

VERIFIED AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS BY SPECIFIC NEGATIVE AVERMENT

NOTICE TO AGENT IS NOTICE TO PRINCIPAL
NOTICE TO PRINCIPAL IS NOTICE TO AGENT

Dear NAME OF THE COP and or his replacement police officer.

I, the flesh and blood man/woman known as **your name here,** hereinafter "CLAIMANT," do hereby affirm and declare that I am of legal age, have first-hand knowledge of the facts contained herein, am educated, to **Masters Degree level in Social Work Law.** Therefore, I certainly feel more than competent enough to make this statement of the facts in relation to the account referenced on Page 1 of 4 of this Affidavit.

Therefore, let it be known by those responsible for the corporate Trust entity known as **MERSEYSIDE POLICE FORCE** (severally, jointly, collectively "RESPONDENT" or "RESPONDENTS and any relevant parent or subsidiary company, including its Assigns, directors, shareholders, agents and affiliates, that I do hereby state that the following is, to the very best of my knowledge, true, correct and complete, presented in good faith, and not intended to mislead in any way.

1. CLAIMANT has seen no evidence from the RESPONDENTS that the use of the traffic citation constitutes a contract.
2. CLAIMANT has seen no evidence from the RESPONDENTS that the bank account signature is a contract or benefit privilege
3. CLAIMANT has seen no evidence from the RESPONDENTS that the Social Security Number normally assigned to persons of subject status constitutes a contract and accepts complicity that it has only been used due to the pressure of today's market place, whereby it is required by everyone and everyone as they have been mandated to request in law and that the CLAIMANT has no interest in it except to be the grantor and holder in due course. CLAIMANT has not seen or been presented any evidence that YOUR NAME HERE is not a fiction in evidence.
4. CLAIMANT has seen no evidence from the RESPONDENTS, that there is a requirement to have a driver's license for free travel on the land by way of mechanical propelled machine. The RESPONDENT therefore concedes that the technical purpose of the driver's license is commercial in nature and agrees that the CLAIMANT does not carry passengers for

hire and that the carrying of the driver's license is to use for identification purposes only and for no other reason expressly applied in hidden adhesion contracts now and forever more. Furthermore, CLAIMANT has not seen or been presented any evidence that the Respondent has been injured ergo CLAIMANT has not seen or been presented any evidence that Respondent and CLAIMANT have an enforceable contract.

5. CLAIMANT has seen no evidence from the RESPONDENT, that there is a requirement that number plates constitute a contract and benefit privilege and accepts that where there is to have ever been one that this was rescinded and void ab initio by the CLAIMANT.

6. CLAIMANT has seen no evidence from the RESPONDENT, that the birth certificate is relevant to Sovereign Status and that this piece of paper through non-formal disclosure without the recipients full knowledge and consent that it constitutes property, ownership and subject status means that the contract is void ab initio and the RESPONDENT in failing to rebut this point accepts this. Furthermore there is now tacit evidence on file of the living breathing sovereign through the scientific DNA of the LEGALLY LIVING BREATHING

7. CLAIMANT which now leaves the CLAIMANT open to be able to claim all heirs and titles under the CESTUI QUE TRUST ACT 1666 and the CESTUI QUE VIE OF 1666 in that 'he may defend his title in the name of the trustee'. *1 Cruise, Bouv. Philippi v. Phillippe*, 115 U.S. 151 (1885). CLAIMANT has seen no evidence from the RESPONDENT that any document she has ever signed nor any document which may denote her as a CITIZEN that can be used to compromise her Sovereign Status as no full written disclosure was provided freely without coercion, misrepresentation and binding in contract. Ergo the RESPONDENT has not challenged the statement that the Passport did not provide full written disclosure about what applying for a passport meant and thus the RESPONDENTS agrees that it is NOT legally binding at all and does not represent the CLAIMANT as a lawful entity. Furthermore the RESPONDENT has not challenged the subject status of the CLAIMANT in that she is not an inhabitant, resident, franchise, subject or ward of, property, chattel of any corporate or corporeal UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT, Country, State, Sovereign Nation, municipal body, corporate City government, county government under any Authority. Furthermore CLAIMANT has seen no evidence that a legislation department or agency created by such authorities, nor the jurisdiction of any employees, officers or agents derive any authority from them

and that the CLAIMANT IS NOT a subject of any of them as all hidden contracts openly signed, agreed to by digital media, verbally or otherwise are now void ab initio.

8. CLAIMANT has seen no evidence from the RESPONDENTS that there is a duty to perform as a Voter or register as a voter and that in so doing the CLAIMANT has voluntarily handed over sovereignty to the State or any other Body Politic.

9. CLAIMANT has no evidence from the RESPONDENTS that there is any obligation on her part to become a subject through the Zip Code and accepts her assertion that **she is a free woman on the land**. The RESPONDENTS in failing to rebut this point with the evidence that is unimpeachable thus accepts the CLAIMANT'S assertion that the Zip Code is merely used for identification only and that no expressly or implied adhesion contract is tied to her free status and that all benefits applied are waived save any common law rights under the United States Constitution, the state of (your State) and The Bill of rights. CLAIMANT has seen no evidence that any use of semantics by those who wish to dominate or masquerade as Government by altering the definitions of words, acts or phrases, to suppose an advantage over the sovereign spirit soul and that the words, person, driver, mail, resident, motor vehicle, drivers, passenger, employee, income, business owner and many others imply in any way shape or form can affect whatsoever her freeman on the land status and sovereignty. The RESPONDENT thus accepts the assertion that no Statute applies and that **she** does not reside or work in any territory, regulations, or implied authority.

10. Furthermore, the CLAIMANT has not seen or been presented any evidence that CLAIMANT is bound by the statutes and laws of THE UNITED STATES. CLAIMANT has not seen or been presented any evidence that Respondent has conformed to the statutes and laws that bind Respondent.

11. CLAIMANT has seen no evidence that any powers, contracts, obligations or controls by any united states officials preclude them from evidencing their oaths of office and their bonds of insurance for public liability and in particular in the Constitution of United States

12. CLAIMANT has seen no evidence that any powers, statutes, ordinances, regulations, rules, and procedures contrary to several Acts of the U.S. Government or the government of (**your state**) are not null and void.

13. CLAIMANT has seen no evidence that the Respondent had any lawful right to seize her property and chattels. They have ignored repeated requests and appeals for the property to be lawfully returned.

14. CLAIMANT has seen no evidence from the RESPONDENT about the true law of the land being supreme and they seem to be under the strict impression that law passed by government legislators bearing the appearance of law constitutes the law of the land. They have failed to provide any evidence that it is not thoroughly unconstitutional. Furthermore the kidnapping and unlawful tort of trespass to retrieve bodily fluid for no apparent LAWFUL misdemeanor is not accepted from their third party intervenors, the findings of which have been returned Refused for Cause due to the onus being on the RESPONDENT who is the man and holder of responsible office to respond.

15. CLAIMANT has seen evidence as requested as to the events of the Custody Event of (date here). As it has come from a third party intervenor it has been sent back Refused for Cause and a Notice Sent stipulating no contract implied. CLAIMANT has not seen or been presented any evidence of the nature of the charge or charges. CLAIMANT has not seen or been presented any evidence that due process has been served upon CLAIMANT. CLAIMANT has not seen or been presented any evidence that a man or woman doing business as a judge for the court is an impartial party to the proceedings.

16. CLAIMANT has changed the Fee schedule from \$5,000.00 as per the original Driver and Vehicle Licensing Agency Claim of Right to \$3000.00 per hour for each hour of unlawful detainment. The charge of \$1 million dollars due to be paid for arrest, handcuff, transportation in chains, tort of trespass and false imprisonment has been offered to be waived only as an out of court settlement.

17. CLAIMANT has seen no evidence that her Revocation of Power of Attorney does not stand as Truth from the RESPONDENT as it pertains to anything that requires certification, license or registration and that fictional rules apply to fictions. RESPONDENT therefore accepts the Secured Party Status of Mary:nmn ARR to all claims placed upon the Fictional Appellant: Miss GIRL GYE

Let the RECORDS SHOW TO THE RESPONDENT that accept that the CLAIMANTS ATTESTATION that she is not the enemy of the State of (your state), at war with the united states, neither is she engaging in insurrection against that of the united states.

Autograph
Sovereign Sui Juris, Freeman on the Land
VERIFICATION

Affirmed, autographed and sealed (with a red thumbprint) before me,
_____, Notary Public, on the 18 day of the month of January in
the year two thousand and ten AD.

Notary Public: Seal:

_____/

¹⁰⁰NEGATIVE AVERMENT, pleading, evidence. An averment in some of the pleadings in a case in which a negative is asserted. 2. It is a general rule, established for the purpose of shortening and facilitating investigations, that the point in issue is to be proved by the party who asserts the affirmative; 1 Phil. Ev. 184; Bull N. P. 298; but as this rule is not founded on any presumption of law in favor of the party, but is merely a rule of practice and convenience, it, ceases in all cases when the presumption of law is thrown into the opposite scale. Gilb. Ev. 145. For example, when the issue is on the legitimacy of a child born in lawful wedlock, it is, incumbent on the party asserting its illegitimacy to prove it. 2 Selw. N. P. 709. 3. Upon the same principle, when, the negative averment involves a charge of criminal neglect of duty, whether official or otherwise, it must be proved, for the law presumes every man to perform the duties which it imposes. (case cites and law book references)

¹⁰¹NEGATIVE AVERMENT: the term used to describe a positive statement that is made in a negative way.

¹⁰²NIHIL DICIT: A judgment NIHIL DICIT can be granted by a court when a defendant does not file a general denial or adequately contest the Plaintiff's lawsuit in the Defendant's answer to the suit. NIHIL DICIT is a Latin term that means "he said nothing." Essentially, the court can make a determination that the Defendant is not denying the Plaintiff's allegations or raising any defenses.

===== /