Q..(You) Before we start can I know your name?
A…(Judge) I don't have to give you my name
Q..Am I not entitled to know who wishes to do business with me?
A…Magistrate Beezley
Q…Thank you

Q…The judge said "we don't recognise unrebutted affidavits"
"We don't recognise Notice to Agent is Notice to Principal and Notice to Principal is Notice to Agent"
What could we have said in reply?

A…I would say "Sir with respect is it not so that an unrebutted affidavit stands as truth in commerce?" If he says "No it doesn't" , then produce evidence, you can provide the maxim of law and say "Are you saying this hasn't stood the test of time, these maxims of law? Are you saying that even your legislation supersedes maxims of law because I've had lawyers tell me they don't sir, so which is it and is it only an offer that you are making because respectfully I don't accept your offer" So you can come back but do it diplomatically because you don't want a contempt charge and don't want any aggression and if he starts losing his cool just say "Sorry if I have offended you tell me what I did wrong, are you threatening me now?'' I've done that and you watch them fall back in their chair. If they throw a wobbly it's just to intimidate and I don't get intimidated. In fact there are times they have sent court security and they come in and when they are about to grab me I say "You touch me and that's assault, back off!!" You tell them to back off because if you don't you'll be implicated, that's how you make them back off. If the judge claims it's not assault, make sure you always have witnesses and I prep them. On one case my friend got up and said "Sir I'm here as a witness and that would be assault" That's your second witness, so they backed off. I've had people do somersaults away from me after I have turned around and seen them coming at me like a big gorilla, I just look up at them and say "You touch me!!!" And then watch them do a somersault backwards. Bunch of cowards. They are not allowed to assault you but if you don't object or express your non consent then you assent, then it's ok to beat you up and detain you. It's a claim, if he says he doesn't recognise it you can say "Well sir you don't have to but are you claiming that an unrebutted affidavit doesn't stand as truth in commerce and are you claiming that I cannot get a Summary Judgment on the facts of my affidavit, and if not why not? What are you trying to hide and conceal? Am I not entitled to it? Even under your own legislation" Just hammer him. But go in prepared. Think the worst and get responses to it. If you are in court you really need to be prepared because they'll pull out every little trick they can.

Q…We asked "Can we question the Prosecutor?"
Judge said "No" What could we have said in reply?

A…I notice in the early days when I asked questions magistrates usually cut you off and say "We're not here to answer questions" My way around that is always to say "Sir before we began (rub your chin and show a bit of concern) I had a number of concerns about todays proceeding" They'll say "Well what are they?" They want to know and get them out of the road. "Well sir perhaps if I could just ask the Prosecutor s/he might clarify something for me" He said "Be my guest, let's get it out of the road" and then BANG. If he says "No you can ask me" That's fine I've had that happen, so you ask the Magistrate and he'll look at the Prosecutor and say "Well?' In other words 'answer the question' If he outright says "No" just wait a couple of statements or paragraphs in the court room and just off the cuff say "Sir why did your informant assault me when I asked him for his business card?" Before he gets a chance to answer the judge will say "Matter dismissed" to protect an informant because an answer would have meant that the Prosecutor would have concurred with you that the informant assaulted you. You've got to set them up really quickly with a little slip, a sneaky question that they won't have time to think about and they'll answer before they think about the repercussions of the answer. So you've got to try these little tricks because they're pretty sneaky in court too and they have full time experience, week after week after week and you're there for a few minutes, it's not a level playing field is it. I've only got a lot of experience because I've spent the time in court helping people.

Q…Judge asked "Do you want to ask the witness any questions about this matter?" What would have been the best answer to that?

A…Well the witness is usually the informant, so you can say “I’d love to cross examine the witness!” And then BANG you can ask him all the set up questions. In fact Your Honour would you mind putting them in the witness box, I’d love to cross examine them in the witness box” they might just risk impeaching themselves and they’ll think “Ooh ooh we’re not doing that” You really want them impeaching themselves.

Q…My friend received an infringement in the mail and it looks similar to a Powerbill with no court details at the top, is this a valid fine?

A…Well when you say ‘valid fine’ I would suggest that no fines are actually valid. How can they issue a fine, in other words you are guilty if there is no court order? Only a court can make a judgment in regards to an outstanding debt. A fine essentially is only an offer and you don’t have to accept it but the best way of dealing with it is either to pay or offer conditionally to pay, in other words ask set up questions. Say ‘I’m prepared to pay when I see evidence of authority jurisdiction eg when I see the signed contract with my signature disclosing that I consented to doing business with you then I’m prepared to pay” That’s a key one because it is simply an offer and a conditional acceptance is very honourable. They will need to provide the evidence. By doing a Conditional Acceptance it is essentially an estoppel. It may stop and it may not, they’re all probabilities, but at the end of the day they cannot proceed without providing evidence. You’re entitled to see the evidence and they don’t want to provide any evidence, why? Because there is none! There is no evidence, they’ll just try and railroad you but don’t get railroaded. If they try that trick you just dissolve them with a Statutory Demand for payment of debt, we’ve got the aces, not them.

Q…We said “We have an agreement with the witness”
Judge said “You got this affidavit with a jp in Winton, we don’t see this as relevant” or words to that effect. What would have been the best answer to this?

A…Well so blasted what, is he a JP or what and doesn’t an affidavit require a seal by a JP, could you identify the legislation that says it has to be from a JP that doesn’t reside in Winton and I’ll comply. Here in Australia we are supposed to use JPs within the State where you have the matter, but I’ve used Jps interstate and no-one has ever raised boo about it. If they say that’s an interstate JP well so what where’s the legislation that says I cannot use a JP from another State especially if I reside there. I’m not travelling there but I’m on the road, where’s the legislation, I need to see it” If they can’t produce it then obviously there is none it’s only a rule of thumb.

Q…Judge said you only got this into court three days ago and you didn’t enter it as evidence as two of the reasons the court would not recognise it, What could we have said in reply?

A…Did you file an affidavit with exhibits which are your evidence, if you did then that is a false claim. You need to say “Your Honour with respect did you not see the affidavit with the exhibited evidence?” He may be making the point the you are supposed to give your adversary 3 clear business days before the court hearing so if you file it within 72 hours of that’s deemed unfair on the respondent party and I use that with precision. The tax office and Banks have lawyers that often serve you as you are going up the steps to the court house or even in the court room. So before the court proceeds I say “Sir with respect I’ve just been served this affidavit outside/here in court right in front of you. I have not had the liberty of examining the affidavit and I’ve not had the courtesy of three clear days Notice so that I can provide a proper reply to it and rebut any facts on it that are appropriate to be rebutted and I’d suggest that we adjourn for a week to afford me opportunity to reply to it”. If he says “Oh I’ll adjourn it for two hours and you can have a read outside” “I’ll accept that Your Honour but if I read it outside and I think that it needs more thorough answers plus evidence to support the answers (which you can’t do in court) then when I come back in court I would say “Well I had a look at it sir however I cannot properly rebut all the facts without providing evidence and I don’t have the evidence here, I have the evidence elsewhere. So I’ll require an adjournment now so I can properly and appropriately rebut this affidavit and I do not consent to its filing to be submitted into the record today” Then they would adjourn it. You’ve got to do it in a logical and common sense manner. Its it is a very simple one that is just reiterated previous affidavits submitted I would just go in and say “Sir with respect there is nothing new in this affidavit so I don’t mind if it is filed or not as the assertions made have already

been rebutted in earlier affidavits. However sir if you want to rely on the maxim of law that an unrequited affidavit stands as truth in commerce then I'll need an adjournment today because I'll need to reply and answer to that affidavit and rebut the assertions made and therefore my affidavit will stand as truth in commerce. Or you have the option to not accept the submission of that affidavit" Rather than adjourn they'll just kick it out. It's a game of ping pong but you've got to know how to play it.

Q…If I am acting as an advocate for the woman in court and the judge asks for my name, how do I answer that to stay safe?

A…I would simply say "Look I answer to the name Morag of the Family Hill and that's it and then just get on quickly with the subject matter because he'll try to hang you up on the name and then stop you and get you caught up with the name. So don't get caught up with the name. Just say "I answer to that and I'm here to assist the court to resolve and settle this matter as quickly as possible, so that all parties are commercially whole" That'll get him off the track.

Q…What is a Judge Alone trial and is it a lawful form of court? This is the definition on Google Category 1 or 2 crimes: For less serious crimes, you have no option other than a judge-alone trial. Depending on the nature of the crime (offence), your case will be heard by either by a judge, justice of the peace or community magistrate. There will be no jury.

A…I've not heard of that I guess it means there is one judge. If means just one judge then it should be a lawful form of court. Australia and NZ are not under Monarchal rule because it's a democracy and all of the Cth of Aus and NZ we are operating in is a US Corporation we have no courts in these countries, they are illusions of courts they are tribunals that are privately owned. Even the High Court. There are no legitimate courts left in Aus and NZ so why would anyone expect to see integrity within a court? I'm not saying there aren't some judges that have more integrity than others because there are but not many.

Q..Should we ask, is this a court of record and if they say no, what is the best reply to that?

A…My understanding a court of record is the former Common Law Court and they don't usually say no. You could ask the question and they usually say "Well the recorder is over there" But that's not the answer to your question and thereupon is because if they answered yes then they have invoked a Common Law Court and then legislation is out the window so they won't say yes they'll just mislead you. So you've got to know when you re being mislead "Thank you for your answer sir, however that's not the answer to my question, maybe to some one else, I do see the recorder by the way. My question was for the second time is this a court of record?" If he says "Well what do you mean by that?" "Well is this not a Common Law Court?" Now you're going to start skidding on a banana skin because he might say "No this is a court of Summary Jurisdiction" where everybody is guilty until proven innocent, it's the reverse of the Common Law scenario. But this approach doesn't usually get settlement or solutions so I'd rather ask set up questions which can quickly come to a head and you're out of the court room again. In the old days we did ask those questions but it didn't really get us that far.

Q…Even though the woman said "I will pay any verified claims" The judge still charged the straw man with cultivation of marijuana and gave the straw man a $300 fine? Should we challenge that immediately in the court?

A…If he has made the judgment you would have to appeal it, if it was made in a magistrate's court the appeal would be made in the District Court which is the next higher level. I remember helping some people many years ago 2003 4 and 5 and some of these people were routinely targeted by police and I always got them off because I came back to "Can anyone here in this court room provide evidence of legislation that prohibits a man or woman growing whatever it is that they need for medicinal purposes?" The room would be silent. After three times I would say, "Look there's no -one that's objecting to it, I guess that we all have agreement that there is no legislation so when can we have the court order?" That worked, we got several people off using this approach. That's a really easy one to do when you know, but use your adversary as your second witness, if they don't answer then whose problem is that? If the judge is about to make an order for a penalty just say "Hang on Your Honour

with respect, I've only asked twice and both times they haven't answered so just give me one second, look for the third time has anyone here got evidence (and if the magistrate attempts to interrupt just wait, if he says 'You don't have to go there" which has happened to me, just wait until they take a breath and then say) you're right Your Honour I don't have to go there but I will. Is there any evidence here today that a wo/man cannot grow any food or medicinal crop that they need and is there any legislation that prohibits them from doing that?" After that the game is over, they'll throw it out. It can be easy to get waylaid by the magistrate so be aware of their tricks don't let them snare you. Don't focus on their bible just concentrate on your position and keep repeating it to get a result. You must get the third one across the line. If he says he's going to make a judgment you say "Your Honour no you're not with the utmost respect, the record shows now that there is an agreement now that there is no evidence of any legislation that says a wo/man cannot and is there anyone here that says nay friend here is not a wo/man?" The room will be deathly silent. So you ask three times and then say "Well we've got an agreement that she is a woman and there is no legislation that prohibits her from growing whatever she needs to look after her health, so are we done today?" If he still tries (and they never have not to that level) but if he tries and says "Well I'm still going to make that decision" "No you're not Your Honour and if you do believe me it will go to an appeal and it might not do your career a lot of good" Under appeals if a Judge's decision is appealed, sometimes it will stunt their career. It was an openly abusive decision it could actually terminate their career and they're not about to jeopardise that I can assure you of that. They don't like appeals.

Q…No plea had been entered and yet they still tried the straw man should we have said the court was not following proper procedure and adjourned or something else?

A…They couldn't make a judgement unless the Magistrate entered a plea on behalf, therefore he is liable for the debt. If the judgement was made and the 'offender' didn't enter a plea, then the magistrate must have as you cannot go to judgement without a plea having been entered in a criminal sense, there's no pleading in a civil matter, it is being decided in a civil matter whether the claim outstanding is valid or not. If there wasn't a plea you would say "Hang on Your Honour how is it you can make an order or a judgement without a plea being entered? Or have you entered the plea and if you have entered the plea, that's ok we don't mind that but I guess you'd be liable for the statement of account that comes out through the order wouldn't you? Because I'm only here as beneficiary, I'm not Trustee, somebody else here must be trustee and who has to pay the debt, it's the Trustee isn't it. Is there anyone here who is claiming it's not the Trustee who pays the debt for an account against the State?" The room will be silent then, because of course it's the Trustee's role and if you're not the Trustee then wipe your hands, you've got nothing left to do the trustee will take care of it.

Q…What if the judge says you can't ask questions about the agreement created by your three step process and affidavits and only about the charges they are trying to stick on your straw man?

A.."Sir with respect aren't you supposed to be impartial? Do you have bias here for the plaintiff today, do you?" And just cock your ear and wait for a reply. Stick it in his ribs but do it respectfully and humbly "Sit I though judicial bias wasn't permitted, it seems that there's bias going on in this courtroom. So if you are prohibiting me from speaking I guess we're finished, I guess you're takin over the case now, in which case there is a liability on some one else other than me" Don't say it is on them because you'll probably get a contempt order or they might get security on to you, but you can say "Well if I'm not permitted to speak I guess I have no interest in this matter any longer , Somebody else has the interest and the liability are we done?" "Oh no we're not done" "Oh well didn't you just deny me the ability to ask questions, well I guess I'm done and I guess some one else has to assume the liability, the Trustee maybe and by the way for the record I am here only as the Beneficiary and the General Executor and as general Executor isn't the role of the Trustee to settle the matter or otherwise they'll be negligent and maybe in breach of Trust duties?" Don't look at the Magistrate when you say that though. They start to shudder and shake, but maybe look at the Prosecutor because they are the co- Trustee. It's good game when you know how to play it and there is no room for fear because what you are doing is using their law against them. Nothing wrong with that.Judge '"You can't ask questions" You "Oh can't ask questions? (look thoughtful) Hmmm (look all around) Your Honour what time is it right now?" "Oh it's ten o'clock" "You just answered a question. Oh well… (proceed to ask more questions)" You know you can play any game you like, you've just got to be creative.

Q… The judge said NZ law applies to Men and Women and everyone, what could have been our answer to that?

A…No no no it's either Men and Women or everyone, because men and women aren't everyone. You could say "Well Your Honour that sounds like a claim to me, could you provide some examples, I'd like to see some examples of legislation that applies to a man or a woman, could you present it for us please and I mean now, not next year, with respect of course" Whenever you hear a claim pull them up. I love claims in fact if I don't hear them make a claim I'll try to trip them up to make a claim because I want them t be in a position where the burden of proof is on them and they are then required to provide evidence but if they don't make a claim they have got nothing to prove. You need them to make a claim so they cannot prove it, they can't prove anything unless they have the evidence for it.

Q…When the judge asked the cop if he received the three Notices and he said "Yes" should we have said something to that?

A…You could have said "He received the three Notices, did you reply to any of them" If they stay silent ccv your ear again and say "Didn't hear ya! Your Honour just take note, did you for the second time did you reply to any of those three Notices now that you have confessed to receiving them? (Cock your ear) Cat got your tongue has it? No no don't look at the back wall the answer is not on the back wall and it's not on your shoe either you can look up and look at me, now for the third time, I'm gonna give you three seconds now did you reply to any of those three Notices? One, two, two and a half (look around) two and three quarters. Three! Your honour we have an agreement, he's got n case to answer when can we have the court order?" BANG it's finished BANG it's that quick but don't make any claims you want the judge or the prosecutor or the informant to make all of the claims then you have got something to get them on.

Q…What if the judge gives a huge fine or tries to impose a jail term?

A… Why would anyone accept a jail term??? That's only an offer you know. Judge "Well we're going to make an order here for 10 years jail" "Sorry sir I don't accept that " Honestly I've done it although not on that sort of matter. Judge said "It's going to be $1,100 dollars" I said "No I don't consent to that one sir" He said "Oh oh aah how about $500?" I said "Well no it's a bit steep for me" "Well what about a good behaviour bond?" "Yeah I'm a good fella, that'll do" You know you can negotiate, it's only an offer.

Q…If we are in court and the judge is making statements that we know are not true, do we get into discussion with him is this the best remedy or will it be seen as arguing?

A…Nope never ever entertain discussion. When you hear a claim say "oh sir that's an interesting comment um with respect, do you have any evidence for that? I'm curious" Just do it once and politely and they'll be in shock because no one pull him up on a furfy. I do, and maybe a few others now too. Don't let them get away with it just pull them up politely and diplomatically" If he says "I don't have to answer that" "Well your Honour that's true but I take it by your refusal, you just told me a porky didn't you (with a smile on your face)' They'll just have a giggle because you're not coming down on them like a ton of bricks. When I went into Benleigh after three years of being away from the court the

security guard said “Mr pytelleck I haven’t seen you for a while” with a big smile. Then in the court the Magistrate waved and said Mr Pyt… (they don’t know what to call me) we haven’t seen you for a while how come you’re here today?” (With a smile) I said “Well (smiling) he needs a bit of a hand. (in a conspiratorial sort of way) Is a man the same thing as a person Your Honour?’ He beamed at me, they love it, it’s flipping game, and I’m not gonna go hard after them, just have fun with it. That comes with a bit of experience. It can be intimidating at first but if you can learn from the experiences here and just treat it lightly you’ll get a much better and quicker result.

Q…Is it ok when the judge says he wants to adjourn to read your affidavit or do we need to object in some way to that as he should have read it when the court received it?

A…No let them adjourn and read it. He’s only asking to read it to ring higher up to get instructions as to how to handle your case. They don’t often read anything before the proceeding as they don’t have time. It’s very common.

Q..What are good questions to ask police if they are on the stand acting as informants?

A…Do you have any evidence that I’m not a wo/man? If the judge intervenes you say didn’t you direct me to ask and now you’re ordering him not to answer, isn’t that deliberately creating a controversy where none exists? Ask Prosecutor Is it an offence to ask your informant to identify his authority and why did they assault me as soon as I asked the question? Judge Dismissed!!! The judge will get rid of you because the answer will convict them

Q…The fine was given for cultivation of marijuana and the fine was $480 all up. They sent the fine by Notice. My friend is thinking of appealing as she had three affidavits one for lockdown/claim of right one for the court case plus three notices to create an agreement with the cops over faulty court documents and a final affidavit outlining everything she had done with evidence exhibited. The judge ignored all that and issued a fine. What is the most important thing to take to court for an appeal? She asked for a court transcript and they had changed things and left things out of it, so without evidence of what really happened in court is it worth appealing? She has been sending back the unopened fine with ‘Incorrectly addressed I am the beneficiary of this estate Please send to the Trustee’

A…The cops would set some one up I know by planting evidence on her I would ask “are we in agreement that my friend here is a wo/man? Is there any statute act or legislation that applies to a wo/man? Has anyone got any evidence that the Creator did not put those plants for the benefit and use of mankind? Oh so there is none (it gets thrown out).

Q..The cops seized my friend’s property (her cellphone with evidence that will hold them to account) and she sent a demand notice and also included demanding her property back in her three step notice but they are not giving it back and just ignoring her. What does she need to do now?

A..Write to the Attorney General and say do you condone your underlings behaviour etc listen to man a webinar 19 Oct

Q...I had my court appearance today.
I went for the ” best script ” stating that I did not consent to the proceeding (I read the none consent notice). The judge cut me off and offered bail. I mentioned again that I do not consent to do business etc. Then he said we don’t need your consent. I replied does a man not

have the right to give his non consent to do business? He did not answer so I repeated 3 times. After the third time I stated that we have agreement now that a man can give his non consent to do business. I got immediately arrested. The officers told me I would have to be in jail until next hearing which would be January. I would not be allowed out for the appearance this would be done through a webcam. A few hours later the police officer came back and said that the judge decided to let me out on bail if I signed the bail and agreed to appear in January again. I don't understand why this happened. I was respectful stuck to the script and it seems they ignored everything. It's if I had no rights. Not sure where to go from here and how this was possible?

A...They put you in jail to get your consent and they just hoped you wouldn't know how to do a Writ of Habeas Corpus for wrongful imprisonment. Then they were able to coerce you into agreeing to their terms by threatening to keep you in jail. They can't keep you for any longer than 24 hours without a valid charge. They did that to a friend of mine as well. Because they are pirates they use dishonest tactics and then say to themselves 'Ignorance of the law is no excuse'. So they blame you for not knowing what to do when they carry out these coercive tactics. Congratulate yourself for going into the lion's den. We never win the first time in court if that is of any comfort to you. However what has happened to you can serve as a warning to others to be prepared for the court to use this tactic and to have the correct response/paperwork ready and waiting.