Private and Confidential

TIME-SENSITIVE-DOCUMENT

ESTOPPEL-CONDITIONS-APPLY

Non-Negotiable

F.A.O: JOHN HENRY DOE, acting as CHIEF CONSTABLE c/o Any Street

(Any Area) BCU Commander Any District

Any Police Station Any Town

Any Town [~Any postcode]

Any Postcode

Our reference: Universal Postal Union Signed For© Ref. Number: XX XXXX XXXX XXX

Re: Your unaccepted Notice of Intended Prosecution Number: [XXXXXXXXXXXX]

Date: June Sixteenth in the Year of Our Lord, Twenty Twenty-Two

DOCTRINE-OF-OFFICE-FOUND

: Notice to agent is notice to principal, notice to principal is notice to agent:

NOTICE-OF-CONDITIONAL-ACCEPTANCE

Re: Notice of Intended Prosecution, INSERT NOTICE NUMBER HERE

F.A.O: JOHN HENRY DOE, acting as CHIEF CONSTABLE:

Please read the following notice thoroughly and carefully before responding. It is a notice. It informs you. It means what it says. The reason why you need to read carefully is simple. We are offering conditional acceptance. This removes controversy, and it means that you no longer have any ultimate recourse to a court of law in this matter, because there is no controversy upon which it could adjudicate. You always have the option of dragging these conditions into a court of law only to be told that they are, indeed, perfectly lawful. That is, of course, always your prerogative should you decide to waste your time;

For this reason, it is important that you consider and respond to the offer in substance. The 'nearest official form' will not suffice, and consequently is likely to be ignored by us, without any dishonour on our part;

On the other hand, there is a time-limit on the agreement being offered. It is reasonable, and if it runs out then you and all associated parties are in default, removing any/all lawful excuse on your part for proceeding in this matter;

For these reasons, it is recommended that you carefully consider this notice and respond in substance. Which means, taking the time to address the points raised herein on an individual point-for-point basis;

Now, to the matter at hand. You have apparently made allegations of misconduct against us.  You have apparently made demands upon us;

We do not understand those apparent demands, and therefore cannot lawfully fulfil them. We seek clarification of your document so that we may act according to the law, and maintain our entire body of inalienable Natural Rights;

Failure to accept this offer to clarify this presentment and to do so completely and in good faith within 14 (fourteen) days, will be deemed by all parties to mean that you, your principal, and all other parties abandon any demands upon us;

As mentioned, we have received a presentment through the post to my care of address. I opened it out of curiosity. I have enclosed the original presentment with this notice;

The presentment alleges that a contravention of the “Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and Schedule 2 to the Road Traffic Offenders Act 1988” has taken place. It also claims that we must provide information under “Section 172 of the Road Traffic Act 1988”, and that non-compliance with this request could lead to court proceedings;

We are happy to deal with this presentment and act upon its instructions, on condition that you can provide us with answers to our questions, numbered one (1) to nine (9):

1. Evidence that i was the “driver” of the mentioned “vehicle” on the alleged date and time, by way of Affidavit of Truth, certified and sworn under penalty of perjury in accordance with the Common Law Procedure Act 1854 Section XLVIII, or a Declaration under Penalty of Perjury signed by a Notary Public or two witnesses of good standing, or by any first-hand material witness that has made the claim;
2. Evidence of the corpus delecti - that is, the body of crime, to which this alleged incident has caused any injury, harm, loss or fraud, in accordance with the legem terrae, or the law-of-the-land;
3. Evidence that your presentment is addressed to i, a wo/man, :John-Henry :Doe, and not to JOHN HENRY DOE, which appears to be a fictitious legal personality construct created by the Crown Corporation via the Birth Certificate, whose main purpose is to assist i, a wo/man, : john-henry: doe. to conduct commerce with corporations worldwide such as yourselves, The Metropolitan Police LLC, who are a run-for-profit business registered with Dun & Bradstreet on the Securities and Exchanges Commission in Washington D.C., with a D-U-N-S Number of 213550913;
4. Evidence that uncorroborated “evidence” from a “speed camera” does not constitute hearsay in a court of law, and this alleged “offence” does not therefore require a second living witness – a man or a woman, to be given the force of law;
5. Evidence that this alleged offence is NOT null and void without a witness statement, as per Magistrates Court Act 1980 Section 5B;
6. Evidence that the “Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and Schedule 2 to the Road Traffic Offenders Act 1988”, and information under “Section 172 of the Road Traffic Act 1988” have the force of law in England, and do not require consent of the governed, to have the force of law;
7. Indeed, please provide evidence that all Acts, Statutes, Legislations and Regulations can be given the force of law without the consent of the governed, as the law suggests that the Acts and Regulations referred to in your presentment, are Acts of HM Parliament & Governments PLC©, which is a recognised Unlimited Corporation, or an all-for-profit business;

An Act, which is not law in the UK, **and it is not even referred to as law**, is an Act of a Corporation. Or a policy. **But it is not a law**. Is it not the case that Acts and Statutes of HM Parliament & Governments PLC©, or any derivatives thereof, **can only be given force of lawby the consent of the governed*?*** By those men and women who have agreed, surely through lack of knowledge and therefore tacit consent, to the Acts and Statutes of HM Parliament & Governments PLC©?

The law suggests there is a mandatory legal requirement under current legislation that **the governed must have given their consent legally,** **and it must bephysically presented as fact**, before any Acts and Statutes of HM Parliament & Governments PLC® can be given the force of law;

The question one must ask now is, if it is not law, how then does your presentment, which is based on Acts and Regulations, become enforceable?

67.61 million people in the UK have not entered legally into those “agreements” (8 million plus Acts, Statutes etc.) with full knowledge, full understanding, and of their own free will;

An agreement must be kept on the public record for the Acts and Statutes of HM Parliament & Governments PLC© or any derivative thereof, to be given an action which involves force... or force of law’;

As reference, relevant Case Law concludes that;

**A “STATUTE” is NOT a law!** – Flournoy v. First National Bank of Shreveport, 197 LA 1057-3 So. 2d 244,248.

**A “CODE” is NOT a law!** – In Re Self v. Rhay, Wn 2d 261, in point of fact in law.

**A concurrent or “joint resolution of the legislature is NOT “law”.** Knowing v. Flynn, 258 N.Y. 292,179 N.E. 705,707, Ward v. State, 176 OKL,368,56 P. 2d 136,137; State ex rel. Todd v. Yelle, 7 Wash. 2d 43, 110.P.2d 162,165.

**STATUTE**.  **Black’s Law Dictionary, 4th Edition**:-

*“*The writing will of the legislature solemnly expressed according to the forms prescribed in theconstitution; an act of the legislature[**therefore, not law**]*”.*

U.S. SUPREME COURT DECISION – **“The common law is the real law, the Supreme Law of the land, the codes, rules, regulations, policy and statutes are “not the law”**. Self v. Rhay, 61 Wn (2d) 261.

U.S. SUPREME COURT DECISION – “**All codes, rules, and regulations are for government authorities ONLY, not human/Creators in accordance with God’s Laws. All codes, rules and regulations are unconstitutional and lacking due process…”**– Rodriques v. Ray Donavan, U.S. Department of Labour, 769 F. 2d,1344, 1348 (1985).

1. Evidence that a County Court or Magistrate’s Court is sanctioned by The Queen and Parliament, so is therefore a legitimate court:

Under "STATUTES (VOLUME 44(1) (REISSUE))/1. NATURE-OF-PRIMARY-LEGISLATION/ (2) DEFINITION-AND-CLASSIFICATION/(iii) Particular Types of Act/ A. CONSTITUTIONAL,-TREATY-AND FINANCIAL-ACTS/1221. Constitutional Acts", we see:

(iii) Particular Types of Act:

A. CONSTITUTIONAL,-TREATY-AND-FINANCIAL-ACTS

1221. Constitutional Acts.

The British Constitution is said to be 'unwritten'. This only means that, unlike most countries, the United Kingdom does not possess a single comprehensive constitution and much of its constitutional principle is embodied in the common law. Nevertheless, there are a number of historic statutes regarded as embodying and setting forth the state's constitutional principles;

1. Any modern Act which amends or adds to these may also be regarded as a constitutional Act;

2. The main significance of classing an Act as a constitutional Act lies in the nature of the interpretative criteria which then apply to it. In particular, the rights the Act confers, **having the quality of constitutional rights, will be regarded by the courts as fundamental and not to be displaced except by clear words**.

See Magna Carta (1215); the Bill of Rights (1689); the Act of Settlement (1700); the Septennial Act 1715. Also see the Parliament Acts 1911 and 1949; the Crown Proceedings Act 1947; the Representation of the People Acts 1949 to 1983; the House of Commons Disqualification Acts 1957 and 1975; the Crown Estate Act 1961; and the Supreme Court Act 1981 (Supreme Court Act 1981 now cited as Senior Courts Act 1981: Constitutional Reform Act 2005 Sch 11 para 1 (in force on 1 October 2009: SI 2009/1604);

The Constitution derives from the Magna Carta 1215, and also from the Bill of Rights (1689); the Act of Settlement (1700); the Septennial Act 1715, as well as Parliament Acts 1911 and 1949; the Crown Proceedings Act 1947; the Representation of the People Acts 1949 to 1983; the House of Commons Disqualification Acts 1957 and 1975; the Crown Estate Act 1961; and the Supreme Court Act 1981;

As Lord Halsbury stated:

**“It is a constitutional principle that the assent of the Queen & Parliament is prerequisite to the establishment of a Court which can operate a system of administrative law in Her Majesty’s Courts in England”;**

This was confirmed by Lord Denning during the debates on the European Communities Amendment Bill, HL Deb 08 October 1986 vol 480 cc246-95 246 at 250:

“There is our judicial system deriving from the Crown as the source and fountain of justice. **No court can be set up in England, no court can exist in England,** **except by the authority of the Queen and Parliament**. **That has been so ever since the Bill of Rights”;**

So, performing administrative acts on behalf of the executive is incompatible with the terms of the Oath, which Judges take when they are created under Section 2 of the Promissory Oaths Act 1868, which every Judge must take. A breach of that Oath is perjury;

Furthermore, no authority, local or otherwise, especially when it is nothing more than a run-for-profit registered corporation like the Metropolitan Police Force LLC, who operate with a D-U-N-S Number of 216166436, **has neither the right nor the judicial capacity to send out a summons, let alone attempt to enforce it;**

If the argument is that common law has no basis in administrative law proceedings (and therefore is irrelevant), it should be noted that administrative law has **not been sanctioned by Parliament;**

The law says to i, that any court without a jury present **is an administrative court**, and as such, has no standing in the *legem terrae* – that is, the law-of-the-land;

**“Actions which overthrow and subvert the laws and Constitution of the Kingdom and which would lead to the destruction of the Constitution are unlawful**”. And clearly, a court that has not been sanctioned by the Queen or Parliament, **is unlawful**;

The case of R V Thistlewood (1820) established that “To destroy the Constitution of the country **is an act of treason**”;

Halsbury’s 4th Edition of Law 2011 also confirms that administrative law is (nothing more than) an arrangement between the Executive and the Judiciary. And that the law is absolutely clear on this subject: **There is NO authority for administrative courts in this country, and NO Act could be passed to legitimise them;**

Lord Diplock stated … (as recorded in HALSBURYS) “**All administrative courts are illegal and can never be legislated into existence”;**

Performing administrative acts on behalf of the Executive is incompatible with the terms of the Oath which Judges take when they are created under Section 2 of the Promissory Oaths Act 1868, which every Judge must take.

**A breach of that Oath is perjury** (See Perjury Act 1911, Sec 5).

To add: **‘Administrative Law’ (so called) forms no part of “the laws and usages of the realm”** – When Judges swear to the Sovereign to uphold via Promissory Oath that binds them to a specific course of conduct – otherwise they cannot be said to perform their judicial duties impartially;

**CASE LAW OF** – R v Donovan [1934] 2 KB 498 at 507, [1934] All ER Rep 207 at 210. In delivering the judgement of the Court of Criminal Appeal Swift J, said: “If an act is unlawful, in the sense of being in of itself a criminal act, then it is plain that it cannot be rendered lawful because the person to whose detriment it is done, consents to it. **No person can license another to commit a crime**”;

**FURTHER CASE LAW:**

One of the grounds upon which actions may be reviewed in administrative law is that of procedural impropriety.

1. The impropriety may consist either of the failure to follow a procedure expressly provided for by a statute or by some other instrument having the force of law.

2. Or of a breach of natural justice.

3. Or it may arise out of the failure to satisfy a legitimate expectation.

**CASE-LAW-PURSUANT-TO-IMPROPRIETY**

Council of Civil Service Unions v Minister for the Civil Service [1985] AC 374 at 411, [1984] 3 All ER 935 at 951, HL, per Lord Diplock.

London & Clydeside Estates Ltd v Aberdeen District Council [1979] 3 All ER 876 at 882, [1980] 1 WLR 182 at 188, HL, per Lord Hailsham of St Marylebone;

O'Reilly v Mackman [1983] 2 AC 237 at 275-276, [1982] 3 All ER 1124 at 1126-1127, HL, per Lord Diplock;

R v Governor of Canterbury Prison, ex p Craig [1991] 2 QB 195 at 204, [1990] 2 All ER 645 at 658, DC, per Watkins LJ;

R v North West Thames Regional Health Authority, ex p Daniels (Rhys Williams) [1994] COD 44, (1993) 19 BMLR 67, DC;

Wang v IRC [1994] 1 WLR 1286, PC.

Where the proper performance of one act is a condition precedent to the performance of other acts or the taking of a decision, and the first act is invalid, all subsequent actions depending upon or flowing from it will likewise be ultra vires and invalid.

**CASE-LAW-PURSUANT-TO-ULTRA-VIRES**:

CR v Brent London Borough Council, ex p Gunning (1985) 84 LGR 168 at 176, 186 per Hodgson J;

R v Manchester City Magistrates' Court, ex p Davies [1989] QB 631, [1989] 1 All ER 90, CA;

R v Secretary of State for the Environment, ex p Birmingham City Council (1984) 83 LGR 79

**LORD-IRVINE-ON-COMMONPLACE ACTIONS:**

DPP v. Jones and Another [1999] Lord Irvine LC “The law should not make unlawful what is commonplace and well accepted.”

Lord Irvine makes the point that, one day you were a farmer with a shotgun, the next you’re a criminal because you don’t have a licence for it. (A license has been required since 1962).

**FURTHER-TO-THIS-IS-THE-CASE-LAW OF:**

R v Donovan [1934] 2 KB 498 at 507, [1934] All ER Rep 207 at 210.

In delivering the judgement of the Court of Criminal Appeal, Swift J, said:

“If an act is unlawful in the sense of being in itself a criminal act, it is plain that it cannot be rendered lawful because the person to whose detriment it is done consents to it. No person can license another to commit a crime.”

Justice Swift is telling us that driving without government documents such as licences, MOT’s etc., cannot be ‘of itself criminal’, as the government licenses these acts, and therefore they cannot be criminal. This is still a leading case, as can be seen from this document which can be found on The House of Lords’ website.

**REGARDING-A-RIGHT-OF-PASSAGE:**

Ex parte Lewis (1888) 21 Q.B.D. 191 Wills J. said in regard to public right of passage:

“The only ‘dedication’ in the legal sense that we are aware of is that of a public right of passage, of which the legal description is a ‘right for all Her Majesty’s subjects at all seasons of the year freely and at their will to pass and re-pass without let or hindrance.’ ”

A financial penalty procured through a pecuniary advantage, howsoever called, is diametrically opposed to “without let or hindrance”. This is operating outside of Statute, as a man or woman cannot be levied by the State or company; only Juristic persons (legal entities) can be so levied against.

1. As both my husband and I are named drivers of the automobile in question, we actually have no recollection who was “driving” at the time of this alleged “offence”. Under the Road Traffic Act 1988 Section 172 Subsection (4), please provide evidence that this alleged “offence” can proceed under such circumstances.

In peaceful, civilised peoples, it is established practice that if an order for a product or service is placed, the man, woman or company making the order must expect to pay for the servicing of that order. No reasonable man or woman ever expects to place orders and have them serviced free of charge. Even your good self, if you have a superior, and you carry out said superior’s orders or wishes, you do so on the basis that you are paid a salary for doing so; the same also holds true with us. In general, the mass population are not aware that they have the right to decline a contract and/or submit a Fee Schedule for their own appearance/performance of that contract; but any other situation is untenable, dishonourable, constitutes business malpractice, and flouts all natural unalienable rights. Therefore, I herein offer our Fee Schedule for your acceptance before any expressed contract commences. Fee Schedule enclosed is not conclusive, and is subject to change without prior notice.

[Complete Fee Schedule available on request]

Fee Schedule (non-negotiable) to be settled in full within seven (7) days of invoice in Pounds Sterling:

1. £1000 (ONE-THOUSAND-POUNDS-GREAT-BRITISH-STERLING) per invalid claim in writing or email, nunc pro tunc;

2. £50.00 (FIFTY-POUNDS-GREAT-BRITISH-STERLING) per letter and/or notice sent by recorded mail, nunc pro tunc;

3. £150.00 (ONE-HUNDRED-AND-FIFTY-POUNDS-GREAT-BRITISH-STERLING) per hour or portion thereof, of the Authorised Representative’s time, nunc pro tunc;

4. £30.00 (THIRTY-POUNDS-GREAT-BRITISH-STERLING) per attempt to contact by telephone and/or mobile phone, including text message, nunc pro tunc;

5. £1000 (ONE-THOUSAND-POUNDS-GREAT-BRITISH-STERLING) per unauthorised door-step visit, nunc pro tunc;

All fees are payable within twentty-one (21) days of date of invoice is received, as evidenced by recorded delivery tracking number. All invoices will be delivered in accordance with the Bills of Exchange Act 1882;

On and for the record, I also hereby decline any offer to contract with your company, except when subject to the terms mentioned herein;

Once again, I look forward to your response to this notice, on a point-for-point basis, within the next fourteen (14) days. Your acquiescence on this matter within the mentioned timeframe, or any response that demonstrates an inability to answer every request for evidence on a point-for-point basis, will indicate that the matter is closed, and this will be confirmed in writing by you and your team at THE METROPOLITAN POLICE FORCE.

Please address any future correspondence in the matter to i, a wo/man, namely: : Dylan-justin: of the smith tribe, as commonly called.

Yours faithfully,

By: (INSERT AUTOGRAPH, NOT SIGNATURE), i.e., : dylan-justin: of the smith tribe

 (include thumbprint in red or blue)

 (cover with clear tape)

All rights reserved.

No assured value, No liability. Errors & Omissions Excepted.

**WITHOUT-RECOURSE, NON-ASSUMPSIT**

Enclosed:

1. Exhibit 1: Your original offer/presentment (a copy has been kept on file);
2. Annexe 1: Affidavit of Non-Corporate Status, autographed and witnessed by a Notary Public, two men or women or Asservation (The Father, The Son, and The Holy Spirit)

**NOTE:** For context, you are considered informed that all meanings in this/any further communication/s are taken from the Oxford Dictionary of English. Or, as commonly understood by living men and women, they are not to be confused with legalese or any other language. All character layout, whether capitalised, lower case, bold or underlined, or any/all combinations thereof are commonly recognised as simple English by living men and women, and they are not to be taken in any other way or meaning. My position in this communication is clear - it is that of a living man/woman standing under natural law, also known as the creator’s law, god’s law, in harmony with common law, therefore operating outside the jurisdiction of statutory rules or man-made legislation, as emphasised by my accompanying Affidavit of Non-Corporate Status. i do not work for any state department, or the crown, nor do i operate under a licence, as i do not require permission nor inculcation from another man or woman to live peacefully.