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Scripture Reading: Matthew 27:57 - 28:10

(8:00)

There is a lot of activity going on on the New York Safe Act

Even though this is a New York Law Suit it’s a law suit by a group of individuals almost 40

Those people who are suing are suing as individuals But this case does affect everyone.

But we are proceeding These people are going to break the law it doesn’t matter what we do or what we say We’re talking about the judge we’re also talking about the New York State Attorney General’s Office They’re going to break the law They don’t care They do not want us to have a court of record They do not want us to have common law

They do not want us to have justice They’ll do anything They’ll bend their own rules

They’ll do whatever it is that they think that they need to do to accomplish that goal

Unless the fear of the people come into the heart of this judge and this magistrate then they will throw this case out But that will not be the end of it

We will continue We may file another paper

They received our papers today, June 4, which was the deadline to answer

That answer went out on Friday

No doubt it’s there this morning

Both the attorney general has it, the court received it.

We should look on the docket they’ll probably record it tomorrow

They should have it

We’ve answered in time

We responded to everything that they put in their paper

They tried to change the conversation

We have an extremely powerful case and position in opposed to their Rule 12 which is to try to throw this case out Rule 12 is pretty clear.

John will read a little from the paper

It is available online

Go to NationalLibertyAlliance.org on the right hand side of the blue bar on top you highlight “Grand Jury” when you highlight “Grand Jury” you come down and you click on

“Amendment 2”

We did file a Writ of Mandamus That was to the United States Supreme Court

It’s a short paper

John will read it:

This is a Writ of Mandamus we wrote to the United States Supreme Court:

(13:00)

It begins:

“U.S. Constitution Article III Section 1 establishes that the federal district courts are subordinate to the United States Supreme Court. The purpose of this Writ is to move the United States Supreme Court to deliver a Writ Mandamus upon Magistrate Christian F. Hummel and Judge Mae A. D’Agostino, herein after magistrates, in the above named court. Commanding said magistrates to honor their oaths and obey the Law of the Land. The Unified United States Common Law Grand Jury entered the above said case by Brief as Amicus Curiae on behalf of the plaintiffs by request and because plaintiffs are being denied a court of record according to the course of the common law as provided for under 28 U.S. Code § 132 , thereby denying plaintiffs due process.”

The Writ of Mandamus concludes with the following:

“Wherefore, we move the United States Supreme Court to perform their Constitutional duty and order Magistrates Christian F. Hummel and Mae A. D’Agostino in the above said inferior court to correct the record as stated by the plaintiffs and provide for the opening of a Court of Record to proceed according to the Common Law.”

That was sent out May 22nd

(22:00)

They responded back

They have not answered the Show Cause

They responded back that they don’t understand what we are talking about

There’s a lot of activity going on in this court

Anybody that is interested in liberty Anybody that is interested in understanding how the court works

Anybody interested in law Anybody interested in being free needs to read this case

Even though we’re focusing in on a Second Amendment violation the case in itself is a great example going up against these people and it lays out everything How they came about

If you read the case from the beginning to the end when we filed how they responded we responded back all the papers we put in memorandums and everything if you read through this case very very carefully if you read through that it’s an education

You will have an understanding of what they are doing the crime they’re committing

and you’ll see how we’re building a case if we can get through this part and they have to answer the cannot answer the original case

We have lots and lots and lots of cases showing their lack of concern of the right of due process of We the People

(31:15)

Probably 60 or more cases Maybe 60 or 70 cases we have

Broken their oaths Denied us our unalienable rights

They have changed our jurisdiction

We have told them straight out We want the jurisdiction of the Constitution

And they said “No” “We’re not going to give it to you”

They’ve charged us money That’s against the law

They’re charging money and they’re getting away with it and they feel comfortable.

These are not Article III courts

Other people have ideas and strategies that we need to go outside of this and do it some other way

Maybe build a court some place I don’t know how we would do that

These people are evil They’re thieves They’re frauds They’ve stolen our liberty They’ve stolen our unalienable rights They have deceived us

They defrauded us They’ve written act after act after act to incarcerate us in a statutory prison

If we don’t behave in the statutory prison then they will throw us in jail

And we have allowed them to do it

They’ve accomplished this because of our ignorance

If we’re going to be ignorant then this is what we have

If we want to be free then it’s time to learn You have to read this case Read all our cases

We always had a plan And the plan was to build cases case after case after case

showing violation after violation after violation showing consistency in the way that they did it showing that there is collusion

Showing that they are denying our most basic rights

our freedom and our right to due process in a court of law in a court of justice

Those courts belong to us not them

We’ve written a lot of papers over the past couple years We’ve served it on every elected individual on the federal and state level

on the judiciary we’ve served it served it on sheriffs served it on all of the congresses and the legislators of all states and all governors

We served them We let them know what the problems were

We did this paper after paper after paper after paper

I believe there were twenty papers

That we have written individual to all these individual groups of people

and served it upon them

And then we moved it into this court

The court case that we opened up that really isn’t a case It’s a depository

A place where we can file all our paperwork

We filed all those paperworks there

(35:45)

We temporarily lost John on the call

(40:00) John rejoined the call

These people have done everything they can to subvert us and we’ve laid it out in these cases

It’s an extremely important case and it covers so many things

and if it moves to where we think it’s going to move everything will be consolidated and then we will do what we need to do We have a tremendous amount of evidence

Cases denial of unalienable rights denial of habeas corpus

The right to be confronted by your accuser and the evidence be shown affidavits be made against you or let me go

That’s the power and authority of the habeas corpus

They have denied that They have rejected them

They deny us our right of due process every time you walk into their courts

because the courts are no longer courts of record

Article III courts have been shut down and they’re operating administrative courts there

And every time you try to push your jurisdiction they push back

They get very angry and upset because you’re exposing their fraud

We’re exposing their crime

This case is extremely important

If you haven’t read it you need to read it You need to read all of our cases It’s an education You’ll find a lot of repetitiveness because it’s the same thing over and over again.

It’s always about violating our right of due process

If you don’t understand what they have done how can you come up against these people?

(43:00)

If you don’t understand what common law is if you don’t understand the basics if you don’t understand the basic process how can you defend yourself?

Read these cases extremely important

John read Rule 12 interpreted by the Supreme Court

It’s on line 15 of our case which is Plaintiff’s answer to the motion

You can find it at NationalLibertyAlliance.org Highlight “Grand Jury” go to “Amendment 2”

and it’s the one on the top “Planitiff’s Answer to the Motion”

Line 15

THE GENERAL RULE The general rule is that a complaint should not be dismissed unless it “appears beyond doubt” that the plaintiff can prove “no set of facts” in support of his claim. Even if the defendant has not demanded such relief in his pleadings, every final judgment shall grant the relief to which the party in whose favor it is rendered is entitled. A complaint should not be dismissed unless it is beyond doubt that no set of facts supports the claim. That is not the case in this case as plaintiffs deny defendants motion to dismiss.”

“RULE 12 CHALLENGE STATEMENT OF A CLAIM AND RELIEF SOUGHT: The claim that the plaintiffs raise in the said Action at Law is a multitude of infringements upon our unalienable right “to keep and bear Arms” evidently secured by the 2nd Amendment upon which relief is simply “defendants’ obedience to the Supreme Law of the Land”. The plaintiffs’ Action at Law distinctly stated, with many supporting facts, a wrong and an injury, a tort! Plaintiffs also clearly and methodically stated, and addressed with sworn facts, the three elements necessary to prove a valid and comprehensive cause of action, which are: 1) Existence of legal duty from defendant to plaintiff, supported by evidentiary facts 2) Breach of duty, supported by evidentiary facts 3) Damage as proximate result, supported by evidentiary facts SHORT SYNOPSIS: The defendants were, and are, bound by oath to obey and support the Constitution thereby having a legal duty to the plaintiffs and all the People of New York State. Instead, the Governor and legislators of both houses violated four U.S. statutes, (1) 18 USC 241, (2) 18 USC 242, (3) 42 USC §1985, and (4) 42 USC §1986. The defendants did this by infringing upon the unalienable right of the plaintiffs to bear arms which is secured by the Bill of Rights. The plaintiffs in support of this Action at Law quoted sixty-eight (68) U.S. Supreme Court quotes, six (6) U.S. Constitution references, two (2) N.Y.S. Constitution references and one (1) reference to the Declaration of Independence all in support of the plaintiffs’ position. The plaintiffs also quoted eleven (11) unconstitutional acts committed by the defendants along with five (5) constitutional statutory violations. Plaintiffs wrote and submitted seven (7) supporting Memorandums of Law in Support of the 2nd Amendment, Authority, Article III Courts, Standing, Founding Documents and the Common Law. The plaintiff also supported this Action with thirty-seven (37+) affidavits. No one in good conscience can find that there is “NO SET OF FACTS” supporting this action. A common law trial will search out and discover the truth of the matter and make right the wrong.”

(50:10)

The only way that they can legitimately throw out the case is that if it appears that there is no facts that are being supported

A compliant should not be dismissed unless it is beyond doubt that no set of facts support the claim.

That is not the case with our case

This is such an important case

This is our pivoting case

This is the case that shows directly the attitude that these judges and magistrates have and the attorney general

They think that they can just trod upon the law and not be held accountable

To think that the can just make the law up That’s what they’ve done

They just made it up it’s all fiction and yet the people don’t know it

The people still go to these courts and think that they’re going to get justice

They’re not going to get justice

We have to force them to give us justice We have to force them out

Line 50

“BEYOND THE RULE 12 CHALLENGE The aforesaid Rule 12(b)(6) challenge is the “ONLY” pre-answer challenge by the defendants that warrants a response. Everything else is mere rhetoric in an attempt to change the narrative without answering and confuse the court. Nevertheless plaintiffs will take liberty to address the assaultive, dangerous and slanderous fabrications recorded in this court of record by the irresponsible Asst. Attorney General Michael G. McCartin, hereinafter Asst. A.G. McCartin because it is malicious and must stand corrected. SOVEREIGN CITIZEN: Asst. A.G. McCartin in his ten (10) page motion to dismiss used the phrase “sovereign citizen” fourteen (14) times. Once on page 2, twice on page 3, once on page 5, once on page 7, five times on page 5, and four times on page 9, whereas the plaintiffs have not used said phrase anywhere in their papers or anywhere else. Plaintiff John Vidurek who is a Law abiding individual, an advocate of constitutional government, and a Vietnam Veteran thereby a patriot of our Republican form of government and its laws, has been visited by federal agents three times, over the years, after filing (three separate) cases in the courts. The first question these federal agents asked was, “Are you a sovereign citizen?” My answer was always no, and I always complied with them completely just as any other “Law abiding” person would and they always left seemingly satisfied, stating that their inquiry concerning me warranted no further investigation…”

Line 120

“FRIVOLOUS: Asst. A.G. McCartin claims the plaintiffs’ evidently written allegations are frivolous and must be dismissed by the Court. Federal Rule 12 does not provide for frivolous complaints to be dismissed. That can only be discovered after the challenge of an Action has been satisfied. It is Asst. A.G. McCartin’s diatribe that is frivolous, it is his rants that do not controvert any material points and is interposed for the mere purposes of delaying in hope of a “status quo” ruling so that the defendants can fraudulently remain silent and again avoid their duty to speak…”

Line 130

“LEGAL SUFFICIENCY: The defendants’ claim that plaintiffs’ Action at Law lacks legal sufficiency and plausibility, which is an opinion that can only be discovered via examination after the defendants answer and the facts and positions of both parties can be examined by the tribunal in a Court of Law. Nevertheless, a plausible claim is defined as reasonable, valid, and truthful. What is more reasonable and valid then the “Supreme Law of the Land” and obedience to that Law ? Government will be imperiled if it fails to observe the law scrupulously. If the Government becomes a lawbreaker, it breeds contempt for law; it invites every man to become a law unto him-self. What could be more significant to a Court of Justice then obedience to that Law by our hired servants?...”

Line 175

“COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL: Asst. A.G. McCartin claims the plaintiffs litigated and lost a similar case in New York State Supreme Court in 2013 and therefore must be dismissed based upon the doctrine of collateral estoppel. This is erroneous on many levels. First, all the cases the defendant used to defend the doctrine of collateral estoppel shared one common chord that supports the plaintiffs position in that it requires “a full and fair opportunity to litigate a valid and final judgment on the merits the issue sought to be precluded from re-litigation must have been necessarily determined in the prior proceeding” and, since such a determination were not met there is no estoppel…”

The paper concludes with the following

“Wherefore, plaintiffs deny categorically defendants’ motion to dismiss for lack of any grounds under Rule 12.”

(1:18:07)

It will be interesting to see where these people go with this

It doesn’t matter which way they go

It doesn’t matter whether they throw it out or keep it in

NLA needs money

We need to sue the judiciary

We need money to do that

Maybe $5,000 - $10,000 above what we normally collect

We don’t pay any high paid lawyers

We don’t have any lawyers writing our papers

This is We the People

Gerard made a comment

Some people feel that we are not doing our jobs

Our indictments go nowhere because nobody has been arrested

They make all kinds of claims of how bad we are

They think we should get a sheriff and go arresting

Obviously they don’t see the bigger picture

They don’t understand where we are going or how

Everybody’s impatient

It’s not something that can be fixed by applying pressure into one area to fix your problem

The types of remedy that they say that we should do go look at Bruce Doucette he’s sitting in jail because he did that that’s one of the reasons he’s in jail because he was impatient and he was going to elect his own judges and his own sheriffs

The same thing with Joaquin (Wah keen)

We’ve been down this road for ten years We’ve dodged some bullets

We had no special knowledge Our knowledge is the school of hard knocks

Our hope was that we would put good clean paperwork in and we might get in front of a judge that would uphold the law

It took us awhile to realize that they don’t let anybody into these positions unless they have something on them

Donald Trump has revealed what they have on them

There’s a lot of stuff that goes on behind the scenes that we can’t talk about

As far as John using a fake name on his papers his handle he used online for over thirty years

Look at the Gun Case what does it say? John Vidurek, et al

This nation is being punished for it’s sin

We’re out here doing the best we can We’re learning

The knowledge we have is the knowledge that we’re trying to give you

common law

NLA the whole site is full of those things that have given us the knowledge that we have

If you go through the site and you read everything that’s there and you take the courses then you will know everything that we know.

There is a couple people that have been writing things and I understand that they are upset

Gerard intends to do a written answer to that

It’s a charge that needs to be answered

Our name is starting to get out

If you deride us and say that our paperwork is useless I know that you don’t believe that because why are you still here

If you got that knowledge yourself then do it yourself

Don’t sit there and try to tear us down when you don’t really understand the plan

The plan is a long term plan

There is no simple fixes here

If we get our Article III courts activated reinstated all that other stuff we’ll be able to do

We won’t have to go hunting for sheriffs to arrest them

Our indictments will stand

If you don’t like what you see then you need to leave

We do the best we can with what we have

You need to study the site

You came in here with a problem and you expected us to solve it

How much have you actually helped us to solve it?

How much have you actually supported us

I know you paid your money to get your paper in

With the money you paid you could not get another legal person to write one tenth of what we write with that money

That money just basically covers paper and stamps

You’re not paying for our knowledge You’re not paying for the hours

If you get a lawyer to go into federal court you got to give him a $30,000 retainer to even think about it

We’re at a stage where we’re starting to get popular People are starting to come in

The Evil Force out there they run things with fear and all these things that make people fight and fall apart

NLA has been through some serious shakeups in the past and we’ve survived them all

If you don’t understand and you don’t like it then you don’t need to write nasty things

I don’t know how good you’re going to do on your own

We’re a force of people and there is a plan

And that plan is being operated right now

This paperwork that John is reading look at how long it took him to read it do you think it took longer to write it?

We have to have strategy This doesn’t just happen

This is countless hours of people’s personal time

You may be writing out of frustration because you have loved ones that are being hurt

The best thing that we can do for that is prayer

It’s going to happen all at once

We are closer now than we’ve ever been

Let’s have some positive energy not negative

(2:03:03)

And if we put all people in jail right now that’s in government that is breaking the law we’d have ghost towns in Washington ghost towns in Albany and our jails would be full We’d have to build more prisons There’s not enough room for them

We have the power to consent What we just laid out right now is total 100 percent control and consent of government Consent coming in Consent going out Consent on decision making If we had a proper process then the debacle out there in Oregon wouldn’t have happened or Nevada with the Bundys None of that would have happened with the Hammonds and the Bundys and the others LaVoy Finicum would still be alive

We don’t have that

The reason why we don’t have that is ignorance

Ignorance of the law

It has been ingrained in you It has been taught to you It’s been taught in your schools Taught through Hollywood You’ve been taught by hearing people talk that are lawyers

You’re taught that you have to get a BAR attorney

BAR attorneys have made statutes law above our Constitution

Now we got to fight to get it back

And we’ll get it back if the people stand up and take it back

This is supposed to be a just nation

We can fix this problem but the people have to become educated

The people have to read and learn

Take our courses Read our papers

We need to take control of our political process

We need to take control of our judicial process

We need to take control of our courts

(2:08:34)

QUESTIONS

Question 1: Could Alex Jones get a fair hearing in the Judicial system or are the Powers That Be just going to drain his funding source?

Alex Jones is a target there’s no doubt about it

The status quo is going to be against him

Here is a question for all 94 federal district courts:

In the past five years how many cases were brought against the government by pro se litigants?

And of those cases that were brought against the government by pro se litigants how many of them were thrown out under Rule 12 ?

Possibly 100 percent

Maybe there’s a couple that make it through

Their case is still going to be lost they’re not going to win

How many of the cases that did get through how many of them won?

You might find pretty much zero

How many cases got through dealing with Rule 12 that was against the government but came in through BAR attorneys ? Probably 100 percent

They all get in

How many are won? Probably zero

You take all of our cases all of the cases that we have filed over the last year and a half or so

and have put into our depository in our court case the depository that we have in Albany , New York You take all the cases for that the Non Judicial Foreclosures, the Habeas Corpuses that were refused and rejected denial of due process and a bunch of other things that we put together plus the twenty or thirty papers that we filed to all of the people in office We were sending papers to sheriffs on a weekly basis We were sending them information for quite some time Unfortunately we couldn’t continue that because we couldn’t afford it It was a good beginning but we got a new plan that works better

It involves the people on the local level They got to get involved and approach their sheriff

and get them connected to a real education understanding what the law really is and what their job really is

Anybody going into a court like Alex Jones status quo is going to be held He’s going to lose They’re going to favor the other side

He could win but it’s not likely

But if he came into a court of law and he went before the People the People will see through it and they will judge rightly

If he’s wrong they will say so If he’s right they will say so

12 people trying to understand they’ll work it out and they’ll figure it out

and they’ll put forth justice but you got to keep them untainted

That’s a problem the judge will get to them or the prosecutor will get to them

We the People got to be the administrators and the protectors of the jury

(2:13:37)

ANNOUNCEMENT

We have guest lecturers for the Natural Healing call-in on Thursdays at 8:00 EST

through the middle of July So we’d like to get a few more people lined up for another month or two Anybody who is into a natural healing technique that would like to give a presentation followed by question just call Jan 814-531-5363 or e-mail Jan at Jan@NationalLibertyAlliance.org

Question 2: Regarding the New York Lawsuit would it have been effective to have also used the Second Militia Clause which lays out that no state but rather Congress alone has the duty jurisdiction power to provide for the army of the militia

In other words the fifty states have no lawful say in the matter

If not could you elaborate as to why not.

Basically they have taken that over Whoever calls the militia firsts seems to have control

One of the problems what they call the militia now is the National Guard John does not have a problem with them calling it the National Guard but it should be called the militia

There was a lot of rejection and denial by the upper rankers in the states when they took the National Guard to send them over to fight in Iran and Iraq That’s not their purpose That’s not why they joined They’re here to defend the people defend the nation

That’s their purpose They are the militia We have armies for that

We shouldn’t have a standing army

But we have a standing army because we always have a war going on

In this day and age maybe we should have a standing army

Our Founding Fathers did not like a standing army because they saw that as a threat

A standing Navy all of the time sure

Marines put them on board a ship there you go

But to send our National Guard which is supposed to be our militia is wrong

To not be able to walk out of the gun store without a weapon that you want to buy right now would be an infringement

Let them run a computer check We are so sophisticated in our computer systems you can find out right away you can find out right away who shouldn’t have a weapon and if you find that your name is in it then you have the opportunity to challenge that

And if you’re in the system wrongly you have the right to sue them for violating your unalienable right of bearing arms

Any court of record where the jury is free not stacked not tainted they will come up with the proper solution

(2:20:40)

Question 3 for Brent You often say that only law is the proper response to lawlessness which I agree When you say that you are not talking about ignoring unconstitutional laws are you? As long as you are prepared to defend yourself in a common law court. The reason that I ask most of what I’ve heard and read so far is that they often ignore our suits and demands if we have not violated any of their unlawful statutes on the other hand when I hear and read guys like Carl Miller he reads opinions that say we are to ignore the unlawful acts of government He seems to have quite a bit of success when he goes into court and defends himself What are your thoughts?

When I hear people talk about this fellow or that fellow has been successful in the federal courts

I wonder what that means. Lawyers aren’t successful in the federal courts

Lawyers get tazed by federal marshals in federal courts right in front of the judge

It goes much beyond that There was a lawyer that was holding himself out as the smartest lawyer that ever lived He’d never been to law school Never taken a BAR exam

And that’s OK But he was holding himself out like that and stealing property

Brent couldn’t convince people that he was dragging into his scheme that he was not the smartest lawyer that ever lived They had paid him tens upon tens upon tens upon tens of thousands of dollars to do what he was doing Stealing property

He gets paid to steal people’s property

And the feds like him Here’s the reason that they like him Because they got him on a leash Because when he does what he does he draws people out that they want to get And if he gets them into a position where they can say that they crossed the line that allows them to prosecute them Then that’s what they do

And that’s what happened in Colorado with the situation out there

That’s just another example

The big danger of all lawyers so called in America are lawyers that work for the government Lawyers that work for the government Professional prosecutors

It’s unavoidable that judges are going to be paid from the government

But it is avoidable that we fill our benches with government employees

And that’s what we’re doing

Chief Justice Roberts pointed out in his annual report this is Justice Roberts of the United States Supreme Court He said during the Eisenhower administration most lawyer setting on the federal bench during the Eisenhower administration were from the private practicing BAR and now he said this was in 2006 in his annual report he said it has flipped now by far and away most judges setting on the federal bench are from government employment and very few of them are from the private practicing BAR

Government lawyers are bound to defend the law of the land all lawyers are bound by that that’s their oath but they turn around and do just the opposite

They don’t defend the law They defend the government

It’s their job to be slaves to the law not slaves to the government

Every American is a lawyer

He can’t live without paying attention to the laws of nature and the laws of nature’s God

(2:34:35)

We have three people who have not given in their affidavits that are on the case

We need that.

We have five people who have given us their affidavits but have never signed into the case

If they want in then they have to give us the paperwork

(2:35:50)

CALLERS

Caller 1: Jim

No response

Caller 2: Jeff New York state of confusion

Did you decide not to address Cuomo’s empowerment of the state police

Caller can’t find that in the complaint

John did not address that directly

We did not address that at this point

First we did the original complaint We don’t want to call it a complaint We want to call it an action

It’s not a complaint We’re not complaining to anyone We’re taking action against these tyrants

Then we were dealing with them trying to through us out of court

We’re staying focused

Once we get into the process first of all the state police have no authority and no right to deal with anything If the state police answer to a political animal like they do

We did address it in the complaint

The head of the state police is appointed by the governor

The governor is a political animal

The governor controls the action of that individual the superintendent

And if the governor tells the superintendent I want you to take the guns away from the people

he’s already said in a conference two years ago they had a news conference and he was asked that very question and he said well if the governor gives me the command to go take guns then we’ll go out and take guns. He’s not constitutionally controlled

And we know that if he doesn’t take the guns he’ll be fired and they’ll get someone who will take the guns That’s the problem with the state police

When caller read pages 15-17 of the complaint which talks about sovereign people

it really didn’t look like what you intended that it was quotations from the founders.

That’s what this lawyer is trying to focus on

On pages 15-17 you have a lot of quotes about sovereign people

Caller thinks that they have studied what NLA has presented to them but they’re really trying hard to discredit us

Their focus is to make us look like we’re saying something that we aren’t

(2:48:20)

Caller 3 Crystal

They tried to put her out of her house

They tried to move forward with it

She is still in her house

She filed the paperwork with the appellate

Retired judges are back in the courtroom

They’re taking everybody’s house

The attorneys and marshals are putting people out of their homes and into apartments

There are no records in the courthouse

We’ve been packing the court

Crystal has been giving everybody NLA information

People are paying very close attention

One of the questions that people ask Crystal to ask NLA

Is there an NLA process or creation on the tablet for documents to remove cases to the federal courts?

move to federal for cause

We have cases where John has done that and you can use those it says for cause you can mirror that When you go into federal court your argument is a due process argument You’re not going to argue the case The fact that you are not given due process You go into federal court and you say, “Hey look, Your Honor, if they want to take me to court and give me due process and they think that they can win I’m good with that. I’m ready for the battle Let’s go. But they’re just taking my property away Without my due process” You’ll win on that

The court was packed

The judge said to Crystal “I don’t care “ She said “I have my warrantee deed, I have my quick claim deed, I have license for 100 years “ He goes, “Tough, we’re changing it”

He goes “You’re out of your house We’re taking it and nothing is going to stop us”

 John requested that next week Crystal give an overview of her story, step by step.

Crystal is still in her house

The judge said that she was going to be out when she went to court on the 21st of May and the courtroom was packed He said that her house was going to be auctioned off at 12 o’clock on May 26th Crystal got a call from a friend that they postponed Crystal’s foreclosure

In Connecticut they are bringing back all the old retired judges to protect the other ones.

Crystal has asked the judge to recuse himself for the past several years. He’s committed treason. He said “We don’t have grand juries You’re not entitled The only grand jury we have is if it’s a criminal case”

Crystal said, “Under my constitutional rights I have a right to have a common law grand jury”

You have the right for the grand jury who are the sureties of the peace to protect your right to come out and battle for you And that’s what we have done

We are going to bring him up to the full grand jury very soon we’re going to bring his name up for indictment if he doesn’t back off

Along with all these other judges that have violated the people’s unalienable rights

and have allowed these houses many, many houses to be taken away with Non Judicial Foreclosures And these judges and prosecutors who have worked together to deny people’s unalienable right of due process

Denial of due process we got quite a few people

Crystal said “How on earth are you going to take my property when I have my warrantee deed, quick claim deed , and everything else ?” He said, “Don’t worry about it we’ll have your name removed.”

He doesn’t have the power to make those changes

Connecticut is the new Hollywood and all the homes are going to be going for over a million dollars.

It’s a big ponzi scheme

Attorneys are coming out of the woodwork

Everybody is watching what’s going on with Crystal

We will pick this up again on Monday