**the truth shall set you free**

**Anything written herein is what I would do/have done, not what I am recommending others to do, the following is for educational and entertainment purposes only, and I am not offering legal advice. When the word “you” is used in the following, it is to be construed as meaning what I would do.**

I have been fortunate enough to listen to a man referred to as “Law Conniseur” where he gives a successful interpretation and synopsis of the application of remedy for ANY statutory charge which has not followed due process in the creation of that statute. Historically when we ask for a paper trail to establish the authority of any office or law we call it a “Notice Quo Warranto“.

**The following material has been successfully used by a number of parties across Australia, BUT it should work in any country that the British Commonwealth has previously taken the time and effort to invade.**

This approach removes our need to worry about the “joinder issues” related to the name, as it only relies on refusing to yield to their jurisdiction by not making a plea, UNTIL they fully satisfy the process of discovery.

Throughout this discourse I refer to a “Notice for Discovery”, but that has many names, including a “Notice to Admit documents”, also a “Notice to Produce documents” and also a “Subpoena of Documents” if it is a ‘criminal’ matter.

An important element of this approach relates to the fact that we are able to claim to be subjects of the Queen of the United Kingdom, because at some point they settled here. If it is to be queried as to how we could be subjects of the Queen of the United Kingdom, then we refer them to section 117 of the Constitution, which does not allow any discrimination and as such by referring to us as anything other than a subject under the Queen of the United Kingdom, then it is a clear breach of that section.

**COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA CONSTITUTION ACT - SECT 117**

**Rights of residents in States**

                   A subject of the Queen, resident in any State, shall not be subject in any other State to any disability or discrimination which would not be equally applicable to him if he were a subject of the Queen resident in such other State.

**It is difficult to envisage the attitude and knowledge of those who will eventually read this process, but essentially very little knowledge outside of it will be required to successfully implement it. (do not try and make sense of any of the dates in the attachments, I just had to make them generic so I used random dates)**

**At the very core of this approach is that for a law to be valid, it must have passed due process as described in the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Australia. For those who are unaware, “lawful” and “legal” are two very different concepts, and this approach explores that fact. If the statute has not been passed lawfully, then it holds no authority, so the question to consider then is “why do unlawful legal statutes exist, and why is it that they hold no authority?”**

**The only real limits to using this process is the natural law of “do no harm”. If you injure someone, then this concept is not likely to work, and basically that is because injuries are usually dealt with under “common law jurisdiction”, which are likely to have been properly created prior to the current body politic attempting to impose “admiralty/quasi-admiralty (statute) jurisdiction” upon the people.**

**This process is really geared toward the corporate overstepping of power against the individual, this process gives empowerment to the little guy. It is excellently placed to help to block the tyranny against activism offenses, health practitioners causing no harm, mortgage defaulters, any style of injury free traffic offence, council rates, parking fines, travelling without a ticket on public transport, fracking amongst other things… we used it on a low end speeding fine, and it was a pleasure to watch the magistrate squirm before she dismissed the matter.**

**I would make a point of saying that we DO NO TAKE any form of “Brief of Evidence” as that will make it look like you intend to defend the matter, because after reading through this you will realise that you are only questioning whether the alleged statute has authority and not putting any effort into “defending it”.**

24. “Proclamation.”

A royal proclamation is a formal announcement of an executive Act; such as a summons to or dissolution or prorogation of Parliament; a declaration of peace or war; an admonition to the people to keep the law or a notification of enforcement of the provisions of a statute, the operation of which is left to the discretion of the Queen in Council. The object of a royal proclamation is only to make known the existing law or declare its enforcement; it can neither make or unmake the law. (Ex p. Chavasse, reGrazebrook, 34 L. J. Bk., 17.) A proclamation is a resolution of the Queen in Council, which means the Cabinet. The document by which it is promulgated passes under the Great Seal. (Anson, Law and Custom of the Constitution, Vol. II., p.45.) It is announced through the official Government Gazette. The proclamation referred to in this clause is one which it is in the discretion of the Queen, acting on constitutional advice, to issue subject only to the condition that the date fixed therein must be not later than one year after the passing of the Act.

http://setis.library.usyd.edu.au/ozlit/pdf/fed0014.pdf

Law Conniseur: Okay, lets have a look at these “notices for discovery”, they have been getting put out around Australia, and they are having an impact. What we are using here in Victoria is a Form 29a. For those of us who are unaware of the court process, on the first occasion at court it will be a mention hearing, where they will ask one to plead; with the three choices being guilty/not guilty/no-plea.

Okay, so what does “no plea” tell us?

Other: you are not giving anyone jurisdiction over you

Law Conniseur: bingo! So you are challenging them, you are saying that you need to be absolutely sure that the forum that I have been invited to has jurisdiction, that it has authority. The key word is authority. How do we question that from the beginning? We in put a no-plea.

Other: excuse me Law Conniseur, we wouldn’t be putting in a notice for defence would we? Because that would give them jurisdiction wouldn’t it?

Law Conniseur: you will find at a mention hearing it will be to establish a plea, that is all that they are interested in. **If** one went in and accepted their jurisdiction because one wanted to challenge them one would be pleading not guilty, *and then* one would need a notice of defence.

Okay, so when I make no plea, I need to add a Notice for Discovery. The form that we have used in Victoria are magistrates general civil procedure rules 2010 form 29a.

**editors notes:** **as you will see, it really doesn’t matter if you use their form or not, I am of the opinion that we are better off making our own with the information that they use on their form. Why use their forms and potentially give them jurisdiction? The counter argument is that promulgation is a constitutional requirement and because they can’t satisfy that basic requirement, the question of whether we grant any jurisdiction by using their forms is irrelevant.**

Law Conniseur: In that Notice for Discovery we ask for a certified copy of the certificate of proclamation of any alleged statute that they intend to rely upon, **and** a certified copy of the certificate of proclamation of any alleged statute that they claim gives them exemption from providing it, **and** a certified copy of the certificate of proclamation of any alleged amendment(s) to any of those alleged statute(s) relied upon.

You need them to show you a certified copy of what they say is the original certificate of proclamation relating to the particular act that they are relying upon. It should be sitting in the Governors office or the attorney generals office, all you want is a certified copy of it.

**Laws in this country must follow a certain type of process to become a law that has authority.**

If you go to any law, say on <http://www.austlii.edu.au> and in the first four sections you should see the section titled “commencement”, and in that section it should state the day and date that it comes into full force and effect.

**If you were to look up the act and there is no specific date of commencement, then it has no authority, and no penalty under it can be applied to you.**

So you serve your notice of discovery via registered post and normal confirmation of delivery onto the man/woman prosecuting the matter; you could also email the clerk of the court a copy of the notice for discovery as evidence and ask that it be printed and put into the file, so that they are a witness to the start of the 28 day period to satisfy it.

Occasionally we have run into them saying that we cannot use the form 29a as this particular matter is criminal and that form is for civil matters, and that we have the wrong paperwork, (and this goes toward to the earlier editors note), so we say to them, sorry but it doesn’t matter, I am challenging the authority of the law that you rely upon and until such time that I can see that authority I am not going to give it any weight at all. Because currently it is neither civil or criminal or summary or whatever, as it has yet to be shown as having any authority. The paperwork that we put in is simply to ask the question of whether the authority exists.

There are two high court cases that back this up and mandatory judicial notice should be taken of two High Court matters that validate the requirement for the prosecution to completely satisfy the Notice for Discovery, with those matters being : - the Amalgamated Society of Engineers v Adelaide Steamship Co Ltd (1920) 28 CLR129 as determined on 31 August 1920 and, The First Uniform Tax Case South Australia v Commonwealth (1942) 65 CLR 373 (anyone who makes a claim must prove the lawfulness of that claim).

The first case has been very high cited since 1920. The second case was in relation to South Australia which was trying to impose taxation and the High Court reminded them of the first case mentioned here which basically said a law is to be considered no law at all until it can show its authority. It must have authority before you can consent to it at all, because they basically relying on you to give consent in order for them to then impose a penalty or say that you are then in breach of an alleged law. So you ask them to show the authority.

We had a case under the fisheries act and sent them in a Notice for Discovery and got a reply back where they said, “we don’t recognise this form”, BUT, they then went into a dialogue where they said that the certificate of proclamation was covered under section 122 of our act which says “you’re to accept the authority as given as drafted in the government gazette”. (the government gazette being little more than the government newspaper).

It’s a manoeuvre from them to try them to get us to consent to their authority, and we do not accept that because UNTIL a law has been shown to have authority then they cannot claim that there has been any breach in relation to that statute or part of that statute.

**editors notes: In any case, in the Notice for Discovery we ask for a “certified copy of the certificate of proclamation for ANY statute, or amendment to statute, upon which they intend to rely”. Effectively meaning, “okay, all good, you guys have a sub-rule to say that it is not required, just show** **us that that particular statute has any authority by proving that it’s been properly promulgated” or we are unable to accept that it has any authority.**

Law Conniseur: Then they may try to use another excuse not to prove their authority by claiming that “for anything to be certified by the Secretary of State is also deemed to be unnecessary”; **again, the question remains, “By what authority do you make that claim??”**

**editors notes: the secretary of state is usually the chief justice or lieutenant governor of the state.**

Other: Law Conniseur, one of the things that we have been asking for is the Head of Power, which they struggle to come up with.

Law Conniseur: The Head of Power is the one would give the proclamation certificate, and what we are asking in a formal way is for that authority. When the executive assents how do they do it? It’s called the proclamation certificate. So that is how you and I can tell if the law has proper assent. So then the Secretary of the State, which is effectively the CEO, the chief administrator, is taking FULL responsibility by certifying that this is the true and original copy of the assent given for that law.

Other: Does the state mean state like new south wales, or state like federal?

Law Conniseur: The states are states, and so is the commonwealth, it is also a state. You would ask the commonwealth Secretary of State for a federal matter, and the state Secretary of State for a state matter.

Other: The “Secretary of State” would be the current state Governor wouldn’t it?

Law Conniseur: No, the Governor signs the original certificate, and is separate from the Secretary of State. What the Secretary of State should be doing is going down to the attorney generals department to get the file that shows this (fisheries/road safety/etc) act has been proclaimed on a certain day of a certain year. The commencement clause or section of that act should state that this statute comes into effect on the date shown on the proclamation certificate. Once they can show that, then you have a law with authority because you can see that the proper due process has been followed.

So when we come to being charged under a specific statute, the first thing we do is go to that statute and we look for its day and year of commencement.

**editors notes:** **If it states anything other than a specific day and date of commencement, then it has it has not received a certificate of proclamation.** **Also, it is very important to remember that EVERY original alleged statute AND ALL SUBSEQUENT AMENDMENTS to that alleged statute need to have a proclamation certificate, or it has NO AUTHORITY.**

Other: Is there a time period for when statute is unlikely to have received proper promulgation?

Law Conniseur: Nothing is likely to have proper assent since 1973.

**editors notes: likely mid 1973 at the federal level, late 1986 (after the Australia act) at the state level.**

Law Conniseur: The court can’t proceed until the Notice for Discovery and inspection of documents has been satisfied. Okay, they will try to claim “The production of a copy of the government gazette containing any matters required by this act required to be published in the government gazette is conclusive evidence of the matter specified therein.” **What a load of rubbish**. “And the production of a certificate purporting to be signed by the secretary stating that any incorporated document, or any amendment to an incorporated document was available for inspection is evidence of the facts stated in the absence of evidence to the contrary.”

**editors notes: if we go to the time and effort of asking for a freedom of information request for the certificate of proclamation, it could be seen as us mounting a defence, and thereby giving jurisdiction. If we had done so, and then we were to put the proof of the non-existence of that certificate of proclamation into the matter, then likely we would have entered into the argument, thereby yielding jurisdiction. Although it is not required reading attached is further information about the concept of questioning jurisdiction (specifically bare protests) as “1967 – Appearing under Protest to the Jurisdiction of a Foreign Court”.**

Other: The fact that that is even there is a red flag isn’t it?

Law Conniseur: BIG TIME. They NEED to provide the proclamation certificate relating to any particular law they rely upon. The Notice of Discovery actually has within it a prevention of the matter to go forward, it’s a form of estoppel. It’s a BRILLIANT form of estoppel, and they will seek our consent with respect to whether we accept the ‘rules/objections’ that they are likely to make as discussed above, or whether we stand firm and insist on seeing that proclamation certificate.

Other: so basically if we accept the rules/objections that they make, then it’s game over for us because we have consented to their authority?

Law Conniseur: EXACTLY, or they might use their uniforms or whatever they have to intimidate us. So, just to consolidate the obligation of whoever the governor or governor general is, where are their obligations? What restricts them with respect to signing a law off as a law?

Other: Do they have restrictions do they?

Law Conniseur: Well, can anyone tell me the section that we are about to go to?

Other: Section 58?

Law Conniseur: BINGO! There it is, and where are the key words?

Other: Subject to this constitution?

Law Conniseur: Yep, subject to this constitution.

Other: Including Section 128.

Law Conniseur: Yep. This is where the best foundation to work off is first and foremost to understand where the obligations of those in any administrative body that exists within the state or the commonwealth lie. When it says “subject to”, we must immediately take our minds to the restrictions that have been put in place by the law, and the laws of England teach us that, and we see that reflected in the constitution. The most powerful section with respect to what is actually taking place around us today is section 71. It is one of the most powerful sections that exist here in law in Australia, or anywhere in the world. So the judicial power of the Commonwealth shall be vested in the Federal Supreme court, to be also known the High Court of Australia and in such other Federal courts that the parliament creates, and in such other courts that it invests with Federal jurisdiction. Courts and only courts can deal with any form of penalty, fine, forfeiture, or loss of property. An infringement notice is a perfect example of a breach of section 71. So when we see a law of a state that empowers a department to issue a fine or a penalty, then it is to be considered as no law at all. So that if a governor has signed off on that, then the next question you would ask is “By what authority is that governor relying upon to bring assent to that law?” So then we ask that governor whether they have taken the prescribed oath. Where do we find that oath? In the **Bill of Rights 1689**, subsection 3 of 13. THAT IS THE ONLY OATH THAT A MEMBER OF THE EXECUTIVE CAN TAKE. THAT IS IT. They cannot make up another oath (which they HAVE unlawfully done) and then say “we have taken our oath”. Sorry guys, but there is ONLY ONE OATH, and that oath is VERY SPECIFIC.

**III     New oaths of allegiance**

“And that the oaths hereafter mentioned be taken by all persons to whom the oaths of allegiance and supremacy might be required by law instead of them and that the said oaths of allegiance and supremacy be abrogated.

I, A B, do sincerely promise and swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to their Majesties King William and Queen Mary.

So help me God.

I, A B, do swear that I do from my heart abhor, detest and abjure as impious and heretical this damnable doctrine and position that princes excommunicated or deprived by the Pope or any authority of the see of Rome may be deposed or murdered by their subjects or any other whatsoever.

**And I do declare that no foreign prince, person, prelate, state or potentate has or ought to have any jurisdiction, power, superiority, pre-eminence or authority, ecclesiastical or spiritual, within this realm.**

**So help me God.** “

http://www.austlii.edu.au/au/legis/act/consol\_act/bor16881wams2c2306/s13.html

Other: How are we able to enforce that? How are we able to say “You can’t take another oath”

Law Conniseur: It’s a wonderful thing the Notice for Discovery!

Other: (much laughter)

Law Conniseur: When you have absorbed what I have been saying, and you put that into that notice, then you have built a mountain. They CANNOT strike that out, UNLESS, and there is ONE clause within the rules that says that “the court MAY strike that application out”. YES, of course they will strike it out if it is vexatious and frivolous and silly, BUT when you are asking for the authority of the law which the High Court grants you the ability to do, then ANY court that attempts to strike that notice out is in breach of the law. We have to stand firm around this notice for discovery. Regardless of whether it is in civil or criminal, it doesn’t matter, because both those jurisdictions come under common law; AND common law is to govern. And that section is the Judiciary Act 1903, section 80, which brings in civil and criminal matters, with common law to govern, so it doesn’t matter. Because the buggers have removed that notice for discovery out of the criminal jurisdiction, then because it’s there in civil, we maintain that mantra. We look to that notice as a form of estoppel. It prevents the prosecutor and court from moving towards convicting you until they have shown their authority.

Other: so they are buggered.

Law Conniseur: they are buggered, but you need to be aware of the above, because you may get a smart alec magistrate saying “oh yeah, where do you get that ability from?” Well, there it is as written above.

Other: Have you had any trouble getting a notice for discovery from the magistrates court at all?

Law Conniseur: No, I just download it straight off the austlii.com website. It’s under that magistrates general civil procedure rules, it’s there, just copy and paste it into a word document, put your requirements into it, serve it on them, and then they have 28 days to respond. Okay so if the court case comes up in between that time you just seek an adjournment until such time that the prosecutor can provide the documents that you have asked for.

**editors note: I am uncertain about whether we should use their form for fear of granting some form of jurisdiction, so we made our own providing the information as required on their form, concept as attached.**

Other: What happens if they don’t? What happens if they make a plea on your behalf?

Law Conniseur: Then they have just erred in law, and they have to give an excuse for doing that, because then it falls under “the Perversion of the Judicial Power”, with a potential penalty of ten years in gaol.

Other: (much laughter)

Law Conniseur: As part of that notice you might ask them if this act is reliant upon the “Queen of Australia”, and if so, where did that entity come from?

Other: Who does the prosecutor have to provide an answer to the notice for discovery to? To the court?

Law Conniseur: To you.

Other: **we are currently having troubles with one court matter as they are saying that the form is civil, not criminal.**

Law Conniseur: **IT does not matter whether it is civil or criminal, because UNTIL they have shown that it has authority, then it is no law at all. It has no classification, because it cannot exist here in Australia at all.** That is where you focus. And if they haven’t satisfied that notice, then the application in front of the court is for a further adjournment on the basis that the prosecutor fulfil the requirements of the notice. Until that notice is fulfilled, then they cannot move forward with that case whatsoever. **If you accept “well okay show me the form in the summary jurisdiction that they are claiming” and then they say “oh there is none”, well then you have just consented to their authority and they can and will prosecute and penalise you to the full extent of the legal system. We really have to stand firm behind what this notice can do for us.**

**editors notes: okay, an application for a court matter to begin is called an “originating application”, once a matter is running an “interlocutory application” is used to petition the court for whatever desired outcome.**

**After the prosecution has had the full 28 days to satisfy the notice for discovery and has failed to do so, one might allow them another 28 days to do so. Once the prosecution has failed to satisfy the notice then a notice of default can issue, concept as attached. Then an “interlocutory application” could be filed to have the matter struck out prior to the next hearing/mention date, concept as attached. It also requires an affidavit in support, concept as attached. You could also include a copy of the notice of default, concept as attached.**

**The other value in attempting to disrupt their process for a petitioned earlier end to the matter is that you get the opportunity to put the information relating to the two High Court cases into a written format in the file and simply refer to them when in court, rather than having to introduce them. It really puts the magistrate on notice that this will go for judicial review if they do not help close the matter out. That means they will push very hard on the final hearing of the matter to convince you to participate, but if you remain firm then they will yield before your smiling eyes.**

**some ideas that one might use in court to help keep it on track for this style of approach is also attached for your consideration (less than two pages, large font).**

Other: would you ask for an adjournment, or would you be better off asking for the matter to be dismissed?

Law Conniseur: well until you put to them what we have discussed, then they might not understand this, so you give them that opportunity. If after going through the process as discussed and they have still failed to satisfy the notice, and the court backs up the prosecutor stating that they do not need to satisfy the notice, then you would orally state that “until that notice has been satisfied, then you do not consider it a law at all”, and so then your application would be, “on the record to have the prosecutions case TO BE STRUCK OFF as being vexatious, frivolous, misconceived, (and the key words are) **AN ABUSE OF PROCESS**”. I think that’s rule 9 of the magistrates courts rules. You are simply asking for the authority that the law relies upon. Via this process, there is an objection you have put forward onto the record of the court that there is no consent. BECAUSE IT’S SUMMARY, when you look at the original meaning of “summary jurisdiction”, it clearly says that a matter that is labelled summary requires the consent of both parties, when consent is **removed** by one of those parties they cannot proceed with a conviction. If they insist on moving forward, you ask for an adjournment, because the court is now on judicial review, then you take them up to the Supreme Court for abusing due process on judicial review. Not only can we keep the courts in line with a judicial review, but you are able to challenge any law under judicial review, so it has two prongs.

Other: would you need to wait for them to trigger the judicial review?

Law Conniseur: NO, you trigger it. You put it on the record, you *could* walk out of the court room after establishing no consent, AND you state that you require a copy of the transcript, because you need a copy of the court proceedings to do a judicial review. **They HAVE TO PROVIDE THE TRANSCRIPT, OTHERWISE IT IS NOT A COURT OF RECORD and failure to provide a copy of the transcript is itself grounds for a judicial review.** All courts within the commonwealth are courts of record.

If they do eventually put in front of you the supposed correct paperwork with a seal on it, then as part of that notice then we are putting in that “I want to see a copy of the oath of the governor/governor general who signed it”.

It should be :

Imperial acts application act 1980 – Sect 8, part 13 subsection 3

http://www.austlii.edu.au/au/legis/vic/consol\_act/iaaa1980240/s8.html

**editors notes: this is the Victorian legislation, but within the attached notices there is legislative support (section 117 of the constitution, as attached) to essentially show that any state may be compelled to use the legislation of any other state without disadvantage to the subject of the Queen of the UK; this really is the nth degree in this approach and is unlikely to be encountered, it is more to show how solid and enforceable this approach is all the way up the chain of evidence.**

  “3.     And that the oaths hereafter mentioned be taken by all persons of whom the oaths of allegiance and supremacy might be required by law, instead of them; and that the said oaths of allegiance and supremacy be abrogated.

        I A.B. do sincerely promise and swear, That I will be faithful, and bear true allegiance, to their Majesties King William and Queen Mary.

        So help me God.

        I A.B. do swear, That I do from my heart abhor, detest, and abjure as impious and heretical, that damnable doctrine and position, That princes excommunicated or deprived by the pope, or any authority of the see of Rome, may be deposed or murdered by their subjects, or any other whatsoever. And I do declare, That no foreign prince, person, prelate, state, or potentate hath, or ought to have any jurisdiction, power superiority, pre-eminence, or authority ecclesiastical or spiritual, within this realm.

        So help me God. “

Law Conniseur: How could a governor sign off to a law that allows those basic requirements under the commonwealth to be broken unless he has an allegiance to that foreign power? Now if he hasn’t taken this oath, then he is obviously working for the foreign power, which is the pope and the holy see of rome and that is HIGH TREASON! So we are working our way to this point where the governor is looking at LIFE IN PRISON for signing off to a law that has not been properly promulgated.

Other: does the governor know this?

Law Conniseur: That’s not our problem.

Other: (much laughter)

Law Conniseur: Actually that is a good point, they have got a point in law that gives them a ‘sort of immunity’ which basically comes back to forgiveness. Sooo, can we forgive them for their trespass?

Other: No, no way/yes/nup/no way/yes, sadly I would forgive them/no chance

**editors notes: NO, they do it intentionally and knowingly and voluntarily, hold their feet to the fire and send them to gaol if they transgress the law**

Other: I would like to make a point that we all shouldn’t be feeding these matters our energy. We should not be bothering to attend these matters and should simply be at home sending out notices, back and forth, and not show up at all in court until they establish their authority.

Law Conniseur: No, no, because they will bring a ruling, and next thing there will be a knock on the door or the house will be auctioned away from them. We have to make a stand in their courts. We’ve got no choice, BECAUSE this system is soooo corrupt within itself, that those within the system look to the courts for their guidance; coppers do, the sheriffs do. So go in and stand firm behind your paperwork knowing the strength that it has.

**editors notes: I see the value in both comments. Pretty much as soon as you receive the offer you should send out the Notice for Discovery to the prosecutor, registered post with confirmation of delivery; if this is done quickly after receiving the ticket (offer) it is likely that the prosecution will not have satisfied the notice before the initial mention. So that the day before the first appearance we are simply emailing in to the clerk of the court and stating that we cannot attend court the next day, and as we cannot make a plea because the prosecution has not yet satisfied the Notice for Discovery, then the prosecution will need to seek an adjournment to a later date. We state that we are happy to allow for the prosecution to have an adjournment to satisfy the Notice, but should they fail to do so at the next hearing, then this matter should be struck out immediately at that next hearing. We ask the clerk to print out the email and place it into the file, and we state that we intend to rely on it as evidence, if so required. They aren’t likely to satisfy the Notice ever, and so that would allow you to reasonably petition the court to have the matter struck out, as was part of your conditional agreement to the prosecution for being granted an adjournment (this is not the focus of the general approach being discussed here, but it lets you have another line of attack to force an ending of the matter, because the adjournment was agreed by the parties contingent upon the satisfaction of the notice for discovery)**

Law Conniseur: Coke said this, all of these books of authority on English law, Halsbury law said it, all the authoritative books have talked about the process of how a law is made and if it has not followed that due process, and has any kinks in it then it is without authority and it is not a law at all. The system has continually misbehaved over hundreds of years, and have abused this process. We can’t even taken it for granted that Austlii has provided the precise version as it was assented to, we can’t accept anything as law until we see that it has been validated and we want a certified copy of it, so the obligation is not only on the secretary of the state of Victoria, but also the commonwealth secretary. We could actually take this even higher, by insisting that the secretary of westminster of the United Kingdom also takes responsibility and says “yes, I’m going to certify a certificate of proclamation exists for this law”.

Other: what does an original copy of a proclamation certificate look like?

Law Conniseur: an example is in the quick and garran.

Editors notes: best of luck people, but if you follow this process, we will correct the endemic corruption within our commercial-legal system. **It’s up to you, do you like living a life of servitude, or does the current system as it has evolved need correction and if so, will you participate in ensuring that happens?**