreement not formally entered into, but in some degree binding, and this may cause me to be falsely understood, fully apprehended, and dissembled, therefore, I Do NOT have understanding"

FICTION OF LAW

Fiction of law. An assumption or supposition of law that something which Is or may be false Is true, or that a state of facts exists which has never really taken place. An assumption. for purposes of justice, of a fact that does not or may not exist. A rule of law which assumes as true. and will not allow to be disproved something which is false, but not impossible. Ryan v. Motor Credit Co.. 30 N.I.Eq. 531. 23 A 2d 607, 621

In their "Fiction" Court their "discretion" is YOU LOSE - regardless how much "Proof" or evidence of how "Right" you are.

"Who You Are" or "Where You Stand"!

In essence, the issue of "who you are" as compared to "where you stand" may be summed up in the following statement: "By declaring and or by defining who you are, you do not define where you stand, but when you declare where you stand, you have also concurrently defined who you are without discussing the matter."

In other words, when I inform a judge by declaring to him that I stand in the Kingdom of God, and ask him to declare to me whether or not his court stands in God's Kingdom, that judge already knows that I am a real, live man of God, and he knows that I am not a "straw-man", without my having ever brought up that issue.

However, if I declare to that same judge that I am not a straw man, or that I am not a corporate persona of the state and that I am a real live man of God, that judge still has every right according to man's law to do everything in his power to entice me into volunteering to enter into "his" jurisdiction. The public record is replete with examples of men and women that have rightly declared that they are real live men or women of God, yet, these same men or women have been subsequently tricked into volunteering to step into the judge's jurisdiction, simply because they did not know where they should be standing! In fact, the mere act of your offering evidence in the form of argument over the issue of the "name" implies that you have tacitly and obviously unwittingly, accepted the judge's alleged authority to rule on that issue!

In short, "who you are" is an issue designed to aid in the court's trickery. That is why they always start with that issue by asking for a "name", or confirmation of a name. Virtually any response you offer in direct response to the issue of a name can only be accepted by them as an offer of evidence concerning the issue of the "name", not the issue of jurisdiction. Even if you "win" the argument with your evidence of "who you are", or "who you are not", you still have not dealt with the more important issue of "where you stand", and in fact you have volunteered to enter their jurisdiction but only as a "man"! Again, the public record is replete with examples where the courts have ruled against real live men and women of God for this very reason.

By ignoring the issue of the name; by not responding to it at all; by simply going right to the issue of "where you stand", YOU will be the one trapping the judge as opposed to him potentially trapping you into his jurisdiction. The judge will not be able to tell you that his court stands in God's Kingdom any more than he will be able to tell you it does not stand in God's Kingdom, and until he addresses your simple question of where his court

stands, he does not have any jurisdiction to continue with his quest to have you address "his" issue of a name.

Why do you think the police, the prosecutors, the courts, or all of the other "persons", always ask you what your name is? Why do you think they persist on this issue so adamantly, often demanding that you "give them your name"? The answer may surprise you.

They really do not care who you are, but they really do care "where" you are! And in most cases, they do know the difference! Basically, they only have jurisdiction over you as a man when you offer to "go" someplace with them. You must "go" into their jurisdiction before they have any control over you. Your name, whether or not it is in upper, or lower case or some mixture thereof, is not the real issue. Whether you are a man of God or a "straw-man" cannot really be the issue, because YOU cannot be a strawman even if you wanted to be. Your "standing" is the issue!

There are only two possible places for you to "stand". You have your entitlement to God's gift of being able to stand in God's Kingdom. And you have the option of "stepping" out of God's Kingdom and into the kingdoms of man. There are many ways the tricksters may utilize to induce, coerce, intimidate or influence you to step into one of their imaginary "kingdoms", but the result is always the same. The principle result of stepping into any one of their jurisdictions is that you have voluntarily stepped out of God's Kingdom - the only true sanctuary.

Quite possibly the most successful and most common manner of trickery the courts employ to entrap men or women of God, is to ask this simple, yet seemingly helpful and harmless question; "do you understand?" Now they may ask if you understand what is going on, or if you understand their procedures, or if you understand what they are saying, or any variety of things, but they will always ask if you "under" stand them. In the old established English language, the use of the words "under" and "stand", were often used to describe relationships between landlords and subjects, or between those in authority and those in subjection to that authority. In other words, a landlord might very well state to his tenants, that they "stand under" his authority. The English language is also replete with examples of reversing word order within commonly used phrases, yet maintaining the same meaning, or as was the early custom in terms of "standing"; the "tenants 'under stand' the landlord", or conversely, the "landlord 'stands over' his tenants".

What this really means in modern use of the language is no different. When a court asks "do you understand?" the correct response would be; "I comprehend your words, but I do not stand under (understand) your authority." The rules of court clearly state that definitions of both words and

phrases as they apply in law may not always be the same as those that apply or that are common in daily language usage outside of the law! So NEVER say to a court, that "you understand them", because this clearly provides them with your consent to be under their jurisdiction - "under their standing", even if you have established yourself as a real live flesh and blood man of God, and even if all you intended to state, was that you "comprehend" them!

Think of this. I am a Man of God and everywhere I go I am standing in God's Kingdom. An officer of some man's court asks me to attend at his court. When I walk into a room that he alleges to be his court, even at his request, I have not yet stepped into his jurisdiction, because I am always standing in God's Kingdom. It then is of no significance what my name is or how it is written, but it is then of paramount importance that I make my declaration of WHERE I am standing! Anyone in that room may ask me my name. My response is simple and straight-forward. "I am a Man of God standing in God's Kingdom, where do you stand?" Or I might say; "I am a Man of God standing in God's Kingdom, where are you?"

Of course there are many possible responses that a statement such as this may elicit. One of the most probable responses is for the judge to say something like this; "This is my court and you are in my court." He may even demand that because he "says" you are standing in his court, that you "give the court your name". There are also many possible responses you might offer. For example, "I am in God's Kingdom and my Christian Name is not for you, do you not have a name of your own?" Or I might say; "I am in God's Kingdom and you say this is your court, please explain to me where your court is (or where your court stands)?" If he says his court is "right here", then I might say; "I am standing in God's Kingdom, are you also?"

The bottom line with this truthful reasoning is simple. I will always be standing in God's Kingdom and that is all I am required to declare. Without exception, I will only ask him where he is standing or if he is standing in God's Kingdom or where his court stands. I might even walk over to his side on his bench if he says something like "my court is right here in this room (or this room is my court)." If I did walk to his place ("right here") behind his bench, then he will undoubtedly ask me to go back to what he will claim to be "my place", or order me to "stand there", to which I would simply ask; "Is that your court over there because a moment ago you said this right here (point to where he sits) was your court. Is your court in God's kingdom, because I stand in God's Kingdom?"

If I was in a challenging mood, I might ask the judge; "Can you show me where God's Kingdom ends and your court begins, because at this time I stand in God's Kingdom and I do not understand where your court is?" Do you think he will declare that God's Kingdom ends outside of his alleged

court room? You might hope so but do not count on it. If he did make such an unlikely statement, my response would be; "I assure you that I am standing in God's Kingdom, therefore your opinion of God's Kingdom is mistaken. You say your court is not in God's Kingdom then I am not in your court and I am not able to understand where your court is."

Now you might conclude that many possible variations of dialogue could ensue. It does not matter what the court officers state, so long as I maintain my simple declaration of being a man standing in God's Kingdom. My declaration is true, it is sound, and above all, no man can prove it to be otherwise. The judge can never bring himself to acknowledge that he is attempting to operate outside of God's Kingdom, hence the judge will never gain jurisdiction over me. And he cannot confirm that he is willing to operate inside of God's Kingdom, because inside of God's Kingdom the judge is merely another man and no man has been granted authority over another by God.

This brings up one more point. I may ask the judge something like; "Are you a judge in (this) your court that you cannot find for me?" If he says; "I am a judge in this (or my) court", then I would respond with; "You testify that you are therefore not a man and that you do not stand in God's Kingdom, as God alone declares Himself as Judge in His Kingdom. As I am now standing in God's Kingdom, I bid you farewell and may God bless you with understanding of His Kingdom."

You might also consider that upon making your declaration of where YOU stand, that you add the following underlined words: "I am a Man of God standing in God's Kingdom, and I can only see other men, my brothers standing in this room with me in God's Kingdom." This will leave the judge in the very uncomfortable and inescapable position of not being able to respond in either the affirmative or the negative. He will try to simply ignore your statement.

He cannot agree that he and the other court officers are also "men of God", as in so doing; he would be negating his own alleged authority. He also cannot disagree with you and say that he and the other court officers are not of God's Kingdom, because this would be tantamount to admitting Treason and breach of Office (in spite of it being true). Because he cannot then identify who HE is, you cannot understand how he can proceed and you state this to him. Then you have him in the position where his only choice of action is to dismiss the court room because he literally cannot make a response that will not cause him infinitely more grief than what he and his court officers intended to inflict upon you.

(Ed. note, as received from: <http://www.naturalgod.com/NaturalMan.html>)