

Laws & Statutes

Laws relate to common law and they are few in number. Common Law is based on judicial precedent (court decisions) rather than legislative enactment (statutes) and is derived from principles and not rules.

Common Law is the Law of the Land – if you harm somebody, cause loss to somebody, commit a breach of the peace or conduct your affairs with mischief, you will come under Common Law jurisdiction where your peers, through the jury system (*Court de Jure*) will decide your innocence or guilt. It is about principles, customs, precedents and established practices, and good old-fashioned common sense – very simple and very effective.

Most courts operate as '*court de facto*' and operate in equity (contract) law jurisdiction, often as so-called 'kangaroo' courts where the outcome is pre-determined.

Most European countries do not operate under common law jurisdiction, they operate under a Napoleonic civil law (*corpus juris*) and through our membership of the EU we are being moved to operate under this European law system. This has very significant meaning when it comes to our rights, discussed later in this section.

The most important point in dealing with courts is that they exist to resolve a controversy; if no controversy exists then the court has nothing to adjudicate upon.

So when replying to a summons (invite) or a debt recovery letter, or final reminder, where you do not agree with the claim being made against you (controversy), you need to reply using 'conditional agreement' subject to certain claims being made against you being proved 'lawfully' by the claimant, such as that your legal fiction is the same as you the living being. A stated time for response and rebuttal of your proof of claim (from claimant) should be given, with a clear understanding that failure to respond in that time constitutes tacit agreement or estoppel by acquiescence, whilst you maintain full honour in law.

Except in reality the courts and the judicial system just tends to ignore these points of law, unlawfully; the law is being ignored by the state to prosecute, fine and imprison individuals.

This proves that under civil law there is no justice; civil courts only dispense a summary judgement. Your guilt is assumed before you even enter a court.

Types of Law/Jurisdictions

1. Common law
2. Tort law

The following are civil/equity laws based on contracts, therefore statutes.

3. Equity
4. Admiralty
5. Maritime

Common law – a crime exists only when there is a victim with actual damages like a broken arm. Has form and substance.

Tort law – A tort, in common law jurisdictions, is a civil wrong. Tort law deals with situations where a person's behaviour has unfairly caused someone else to suffer loss or harm. A tort is not necessarily an illegal act but causes harm and therefore the law allows anyone who is harmed to recover their loss. Tort cases involve such topics as negligence, false imprisonment, defamation, product liability (defective consumer goods), copyright infringement, environmental pollution and many others.

Equity – otherwise known as civil law; a private contract or agreement is involved. For an action to be brought there must be a breach of contract and damages. Has form only, no substance.

Maritime – or commercial contract law originates in the rules of trade upon the high seas between international merchants and is enforced by military organizations.

Admiralty – is armed enforcement of the laws of commerce (the law merchant)

Maritime operates in times of peace, admiralty in times of war.

Statute – Legislative rule of Society given the force of law by consent of the governed

Not all statutes are bad, and many are probably needed, it is the way they are applied that is wrong. Not that long ago someone speeding could be pulled over by a police officer and given a warning, there was an element of discretion by the officers, speed camera's offer no such discretion. Our police force now operate to targets; they are expected to meet a quota of PCN's, so they have no incentive to issue a warning or a 'ticking off'. Likewise traffic wardens have quota's to meet and many are totally unreasonable little Hitler's. Good statutes should complement and strengthen common law

New laws (statutes) are usually introduced as primary legislation which should be properly discussed in the House of Commons and then passed to the House of Lords for approval. However, following Blair and Brown's Labour government the House of Lords no longer have the power to refuse a bill (incidentally this means all statutes passed since the Lords power was removed are null and void), and most primary legislation is rushed through at times when very few dissenters will be present, such as on Friday's when MP's have left for the weekend, or just before holidays. Once a piece of primary legislation has been passed, statutory instruments can be added to that legislation without any consideration at all.

As mentioned earlier, we need some statutes, for instance treason is a statute, others that serve a purpose are drink driving and reckless or dangerous driving, particularly if these cause an accident. People who drink and drive and then have an accident should expect to be punished with a fine or penalty points. Generally, speed signs should be advisory not always mandatory, so speed traps and cameras should be banned except at accident black spots and possibly at some traffic lights to catch red light jumpers. So not all statutes are bad, but the vast majority are badly applied or are unreasonable or downright malicious.

Treasonous politicians and rogue elements within the judiciary are crudely attempting to bludgeon the British people into accepting *Corpus Juris*, the embryo of a future European Criminal Code. This would mean the British people giving up their ancient rights to *Habeas Corpus* and to accept without a whimper the European system of Justice where you are 'guilty' until proved 'innocent' and where you can be imprisoned for weeks, possibly even months without any evidence being produced against you.

This unlawful legal control system that has been set up by the political elite, the judiciary and the Law Society (with their unfathomable 'legalese' which is primarily designed to keep the bulk of the population in complete ignorance of what's happening), along with the corporate and banking sectors, is now starting to be challenged by those who understand the complete supremacy of Common Law over Statute Rules. Recently, we have had the spectacle of Judges and Magistrates fleeing from their own courts when challenged by ordinary decent lay people as to whether or not they are acting under their solemn oaths of office when judging a case involving a breach of a Statute Rule (speeding offence, non-payment of the unlawful Council Tax etc.). These solemn oaths only refer to upholding the Common Law and not to the rules of Society. People are now rapidly waking up as to how this massive deception and extremely profitable fraud works and it won't be long before these unlawful *de facto* courts become paralysed with the people taking back the actual courts in the name of Common Law and real justice.

A rejection of statutes does not imply a rejection of the law. A rejection of statutes is a rejection of governance. It is for those governing to make sure that the statutes they make are acceptable. The 'legal' profession has failed in its duty to maintain and understand the distinction between laws and statutes – through ignorance – but also because ignorance of the distinction has given the 'legal' profession enhanced authority – why would they promote knowledge of the difference? It isn't in their interest to do so. It is after all, the legal profession that now runs the court system – with magistrates having been pushed to the side by statute.

(The Magistrate Court Act 1980). Magistrates have been made subservient to the decision of the legal adviser in court. This was a power-grab statute.

- If a statute is passed transferring their authority (to Brussels for example) – we can withdraw our consent because such an act is unlawful.
- It has become the habit of the legal profession to describe statutes as laws. Habits, no matter how entrenched do not however create facts. Statutes are not laws.
- If statutes become overly prescriptive, restrictive, onerous and oppressive – the people not only have a right to withdraw their consent – they have an obligation and a duty to do so in order to defend themselves against tyrannical power.
- Statutes are supposed to protect society and help in fair and just governance, but from time to time (over centuries) statutes mutate to become more oppressive and work against the wider interest of the community and invariable benefit small sections of society.
- Every statute (with very few exceptions – treason) should have a so-called 'sunset' clause, after say one year the statute should be re-accessed on its merits, is it still applicable? Has it worked as intended? Is it fit for purpose? If not, it is removed, if it is not represented at its sunset it would also be removed. Therefore, positive steps would need to be taken to keep a statute current.