

Go slow and question everything, ask for facts and don't accept any opinions, these include the words law, statute, state, city, jurisdiction, license, constitution. Each one is an opinion and does NOT reflect reality or verifiable experience, ALWAYS ask them to tell you what it is FACTUALLY, don't let them off the hook because you think you understand or you think it is obvious. If it's obvious, then it can be demonstrated easily. I don't take a position unless it is using one they have already spewed forth.

My opinions can be rejected, so I only use theirs, which of course will always contradict if I ask the rights questions i.e., do I have basic human rights, and does your control [jurisdiction] over my life depend on my freely given consent?

All non-lawyers are legally incapable of defending themselves REGARDLESS of education level:

"Even the intelligent and educated layman has small and sometimes no skill in the science of law. If charged with crime, HE IS INCAPABLE, generally, of determining for himself whether the indictment is good or bad. He is unfamiliar with the rules of evidence. Left without the aid of counsel he may be put on hearing without a proper charge, and convicted upon incompetent evidence, or evidence irrelevant to the issue or otherwise inadmissible. He lacks both the skill and knowledge adequately to prepare his defense, even though he may have a perfect one. He requires the guiding hand of counsel at every step in the proceedings against him. Without it, though he be not guilty, he faces the danger of conviction because he does not know how to establish his innocence." Gideon v. Wainwright, 372 U.S. 335, 344-345 (1963) (emphasis mine).

When I stick to this, attorneys insist I'm more than capable of defending myself. It's hilarious. I always ask whose opinion is relevant, the state lawyer, the judge or the Supreme Court's.

I remind them to be RESPONSIVE to the question I am asking. It's important not to improvise the questions, they are worded a certain way to purposely box them into a corner. ANYTHING that is NON-RESPONSIVE, including answers beyond yes or no, I object and say:

"OBJECTION, NON-RESPONSIVE, MOVE TO STRIKE"

They will do and say whatever they have to in order to keep me off-point, including intimidation and disparaging me, I ignore it and keep them on point and request they be responsive. I don't argue, if they don't throw it out when it is clear I make a note of it and move on. I always remember not to go in to prove I'm right or to teach them something.

I challenge the appearance of the attorney claiming to represent the so-called "state." I use the questions in regards to the complaining party; I want the attorney to bring forth evidence of a complaining party. Without this evidence there is no case. He is to prove he represents someone other than himself who has standing to complain, i.e., I violated a legal right that resulted in damage.

I write the answers down. I always repeat throughout 'I am not a lawyer and I don't understand'. And I always OBJECT to anything I think is not fair or proper and if I don't understand it.

Objections based on RELEVANCE are big with "state" lawyers. I expect tons of them and gear my questions to getting them or the judge to admit the RELEVANCE for me ahead of time.

Questions are geared to getting the judge to sustain an objection the witness is not able or competent to testify. When this happens [or any time the judge says the witness cannot or is incompetent to testify], I ask for all the testimony to be stricken. These questions can be used at the first appearance or when questioning a witness on cross-examination. I ask the cop the questions because I am supposed to be entitled to confront my accuser and demand the nature and cause of the charges and proceedings against me.

If my questions are not answered then I am not being informed of the nature and cause of the charges and proceedings and cannot defend myself, notwithstanding I am legally incapable of defending myself. I am not getting a fair and meaningful hearing.

Having them be non-responsive is part of the objective.

The judge will call the case and ask how I plead, guilty or not guilty.

Sir I'm not a lawyer and I just don't understand these proceedings, I intend on pleading guilty [I hand him the unsigned plea of guilty] and paying the fine, but I do have some questions before I can do that. [I repeat often

that I'm not a lawyer and don't understand]

Am I entitled to a fair hearing? Yes or no. [Proves RELEVANCE of following questions]

Am I entitled to a meaningful hearing? Yes or no.

What are the consequences, if any, if you don't give me a fair and meaningful hearing?

Am I entitled to be informed of the nature and cause of the charges and proceedings against me? Yes or no.

I've been charged with a crime correct? Yes or no.

And with all crimes there must be a corpus delicti correct? Yes or no.

If no: I believe the Supreme Court ruled in: "In every prosecution for crime it is necessary to establish the "corpus delicti", i.e., the body or elements of the crime." People v. Lopez, 62 Ca.Rptr. 47, 254 C.A.2d 185.

Is this court bound by Supreme Court rulings? Yes or no.

If no: This court is not under the Supreme Court? Yes or no.

Is this court specifically exempt from basic principles of criminal law held by every Supreme Court in the Commonwealth of Australia? Yes or no.

Could you please provide the legal authority you rely on that this court is exempt from such basic principals? Yes or no.

I can receive a fair trial without proof of a corpus delicti? Yes or no.

Do you agree with the supreme court that the "Elements of "corpus delicti," injury or loss or harm and a criminal agency which causes such injury, loss or harm, need only be proven by a "reasonable probability," i.e., by slight or prima facie proof..." People v. Ramirez, 153 Ca.Rptr. 789, 791, 91 C.A. 132. Yes or no.

May the court proceed against me, without proof of a corpus delicti, meaning injury and criminal agency? Yes or no.

Are there any allegations of injury? Yes or no.

So there is no corpus delicti, which is required to proceed against me? Yes or no.

The court may not proceed against me correct? Yes or no.

Would your orders and judgments be valid if I don't get a fair hearing? Yes or no.

Would you seek to enforce your orders and judgments if I don't get a fair hearing? Yes or no.

Would you seek to enforce your orders if there was no evidence of jurisdiction over me? Yes or no.

What rules, if any, govern the proceedings here?

Do you have to comply with all the rules? Yes or no.

Are there rules you can ignore? Yes or no.

If yes: Which ones, why?

Do the constitutions, Commonwealth and Victorian, govern these proceedings? Yes or no.

Do you have to comply with the constitutions, or are there clauses you can ignore? Yes or no.

If yes, then which ones? Why?

Do you [the judge] have discretion to accept testimony from a witness you declare incompetent to testify?

Is this ticket consistent with the constitutions? Yes or no.

Is everything on this ticket true and correct? Yes or no.

Would a meaningful and fair hearing require responsive answers to questions I ask? Yes or no.

If I ask questions because I do not understand what is going on, can I expect a responsive answer? Yes or no.

Am I entitled to responsive answers to my questions? Yes or no.

Would a hearing be fair and meaningful if I did not get responsive answers to my questions? Yes or no.

Can I get a fair and meaningful hearing if there is a conflict of interest? Yes or no

Are the prosecutor's arguments and legal opinions admissible as evidence against me? Yes or no.

Do they have to be supported by facts provided by a witness I am permitted to cross-examine? Yes or no.

Who has the burden of proof in the proceedings? [From this point I expect the one with the burden of proof to answer my questions]

Are you, the judge and state lawyer [if there is one], permitted to testify in the proceedings? Yes or no.

For the criminal case is that burden of proof beyond a reasonable doubt or preponderance of evidence?

For the civil case is that burden of proof beyond a reasonable doubt or preponderance of evidence?

When you say evidence, does that mean facts or opinions?

Does the burden of proof apply to each element of the crime? Yes or no.

Do I have a right to confront witnesses against me? Yes or no.

If no, how can I get a fair and meaningful hearing if I can't confront the witnesses you rely on?

Do I have a right to challenge any and all evidence being used against me? Yes or no.

If no, how can I get a fair and meaningful hearing if I can't challenge evidence you rely on?

Could this court proceed against me if the alleged plaintiff lacked standing to complain against me? Yes or no.

Would I have to enter a plea if there was no cause of action presented? Yes or no.

Would I have to enter a plea if there was no crime presented? Yes or no.

Would I have to enter a plea if the alleged plaintiff lacks standing to complain against me? Yes or no.

Would I have to enter a plea if there is no jurisdiction over me? Yes or no.

Would there be a crime if there was no jurisdiction? Yes or no.

Is jurisdiction an element of this alleged crime? Yes or no. [Presumed innocent question will contradict his answer here if yes]

If no: So the one bringing the complaint is not required to prove jurisdiction? Yes or no.

Why?

Does this ticket present a justiciable case or controversy? Yes or no.

Would I have to enter a plea if a justiciable case or controversy has not been presented? Yes or no.

Do you agree with this Federal Supreme Court ruling: “courts only adjudicate justiciable controversies.” United States v. ICC, 337 U.S. 426, 430 (1949)?

Does that apply to you and this court? Yes or no.

This court only adjudicates justiciable controversies? Yes or no.

Does a justiciable case or controversy require the violation of a legal right? Yes or no.

(end of basic set up questions)

Is this a criminal complaint? Yes or no.

Am I presumed innocent of this alleged crime? Yes or no.

Am I presumed innocent of every element of this alleged crime? Yes or no.

So you Sir [judge] presume there is no jurisdiction? Yes or no.

[He may have already said I was presumed innocent of every element of the alleged crime, I may have to point out the contradiction, remember the burden of proof has already been established]

Is there evidence of a complaining party? A responsive answer is only yes or no.

I did not ask if there was a complaining party or who you think it is. I asked, is there evidence of a complaining party? Yes or no?

If yes: O.K., what is that evidence and who gave it to you?

Apparently, you think there is evidence here. Are you concealing that evidence from me? Yes or no.

Evidence of a complaining party consists of facts proving there are citizens and a state. This requires showing a voluntary relationship of allegiance and a duty to protect. This is impossible for them to do.

Do you [Mr. Prosecutor] have any evidence to prove you represent anyone other than yourself? Yes or no. [if on cross-examination to cop: is there evidence to prove Mr. Prosecutor represents anyone other than himself?]

Can you prove he/she/they have standing to complain against me? Yes or no.

Do you have evidence to prove one or more of his/her/their legal rights was violated? Yes or no.

If yes: Which legal right? [Life, liberty, property. I don't help them out though.]

[If the judge enters a plea of not guilty, usually accusing me of refusing to plea]

Sir, on whose behalf did you enter that plea?

Do you represent me? Yes or no.

How can you enter a plea on my behalf and not be representing me?

Then on whose behalf was the plea entered?

[I may ask here]

Sir, who do you represent here? [There are questions like this further down]

[Holding ticket] Is this a civil action? Yes or no.

Does this ticket present a valid cause of action? Yes or no.

Is this civil case in the nature of a contract dispute or a tort? (if they don't know or won't answer, I am not being informed so I cannot defend myself and he already told me a fair and meaningful hearing requires responsive

answers to questions.)

Contract: is there evidence of a contract? Yes or no. (requires, at the minimum, an offer, acceptance, meeting of the minds and consideration plus at least two parties).

If yes: And how many elements are there to a contract?

Does this ticket present every element of a cause of action? Yes or no.

How many elements does a cause of action consist of? (Two, I don't tell them though)

What are the two elements of a cause of action? (breach of duty [legal right] and damage)

The supreme court has held these are the two elements: "The injury alleged MUST be, for example, "DISTINCT and PALPABLE,"...and not "abstract" or "conjectural" or "hypothetical,"...The injury must be "fairly" traceable to the challenged action, and relief from the injury must be "likely" to follow from a favorable decision." Allen v. Wright, 468 U.S. 737 (1984) (citations omitted) (emphasis added).

Where on this ticket is a "distinct and palpable" injury presented?

What are the essential elements to a justiciable case or controversy? (breach of duty and damage)

Tort: Same problem as with contract, no injury.

If there is no evidence of a cause of action presented then the complaint should be dismissed, he has already said it would have to be.

Is this ticket consistent with the Victorian constitution? Yes or no.

[There is most likely going to be an objection, calls for a legal conclusion, the witness is incompetent to testify! I ask for all the legal opinions to be stricken, including the ticket.]

[If they fight and object to the previous question without declaring the cop incompetent] Did you file an invalid ticket? Yes or no.

Would you knowingly file a ticket that was not consistent with the Victorian constitution? Yes or no.

Is this ticket consistent with the Victorian constitution? Yes or no.

Is there a victim? Yes or no.

Have I been accused of violating someone's rights? Yes or no.

If yes, can you identify the right I allegedly violated? [To clarify, was it some one's right to life, liberty or property?] There will also be an inconsistency with the ticket where no victim is noted.

Did I violate the judge's rights? Yes or no.

Did I violate the police officer's rights? Yes or no.

Did I violate any of your rights? Yes or no.

This civil action does not involve the alleged violation of a legal right? Yes or no.

How does someone acquire standing in a civil case?

Then please explain how the alleged plaintiff has standing to complain against me.

Is your purpose here today to protect rights? Yes or no.

Didn't you already state the ticket is consistent with the Victorian constitution? Yes or no.

Please take judicial notice of article one section two (check) of the Victorian constitution. "All political power is

inherent in the people, and governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, and are established to protect and maintain individual rights.”

How is this ticket consistent with the Victorian constitution when article two section two states the government was “established to protect and maintain individual rights” and you’ve said I am not accused of violating any one’s rights?

Would your [the judge’s] actions and orders be valid if you [he] did not have jurisdiction over me? Yes or no. [This question proves the RELEVANCE of the following questions. That is why I ask it. I may have to come back to it.]

Does Mr. Judge have jurisdiction over me? Yes or no.

[If objection] Did you bring this ticket to this court? Yes or no.

Do you understand the nature and cause of the charges and proceedings you instigated against me? Yes or no.

Then tell me, does Mr. Judge have jurisdiction over me? Yes or no.

Is that an arbitrary opinion? Yes or no.

So it’s based on facts currently within your knowledge? Yes or no.

Who provided those facts to you?

Are they on this ticket? Yes or no.

So if I asked for the facts proving where, when, why and how you acquired your alleged jurisdiction over my life you could provide it? Yes or no.

Do you know and understand what jurisdiction is factually? Yes or no.

Factually what is jurisdiction? [Legal opinions, basically anything beyond CONTROL over people and property, is NON-RESPONSIVE, I OBJECT and MOVE TO STRIKE.]

Is jurisdiction control over me? Yes or no.

Do you exercise control over me? Yes or no.

Factually, how was your jurisdiction, or control over me, acquired? [I never accept the spewing forth of political gibberish here.]

Objection, Non-responsive, move to strike.

Does your control over me depend on my freely given consent? Yes or no.

If I don’t consent to your control over my life and property you’ll back off and leave me alone? Yes or no.

My consent to your control over my life is not required? Yes or no.

Would it be accurate to state you acquired your control over my life violently? Yes or no. [This has to conflict with the previous question]

So your control over me is based on your coercion?

Doesn’t control imply ownership? Yes or no.

Didn’t you state I had basic human rights? Yes or no.

Can you please explain to me how I have basic human rights that you respect while you take control over my life and property without my consent?

Is the judge a party to these proceedings? Yes or no.

(Relevance was established earlier when told I'm entitled to a fair meaningful hearing, conflicts of interest. I'm not a lawyer, I don't understand.)

Are you [state attorney] a party to these proceedings? Yes or no.

Is he a witness in these proceedings? Yes or no.

Are you [state attorney] a witness in these proceedings? Yes or no.

Is the judge permitted to offer testimony against a party? Yes or no.

Are you [state attorney] permitted to offer testimony against a party? Yes or no.

What prohibits you both from testifying?

May both of you disregard that? Yes or no.

Would it be a fair hearing if either of you did? Yes or no.

Who does the judge represent in all of this? Who do you [the judge] represent here?

They may say: "I'm the judge."

Remember, explanations about the job or title are NON-RESPONSIVE i.e., I make decisions, rulings etc.

(That is NON-RESPONSIVE, move to strike), I know what your title is, I need to know who you represent here. On whose behalf are you appearing today?

The judge either represents the "state" or he's there on his own behalf. If he represents the "state" or the "people of the state," then he represents the plaintiff. If there on his own behalf, then he may not claim the "constitution" as so-called "authority."

If the "state" then there is a conflict of interest. I've already been told I can't get a fair hearing if there is a conflict of interest.

If you don't represent anyone and are appearing on your own behalf, then you are here on your own authority? Yes or no.

How can you be here pursuant to the "constitution" and at the same time be here on your own authority?

If you are here pursuant to the "constitution" then how could you not represent the "state," the plaintiff?

What is the nature of your [the cop's] relationship to the judge? [Any type of relationship would imply a conflict of interest]

If there is no relationship then why is the judge holding me to answer your complaint?

Please tell me why that is not a conflict of interest.

Is it still your opinion you [or the judge] have jurisdiction over me?

Is your opinion that you have "jurisdiction" arbitrary?

So it's based on facts currently within your knowledge?

"Except for physical violence, where, when, why and how was your alleged "jurisdiction" over me acquired?"

What if they cite a "Supreme Court" case or the "law"?

That is NON-RESPONSIVE, objection, move to strike, ask for the facts again.

Would you have jurisdiction over me if I was not within the state? Yes or no. [Also proves RELEVANCE of next

questions.]

So if I am not within the state you have no jurisdiction over me? Yes or no.

For your orders to have any validity I would have to be within the state? Yes or no.

Is it your opinion I am within the state? Yes or no.

Is that an arbitrary opinion? Yes or no.

So it's based on facts currently within your knowledge? Yes or no.

And it's already been proven, by a preponderance of evidence, that I am within the state? Yes or no.

OK, factually, what is the state? Remember prior testimony. Point out the inconsistent statements, he said he had facts and evidence consisted of facts, not opinions. This is an attack on credibility. If they won't dismiss move on, I've made my case there are no facts.

Any objection on RELEVANCE, is overcome by pointing out they admitted there is no jurisdiction unless I am within the state.

[If there are claims the state is the ground and similar nonsense] Are you telling me the prosecutor represents the ground?

Would there be a cause of action against me if I was not within the state? Yes or no.

Is it your testimony I am within the state? Yes or no.

Is that an arbitrary opinion? Yes or no.

So it's based on facts currently within your knowledge? Yes or no.

Factually what is the state?

Would there be a crime if I was not within the state on [date]? Yes or no.

So there is no crime unless I am within the state on [date]? Yes or no.

[If objection/problem because of the hypothetical]

Does the statute require my presence within the state for there to be a crime? Yes or no.

Is it your testimony I am within the state? Yes or no.

Is that an arbitrary opinion? Yes or no.

So it's based on facts currently within your knowledge? Yes or no.

Factually what is the state?

[If there are claims the state is the ground and similar nonsense] Are you telling me the prosecutor represents the ground?

[If objection/problem because of the hypothetical]

Does the statute require my presence within the state for there to be a crime?

Would there be a cause of action against me if there was no traffic statutes? Yes or no.

So without the traffic statute there is no cause of action or alleged violation? Yes or no.

So, I didn't cause any damage correct? Yes or no.

And I did not violate any one's legal right's correct? Yes or no.

You have accused me of violating a statute? Yes or no.

Did I violate the statute? Yes or no.

And this statute is applicable to me? Yes or no.

Is that an arbitrary opinion? Yes or no.

So it's based on facts currently within your knowledge? Yes or no.

Factually what is a statute?

If by a miracle he is permitted to answer and can actually tell me:

Do you have facts, currently within your knowledge to prove where, when, why and how this [whatever a statute is] actually became applicable to me? Yes or no.

What are those facts?

Would there be a crime if there was no traffic statutes [I use the specific one]? Yes or no.

So without this traffic statute there is no crime? Yes or no.

So, I didn't cause any damage correct? Yes or no.

And I did not violate any one's legal right's correct? Yes or no.

You have accused me of violating a statute? Yes or no.

Did I violate the statute? Yes or no.

And this statute is applicable to me? Yes or no.

Is that an arbitrary opinion? Yes or no.

So it's based on facts currently within your knowledge? Yes or no.

Factually what is a statute?

If by a miracle he is permitted to answer and can actually tell me:

Do you have facts, currently within your knowledge to prove where, when, why and how this [whatever a statute is] actually became applicable to me? Yes or no.

What are those facts?

I keep a record so I can accurately summarize what happened i.e.,

I am not a lawyer, I don't understand, I didn't want a trial, I wanted to plead guilty and pay the fine. But, because I don't understand I had a few questions. Despite being told I was entitled to a fair and meaningful hearing where I was entitled to responsive answers to my questions you have refused to answer questions and have not permitted me to defend myself.

In addition, there is no proof of a corpus delicti, a requirement for every criminal prosecution.

CORPUS DELICTI

The body of the offence; the essence of the crime.

It was a general rule not to convict unless the corpus delicti can be established, that is, until the dead body has been found. Instances have occurred of a person being convicted of having killed another, who, after the supposed criminal has been put to death for the supposed offence, has made his appearance alive. The wisdom of the rule is apparent; but in order to insure justice, in extreme cases, it may be competent to

prove the basis of the corpus delicti by presumptive, but conclusive, evidence.