Things to consider when defending yourself in court:

Challenge: Jurisdiction, Corpus Delicti, Whether or not there is a valid cause of action, whether or not there are credible witnesses that are unbiased to the state, and whether or not you are able to receive a fair trial (which is never). Once you get the officer to incriminate his oath, tell the judge, “I motion to strike the testimony of this witness as his testimony has been proven to be incompetent.”

Remain respectful, act innocent, and seem timid and weak.

If you're unfortunate to have gotten a traffic ticket or citation, keep the following tips in mind, your chances of getting it kicked out are much greater:

1. **Do not be argumentative.**
   Traffic courts are scams run by people only interested in taking money. They are not in place to administer justice. Being argumentative only ensures you will be separated from your money. Going in thinking justice is being administered is to start off on the wrong foot. Any traffic court judge interested in administering justice would throw out the majority of traffic tickets within minutes of them being filed by the police and mail an apology to each defendant for their time wasted on the traffic stop.
2. **Don’t bring your own opinion or arguments to convince the judge.**
   Traffic court judges don’t care what we think, except of course what we think is the easiest and fastest way to pay the court fine. We are considered guilty the moment the cop decides to write the ticket. Traffic court is about making it look good and the judge is always going to be perceived as correct and you wrong. After all, he’s judge. But, we can get the judge to contradict himself. If an argument or opinion is used, it should always be the judge’s.
3. **Stick to the facts.**
   Sticking to the facts is the fastest and most effective way to demonstrate there is no case. Just asking a couple of questions is usually enough to have the only witness against you declared incompetent, which requires his testimony, including the ticket, to be stricken. Keep in mind that impeaching the only witness does not mean a judge will strike the testimony and throw the ticket out.
4. **Repeat I am not an attorney I don’t understand.**
   All non-lawyers are legally incapable of defending themselves and it is unfair to put someone on trial who does not understand the nature and cause of the proceedings against them. The more the judge explains about what is going on, the more can be used to make him contradict himself and prove there is no case. If he says, “You will have to inquire a lawyer about that question”. Say, “Judge, are you telling me that this court is operating under a secret jurisdiction known only to attorneys and lawyers, and not to the American people? That is a conspiracy against my rights and a violation of your oath of office, and a colorable offense.”
5. **Don’t object and press a particular point more than twice.**
   This is related to number one. If I keep pressing a point, the judge is only going to get angry, and judges are notorious for having anger management problems. Remember, traffic court judges do not care. One thing they care about is making the robbery look good. Don’t help him make it look good.
6. **Stay on point.**
   Lawyers, with and without those flowing black robes, are masters of diversion. Never forget their goal is not getting to the truth and administering justice, it’s about getting the money you worked hard to earn. If they get you off-point, they win; your attention on real issues is gone, and before you know it, the proceeding is over.
7. **Only accept responsive answers to questions.**
   Only accepting responsive answers keeps things on point and works to destroy the appearance of a case. Beware though, know in advance what is responsive to the question. Bureaucrats are very good at giving what may appear to be responsive answers; they may sound good, but they are not responsive. A good example is “Factually, what is the Constitution?” and the bureaucrat answers with: “It’s the supreme law of the land.” It sounds impressive, but it’s not responsive to the question. A responsive answer is devastating to a bureaucrat’s case. I have several scripts available I have used in court successfully.

8. **Ask questions.**
   One tactic judges, lawyers and bureaucrats use to divert attention away from what they are doing is to accuse people of "arguing." This is an attempt to make anyone in court look bad, as if we're the problem and not the traffic court. By just asking questions, we can point out we not arguing, just asking questions. From experience, this is very embarrassing for the individual accusing me of arguing. Asking questions is also incredibly effective at demonstrating there is no case, provided of course, we stay on point and only accept responsive answers.
9. **Get judge and, or the prosecutor to commit to positions.**
   Traffic court judges do not care if you think they have violated the Constitution or the law. But because their main job is to make robbing people look good, traffic court judges do not like to contradict themselves. To do this, I ask questions to get the judge to commit to certain positions e.g., "Am I entitled to be **informed** of the **nature** and **cause** of the charges and proceedings?" and "Am I entitled to a fair hearing?" Because the very nature of traffic courts is unfair, it's easy to get the judge to contradict himself.
10. **Use those positions/ arguments against the judge or prosecutor.**
    The judge's and prosecutor's positions can always be used to get them to contradict themselves later. As with the first question above, after a few more questions the judge will say, "I'm not here to answer your questions." I just have to then remind him he already told me I was entitled to be informed. Also, by asking just a couple of questions, I've had judges declare a witness competent, incompetent and then competent again in only a few minutes. By contradicting himself like that, all pretense of fairness is gone.

One of the most valuable pieces of information you can learn about traffic courts and bureaucrat attacks is this: **A ticket/ complaint is not synonymous with a case.** Of course a traffic court judge will disagree with this. His object is not truth and justice, it's taking money away from people.

Remember, just because a cop writes a ticket does not mean he has presented a case before a court. No court has the "legal" authority to proceed against someone unless a case is presented to it; this is just a short list of the "authorities" to prove it. However, traffic court judges are interested only in getting your money, so things like the "law" do not interest them.

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 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
"Objection, non responsive, move to strike."

"Objection, to the term ___, the use of such terms assumes facts not in evidence and nothing in relation to these legally defined terms has been previously agreed to, and furthermore, their use requires legal conclusion." OR "Objection, calls for legal conclusion."

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. "I object, it is not my wish."

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/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. If there is disagreement, then you want them to be specific about it, this goes for any disagreement and ALWAYS have them be specific, do not let them get away with being vague. Get them to answer "yes" or "no". and to give direct testimony.

Having them be non-responsive is part of the objective.
(If the judge ever says "This is a crime against the people say "Which people? Can you give me their names?)

When they ask you who you are respond by: **I am here by special appearance to challenge the jurisdiction** of... I do not agree or consent to an non-judicial making. First question, **are you a judge in the state of** Texas, an actual **judicial officer** or are you a **hearing officer or commissioner** or any other type of individual that **isn't a judicial officer?** If you are **not an official judge** and this is **not** an **official judicial proceeding** then I am not consenting to any of this, so are we done here?

PRELMINARY SCRIPT

[*The judge will call the case and ask if you're ready to proceed*]

"No Sir, I have a pending motion to dismiss the complaint/information, I'd like to go through that if there is any opposition to it."

[*Prosecutor will object*]

"What in particular do you object to?"

"There are several parts, let's take a minute and you can be specific and if you disagree with a particular point, you can demonstrate how and why it is incorrect and provide your facts and legal support to prove it."

[The same with the judge, if there is disagreement, then you want them to be specific about it, this goes for any disagreement and ALWAYS have them be specific, do not let them get away with being vague.]

[Ask them about each point in the motion e.g., isn't the sole purpose of government to protect/secure rights? Use the motion as your guide]

"The motion is appropriate at this time and may moot the need for a prelim if granted."

"Are you denying it with any input from the prosecution?"

"What facts and legal support do you have besides just your opinion?"

[If forced to do the hearing, remember to object to the denial of the issues in the motion]

[If the judge ever refuses to inform you of the cause and nature of a crime say, "Let me remind you of my 6th amendment rights to be informed of the nature of cause of the charges and that it is a felony under 18 U.S.C. Section 241 for any Judge to deny me any right guaranteed by the Constitution]

[to judge]

1. 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] (If the motion is denied, continue to question further)
2. Judge, will this court uphold the **Supreme** Court, the Federal and State **Constitutions**?
    1.1. Am I entitled to a fair hearing today? Yes or no.
    1.2. Can I get a fair trial if there is a conflict of interest? Yes or no.
    1.3. Who do you represent here today?
    1.4. What is the nature of your relationship to this other lawyer [prosecutor]?
    1.5. If there is no relationship, then why are you holding me to answer his complaint?
    1.6. If you are being paid by the state, and you represent the state of TX, and the state of TX is a party, then you represent a party to these proceedings?
        1.1.1. If you represent a party to these proceedings, wouldn't that be a conflict of interest?
        1.1.2. But I'm not the one paying you, the other party is, how is that not a conflict of interest?
        1.1.3. Could you please explain how you can admit to representing a party and to these proceedings and have it not be a conflict of interest?
        1.1.4. If you represent no one, then is this your own private court? Aren't you paid by the state of TX? Yes or no.
3. Do you hold an objective standard of proof? Yes or no.
4. Am I entitled to a meaningful hearing? Yes or no.
    1.1. What are the consequences, if any, if you don't give me a fair and meaningful hearing?
5. Am I entitled to be informed of the nature and cause of the charges and proceedings against me? Yes or no.
6. I've been charged with a crime correct? Yes or no.
    1.1. [YES] And with all crimes there must be a *corpus delecti* correct? Yes or no.
    1.2. [NO] I believe the supreme court ruled in: "In every prosecution for crime it is necessary to establish the "corpus delecti", i.e., the body or elements of the crime." People v. Lopez, 62 Ca.Rptr. 47, 254 C.A.2d 185.
        1.1.1. Is this court bound by supreme court rulings? Yes or no.

1.1.1.1. [NO] This court is not under the supreme court? Yes or no.

1.1.1.2. Is this court specifically exempt from basic principals of criminal law held by every supreme court in the United States? Yes or no.

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

1.3. I can receive a **fair trial without proof** of a corpus delecti? Yes or no.

1.4. Do you agree with the supreme court that the "Elements of "corpus delecti," 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 Cal.Rptr. 789, 791, 91 C.A. 132.? Yes or no.

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

1.1.1. [YES] Are there any allegations of injury? Yes or no.

1.1.1.1. [NO] So there is no corpus delecti, which is required to proceed against me? Yes or no.

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

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

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

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

9. What rules, if any, govern the proceedings here?

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

1.2. Are there rules you can ignore? Yes or no.

1.3. [YES] Which ones, why?

1.4. Do the constitutions, US and State, govern these proceedings? Yes or no.

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

1.1. [YES] Which ones? Why?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

17. 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*]

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

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

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

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

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

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

1.1. [NO] How can I get a fair and meaningful hearing if I can't confront the witnesses you rely on?

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

1.1. [NO] How can I get a fair and meaningful hearing if I can't challenge evidence you rely on?

23. Could this court proceed against me if the alleged plaintiff lacked standing to complain against me? Yes or no.
24. Would I have to enter a plea if there was no cause of action presented? Yes or no.
25. Would I have to enter a plea if there was no crime presented? Yes or no.
26. Would I have to enter a plea if the alleged plaintiff lacks standing to complain against me? Yes or no.
27. Would I have to enter a plea if there is no jurisdiction over me? Yes or no.
28. Would there be a crime if there was no jurisdiction? Yes or no.
29. Is jurisdiction an element of this alleged crime? Yes or no. [Presumed innocent question will contradict his answer here if 'yes']
    1.1. [NO] So the one bringing the complaint is not required to prove jurisdiction? Yes or no.
        1.1.1. Why?
30. Does this ticket present a justiciable case or controversy? Yes or no.
    1.1. Would I have to enter a plea if a justiciable case or controversy has not been presented? Yes or no.
    1.2. Do you agree with this United States Supreme Court ruling: "courts only adjudicate justiciable controversies." United States v. ICC, 337 U.S. 426, 430 (1949)?
    1.3. Does that apply to you and this court? Yes or no.
    1.4. This court only adjudicates justiciable controversies? Yes or no.
    1.5. Does a justiciable case or controversy require the violation of a legal right? Yes or no.

Questions for cop when on stand

(You do not have to read this entire script, at any moment you once you feel the opponent is incompetent, you can move to dismiss due to finding the witness incompetent)

1. Were you the one who arrested me on the date in question? Yes or no.
2. You determined on your own I violated the laws of the state of TX? Yes or no.
    1.1. You are certain I violated the laws of the state of TX? Yes or no.
    1.2. You're qualified to determine on your own I violated the laws of the state of TX? Yes or no.
3. Are you an expert in the interpretation and application of the constitution and laws? Yes or no.
    1.1. When you determined I was subject to the law, was it based on facts or was it arbitrary? Yes or no.
        1.1.1. And there is a factual connection between the constitution, laws and me? Yes or no.
        1.1.2. And you know what those facts are? Yes or no.
        1.1.3. Factually what is the constitution factually and what facts connect it to me?

4. You didn't file a false police report? Yes or no.
    1.1. You're qualified to determine if you wrote a false report? Yes or no.
    1.2. How did you obtain my drivers license number?
    1.3. How did you put it on the complaint?
    1.4. Were you aware it was incorrect?
    1.5. Did you intentionally put the wrong number on the complaint? Yes or no.
        1.1.1. [NO] Can you explain why it was incorrect?
        1.1.2. [Motion to dismiss due to negligence or incompetence based on how he responds]

~~5. You didn't falsely arrest me? Yes or no.~~
    ~~1.1. Are you qualified to determine if it's a false arrest or not? Yes or no.~~

6. I'm accused of violating laws of the state of TX? Yes or no.
    1.1. Do these laws apply outside of the state of TX? Yes or no.
    1.2. And it's your opinion I was within the state of TX? Yes or no.
    1.3. Is that an arbitrary opinion or is it based on facts currently within your knowledge?

1.4. Are you qualified to testify to my presence within the state and applicability of the laws of the state of TX to me? Yes or no.
1.5. Are you qualified to testify to applicability of the laws of the state of TX to me? Yes or no.
1.6. Since this opinion is based on your current knowledge, you should be able to tell me factually what the state of TX is, what is the state factually? [if objection, goes to credibility, prior statements, presence within state already determined essential to violate the law]

7. Would there be a crime if I were not within the State on the date in question?
   1.1. Did you witness me within the state?
   1.2. Did you witness me committing a crime?
   1.3. How many elements are in this crime?

8. Is there any evidence I violated anyone's legal rights?
   1.1. Are you accusing of separate acts and results?
   1.2. So you're only accusing me of several acts, such as allegedly violating the laws of the state of TX?
      1.1.1. Except for allegedly violating the laws of the state of TX, what acts did I commit that are criminal?
      1.1.2. Without the law itself, there is no actual crime?

9. Does this ticket present every element of a cause of action? Yes or no.
10. How many elements does a cause of action consist of? (Two, I don't tell them though)
   1.1. What are the two elements of a cause of action? (breach of duty [legal right] and damage)
   1.2. 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).
      1.1.1. Where on this ticket is a "distinct and palpable" injury presented?
      1.1.2. What are the essential elements to a justiciable case or controversy? (breach of duty and damage)

11. **Tort:** Same problem as with contract, no injury.
    1.1. (If there is no evidence of a cause of action presented then the complaint is invalid)

To Prosecuting Attorney:

12. Is this ticket consistent with the TX constitution? Yes or no.
    1.1. [There is most likely going to be an objection, calls for a legal conclusion. If so, the witness is incompetent to testify! I ask for all the legal opinions to be stricken, including the ticket.]
    1.2. [If they fight and object to the previous question without declaring the cop incompetent] Did you file an invalid ticket? Yes or no.
    1.3. Would you knowingly file a ticket that was not consistent with the TX constitution? Yes or no.
    1.4. Is this ticket consistent with the TX constitution? Yes or no.
    1.5. Would you agree that the State of "TX" is the Victim is in this case?
        1.1.1. And are you representing the state of TX?
        1.1.2. And can you please point out the Victim that you are representing today for the court?
        1.1.3. If you are representing someone, then where is your client? There are millions of people living here, do you claim to represent all of them including me? And If so, we will need to subpoena each and every one of them to court. I cannot proceed if I cannot address my accuser. Can you please give me the names of the victims you claim to represent?
        1.1.4. Can you provide any evidence that you represent anyone besides yourself?
        1.1.5. Can you prove that the victim "he/she/they" have standing to complain against me? Yes or no.
        1.1.6. Is there any evidence of an accuser or a complaining party in this case?
        1.1.7. Do you have evidence to prove one or more of his/her/their legal rights was violated? Yes or no.
        1.1.8. Is there a victim? Yes or no.
        1.1.9. Have I been accused of violating someone's rights? Yes or no.
        1.1.10. If yes, can you identify the right I allegedly violated of anyone? [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.
        1.1.11. Did I violate the judge's rights? Yes or no.
        1.1.12. Did I violate the police officer's rights? Yes or no.
        1.1.13. Did I violate any of your rights? Yes or no.
        1.1.14. This civil action does not involve the alleged violation of a legal right? Yes or no.
13. How does someone acquire standing in a civil case?
    1.1. Then please explain how the alleged plaintiff has standing to complain against me.
14. Is your purpose here today to protect rights? Yes or no.
    1.1. Didn't you already state the ticket is consistent with the TX constitution? Yes or no.
    ~~1.2. Please take judicial notice of article two section two of the Arizona 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."~~
        ~~1.1.1. How is this ticket consistent with the Arizona constitution when article one section one 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?~~
    1.3. This complaint should be thrown out, there are no competent witnesses to meet even an minimal burden of probably cause, there are no witnesses to prove the laws are applicable. All I'm accused of are violating statutes and the ones making the accusation are not qualified to testify or make such legal determinations.

(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?

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 <u>CONTROL over people and property</u>, 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 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.

Do you know what the state is factually? 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.

Do you know what the state is factually? 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 the 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.