New landmark case: **Leighton V Bristow & Sutor Cardiff HCJ Judgment 20230920 V Final**

Affects agents- and that's what they are PRIVATE DEBT AGENTS- not GB Bailiffs as the 'case' has never seen a court room.

The conduct of these enforcement officers is strictly controlled under the Tribunals, Courts and Enforcement Act 2007. Schedule 12: details that the enforcement officer must show their identity and the proof of authority from the court that entitles them to be on the premises. [not just a digital copy of something no doubt unsigned issued from the council] Stand your ground.

We know via wins such as the Peacekeepers- [who got an estoppel in Equity as Liverpool Council could not prove the obligation to pay- Where is the obligation to pay?] And, that council tax is and always was yet another tax and scam upon the people.

Council tax comes under the Local Government Finance Act 1992. All acts require CONSENT to be given the **Force** of Law; they are merely rules and regulations. They are NOT law. There is NO law requiring anybody to pay tax of any kind.

The Local Government Finance Act 1992 evidences NO mandatory OBLIGATION to make payment towards council tax.

**See the Bill of Rights- The Bill Of Rights 1688-**

'And several Grants and Promises made of Fines and Forfeitures before any Conviction or Judgement against the Persons upon whom the same were to be levyed. All which are utterly directly contrary to the knowne Lawes and Statutes and Freedome of this Realme.'

**LIABILITY ODER- AS THE LATE GREAT BARON DAIVID WARD SAID: WHERE IS THE CONSENT OF THE GOVERNED- LEGAL V LAWFUL: LEGISLATION IS ONLY GIVEN THE FORCE OF LAW BY THE CONSENT OF THE GOVERENED: BALCKS LAW:**

**AND SUPERIOR STATUTES- CONSTITUTIONAL LAW- ALSO SEE: THE 12 PRESUMPTIONS.- PUBLIC V PRIVATE- USE YOUR FICTION AS AN AVATAR IN COMMERCE.**

**Liability Orders... SIMPLY SHOWING THE INSTRUSTIONS FROM THE COUNCIL IS NOT AN ORDER FROM THE COURT.**

The definitive court record is a copy of the court register. No memorandum of entry- no adjudication. The Liability orders are NOT being produced and or sent from a 'court'.

DSAR [DATA SUBJECT ACCESS REQUEST] the court and the council.

**IF THERE IS NO CASE NUMBER- THERE IS NO CASE. THE DEFINITIVE COURT RECORD IS A COPY OF THE COURT REGISTER- NO MEMORADUM OF ENTRY-NO ADJUDIACTION.**

For entertainment purposes only. This does not constitute legal advice.
Copy of the original material is permitted only by the author
Without Prejudice. All rights reserved.

Remember: Liability Orders: Equally there has never once been a liability order granted by a magistrate's court on this land for the non- payment of council tax. Only the application was granted. A court order is something of material substance that must comply with the civil procedure rules. This must contain upon it a court seal and the name in clear text of the Judge or Magistrate. No Such document or record exists because that was not the service that was requested by the Council.

**Baron**: "We have visited your company Magistrates court Mrs S Pye on the 17th day of July 2013 and no such court order was granted, and no such court order was requested by Warrington Borough Council or yourself. A 'copy' of a liability order isn't a liability order - **Just like a rainbow isn't a pile of sh*t.**😂

**Be aware they will bamboozle and railroad you:**

**'Railroading' defined: - a pre-determined path or conclusion. This is the collusion of the 'courts' and the councils. SEE ROGER HAYES – UK COLUMN- Judge: Can we first find out who is in the court... is MR ROGER HAYES in the court?**

MR HAYES REPRESENTED HIMSELF AS A THIRD PARTY FOR AND ON BEHALF OF THE LEGAL FICTION. THE JUDGE WOULDN'T ALLOW THIS – SO ROGER SKILLFULLY STATED THAT THERE WAS A SOLICITOR [BAR MEMBER] AS A THIRD PARTY REPRESENTATIVE FOR THE COUNCIL- OTHERWISE THE PLANTIFF HADN'T APPEARED AND THE CASE WOULD BE DISMISSED. THE SOLICITOR HERE IF YOU HAVE ADDRESSED YOUR NOTICES TO THE 'CEO' OF THE COUNCIL IS A THIRD PARTY INTERLOPER AND ALL THEY SAY IS NOW HERESAY- MOVE TO STRIKE. IF SENT 'PRIVATE AND CONFIDENTIAL'- SEE MAIL FRAUD.- POSTAL SERVICES ACT 2000.

The Council Tax Administration and Enforcement 1992 regulations states that the Magistrates (magi- magicians, tricksters) make/issue the order, nowhere does it state that the court give authority to the council to print the orders.

These liability 'orders' are used to confirm to the 'bailiff' [enforcement officer] they have 'authority' to 'act'. These documents are presented as though they are issued from the court.

They bulk list cases also: so they are not meeting their own rules aka Civil Procedural Rules, see:

**Lord Justice Waller R v Leeds Justices ex parte Kennett 1996 RVR 53.**

Bulk listing may comply for the council but NOT the court. **Magistrates Court Rules 1981.**

Applications for liability orders are presented in BULK this is unlawful.

Before a warrant or summons (summoning the dead) can be issued information must be laid before the Judge. If a Magistrate authorises the issue of a summons without having applied his mind to the information he is guilty of dereliction of duty.

For entertainment purposes only. This does not constitute legal advice.
Copy of the original material is permitted only by the author
Without Prejudice. All rights reserved.

It must exercise 'Judicial Function' - not merely administrative. Automatically generated electronic signatures of the 'Clerk of the Court/Justices' issued by council software are not lawful. Both the council and the Magistrates are acting 'Ultra Vires'- outside their given authority**. Regina v. Brentford Justices, Ex Parte Catlin [1975]**

**HALSBURY LAWS**

Halsbury's Laws of England states that the Oath does not authorize "any Judge or Magistrate", '[in the Common Law Jurisdiction of England and Wales'], to adjudicate any Hearing in which the matter is to be decided in any way other than "by trial by Jury.

It is my understanding that demanding monies by false representation is in breach of the Fraud Act 2006, Section 2.

It is my understanding that demanding monies without providing full disclosure is in breach of The Fraud Act 2006, Section 3.

It is my understanding that demanding monies without providing evidence of authority or jurisdiction is in breach of The Fraud Act 2006, Section 4.

***It is my understanding that:***

**Halsbury's on Administrative Law 20-11**: "**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."**

It is my understanding that according to Observance of due Process of Law 1368 section 3: "None shall be put to answer without due Process of Law.

**The Council have no authority to bulk print their own summons.**

Summons in legalese means 'invite'- where you are then 're-presented' from your CHRIST name off the land and onto the Maritime SEE as your Dead legal fiction, and into the fictional dead realms of Baal. The black Saturnian robes of the Judge, Saturn = Satan/Set. Game SET match. Lower courts are administrative and procedural. Unlawful.

**Regina v. Brentford Justices. Ex parte Catlin, the closing comments of Lord Widgery C.J.**

"....It must however be remembered that before a summons or warrant is issued the information must be laid before a magistrate and he must go through the judicial exercise of deciding whether a summons or warrant ought to be issued or not. If a magistrate authorises the issue of a summons without having applied his mind to the information then he is guilty of dereliction of duty and if in any particular justices' clerk's office a practice goes on of summonses being issued without information being laid before the magistrate at all, then a very serious instance of maladministration arises which should have the attention of the authorities without delay...."

For entertainment purposes only. This does not constitute legal advice.
Copy of the original material is permitted only by the author
Without Prejudice. All rights reserved.

**A summons to a commercial court is only an invitation:**

A summons to a commercial court is only an invitation and operates as a court de facto a kangaroo court, a private court and is not a lawfully convened public court de jure.

On board these ships on the land disguised as lawful courts by default actually operate under admiralty jurisdiction you are... automatically perceived as dead, a corporation, lost at sea incompetent, a ward of the state, you will NOT have any say as to what happens in these corrupt courts and there most certainly won't be a jury of your peers present.

These courts perform administrative banking processes and you do NOT get a say because to these courts you exist only as a piece of paper that has no voice and can be administered and processed as such.

You are guilty until proven innocent and you will not get your chance to protest prove your innocence as these courts do not operate on oath under the Common Law or the Law of the Land as you are aboard a metaphorical ship on the high seas.

**De facto**: describes practices that exist in reality, regardless of whether they are officially recognized by laws or other formal norms. It is commonly used to refer to what happens in practice, in contrast with de jure, which refers to things that happen according to official law, regardless of whether the practice exists in reality.

**De jure:** (Latin: “from the law”) legal concept that refers to what happens according to the law, in contrast to de facto (Latin: “from the fact”), which is used to refer to what happens in practice or in reality. For example, a de jure leader has the legal right to authority over a jurisdiction, but a de facto leader is someone who exerts authority without holding the legal right to do so. The term de jure is often used in legal matters to distinguish legal standard from de facto practice.

**A legal precedent regarding the extortionate fees Councils are charging in regards to council tax liability orders:**

The actual cost for a liability order is £3 in legislation, as set out in The Magistrates’ Courts Fees (Amendment) Order 2014 (Section 4.1).

The councils are adding ridiculously unjustifiable costs … and abusing the legislation in the “Council Tax (Administration and Enforcement) Regulations 1992 (Section 34.7)” which states they can charge

“a sum of an amount equal to the costs reasonably incurred by the applicant in obtaining the order.”

Note how vague the wording is for "reasonably incurred” … but all other forms of litigation must adhere to a clear and specific schedule, as defined by statute. On April 30th 2015, the Reverend Paul Nicolson challenged this in the courts against Haringey Council, who were charging a sum of £125 pounds each and every time for a summons: a number which they had (like other councils) simply

For entertainment purposes only. This does not constitute legal advice.
Copy of the original material is permitted only by the author
Without Prejudice. All rights reserved.

pulled out of thin air … and refused to justify or provide an account of these so-called "reasonably incurred" costs.

**WHAT WE ALSO MUST REMEMBER IS THAT ADMINISTRATIVE COURTS ARE PRIVATE PLACES OF BUSINESS SINCE ALL GOVERNMENTS HAVE INCORPORATED: THE JUDGE IS THE JANITOR AT MCDONALDS.**

**SO THE COMPANY ACT SC44 COMES INTO PLAY- NOTHING IS EVER SIGNED.**

**CLEARFIELD DOCTRINE**

Please note that under the Clearfield Doctrine, a Supreme Court Case, Clearfield Trust Co. v. United States, (1943) 318 US 363-371, when the State or government enters commercial business, it abandons its sovereign capacity and is to be treated like any other corporation. The Clearfield Doctrine strips ……COUNCIL of its "government" cloak and any protection that it offers.

This 'Government' has been trading arms on the securities market for many many years using CTAX.

Note: We draw your attention to the Sc 15 and 17 of the Terrorism Act 2000: 15 Fund-raising. • (1) A person commits an offence if he— • (a) invites another to provide money or other property, and • (b) intends that it should be used, or has reasonable cause to suspect that it may be used, for the purposes of terrorism.

**FOREIGN CASE LAW:**

The use of foreign cases and comparative law is widely accepted in England. While the use is regulated, in that there must be specific reasons for resorting to foreign law, its value is not underestimated.

**Fairchild v Glenhaven Funeral Services Ltd [2002] UKHL 22, [2003] 1 AC 32**, which was criticised for its extensive reference to foreign law in Weir.D & F Estates Ltd v Church Commissioners for England [1989] AC 177, which referred to American law. **White v Jones [1995] 2 AC 207,** which relied on German law. **Hadley v Baxendale [1854] 9 Ex Ch 341,** which was heavily influenced by American law and the French Civil Code. **R v Jogee [2016] UKSC 8,** in which Australian law featured heavily.

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT 1888 ACT SC79**

**79 Incorporation of county council.**

**(1). . . . . F1**

**(2)All duties and liabilities of the inhabitants of a county shall become and be duties and liabilities of the council of such county.**

**(3)Where any enactment (whether relating to . . . F2 bridges, or other county purposes, or to quarter sessions) requires or authorises land to be conveyed or granted to, or any contract or**

For entertainment purposes only. This does not constitute legal advice.
Copy of the original material is permitted only by the author
Without Prejudice. All rights reserved.

**agreement to be made in the name of, the clerk of the peace, or any justice or justices or other person, on behalf of the county or quarter sessions, or justices of the county, such land shall be conveyed or granted to, and such contract and agreement shall be made with, the council of the . . . F3 county concerned.**

**BREACH OF DATA- BREACH OF TRUST LAW- COUNCIL HAD NO RIGHT TO PASS YOUR DETAILS FORWARD TO ANYONE UNLAWFULLY. DATA PROTECTION ACT AND GDPR. UTILISE DSAR AND FOI.**

**Duty to disclose 'residency'**

Is a resident required to notify the council when they move into a property?

"No legal duty exists that requires a resident to notify a council of residency at a particular address for council tax purposes**" D, R v (Rev 1) [2019] EWCA Crim 209**. The Court of Appeal rules.

Remember - resident means in legalese 'temporarily residing to do BUSINESS'. Blacks Law.

**NOTES**

DECEPTION OF LANGUAGE ON DOCUMENTS- WITH THE USE OF UPPER CASE HIEROGLYPHIC LATIN TEXT- ALL CAPS DEAD FICTION- CAPITUS MAXIMA.

TWO DIFFERENT GRAMMATICAL STRUCTURES ON ONE DOCUMENT IS FRAUD BY ITSELF:

CAPS, LOWER CASE, BOLD, NUMBERS [ALGERBRAE]- WHAT IS THE CORRECT INTERPRETATION??- IT IS BABBLE- NOT ON THE PAGE FOUR CORNER RULE-[ANYTHING ON THE DOCUMENT IN A BOX IS NOT ON THE PAGE].

FACT V FICTIONS- CANNOT TRY A FACT IN A FICTION- A COURT IS A KANGAROO COURT- JURISDICTION- CORPORATE RULES POLICIES AND CODES- WE ARE NOT CARGO OR THINGS- MARITIME MENAING = **'SEA OF TIME.'**

CONTRACTS AND CONDITIONS- CITIZEN- SHIP- A CITIZEN=MUNICIPAL SERVANT- public servant.

**EVEN THE COMMON LAW- MEANS TO 'OBLIGATE TO BURDEN'- THIS IS ROME- THIS IS THE FALL OF ROME.**

**DO NOT FORGET TRESPASS NOTICES AND TRESPASS VIOLATIONS.**

For entertainment purposes only. This does not constitute legal advice.
Copy of the original material is permitted only by the author
Without Prejudice. All rights reserved.

**TO SUMMARISE:**

Landmark Case: Leighton v Bristow & Sutor Cardiff HCJ Judgment 20230920 v Final

This ground-breaking legal precedent involves agents, distinct from traditional bailiffs, as the case has never graced a courtroom. Enforcement officers' behaviour is meticulously governed by the Tribunals, Courts, and Enforcement Act 2007, Schedule 12. This mandates officers to display their identity and court-issued authority when present on premises, emphasizing the need for tangible proof rather than digital copies. Stand resolute in asserting your rights.

Legal victories, such as those achieved by the Peacekeepers, have questioned the very obligation to pay council tax, classifying it as another unjust levy on the public. Council tax falls under the Local Government Finance Act 1992; however, acts necessitate consent to attain the force of law, as they are rules, not inherently laws. The Local Government Finance Act 1992 fails to establish a mandatory obligation to pay council tax, aligning with the principles outlined in the Bill of Rights 1688.

Liability orders, crucial in these matters, are brought into question. Contrary to popular belief, these orders are not produced or dispatched directly from a court. The definitive court record is derived from the court register, and the absence of a memorandum of entry raises questions about the legitimacy of the adjudication process. Without a case number, there is, essentially, no case.

It is imperative to challenge the authenticity of liability orders, emphasizing that no actual court order, as per civil procedure rules, has been granted for non-payment of council tax. Highlighting the lack of material substance, absence of a court seal, and the clear identification of the judge or magistrate, questions are raised about the validity of these purported orders.

The legal landscape is further complicated by the administrative nature of the courts involved. Administrative courts, operating under admiralty jurisdiction, view individuals as legal fictions—corporations lost at sea. Summonses, often misconstrued as lawful, are mere invitations to private commercial courts, lacking the constitutional foundation of public courts.

Moreover, councils exploit legislation to inflate costs associated with liability orders, defying the stipulations of The Magistrates' Courts Fees (Amendment) Order 2014. The vague language of "reasonably incurred" costs allows councils to impose unjustifiable fees without transparent justification. Challenges in court have exposed these practices, with cases like Reverend Paul Nicolson contesting exorbitant charges imposed by councils.

Under the Clearfield Doctrine, when the government engages in commercial activities, it relinquishes its sovereign status. The government is treated as a corporation, devoid of sovereign immunity. This revelation exposes the government's trading activities on the securities market using council tax.

For entertainment purposes only. This does not constitute legal advice.
Copy of the original material is permitted only by the author
Without Prejudice. All rights reserved.

Foreign case law is recognized in England, influencing legal decisions. Cases such as Fairchild v Glenhaven Funeral Services Ltd and White v Jones draw upon foreign legal principles. Additionally, the Local Government Act 1888 and principles of breach of data and trust law are cited to challenge councils' authority and practices.

In summary, the intricate legal nuances discussed underscore the need for individuals to critically examine the legitimacy of council tax liability orders and the practices employed by councils and administrative courts. Understanding legal rights, challenging assumptions, and leveraging legal precedents are essential in navigating these matters.

USEFUL LINKS:

https://the98thmonkey.substack.com/p/council-tax-debts-have-now-become?r=zpppo&utm_medium=email

https://www.ukcolumn.org/writer/roger-hayes

https://www.scribd.com/document/514231949/Baron-David-Ward-Affidavit-Statement

https://www.amazon.co.uk/COUNCIL-RECOVERY-APPROVED-MAGISTRATES-JUDGES/dp/B08HTM67YR

https://sites.google.com/view/beat-the-bailiffs/home

https://realmedia.press/bailiff-companies-acting-unlawfully-local-authority-contracts-says-independent-review

www.darkmatters.contact

*[ALL THIS AND MORE TO BE FOUND AT DARK MATTERS]*

*HELP SUPPORT THE CHANNEL: BUY US A COFFEE/DONATE SO WE CAN KEEP CREATING MORE CONTENT:*

https://buy.stripe.com/6oE5o78m0giN7VSbII

https://www.youtube.com/@darkmatters.contact

https://www.facebook.com/darkmatterspresents

https://www.instagram.com/darkmatterspresents

https://www.bitchute.com/channel/qFhwwduk74RI/ [too hot for You Tube Content]

For entertainment purposes only. This does not constitute legal advice.
Copy of the original material is permitted only by the author
Without Prejudice. All rights reserved.